

OXFORD
LINGUISTICS

The Morphosyntax of Gender

RUTH KRAMER

OXFORD STUDIES IN THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS

The Morphosyntax of Gender

RUTH KRAMER

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Ruth Kramer 2015

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014958986

ISBN 978-0-19-967993-5 (Hbk)

ISBN 978-0-19-967994-2 (Pbk)

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

The Morphosyntax of Gender

OXFORD STUDIES IN THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS

GENERAL EDITORS

David Adger and Hagit Borer, Queen Mary, University of London

ADVISORY EDITORS

Stephen Anderson, Yale University; Daniel Büring, University of California, Los Angeles; Nomi Erteschik-Shir, Ben-Gurion University; Donka Farkas, University of California, Santa Cruz; Angelika Kratzer, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Andrew Nevins, University College London; Christopher Potts, Stanford University; Barry Schein, University of Southern California; Peter Svenonius, University of Tromsø; Moira Yip, University College London

RECENT TITLES

43 Genericity

edited by Alda Mari, Claire Beyssade, and Fabio Del Prete

44 Strategies of Quantification

edited by Kook-Hee Gil, Steve Harlow, and George Tsoulas

45 Nonverbal Predication

Copular Sentences at the Syntax–Semantics Interface

by Isabelle Roy

46 Diagnosing Syntax

edited by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver

47 Pseudogapping and Ellipsis

by Kirsten Gengel

48 Syntax and its Limits

edited by Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali, and Robert Truswell

49 Phrase Structure and Argument Structure

A Case Study of the Syntax–Semantics Interface

by Terje Lohndal

50 Edges in Syntax

Scrambling and Cyclic Linearization

by Heejeong Ko

51 The Syntax of Roots and the Roots of Syntax

edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Hagit Borer, and Florian Schäfer

52 Causation in Grammatical Structures

edited by Bridget Copley and Fabienne Martin

53 Continuations and Natural Language

by Chris Barker and Chung-chieh Shan

54 The Semantics of Evaluativity

by Jessica Rett

55 External Arguments in Transitivity Alternations

by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Florian Schäfer

56 Control and Restructuring

by Thomas Grano

57 The Interaction of Focus and Givenness in Italian Clause Structure

by Vieri Samek-Lodovici

58 The Morphosyntax of Gender

by Ruth Kramer

For a complete list of titles published and in preparation for the series, see pp 287–8.

General preface

The theoretical focus of this series is on the interfaces between subcomponents of the human grammatical system and the closely related area of the interfaces between the different subdisciplines of linguistics. The notion of “interface” has become central in grammatical theory (for instance, in Chomsky’s Minimalist Program) and in linguistic practice: work on the interfaces between syntax and semantics, syntax and morphology, phonology and phonetics, etc. has led to a deeper understanding of particular linguistic phenomena and of the architecture of the linguistic component of the mind/brain.

The series covers interfaces between core components of grammar, including syntax/morphology, syntax/semantics, syntax/phonology, syntax/pragmatics, morphology/phonology, phonology/phonetics, phonetics/speech processing, semantics/pragmatics, and intonation/discourse structure, as well as issues in the way that the systems of grammar involving these interface areas are acquired and deployed in use (including language acquisition, language dysfunction, and language processing). It demonstrates, we hope, that proper understandings of particular linguistic phenomena, languages, language groups, or inter-language variations all require reference to interfaces.

The series is open to work by linguists of all theoretical persuasions and schools of thought. A main requirement is that authors should write so as to be understood by colleagues in related subfields of linguistics and by scholars in cognate disciplines.

Gender features stand at the intersection of syntax, semantics, and morphology, and how their role is divided between these three domains has long been a puzzle. In this monograph, Ruth Kramer develops a new theory of the morphosyntax of gender, arguing that gender features appear not on lexical roots or on elements high in the structure of noun phrases, but on the nominalizing head *n*. She defends a particular theory of gender features based on the notions of interpretability and bivalence, and shows how this theory predicts the attested typological variation in gender systems, drawing on fascinating data from a number of lesser studied languages. Overall, the book proposes the first comprehensive theory of gender as a phi-feature in generative linguistics.

David Adger
Hagit Borer

Acknowledgments

This project has been through various stages of development for many years, and it is a challenging task to acknowledge all of the generous people who have assisted along the way. Nevertheless, I will do my best since they all greatly deserve it.

The core of this book originates in my dissertation (Kramer 2009), and I can never thank my committee enough for their help and insights: Sandra Chung, Jorge Hankamer, and James McCloskey. I also thank my peers at Santa Cruz for their feedback and encouragement (especially the members of the Morphology Reading Group): Vera Gribanova, Boris Harizanov, Mark Norris, Kyle Rawlins, Anie Thompson, and Matthew Tucker.

