Matthew Baerman, Greville G. Corbett, Dunstan Brown & Andrew Hippisley (eds.). *Deponency and Morphological Mismatches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press and the British Academy (= http://ukcatalogue.oup.com/product/9780197264102.do - #Proceedings of the British Academy 145), 2007. xv + 324pp. ISBN-13 978-0-19-726410-2.[1]

Reviewed by GEREON MÜLLER

1 Overview

The present volume is a collection of articles on (extended) deponency, that is, on phenomena in the world's languages that resemble in some way the classical phenomenon of deponent verbs in Latin, where passive morphology accompanies active syntax. Deponency has so far been a neglected phenomenon in both linguistic typology and grammatical theory; the book under review is most welcome for this reason alone. The twelve contributions cover various aspects of deponency in a variety of languages, and from different points of view (some are more typologically oriented, some represent in-depth studies of deponency phenomena in particular languages or language groups, and yet others have a focus on grammatical theory). Still, the overall impression is one of remarkable interaction and convergence; there are recurring empirical phenomena and recurring analytical issues, and most authors have clearly made an effort to integrate the other contributors' work into their articles. This may have been facilitated by the fact that the contributions mainly go back to a 2006 workshop organized by the Surrey Morphology Group that did have a fairly narrow, focussed call for papers (and also by the fact that at least half of the contributions go back to linguists that are either part of this group, or closely associated with it). In addition, it seems to me that the editors took their job quite seriously and strongly encouraged cross-linguistic and cross-framework discussion; and they must have suggested integrating material of other contributions to this book wherever possible.

Among the deponency phenomena tackled in this volume are core cases of deponency,

like deponent verbs in Latin and their counterparts in Greek and Sanskrit. Next, there are interesting cases of extended deponency that raise fascinating typological and theoretical questions, and that consequently show up in various contributions (like the spurious antipassive in Chukchi or deponent nouns in Tsez and Archi). Finally, there are slightly more remote issues like Spanish pseudoplurals or the agreement prefixes of Iwaidja and Ilgar.

In what follows, I first address the individual contributions in the order in which they appear in the book (section 2), then I identify major topics as they emerge from the book (section 3) and, finally, I provide some concluding remarks (section 4).

2 The contributions

The first article, 'Morphological Typology of Deponency' by Matthew Baerman, serves as an introduction to some central (mainly typological) issues related to the concept of deponency, which is broadly conceived of as a mismatch between form and function. The core case of deponency is of course the phenomenon for which the term was originally coined, namely Latin verbs which may exhibit active syntax but passive morphology. Against this background, Baerman defines deponency as follows (p. 2):

> Deponency is a mismatch between form and function (1). Given that there is a formal morphological opposition (2) between active and passive (3) that is the normal realization of the corresponding functional opposition (4), deponents are a lexically-specified set (5) of verbs whose passive forms function as actives. The normal function is no longer available (6).

Baerman suggests to treat (1) as the central, defining characteristic of deponency; all the other properties are subject to parametrization. This generalization of the concept of deponency makes it possible to look at other form/function mismatches from the same perspective, and thereby functions as a prerequisite for the present volume (where most of the contributions do in fact not focus on Latin deponent verbs). Baerman notes that (2) restricts deponency to word

forms as it stands, but if this requirement is subject to potential variation, one might find similar phenomena beyond words, too, for example in the realm of constructions. Next, (3) restricts deponency to active/passive oppositions, but if this is not *per se* a defining property of deponency, other oppositions within grammatical categories may also give rise to deponency. As an example, he looks at verb inflection in Keres, where the stative/non-stative opposition is involved (depending on the number, that is, singular/dual *vs*. plural), the verb meaning 'to be lying down' gets stative or non-stative inflection). (4) declares deponency to be exceptional; as Baerman shows for deponency with verbal inflection classes in Ngiyambaa, this does not always have to be the case: in this language, choice of conjugation class often goes hand in hand with transitivity or intransitivity of a verb, but with 40% of the verbs, there is no such connection, that is, there is deponency. As regards (5), Baerman shows that there are cases of deponency which, unlike deponency in Latin, are not lexically restricted. As an example, he discusses paradigmatically conditioned deponency in Yurok, where there are some morphologically passive forms in the regular transitive verb paradigm, which are used in active contexts in the syntax. Finally, Baerman highlights three cases showing that property (6) is not a defining characteristic of deponency because the normal function is available after all, despite the use of the morphological exponent that would normally encode the function for some other function: first, there is the phenomenon of POLARITY in deponency. One such case involves stem alternation via reduplication with telic *vs*. atelic verbs in Tübatulabal. Normally, the telic stem is generated by reduplication on the basis of the atelic stem; however, there are some thirty verbs where the telic stem is in fact the basis, and the atelic stem is formed by reduplication. Second, (6) is falsified (as a defining property of deponency) by the existence of HETEROCLISIS, that is, the mixing of two or more inflection classes in one paradigm. This is illustrated by preterite present verbs in Germanic languages (like Gothic or German), which use (strong) past tense forms for present tense contexts without thereby losing the past tense part of the paradigm; rather, this part is filled with weak past tense forms. And third,

SYNCRETISM can be viewed as an instance of deponency; and if it is, this implies that the defectivity requirement (6) does not hold in general.

In my view, Baerman's paper serves its purpose of setting the scene and illustrating some of the possible variation in the domain of deponency very well. What it does not attempt to do is introduce the key issues raised by deponency for grammatical theory; arguably the book might have profitted from introductory remarks on these issues, too.

In 'Deponency, Syncretism, and What Lies Between', Greville G. Corbett addresses the differences between syncretism and deponency against the background of the 'canonical typology' approach developed by him and others over the last few years. Corbett does not consider concepts like DEPONENCY and SYNCRETISM as primitives, but decomposes them into combinations of more primitive properties. In each case, though, a particular combination of these more primitive properties will count as 'canonical', with other combinations that deviate from the canonical concept being classified as less canonical. Thus, Corbett proposes that 'canonical deponency' is characterized by (a) loss of the original function; (b) defectivity of the paradigm; (c) 'slabs' as the relevant domains (for example not just one person/number combination, say, first person singular, emerges with passive morphology with deponent verbs in Latin, but all person/number combinations do); and (d) the fact that it generalizes across cells. On this view, cases of deponency where, for example, the paradigm does not become defective (that is, the normal function is still available) are not canonical instances of deponency. In contrast, 'canonical syncretism' implies that (a) the original function is retained; (b) the paradigm does not become defective; (c) the relevant domains are single cells; and (d) there is a generalization across lexemes (not cells). Corbett then discusses the status of two phenomena from Daghestanian languages. First, the noun *xexbi* 'child(ren)' in Tsez is interesting because it shares properties (a) and (b) with canonical syncretism (it has plural inflection in the singular, but it also retains plural inflection in the plural, and there is no defectivity) but properties (c) and (d) with canonical deponency (all cases are affected in the

same way, and only few items are affected). Second, the noun *on* ‘cow’ in Archi exhibits the non-canonical property of suppletion (the plural stem is *bc'i*), and it exhibits deponency since the suppletive plural forms take singular ergative markers *-li* in the ergative and other (non-absolutive) cases. This latter fact is strictly speaking irrelevant for the question of where the line is to be drawn between syncretism and deponency, but it serves to show that ‘[i]t is possible for deponency to interact with other non-canonical phenomena, giving rise to lexems which are even less canonical’. Note that this wording presupposes that deponency as such is not canonical; and that among the various kinds of deponency that are in principle possible, some are less canonical than others; furthermore, even lexemes can be more or less canonical. This minimally requires that canonicity can be defined at various levels; it is not clear to me whether this means that there is no simple single concept underlying the notion of ‘canonicity’.

