

Towards the valuation of PHI-features

Beata Trawiński (University of Tübingen)

PHI-features like CASE, PERSON, NUMBER and GENDER are often assumed to be valued for a word in the lexicon and to take atomic values. There are, however, cases where the valuation of PHI-features poses some problems. One such case is when a single form satisfies conflicting grammatical requirements (Dyła 1984; Pullum and Zwicky 1986; Ingria 1990; Müller 1999), and another is when a form is resolved on the basis of multiple sources, as in nominal coordination (Corbett 1983; Sag et al. 1985). Dalrymple and Kaplan (2000) discuss both of these problems and propose an LFG analysis which draws on the assumption that PHI-features take set-shaped rather than atomic values. However, this analysis fails to account for a number of empirical facts, since it mainly operates at the syntactic level.

This paper focuses on resolving PHI-features' values on the basis of multiple sources. The discussion not only involves well-known facts from the domain of nominal coordination, but also provides some new data that haven't been considered so far in this context. On the one hand, we focus on the so called comitative constructions (Dyła 1988; Mc-Nally 1989; Vassilieva and Larson 2005; Feldman 2001; Ionin and Matushansky 2002), demonstrating that they correspond to nominal coordination regarding the resolution of PHI-features' values. On the other hand, we discuss a number of non-phrasal expressions where the internal gender resolution can be observed. In particular, Polish first and second person plural pronouns and morphosyntactically feminine title terms such as *wysokość* 'highness' are taken into consideration.

We propose a lexicalist constraint-based approach to the valuation of PHI-features which incorporates morphosyntactic, semantic and contextual aspects. Furthermore, we base this approach on the following assumptions: (1) linguistic signs contain information on their number, gender and, in the case of verbs, person at the semantic and morphosyntactic representation levels (Czuba and Przepiórkowski 1995; Kathol 1999; Wechsler and Zlatic 2001); (2) the values of the semantic features PERSON, NUMBER and GENDER are treated in terms of inherent versus resolved values; (3) the inherent values are specified in the lexicon; (4) the resolved values are instantiated by language-specific principles of resolution (Corbett 1983). For the majority of words, the values of the semantic PHI-features will be treated in terms of inherent values. For Polish title terms as well as for first and second person plural pronouns we assume that the values of their PERSON and NUMBER features should also be treated in terms of inherent values. The value of their GENDER feature will, however, be resolved by virtue of a gender resolution constraint for Polish. Finally, the semantic PHI-features of nominal coordination and comitative constructions will be subjected to the resolution principles. Our proposal is implemented within the framework of HPSG (Pollard and Sag 1994), uniformly licensing the valuation of PHI-features at the lexical and phrasal levels.

Bibliography

- Corbett, G. G. (1983). *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers: Agreement Patterns in Slavic*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Czuba, K. and A. Przepiórkowski (1995, aug). Agreement and Case Assignment in Polish: An Attempt at a Unified Account. Technical Report 783, Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences.
- Dalrymple, M. and R. M. Kaplan (2000). Feature Indeterminacy and Feature Resolution. *Language* 76(4), 759.798.
- Dyła, S. (1984). Across-the-Board Dependencies and Case in Polish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15(1), 701.705.
- Dyła, S. (1988). Quasi-Comitative Coordination in Polish. *Linguistics* 26, 383.414.
- Feldman, A. (2001). Comitative and Plural Pronoun Constructions. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Israel Association of Theoretical Linguistics, held at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel, June 11-12, 2001*.
- Ingria, R. (1990). The Limits of Uni_cation. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the ACL, Pittsburgh*, pp. 194.204. Association of Computational Linguistics.

- Ionin, T. and O. Matushansky (2002). DPs with a Twist: A Unified Analysis of Russian Comitative. In W. Browne, J.-Y. Kim, B. H. Partee, and R. A. Rothstein (Eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 11: The Amherst Meeting 2002*, Ann Arbor. Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Kathol, A. (1999). Agreement and the Syntax-Morphology Interface in HPSG. In R. Levine and G. Green (Eds.), *Studies in Contemporary Phrase Structure Grammar*, pp. 209.260. Cambridge and New York Philadelphia: Cambridge University Press.
- McNally, L. (1989). Comitative Coordination in Russian. In *Papers on the Plural Pronoun Construction and Comitative Coordination*, pp. 9.15. UCSC Syntax Research Center Report SRC-89-02.
- Müller, S. (1999). An HPSG-Analysis for Free Relative Clauses in German. *Grammars* 2(1), 53.105.
- Pollard, C. and I. A. Sag (1994). *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pullum, G. K. and A. M. Zwicky (1986). Phonological Resolution of Syntactic Feature Conflict. *Language* 62, 751.773.
- Sag, I. A., G. Gazdar, T. Wasow, and S. E. Weisler (1985). Coordination and How to Distinguish Categories. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 117.171.
- Vassilieva, M. B. and R. K. Larson (2005). The Semantics of the Plural Pronoun Construction. *Natural Language Semantics* 13, 101.124.
- Wechsler, S. and L. Zlatić (2001). A Theory of Agreement and its Application to Serbo-Croatian. *Language* 76.4, 799.832.