I have presented portions of this book at the University of Pennsylvania, Yale University, the ST@R reading group at Rutgers University, the syntax-semantics reading group at New York University, the University of Delaware, the University of California, Santa Cruz, and George Mason University. I have also presented portions of it at the following conferences/workshops: the 15th International Morphology Meeting, the 30th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, the 43rd and 45th Annual Conferences on African Linguistics, and the workshop on “Allomorphy: Its Logic and Limitations.” I thank the audiences at all of these presentations for their invaluable feedback and suggestions, especially Pranav Anand, Karlos Arregi, Mark Baker, Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero, Amy Rose Deal, Marijke de Belder, Rose-Marie Déchaine, David Embick, Jane Grimshaw, Richard Kayne, Jean Lowenstamm, Andrew Nevins, Elizabeth Ritter, Peter Svenonius, Martina Wiltschko, Matt Wolf, and Raffaella Zanuttini.

Portions of Chapters 2 and 3 appear in “Gender in Amharic: a morphosyntactic approach to natural and grammatical gender,” *Language Sciences* 43: 102–15. Portions of Chapters 3 and 8 are to appear in “A split analysis of plurality: evidence from Amharic,” to be published in *Linguistic Inquiry*. I thank the four anonymous reviewers of these papers for comments and suggestions that have been integrated into this book as well. I also thank the members of the Seminar on Morphosyntax at Georgetown in Spring 2014 for reading “Gender in Amharic” and offering useful feedback: Melanie Ashkar, Colleen Diamond, Ava Irani, Morgan Rood, Brett Sutton, and Katherine Vadella.

I turn next to those who engaged with the book as a manuscript. First credit goes to Mark Norris, for reading almost the entire manuscript with incredible speed and cheer, and for assisting with Icelandic and Estonian data. I am also deeply grateful to the following readers/commenters on portions of the manuscript: Azeb Amha, Peter K. Austin, Joshua Birchall, Héctor Campos, Sandra Chung, Donka Farkas,

Christopher Green, Vera Gribanova, Boris Harizanov, Heidi Harley, Bryce Huebner, Donna Lardiere, Eric Mathieu, Jason Merchant, Francesca Merlan, Doris Payne, Paul Portner, Conor Quinn, James Rupp, Angela Terrill, and Katherine Vadella. None of these people are responsible for errors of fact or interpretation.

I am also profoundly thankful to all the consultants whose insight has shaped this work: Senayit Ghebrehiywet, Girma Demeke, Bekale Seyum, Betselot Teklu, Hileena Eshetu, Harya Tarakegn, Mehret Getachew Tadesse, Meriem Tikue, Azeb Amha, Marta Baffy, Héctor Campos, Angela Donate Velasco, Donka Farkas, Paula Ganga, Nagarajan Selvanathan, and Esther Surenthiraraj.

Additionally, I am grateful for the research support that I have received during the creation of this book. I thank Georgetown University for a Junior Faculty Research Fellowship and Summer Academic Grant that supported several months of writing, and I also thank Carole Sargent and the book club members of Summer 2014 for helping me keep up the momentum. Credit is also due for research assistance to Lindley Winchester, Morgan Rood, Laura Siebecker, and Lauren McGarry.

Finally, this book could never have been completed without the patient support of my family and of Bryce Huebner. This book is dedicated to them.

List of figures and tables

Figures

1.1 The DM model of the grammar	5
1.2 The architecture of PF	6
8.1 Controller genders in Romanian	178

Tables

3.1 How roots are licensed in Amharic	50
3.2 Amharic licensing conditions	57
5.1 Two genders, three <i>ns</i>	72
5.2 Definite determiners/3rd person singular pronouns in Dieri	75
5.3 Predicted genders	87
6.1 Two genders, four <i>ns</i>	89
6.2 Licensing conditions for Spanish	97
6.3 Licensing conditions for Maa	105
7.1 Four <i>ns</i> : possible inventories	121
7.2 Four <i>ns</i> : possible inventories (with genders)	122
7.3 Lavukaleve object marker paradigm	136
8.1 Plural strategies in Somali	154
8.2 Analysis of the Somali plural	162
10.1 Analysis of the Somali plural (identical to 8.2)	224
10.2 Spanish declension classes	236
11.1 Possible inventories of gender-relevant <i>ns</i>	248
11.2 Noun classes in Sesotho	252