In ‘Extending Deponency: Implications for Morphological Mismatches’, Andrew Spencer further refines and develops the system of fine-grained variables identified by Baerman & Corbett as underlying deponency and related concepts (like syncretism and heteroclisis). He suggests to evaluate possible mismatches of form and function by postulating the variables (i) Dom[ain] (within or between lexical classes), (ii) Para[digm covergage] (slab or cell); (iii) Gen[erality] (lexical exception, subclass, whole class), and (iv) Def[ectivity] (yes or no). Canonical deponency, on this view, can be encoded as Dom(within), Para(slab), Gen(exc, subcl) Def(yes). The major innovation of this system is, according to Spencer, that there are many cases of deponency where there is an interclass mismatch. Some item that belongs to a certain part of speech in the syntax may belong to a different part of speech in the morphology. For instance, the Russian word *stolovaja* ‘dining room’ inflects like an adjective but has the syntactic distribution of a noun; the same goes for nouns like *Angestellte(r)* ‘employee’ in German. Similarly, past tense forms of Russian verbs are of course syntactically verbs although morphologically they look like short-form adjectives; plain negative forms of

Japanese verbs inflect like adjectives, too. Of course, in all these cases, it is possible in principle to postulate an empty category in the syntax (whose presence then may or may not be obligatory, as regards the defectivity issue) and thereby avoid the conclusion that deponency is involved at all. After all, the relevant constructions typically have their origin in ellipsis operations (see for example Isaenko 1975, 170-5. on Russian and German). This option would eventually have to be argued against in detail in every single case; Spencer does not attempt to do this here, though.[2] These considerations notwithstanding, phenomena involving interclass deponency can easily be described by the system of variables in (i)-(iv), and, as Spencer shows, the same goes for many of the cases of deponency highlighted in the other contributions to this volume, for example the spurious antipassive in Chukchi, or the Tsez noun *xexbi*. In contrast, the particularly complex case of the Hindi conjugation system that is discussed in section 3 of this article would seem to require a further extension of this system. Spencer (pp. 67-68) '[…] therefore leave[s] it to others to decide exactly how such morphology fits into the grand scheme of things'. Spencer concludes with remarks on what a possible kind of mismatch may look like. He suggests that '[…] no logical possibility can be ruled out' as far as the combination of the properties in (i)–(iv) is concerned, and he notes that this implies that the '[…] more traditional labels [...] have outlived their usefulness' (pp. 68-69) since they each refer to only one of the many possible combinations of properties.[3]

Gregory Stump's 'A Non-Canonical Pattern of Deponency and Its Implications' is the first paper in the present volume that is written from the perspective of grammatical theory. Stump points out that two basic types of theoretical approaches to deponency can be distinguished; he calls these types FORM DEPONENCY and PROPERTY DEPONENCY. Form deponency arguably corresponds to the standard view: there is a mismatch between morphology (more precisely, the morphological exponent) and syntax (more precisely, the morphosyntactic property set that the morphological exponent is matched with in most recent theories of grammar). Thus, a deponent verb form like Latin *horttur* 's/he urges' has a passive inflectional exponent but is

syntactically active. Property deponency, on the other hand, characterizes theories according to which there is no mismatch between morphology and syntax; rather, the mismatch is between syntax and semantics. On this view, *horttur* is passive in both morphology and syntax, but it is interpreted as active (or at least non-passive) in semantics. Of course, a precondition for this second approach to work is that the notion PASSIVE is actually irrelevant for Latin syntax. Rules that look like they might refer to the voice property of a verb must instead refer to '[…] its argument structure, subcategorization restrictions, and case-assignment properties' (pp. 90-91). Stump argues that the empirical evidence often does not decide between the two approaches in an obvious way, but he carries out a case study based on middles in Sanskrit that does indeed seem to argue for a property deponency analysis. In Sanskrit, there is a class of verbs (called TMANEPADIN VERBS, or –VERBS) that may take on middle forms in the presence of active (non-middle) interpretation. The middle interpretation, in terms of an affected subject, is also possible with these forms, that is the deponency does not lead to defectivity, and there is no loss of the original function. This, as such, can be modelled both via form deponency and via property deponency. However, there are two arguments for the latter approach. First, even in cases of active interpretation, the information 'middle' must be syntactically (and not just morphologically) available because it evidently participates in agreement rules: an auxiliary verb that co-occurs with the –verb in the periphrastic perfect also must have formal middle marking. Second, there is a system-wide syncretism pattern according to which the passive forms of a verb have to be syncretic with the middle forms in a number of contexts, and the deponent –verbs are no exception. Thus, the information 'middle' must be accessible at the point where this generalization is expressed, which can clearly not be the individual morphological exponent.[4]

The focus of the next two papers is neither on linguistic typology nor on grammatical theory. Rather, 'Deponency in the Diachrony of Greek' by Nikolas Lavidas & Dimitra Papangeli and 'Deponency in Latin' by Zheng Xu, Mark Aronoff & Frank Anshen are in-

depth empirical studies of deponent verbs in Greek and Latin, respectively. The first study aims to describe changes in the domain of deponent verbs in the history of Greek. The main observation is that some verbs that were originally deponent later took on regular active inflections; some verbs that started out with active inflections later became deponent verbs; and some deponent verbs (and, of course, most regular verbs) did not change at all. As for the analysis, Lavidas & Papangeli eventually adopt Embick's (2000) (second) approach (p. 120; see below).

The second study is mainly concerned with the question whether there might be some correlation between a verb's semantics and its readiness to be deponent in Latin. One result is that Latin deponent verbs tend not to occur with physically affected objects; the interpretation of this finding is such that the use of passive form with active function serves to signal a 'non-canonical active verb', that is, a verb that is not high on a scale of transitivity. As regards the theoretical implementation of this finding, the authors' position is defeatist: 'Can the relation between Latin deponency and physical affectedness be deduced from any theoretical framework? We leave [this question] for more ambitious folk' (p. 143).

