

Locality and roots
Heidi Harley, University of Arizona

Roots can have various idiosyncratic properties conditioned by other properties of the morphosyntactic environment in which they find themselves, both interpretive and phonological. There are strong hypotheses about whether there is a principled characterization of possible conditioning domains for such properties, for both semantic (Arad 2000, Marantz 2001) and morphophonological (Embick 2008) such properties. In this talk, I consider examples of each type, arguing against the strongest version of the locality hypothesis for semantic conditioning, and exhibiting a case of a fairly local domain for morphophonological conditioning. Along the way I consider passivizable and non-passivizable idioms, root suppletion, and the syntactic individuation of roots.

In the first part of the talk, I discuss domains of idiomatic interpretation, (joint work with Arizona graduate student Megan Stone). We have identified several counterexamples to the claim that the meaning determined for a root by its combination with the first categorizing node must appear deterministically in combinations with further categorizing nodes; examples such as *classifieds* and *editorial* (n), where the meanings of *classify* and *editor* do not seem to be compositionally involved in the meanings of the forms derived from them. We then go on to consider what kinds of contexts *can* condition special root meanings, pursuing the thesis of Marantz 1984, 1997 and subsequent work that external arguments cannot participate in such conditioning. The heads (like Voice) which select these arguments, however, *can* be conditioners, which allows a syntactic characterization of the passivizable/non-passivizable distinction. We also provide counterexamples to Nunberg, Sag and Wasow's contention that passivizability is dependent on the compositional mapping of subparts of idioms to subparts of their conceptual structure.

In the second part, I discuss the phenomenon of root suppletion in Hiaki, a Uto-Aztecan language of Sonora and Arizona. Like many Uto-Aztecan languages, Hiaki exhibits root suppletion in 10-12 verbs, conditioned by number—there are distinct roots for singular and plural. Intransitive suppletive roots are sensitive to the number of their subject, but transitive suppletive roots are conditioned by the number of their object. This ergative pattern of root competition makes sense in a cyclic, bottom-up theory of spell-out only if the intransitive roots are unaccusative, but many of them have meanings typical of unergative verbs in English (*walk*, *run*, etc.) Assuming the syntactic account of applicativization proposed by Marantz 1991, McGinnis 1997, Pytkkanen 2002, inter alia, however, I can demonstrate that these intransitives in Hiaki do indeed behave like unaccusatives syntactically, not like unergatives—unlike true Hiaki unergatives, these suppletive verbs do not permit applicativization.

Drawing on these two threads of argumentation, I conclude that syntactic root nodes are individuated by (the equivalent of) indices, and both phonological and semantic interpretation are realized in a context-dependent fashion.