List of abbreviations

1	1st person
2	2nd person
3	3rd person
ABS	absolutive
ACC	accusative case
ACT	action particle
ADJ	adjectivalizer
AFFIRM	affirmative
AN(IM)	animate
ANA	anaphoric
ANT	anterior verb suffix
AUX	auxiliary
CAUS	causative
CL	classifier
COLL	collective
COP	copula
D	determiner
DAT	dative
DEF	definite marker
DIM(IN)	diminutive
DIS	distant demonstrative
DM	Distributed Morphology
DUR	durative
EMPH	emphatic particle
ERG	ergative case
F	feminine
F/N	feminine or neuter
FEM	female natural gender
FOC	focus
GC	gender clitic
GEN	genitive case

HAB	habitual
HON	honorific
IMP	imperative
INAN	inanimate
INF	infinitive
INFL	inflection
INT	intensive
LOC	locative case or locative marker
M	masculine
M/F	masculine or feminine
M/N	masculine or neuter
N	neuter
<i>n</i>	'little' <i>n</i> , nominalizing head
NEG	negation
NF	non-feminine
NMLZ	nominalizer
NOM	nominative case
NONFIN	non-finite
.O	object agreement/marker
PAST	past tense
PC	past continuous
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
POSS.ART	possessive article
PP	past punctual
PREP	preposition
PRES	present tense
PROD	product verbalizer
PROP	propriative case
RED	reduplicant
REFL	reflexive
RF	realis future
RP/P	realis past/present
S	singular
.S	subject agreement/marker

STA	stative
SUP	supine
T	tense
TOP	topic
TV	theme vowel
VBLZ	verbalizer
VICIN	vicinity

Contents

<i>General preface</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	x
<i>List of figures and tables</i>	xii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Major themes	1
1.2 Frameworks: Minimalism and Distributed Morphology	3
1.2.1 Setting the scene	3
1.2.2 A little Minimalism, a lot of DM	4
1.2.3 Lexical decomposition	7
1.2.4 Summary	9
1.3 Limitations	10
1.4 The lay of the land: chapter previews	11
2 The Amharic gender system and previous approaches to gender	14
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Gender in Amharic	14
2.2.1 The facts	15
2.2.2 Summary, typology, diachrony	20
2.3 The morphosyntax of gender: previous approaches	23
2.3.1 GenP and NumP	24
2.3.2 Gender on the noun: lexicalism	26
2.3.3 Gender on the noun: Distributed Morphology	32
3 A <i>n</i> analysis of gender	37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 The morphosyntax of gender: a new approach	37
3.3 Further evidence for <i>n</i> as the locus of gender	42
3.4 Licensing conditions and interpretability: refining the analysis	49
3.4.1 Licensing conditions	50
3.4.2 The interpretability of gender features	57
3.5 Conclusion	63

4	Defining gender	65
4.1	What gender is, and what gender isn't	65
4.1.1	Classifiers and declension class are not genders	67
4.1.2	Noun class and pronominal gender are gender	68
4.1.3	Gender is not like other phi-features	69
4.2	Conclusion	71
5	Case study 1: Two genders, three <i>ns</i>	72
5.1	Introduction	72
5.2	Masculine default or feminine default	73
5.2.1	Masculine default: Dieri	74
5.2.2	Feminine default: Zayse and Zargulla	79
5.3	Animacy-based gender systems and a negative prediction	82
5.3.1	Introduction	82
5.3.2	The gender system of Lealao Chinantec: description	84
5.3.3	The gender system of Lealao Chinantec: analysis	86
5.4	Conclusion	88
6	Case study 2: Adding an uninterpretable gender feature	89
6.1	Introduction	89
6.2	Uninterpretable feminine gender: Spanish	90
6.2.1	The gender system of Spanish: description	90
6.2.2	The gender system of Spanish: analysis	95
6.2.3	Comparing Spanish and Amharic	98
6.3	Uninterpretable masculine gender: Maa	99
6.3.1	The gender system of Maa: description	100
6.3.2	The gender system of Maa: analysis	104
6.4	Uninterpretable animacy: Algonquian	105
6.4.1	The gender system of Algonquian: description	105
6.4.2	The gender system of Algonquian: analysis	110
6.5	Conclusion	114
7	Case study 3: Three-gender languages	116
7.1	Introduction	116
7.2	Three genders, three <i>ns</i> : Mangarayi	116
7.2.1	The gender system of Mangarayi: description	117
7.2.2	The gender system of Mangarayi: analysis	118
7.3	Three genders, one uninterpretable feature: Wari'	121
7.3.1	The gender system of Wari': description	123
7.3.2	The gender system of Wari': analysis	125