Andrew Hippisley's article 'Declarative Deponency: A Network Morphology Account of Morphological Mismatches' presents detailed morphological analyses of two deponency phenomena, *viz*., deponent verbs in Latin and deponent nouns in Archi. The analyses are based on Network Morphology (see Corbett & Fraser 1993), but could just as well be formulated in any other realizational-inferential morphological theory (for example Stump's 2001 Paradigm Function Morphology). Deponency with Latin verbs, for example, is modelled as follows (also see *Hippisley's analysis of Latin deponent verbs* below): given a morpho-syntactic property set (that is, the syntactically defined context for morphological realization) which bears the feature [+ACTIVE], there is a general rule that demands the use of a certain form class of exponents that realize it (this class is somewhat misleading called ACT\S\DO6(-)FORMS even though there is no intrinsic relation; see section 3 below). Similarly for the morphosyntactic

property set [+PASSIVE], which is realized by exponents from the form class PASS_FORMS (p. 151). However, verbs which are lexically marked as deponent are also subject to another rule that requires PASS_FORMS exponents for [+ACTIVE] contexts, except for those parts of the paradigm where Latin deponent verbs still take active exponents (p. 159). This second requirement is more specific and overrides the first one, thereby triggering passive morphology in active contexts with deponent verbs. What this analysis does not yet ensure is that deponent verbs with passive morphology cannot show up in passive contexts. To derive defectivity, it is stipulated that, with deponent verbs, passive contexts are undefined (p. 163). Pre-theoretically, one might think that the defectivity property is intrinsically linked to the very existence of deponency. If passive morphology shows up in active contexts, it is, according to this view, 'used up', and cannot show up in passive contexts anymore. No such functional reasoning is present in Hippisley's analysis: the two pertinent assumptions (passive morphology for active contexts, and no realization of passive contexts) are logically independent. Therefore, the approach evades potential problems with the many cases of deponency that do not involve defectivity, like *xexbi* 'child(ren)' in Tsez (where one exponent is used for both singular and plural) or deponent nouns in Archi that are addressed in detail in the final part of the paper (where there are number mismatches without syncretism. For example, *xali* 'family' takes as its plural exponents the set of class 2 plural markers, but uses for (non-absolutive) singular contexts exponents from the set of class 3 plural markers. The relevant rule leading to defectivity is simply not present in these morphological systems.

In 'The Limits of Deponency: A Chukotko-Centric Perspective', Jonathan Bobaljik is concerned with the analysis of the spurious antipassive in Chukchi. This language has an ergative argument encoding pattern, and antipassive morphology normally signals a detransitivization of the verb, with absolutive rather than ergative showing up on the external argument (see (1a) and (1b)). However, in certain marked combinations of external and internal argument (more specificially, in combinations of the type 3.SG>1.SG, 2>1.SG, and

2>1.PL), antipassive morphology is required even though the clause stays transitive (and the external argument bears ergative case; see (1c)).

(1) (a) aaek-a kimit-n ne-netet-n

youth-ERG load-ABS 3.SUBJ(TRANS)-carry-3.SG.OBJ

'(The) young men carried away the load'

(1) (b) aaek-t Ø-*ine*-netet-et kimit-e

youth-PL(ABS) 3.SUBJ(INTR)-AP-carry-3.PL.SUBJ(INTR) load-INSTR

'(The) young men carried away a load'

(1) (c) -nan m Ø-*ine*-u-i

he-ERG I(ABS) 3.SG.SUBJ(INTR)-AP-see-3.SG.SUBJ(INTR)

'He saw me'

Bobaljik's analysis is based on Distributed Morphology, according to which inflectional exponents are post-syntactic realizations of functional heads. He assumes that an internal argument DP moves to a position in front of the functional head V in transitive clauses, and that the marked contexts mentioned above block such movement of the object. With regular antipassive formation, the object also stays *in situ*. Thus, the two relevant contexts, that of spurious antipassive and that of antipassive, share a property that sets them apart from standard transitive contexts. Now the only thing that remains to be done is to assume that morphological realization of the functional category V proceeds differently depending on whether object movement has applied or not: a marker *ine* is inserted in V/…OBJ contexts, whereas a zero marker Ø is inserted in bare V contexts after object movement. Thus, *ine* is not actually an antipassive marker. It just happens to be the morphological realization for a V as it shows up in antipassive contexts as well as in certain well-defined transitive contexts, and the only thing that the two contexts have in common is that there is no object movement. Consequently, there is no 'spurious antipassive' either and this means that, on Bobaljik's

analysis, the phenomenon does not involve deponency (conceived of as a mismatch of form and function) at all, neither as form deponency nor as property deponency.

The article ‘Slouching Towards Deponency: A Family of Mismatches in the Bantu Verb Stem’ by Jeffrey Good gives an overview of deponency with verbs in Bantu languages, more specifically, pseudo-causative verb forms and pseudo-passive verb forms. It turns out that clear cases of deponency are often not easy to identify. For instance, pseudo-causatives in Kinyamwezi exhibit the typical phonology of transitive suffixation, *viz*. final palatalization, and they are syntactically intransitive, which taken together would make them a good candidate for deponency as such. However, morphophonological alternations, as they are typical of transitive markers, are absent with these verbs, which leaves open the possibility that what looks like transitive marking is in fact merely accidental homophony. In other cases, for example pseudo-causatives in Chimwiini, closer inspection reveals that an interpretation of the relevant verbs as causativized may not be systematically excluded, which will then undermine the hypothesis that deponency is involved from the other side. A few cases do seem to involve genuine deponency, though. This holds for pseudo-causatives in Ganda, where Larry Hyman has argued in detail that a transitive exponent may show up in the presence of strictly intranstive syntactic behaviour. Arguably, it also does for at least some pseudo-passives in Kinyamwezi, where it looks as though a true passive exponent that participates in morphophonological alternations typical of uncontroversial passive exponents goes hand in hand with active syntax, including absence of a non-passivized verb. As for the repercussions on grammatical theory, Good notes vaguely that pseudo-causatives and pseudo-passives in Bantu languages ‘[…] appear to be broadly in line with Kiparsky’s (2005) suggestion that the devices of lexical phonology and morphology are adequate for the analysis of deponency.’ Of course, however, as far as I can see, in the absence of further explication of formal properties of deponency in Bantu verbs, none of the existing theories of deponency will face any problem when it comes to accounting for the basic pattern.

In his contribution ‘Spanish Pseudoplurals: Phonological Cues in the Acquisition of a Syntax-Morphology Mismatch’, Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero looks at pairs of nouns like *virus* vs. *Carlos* in Spanish. He shows that whereas the *s* signals an athematic stem in *virus*, it is best analyzed as a genuine plural marker in *Carlos*. Evidence for this comes from derivational morphological operations that apply to stems rather than to inflected word forms. For instance, adding the augmentative suffix *ot* produces *virus-ot-e* (where *s* is maintained) in the first case, but *Carl-ot-e* (where *s* disappears) in the second one. Since *Carlos* (like, irrelevantly, *virus*) can be used both in plural and in singular contexts in syntax, the singular use instantiates a case of a pseudo-plural, that is to say, deponency. Finally, the question is addressed in some detail how the difference can eventually be acquired, given low frequency of the decisive forms in the child’s input, which gives rise to a standard poverty of the stimulus problem. An optimality theory-like ranking of parsing preferences is introduced that produces the right outcome. From the perspective of typology, Bermúdez-Otero localizes Spanish pseudo-plurals ‘somewhere in between’ (p. 264) canonical deponency as in Latin deponent verbs and spurious antipassive in Chukchi: they are lexically exceptional, but they do not involve defectiveness (a singular pseudo-plural form *Carlos* does not imply that the ‘regular’ plural form cannot be used). From the perspective of grammatical theory, things are a bit more complex. Bermúdez-Otero contends that the kind of deponency involved here is atypical in that its ‘[…] motivation is essentially phonological’. In line with this, he claims that ‘[…] it is unlikely that the mechanisms proposed to deal with [other cases of deponency] will adequately deal with [this one]’ (p. 265). This issue has remained unclear to me. By ‘essentially phonological motivation’, Bermúdez-Otero evidently has in mind some of the above-mentioned parsing preferences that are supposed to determine how a given string is segmented by a child acquiring the language (like ‘Avoid athematic stems’ and ‘Avoid □ stems’). However, from the perspective of grammatical theory, which is always one of generation (not parsing), this issue strikes me as orthogonal. Here, the real question would be:

why does the singular word form of the stem *Carlo* have a plural marker (giving rise to deponency) rather than a zero exponent (or no ending at all), as one would expect? As far as I can see, this basic question is not addressed at all; but I do not see how the answer to this question could possibly be phonological or, for that matter, substantially different from one that one could give for cases where a noun has the wrong number in Archi (as they are discussed by Corbett & Hippisley, among others).

In 'Pseudo-Argument Affixes in Iwaidja and Ilgar: A Case of Deponent Subject and Object Agreement', Nicholas Evans addresses potential cases of deponency with argument-encoding morphology on verbs in the closely related North Australian languages Iwaidja and Ilgar/Garig. The main bulk of the paper is reserved for an illustration of the morphosyntax of argument-encoding by verbal prefixes in these languages. Given the empirical material that Evans presents, the system looks intricate but fairly systematic, and certainly not radically different from others that have successfully been analyzed in more recent rule-based (or constraint-based) morphological theories. Still, somewhat perplexingly, Evans seems to suggest that the argument-encoding systems of Iwaidja and Ilgar/Garig are beyond scientific analysis when he states that '[…] no single account can be given that works across the whole paradigm', and that '[t]he net effect of all these irregularities is that attempts to give regular rules [*sic*] for the formations of the prefix combinations only go a fraction of the way to accounting for the forms by regular rule [*sic*]' (pp. 276-277). In other words, Evans wants us to believe that the data are too complex to be analyzed systematically. If taken seriously, this would, by generalization (all language patterns look complicated at first sight), seem to put an end to all scientific investigation of language. Be that as it may, eventually Evans discusses a number of candidates for deponent verbs. He differentiates between two groups. In the first group, the prefix '[…] adds some semantic specification' in the form of a 'pseudo-argument', either by replacing the argument-encoding of the object (which is then realized as a pronoun) with a transitive verb, or by adding it to an intransitive verb. In the second group, adding the

prefix does not imply an alternation with an independently existing verb. In both cases, the classification of the verbs as deponent solely relies on the assumption that the 'additional semantic specification' (for example, 'with respect to place') cannot be classified as a true (albeit phonologically empty) argument (that is cross-referenced by a regular object agreement prefix). This may or may not be the case, but Evans makes no attempt to actually show it by invoking tests as they have been developed in the literature (see Rizzi 1986, among many others). In the absence of strong evidence for one or the other position, it remains unclear whether there is deponency at all in Iwaidja and Ilgar verbs.

The article 'How Safe Are Our Analyses?' by Peter Matthews concludes the volume. Matthews addresses some of the main topics from a more general perspective. Among other things, he raises the question of whether deponency should indeed be conceived of as some kind of 'mismatch', or whether it should not better be viewed as a selective neutralization of an otherwise existing opposition in the language. Furthermore, he argues against Corbett's concept of canonical deponency, pointing out (rightly, in my view; see below) that '[…] what is canonical in Latin is not so already in, for example, English' (p. 313).

3 Major topics

In my view, two major topics of the volume can be identified, one concerning linguistic typology and the other one concerning grammatical theory.

3.1 Typology

From the perspective of typology, a recurring theme is that of deponency and canonical typology. Canonical typology has been introduced elsewhere (see, for example, Corbett 2005), but it figures prominently in the present volume, particularly in the first three contributions (by Baerman, Corbett and Spencer). There are two aspects to this approach to typology. On the one hand, holistic grammatical concepts and categories as they have standardly been

postulated (like subject, incorporation, agglutination, syncretism or deponency) are abandoned, and decomposed into finer-grained, narrowly defined variables. This approach can be viewed as representative of much recent work in typology (see Bickel 2007 for a recent overview).[5] On the other hand, there is the canonical part of canonical typology. Having decomposed a concept that is traditionally viewed as holistic into finer-grained, *a priori* independent variables that can combine in many different ways in individual languages and constructions, one particular combination is then nevertheless singled out as 'canonical', and given the original name.

This is exactly what has happened with DEPONENCY in the present volume. On the one hand, it is shown that the traditional notion of deponency is to be decomposed into finer-grained variables, with only a form/function mismatch remaining as the ultimate gist of the phenomenon, and all other aspects subject to variation. On the other hand, it is still assumed (by Corbett, Spencer and others), that one particular setting of variables is the canonical one, whereas all other possible settings deviate from the canonical concept to various degrees. Of course, in the case at hand, the canonical notion of deponency is just the one that is defined by the combination of properties that can be found with Latin deponent verbs. I must admit that I find this part of the general typological approach puzzling. Why should Latin deponent verbs represent a more canonical case of deponency than, say, deponent nouns in Archi, preterite present verbs in Gothic, the spurious antipassive in Chukchi or, for that matter, pseudoplurals in Spanish? I can think of no justification for this position that would not rely either on a researcher's gut feeling or on classical-philological bias, neither of which would seem to be compatible with basic tenets in modern typology. Rather than arbitrarily singling out one combination of properties as canonical, it seems to me that the proper way to do typology here would consist of first treating all possible combinations as equal, and then, having assembled a sufficiently rich data set, trying to determine whether particular combinations of deponency-related properties tend to cluster together more than other combinations. Then, if it should

emerge that there is a pattern of form/function mismatch-related properties that occurs significantly more often than the other patterns, one can rightfully call this pattern canonical, and address the kinds of questions that the canonical typology approach wants to address. Crucially, it is the distribution of all possible clusterings of properties in the data that should decide whether a combination is canonical, not the researcher's gut feeling or bias.