7.4	Three genders, two uninterpretable features: Lavukaleve	129
7.4.1	The gender system of Lavukaleve: description	131
7.4.2	The gender system of Lavukaleve: analysis	133
7.4.3	Conclusion: Lavukaleve	138
7.5	Conclusion	139
7.6	Excursus: default gender in three-gender languages	140
7.6.1	Default gender in Mangarayi, Wari', and Lavukaleve	141
7.6.2	Default gender in Russian, Icelandic, and Tamil	142
7.6.3	Suggestions for analysis and conclusion	145
8	Gender is not on Num: Evidence from Somali and Romanian	147
8.1	Introduction	147
8.2	Gender switch in Somali: all plurals are <i>n</i>	148
8.2.1	Gender in Somali: description and analysis	149
8.2.2	The plural system of Somali	151
8.2.3	Plurality is on <i>n</i> in Somali: evidence	155
8.2.4	Somali plural system: analysis	159
8.2.5	Alternative analyses and conclusions	164
8.3	Gender switch in Romanian: the neuter is real	166
8.3.1	The Romanian gender system	166
8.3.2	The analysis of Romanian gender	169
8.3.3	Alternative analyses	177
8.3.4	Interim conclusion	183
8.4	Conclusion	183
9	Gender and nominalizations	185
9.1	Introduction	185
9.2	Nominalizations are gendered: data	185
9.2.1	Theoretical background	185
9.2.2	Various types of nominalizations are gendered	187
9.2.3	All of the gender-relevant <i>ns</i> can nominalize	190
9.3	Nominalizations are gendered: predictions	192
9.3.1	Derived nouns without <i>n</i>	193
9.3.2	One gender, many exponents	196
9.3.3	Nominalizations in an animacy gender system	200
9.3.4	Interim summary	204
9.4	Two problems (and their solutions)	205
9.4.1	Gender features expounded separately?	205
9.4.2	Same nominalization, different genders?	209
9.5	Conclusion	212

10	The highest gender wins and the interaction of gender and declension class	213
10.1	Introduction	213
10.2	May the highest gender win: gender and multiple <i>ns</i>	213
10.2.1	The highest gender wins: data	214
10.2.2	A cyclicity explanation for the highest gender hypothesis	220
10.2.3	Conclusion and implications	226
10.3	A diminutive digression	227
10.4	Declension class and gender	233
10.4.1	Background	233
10.4.2	Spanish declension class: a case study	235
10.4.3	Summary, and directions of correlations	243
10.5	Conclusion	244
11	Conclusion	245
11.1	Putting it all together	245
11.1.1	Question A: Gender on <i>n</i>	245
11.1.2	Question B: The relationship between natural and arbitrary gender	247
11.1.3	Question C: Gender assignment	248
11.1.4	Evidence for Distributed Morphology	250
11.2	Areas of future research	250
11.2.1	Phonologically determined gender assignment	250
11.2.2	Languages with more than three genders	251
11.2.3	The role of social factors	253
11.2.4	Languages that lack gender	254
11.3	Meta-conclusion	256
	<i>References</i>	257
	<i>Index of languages and language families</i>	281
	<i>Subject index</i>	284

Introduction

1.1 Major themes

Gender is regularly defined as the sorting of nouns into two or more classes, as reflected in agreement morphology on determiners, adjectives, verbs and other syntactic categories (e.g. Hockett 1958: 231, Fodor 1959: 2, Corbett 1991: 1, Comrie 1999: 457, Matasović 2004: 19–20). Consider the Amharic examples in (1)ab.

- (1) a. *ya säw dāgg nāw* b. *yatʃtʃ set dāgg nat*
 that.M man good be.3MS.S that.F woman good be.3FS.S
 ‘That man is good.’ ‘That woman is good.’ (Leslau 1995: 66, 67)

In (1)a, the demonstrative is *ya* and the copular verb is *nāw*, whereas in (1)b, the demonstrative is *yatʃtʃ* and the copular verb is *nat*. Since the demonstrative and the copular verb formally differ depending only on the head noun of the subject, it is clear that *sāw* ‘man’ belongs to one gender (masculine) and *set* ‘woman’ belongs to another gender (feminine).¹

Gender has been called “a time-honored subject of linguistics” (Unterbeck and Rissanen 2000: ix), and Matasović (2004: 13) dubs it “the only grammatical category that ever evoked passion.” Corbett calls gender the “most puzzling of the grammatical categories” (Corbett 1991: 1). Unsurprisingly then, there are rich and significant literatures on the sociolinguistics of gender (see e.g. Hellinger and Bußmann 2001), the acquisition and processing of gender (see e.g. Franceschina 2005), the typology of gender systems (see e.g. Corbett 1991), and the diachronic development and loss of gender systems (see e.g. Matasović 2004).

However, there has been less research on the morphological and syntactic aspects of gender. There are clear, thorough descriptions of gender assignment in many languages (see e.g. Corbett 1991: chs 2 and 3), but the most basic questions for a morphosyntactic analysis of gender assignment remain controversial: where is gender located in the hierarchical structure? How is gender assignment

¹ See Chapter 4 for a refinement of this definition of gender.