3.2 Grammatical theory

From the perspective of grammatical theory, a major theme is the distinction between form deponency and property deponency introduced in Stump's contribution. In my view, such a taxonomy of theoretical approaches is extremely welcome because it opens up the possibility of finding differences and convergences among competing analyses for deponency phenomena that may otherwise be masked by particularities of the chosen framework for analysis, and thus makes a better evaluation of analyses possible. In what follows, I would like to take Stump's taxonomy based on two kinds of approaches as a point of departure, and enrich it by two further types in view of the fact that, upon closer inspection, the original taxonomy does not yet seem to cover all possible analyses of deponency.[6] For concreteness, the following is an extension of Stump's taxonomy of deponency analyses, including for each analysis type references to literature where it it is adopted:

> *Form deponency*: There is a featural mismatch between a morphological exponent and morphosyntactic property set that it realizes. Cf. Stump (2006).
>
> *Property deponency*: There is no mismatch between the morphological exponent and the morphosyntactic property set; but there is a mismatch between the morphosyntactic property set and its interpretation Cf. Embick (2000), Kiparsky (2005) and Stump (this volume).
>
> *Spurious morpho-syntactic deponency*: There is no mismatch. The morphological exponent faithfully realizes the morphosyntactic property set, but the features involved

are more abstract than one might initially have thought. Cf. Bobaljik (this volume) and Keine (2010b)

Spurious morphomic deponency: There is no mismatch. The morphological exponent faithfully realizes a purely morphological ('morphomic', Aronoff 1994) property set; there is a relation between syntactic features and morphomic features, but it is indirect. Cf. Sadler & Spencer (2001), Kiparsky (2005), Brown (2006), Hippisley (this volume) and Schulz (2010).

Let me address the four analysis types in turn.

3.2.1 Form deponency

Form deponency would *a priori* seem to be the simplest and most straightforward approach.[7] According to this type of analysis, a morphosyntactic property set [+ACTIVE] is normally realized by matching [+ACTIVE] exponents in Latin, and a morphosyntactic property set [+PASSIVE] by [+PASSIVE] exponents; but with deponent verbs, the morphosyntactic property set [+ACTIVE] is realized by [+PASSIVE] exponents, and the morphosyntactic property set [+PASSIVE] is not realized at all. There are various ways how 'morphosyntactic property set' can be understood in a form deponency approach, for example it can define a paradigm cell (as in Paradigm Function Morphology), or it can define the insertion site (typically a functional head) of a syntactic context (as in Distributed Morphology), but this issue is orthogonal to the question of how to basically model deponency. Given the apparent simplicity and naturalness of this kind of approach (after all, it captures directly the traditional insight underlying the name of the phenomenon, with *deponere* meaning 'set aside' or 'get rid of'), it is somewhat surprising that there seem to be fairly few analyses around that take this general form. As a matter of fact, I contend that none of the analyses in the present volume qualifies as an instance of form deponency. Stump is a prominent example, though.

Stump (2006: 286-9) postulates that there is a distinction between 'content paradigms' and

'form paradigms', with cells of the former corresponding to cells of the latter by means of rules of *paradigm linkage*. For each cell <L,σ> (where L stands for the abstract lexeme, and σ is a morphosyntactic property set encoded via morpho-syntactic features) of the content paradigm, the actual morphological realization of <L,σ> is determined by a corresponding cell <s,σ>, where s is a stem and σ is again a morphosyntactic property set encoded by features; <s,σ> is called the form correspondent of <L,σ>. The morphological realization of <s,σ> by exponents, in turn, is determined by standard rules of exponence and rules of referral, as in Stump (2001). Crucially, the content paradigm captures the morphosyntactic property set as it is relevant in the syntax whereas the form paradigm determines how realization of feature sets by exponents takes place. Paradigm linkage rules may now operate in such a way that a mismatch between the features active in syntax and the features governing morphological exponence can arise. For the case of Latin deponent verbs, Stump makes the following suggestion. First, there is a general default rule of paradigm linkage according to which the realization of <L,σ> is that of <r,σ>, where r is the root of L; see [a]. Second, there is a special deponency rule stating that the realization of <L,σ> is in fact not that of <r,σ>, but rather what is determined for r by function f applying to σ; see [b]. Since this latter rule is more specific, it overrides the former rule if both can in principle apply, that is, in the case of deponent verbs.

[a] *Universal default rule of paradigm linkage*:

If <L,σ> is a content-cell and stem r is stipulated as the root of lexeme L, then <L,σ> has <r,σ> as its form-correspondent, that is, the realization of the content-cell <L,σ> is that of the form-cell <r,σ>.

[b] *Latin rule of paradigm linkage*:

Where L is a deponent verbal lexeme having r as its root, the content-cell <L,σ> has <r,f(σ)> as its form-correspondent.

The function f presented below models the mismatch by yielding a corresponding passive

form if σ is an active form. The definition of the Latin property mapping f is:

If σ = {active X}, then f(σ) = {passive X}; otherwise f(σ) = σ .

Consequently, with deponents a picture as in emerges, where (2a) is a content cell, (2b) is a corresponding form cell (given the *Latin rule of paradigm linkage* above), and (2c) below is the realization that is predicted for this form cell by regular rules of exponence, and that is then derived as the (unfaithful) realization of this content cell:

(2a) <FATĒRĪ 'confess', {1st singular present nonperfect active indicative}>

(2b) <fat, {1st singular present nonperfect passive indicative}>

(2c) realization: *fateor*

Importantly, in this account the relevant morphosyntactic features of the content cell and of the form cell are all of the same type (σ occurs in both cases), as are the features of the actual morphological exponent. Furthermore, the featural information that is present in the content cell is the one that is relevant for syntax; there is no further mismatch with respect to interpretation. For these reasons, the approach qualifies as an instance of form deponency. There is a true mismatch of active and passive features with deponent verbs. Other theoretical analyses of form deponency are, of course, conceivable but, as noted, curiously there do not appear to be too many around.

3.2.2 Property deponency

Consider next property deponency. Recall that in the contribution to the present volume, Stump argues that Sanskrit –verbs should be analyzed in this way because here the WRONG morphosyntactic feature ([+MIDDLE], with an active interpretation) does not merely affect the morphological realization of the exponent; this feature is also syntactically visible, for example, it participates in agreement. Thus, –verbs can be morphologically and syntactically marked [+MIDDLE], but can, by stipulation, escape a standard [+MIDDLE] interpretation, *viz*., an interpretation of the object as affected. Technically, this can be implemented by assuming

paradigm-dependent interpretation of features to be possible, as it is done by Stump. But again, there are other options. Embick's (2000) analyses of Latin deponent verbs are a case in point.

Embick adopts a Distributed Morphology perspective, according to which inflectional exponents are post-syntactic realizations of functional heads. To account for deponency in Latin, he devises two analyses. He argues that the second analysis is eventually superior, for reasons that are not directly relevant to the present discussion. In both analyses, there are two possible sources of the feature [+PASSIVE]. In the first analysis, [+PASSIVE] may either be present in the syntax, triggering passive morphology AND interpretation (this is the case of standard passives), or it may be inserted after syntax, where it still triggers passive morphology (given late insertion of morphological exponents) but comes too late to trigger passive syntax, or passive interpretation (this is the case of deponent verbs). Thus, under the second scenario, there is a COUNTER-FEEDING relation between [+PASSIVE] insertion and interpretation: With regular passive clauses, [+PASSIVE] feeds interpretation; with deponent verbs, [+PASSIVE] cannot feed interpretation (given a Chomskyan Y-model of grammar, where the level of logical form (LF) branches off before morphological and phonological operations take place). On this view, deponent verbs can be viewed on a par with typical cases of opacity as they are known in phonology.

In the second analysis developed by Embick, [+PASSIVE] may show up in two different positions (rather than at two different stages of the derivation): With regular passivization, it is part of a functional head (triggering passive syntax and intepretation). With deponent verbs, it shows up on a root, where subcatgorization information of the verb and interpretation of the clause as active are not affected. Morphological realization of [+PASSIVE] proceeds uniformly, though.

In both analyses, a feature [+PASSIVE] of the morphosyntactic property set is matched with a feature [+PASSIVE] of a morphological exponent, and standard [+PASSIVE] interpretation is

not possible with deponents. Thus, there is a mismatch, and it is not one between a morphosyntactic property set and a morphological exponent but one between a morphosyntactic property set and the interpretation. Therefore, both analyses would seem to belong to the group of property deponency analyses. However, it may be interesting to note that at least Embick's first analysis is not actually automatically capable of achieving what Stump introduces the concept of property deponency for *viz.*, ensuring full syntactic activity of the feature in question: if [+PASSIVE] is inserted post-syntactically with deponent verbs, it comes too late to trigger passive interpretation; but it also comes too late to participate in syntactic agreement rules. Thus, if Embick's first analysis were to be extended to –verbs in Sanskrit without further modification, it looks as though one would have to assume that agreement is also a post-syntactic phenomenon (that can be fed by post-syntactic [+PASSIVE] insertion; see Bobaljik 2008 and Keine 2010a).

3.2.3 Spurious morpho-syntactic deponency

The third type of analysis to be discussed here is what I have called SPURIOUS MORPHOSYNTACTIC DEPONENCY. In such an approach, it is assumed that there is in fact no mismatch at all: the morphological exponent faithfully realizes a morphosyntactic property set, which receives its standard interpretation. However, the features involved here are assumed to be significantly more abstract than is standardly postulated. Bobaljik's (this volume) analysis of spurious antipassive in Chukchi is a typical example of this kind of approach. Recall that in his analysis, the 'antipassive' marker *ine* is in fact not an antipassive marker but an exponent that realizes a functional category V (which forms a complex head together with the verb stem) in the presence of an object to its right. Standard antipassive contexts and transitive contexts with certain marked person combinations of external and internal arguments have in common that the object shows up to the right of V (whereas it undergoes movement in other transitive contexts), and this accounts for the identity in marker

choice. Clearly, this analysis involves neither form deponency nor property deponency.

A similar analysis has been given by Keine (2010b) for *infinitivus pro Participio* (IPP, also called 'Ersatz infinitive') constructions in German. The phenomenon is illustrated by the data in (3a) and (3b): if a modal verb like *wollen* ('want') is embedded by a perfect auxiliary and embeds an infinitive itself, it shows up as an infinitive, not as a past participle as one would normally expect because the perfect auxiliary regularly takes a past participle in German, not an infinitive (see (3c) and (3d)). In addition, the VP headed by the modal verb is extraposed in IPP constructions. Thus, in contrast to other cases of deponency, the IPP effect is both morphologically and syntactically conditioned.

(3) (a) **dass sie das Lied singen GEWOLLT hat*

that she the song sing-INF want-PART has

(3) (b) *dass sie das Lied hat singen WOLLEN*

that she the song has sing-INF want-INF

(3) (c) *dass sie das GEWOLLT hat*

that she that want-PART has

(3) (d) **dass sie das hat WOLLEN*

that she that has want-INF

Keine's (2010b) analysis is similar to Bobaljik's account of the Chukchi pattern, and it also relies on post-syntactic insertion of exponents into functional heads: the infinitive marker is viewed as the default exponent whereas the past participle exponent is used if a verb is c-commanded by a perfect auxiliary (V^{PERF}). If verb movement has applied to a position outside of the c-command domain of V^{PERF}, the context for participle morphology is not present anymore, and the default infinitive exponent is inserted. The movement of the most deeply embedded verb is normally blocked. However, it is forced by a special filter with certain kinds of embedding verbs.

3.2.4 Spurious morphomic deponency

The fourth way to model deponency can be referred to as SPURIOUS MORPHOMIC DEPONENCY. Here, the central assumption is that 'active' inflection, 'passive' inflection, etc. in Latin are pure FORM CLASSES, without any direct syntactic interpretation. Thus, in such an analysis, the relevant features governing morphological exponence are MORPHOMIC in the sense of Aronoff (1994). The existence of morphomic features as such can be viewed as well motivated. Inflection class features are morphomic by definition since they play no role in syntax (otherwise they would qualify as gender features). Furthermore, it has been argued that inflection class features should be decomposed into combinations of more primitive features so as to capture transparadigmatic syncretism (see Alexiadou & Müller 2008, Trommer 2008 and Müller 2007, and references cited in these articles), which would then render any attempt at non-morphemic reanalysis of inflection class features futile, as in Wunderlich (1996). In addition, it can be noted that the decomposition of ANY feature with the purpose of accounting for syncretism via underspecification, as it is standardly adopted since Jakobson (1962) or Bierwisch (1967), makes the more primitive feature resulting from decomposition morphomic. The reason is that, whereas there appears to be good reason to assume that morphology can operate with individual features like, for example [+OBLIQUE], [+GOVERNED], [–1], or [–3], syntactic rules have no access to this fine-structure, and can (at least in the vast majority of cases) only mention the fully specified feature combination (like [+OBLIQUE,+GOVERNED] = dative, or [–1,–3] = second person). Next, a 'transcategorial' decomposition of morphological features yielding second-order features that capture combinations of instantiations of two distinct grammatical categories like, for example [±STANDARD], or [±MARKED], as they have been suggested for deriving syncretism across categories by Wiese (1999) and Trommer (2005), among others, certainly creates morphomicity. Finally, it has been argued that one should even postulate purely morphomic features for syncretism, where what the feature refers to does not seem to correspond to a

natural class of contexts by any stretch of the imagination, and no attempt can be made to end up with the feature via decomposition of the standard grammatical categories (see Bonami & Boyé 2010).

Against this background, the assumption that deponency does not involve any kind of feature mismatch because the feature required for morphological exponence is morphomic certainly cannot be viewed as *a priori* implausible. And indeed, it turns out that this approach has been pursued in a number of analyses of deponency phenomena.

A first candidate for this kind of approach is Kiparsky, who notes (p. 121):

> These data [which show that verbs of any semantic type can be deponents in Latin, and that there are semi-deponents] suggest that passive inflection in Latin is a *conjugational* feature – we'll call it [±Passive] – which can be lexically specified, for verb stems as well as for inflectional endings, or left unspecified.

However, later in the article Kiparsky (p. 122) states that:

> [+Passive] inflections trigger one or more of the operations on the verb's argument structure [...], forming passives, as well as possibly reflexives, reciprocals, and inchoatives, depending on further, partly idiosyncratic, properties of the verb.

Directly triggering an operation on a verb's argument structure is not a possible property of a morphomic feature, so this understanding of [+Passive] would seem to be more in line with Embick's view. A proper treatment of deponency is not the most important goal of Kiparsky's (2005) article, so he is not too specific about the formalism, and it is hard to decide whether the approach relies on spurious morphomic deponency or not.

The situation is different with Schulz (2010), who explicitly develops a morphomic analysis of Latin deponent verbs and some related phenomena. Extending Aronoff's (1994) work on binyanim in Modern Hebrew, Schulz argues that voice is not a morphological category in Latin. Rather, there are various form classes ('second-order inflection classes'),

and a verb may in principle belong to several such form classes, so that it is able to select more than one marker set. However, deponent transitive verbs belong to fewer form classes than regular transitive verbs. This derives possible inflectional patterns for the various types of verbs in Latin, but it does not yet ensure that certain kinds of patterns seem to be confined to active clauses, other kinds of patterns show up in passive clauses with most verbs but in active clauses with deponent verbs, and so on. Here Schulz assumes that a proper voice feature may also show up on verb stems, together with morphomic form class features triggering morphological exponence. It is this voice feature that is matched with a voice feature in the syntax. This way, morphological exponence is correlated with syntactic features after all, albeit very indirectly. The resulting approach is not particularly restrictive. For instance, nothing would preclude the existence of a class of verbs that we may refer to as 'polar deponent verbs' in Latin, where the exponents that are typically used in passive contexts are used in active contexts (as with deponent verbs) and, in addition, the exponents that are typically used in active contexts are used to express passive (thus avoiding defectivity). However, from a more general point of view, it is not clear whether this lack of restrictiveness is in fact a shortcoming of the proposal. As noted above, in his contribution to the present volume Baerman observes that the polarity effect with morphological exponence in telic *vs*. atelic verbs in Tübatulabal looks just like this.

Furthermore, the Paradigm Function Morphology approach to Latin deponent verbs in Sadler & Spencer (2001) already qualifies as an instance of spurious morphomic deponency. The authors distinguish between a syntactic voice feature ('S-VOICE') with values ACTIVE and PASSIVE, and a morphological feature ('m-voice') with values Active and Passive. There are default rules correlating S-VOICE:ACTIVE with m-voice:Active and S-VOICE:PASSIVE with m-voice:Passive; deponency arises where S-VOICE:ACTIVE is correlated with m-voice:Passive, which overrides the default in the case of deponent verbs. Since there is no intrinsic relation between the two types of features (S-VOICE and m-voice), there is no particular mismatch in

the case of deponent verbs: rather, in this approach there is a systematic and radical mismatch between morphological exponence and morpho-syntactic property set, and the correlation is brought about indirectly in ALL cases, by designated rules correlating the two feature types. On this view, deponent verbs are exceptional only insofar as they override a default, but overriding defaults is ubiquitous in this kind of approach, and typically does not result in any kind of exceptionality or perceived markedness. Moreover, one could just as well envisage a minimally different version of this analysis that does without defaults (in this domain at least): non-deponent verbs could be given a class feature [+α], deponent verbs could be assigned the feature [–α], and the two rules correlating S-VOICE:ACTIVE and m-voice:Active, and S-VOICE:ACTIVE and m-voice:Passive, could then be restricted to [+α] and [–α] contexts, respectively.

Hippisley's two Network Morphology analyses in the present volume are of exactly the same type: they are also strictly morphomic. To see this, consider the statements that Hippisley adopts for Latin deponent verbs:

VERB

<syn> == "<mor>"

<mor active> == ACTFORMS:< >

<mor passive> == PASSFORMS:< >

DEPONENT

< > == VERB <mor active> == PASSFORMS:< > (This yields deponency)

<mor active imperfective future infinitive> == VERB (This captures an exception)

<mor passive> == *undefined*. (This yields defectivity)

Typographical preferences aside, this analysis is indeed very similar to the one developed in Sadler & Spencer (2001). In particular, ACTFORMS, PASSFORMS are morphomic features: they

define form classes and play no role in syntax. Unfortunatley, by chosing an identical name for features with a different ontological status (morpho-syntactic property *vs.* morphological form class), there is a certain danger that people who study the analyses only superficially may misinterpret them substantially. Sadler & Spencer (2001) are fully aware of this potential problem:

> We mustn't be fooled by notation here, of course. The features 'Tense' and TENSE are completely different formal objects on such a view (as can be seen by replacing all the feature names with completely arbitrary integers).

Similarly, Hippisley's analysis works in exactly the same way if one replaces ACTFORMS, PASSFORMS with FORM-CLASS 1, FORM-CLASS 2; or, indeed, with PASSFORMS, ACTFORMS, respectively. It is my firm belief that providing the morphological form classes with names that reveal their morphomic status would would be vastly preferable because it would exclude possible misunderstandings about the workings of the theories.

Irrespective of these issues, it can be noted that spurious morphomic deponency looks like the standard approach to deponency in Network Morphology: Hippisley's analysis of deponent nouns in Archi, and the three analyses of deponency phenomena developed by Brown (2006) also do not rely on either form deponency nor property deponency.

3.2.5 The taxonomy: conclusion

Given that four different types of analyses of deponency can be distinguished, with different consequences both for the analysis of individual phenomena and the overall organization of grammar, one may ask whether there is reason to try to strengthen one of the analysis types, and perhaps ideally dispense with the remaining analysis types altogether. I take this question to be open. However, it can be pointed out that some of the analysis types are far from innocuous whereas others cannot be generalized easily. As regards the latter issue, consider spurious morphosyntactic deponency approaches. It is completely unclear whether a different

syntactic context can plausibly be assumed in all attested cases of deponency. For instance, to account for Latin deponent verbs in this way, it would have to be postulated that there are syntactic, for example movement-related, differences between deponent transitive verbs and regular transitive verbs (which then can be assumed to trigger differences in morphological exponence by providing different insertion contexts despite basic categorial identity). Similarly, there would have to be syntactic differences between deponent and regular nouns in Archi, and so on. As things stands, it looks as though it will be difficult to find independent motivation for the postulation of such syntactic differences.

As for the many spurious morphomic deponency approaches, they certainly work, but there is no denying that they complicate the syntax/morphology interface because the two levels do not talk about the same kinds of features even though there is a tight interaction.This interaction must then be derived by stipulation in each case. Also, it is not quite clear where to stop with morphomic analysis.[8] It seems clear that there must be some features that are truly SHARED by morphology and syntax and, for reasons of theoretical parsimony, one might then want to use this kind of interpretable feature whenever possible.

Finally, property deponency approaches also strike me as potentially problematic, even though I think that Stump makes a very good case for them. The reason is that they make some radical assumptions necessary. For instance, as Stump notes, a feature like [+PASSIVE] cannot be mentioned by syntactic rules if passive deponency is derived in this way. Furthermore, in what appears to be the majority of cases of deponency that are attested in the literature, it seems that the feature associated with morphological exponence is in fact not the one that syntactic rules require, which would seem to exclude a property deponency approach in at least these cases (though see the above remarks on Embick 2000).

In view of all this, my own tentative conclusion is that the form deponency approach should be strengthened, and generalized as much as possible. Whether it is eventually a viable concept to cover all instances of deponency remains to be seen.[9]

4 Conclusion

This is a remarkable volume, and the first of its kind. All contributions discuss interesting phenomena. Most of them are of high quality and some strike me as truly impressive because they offer new typological or theoretical ideas. What is more, to get hold of the twelve papers collected here, one does not even have to go and buy this book: the complete volume is available for free online, from the homepage of the British Academy (see http://www.proc.britac.ac.uk/cgi-bin/somsid.cgi? page=volumes/pba145).

In addition, the book is complemented by a website containing a lot of material on deponency that also originates in the project responsible for the present volume (see http://www.smg.surrey.ac.uk/deponency/). Among other things, one can find there a cross-linguistic database, a typological database (which, *inter alia*, suggests that deponency can affect virtually every grammatical category and can be conditioned by any instantiation of a grammatical category), and a set of formal analyses in Network Morphology carried out by Andrew Hippisley and Dunstan Brown.[10] Together, the book and the website provide a great service to the field.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis & Gereon Müller 2008. Class features as probes. In Asaf Bachrach & Andrew Nevins (eds.), *Inflectional identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 101–155..

Aronoff, Mark 1994. *Morphology by itself*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press..

Baerman, Matthew, Greville G. Corbett, Dunstan Brown & Andrew Hippisley (eds.) 2007. *Deponency and morphological mismatches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (for The British Academy).

Bickel, Balthasar 2007. Typology in the 21st century: Major current developments. *Linguistic Typology* 11: 239–251.

Bierwisch, Manfred 1967. Syntactic features in morphology: General problems of so-called pronominal inflection in German. In *To Honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, 11 October 1966*. (= Janua Linguarum 31-33). The Hague and Paris: Mouton. 239–270.

Bobaljik, Jonathan D. 2008. Where's phi? Agreement as a post-syntactic operation. In Daniel Harbour, David Adger & Susana Béjar (eds.), *Phi-Theory: Phi features across interfaces and modules*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 295–328.

Bonami, Olivier & Gilles Boyé 2010. Opaque paradigms, transparent forms. Unpublished manuscript. University Paris-Sorbonne and University Bordeaux 3.

Brown, Dunstan 2006. Formal analyses of Chukchi, Kayardild, Tülatulabal. Ms., Surrey Morphology Group. Available from

http://www.smg.surrey.ac.uk/deponency/DeponencyDATRanalyses.htm.

Corbett, Greville G. 2005. The canonical approach in typology. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges & David S. Rood (eds.), *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 25–49.

Corbett, Greville G. & Norman M. Fraser 1993. Network morphology: a DATR account of Russian nominal inflection. *Journal of Linguistics* 29: 113–142.

Embick, David 2000. Features, syntax, and categories in the Latin perfect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 185–230.

Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Kenneth Hale and Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.. 111–176.

Isačenko, Alexander V. 1975. *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart*. München: Hueber.

Jakobson, Roman 1962. Morfologieskije nabljudenija. In *Selected Writings*, volume 2, pages 154–181. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Keine, Stefan 2010a. *Case and agreement from fringe to core. Impoverishment effects on agree*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Keine, Stefan 2010b. Substitute infinitives as non-substitutes. *Linguistische Berichte* 223: 331–341.

Kiparsky, Paul 2005. Blocking and periphrasis in inflectional paradigms. In Gert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.),, *Yearbook of Morphology 2004*. Dordrecht: Springer. 113–135.

Müller, Gereon 2007 Notes on paradigm economy. *Morphology* 17: 1–38.

Müller, Gereon 2010. An optimality-theoretic approach to deponency. Unpublished manuscript. Universität Leipzig.

Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky 2004. *Optimality Theory. Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rizzi, Luigi 1986. Null objects in italian and the theory of 'pro'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 501–557.

Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer. Syntax as an exponent of morphological features. In Gert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2000*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 71–96.

Schulz, Patrick. 2010. The form, function, and meaning of morpho-syntactic features. B.A. Thesis, Universität Leipzig.

Starke, Michal 2009. Nanosyntax: A short primer to a new approach to language. *Nordlyd* 36: 1–6.

Stump, Gregory 2001. *Inflectional morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stump, Gregory 2006. Heteroclisis and paradigm linkage. *Language* 82: 279–322.

Trommer, Jochen 2005. Markiertheit und Verarmung. Unpublished manuscript. Universität Leipzig. Presented at the Honorary Doctorate Colloquium for Manfred Bierwisch,

Leipzig 2005..

Trommer, Jochen 2008. A feature-geometric approach to Amharic verb classes. In Asaf Bachrach & Andrew Nevins (eds.), *The bases of inflectional identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 206–236.

Wiese, Bernd 1999. Unterspezifizierte Paradigmen. Form und Funktion in der pronominalen Deklination. *Linguistik Online* 4. (www.linguistik-online.de/3_99).

Wunderlich, Dieter 1996. Minimalist morphology: the role of paradigms. In Gert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1995*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 93–114.

Notes

[1] For helpful and enjoyable discussions, I am grateful to the participants of the advanced seminar *Deponenz* at Leipzig University in 2009, where we studied this book in detail. In particular, thanks go to Anke Assmann, Doreen Georgi, Johannes Hein, Alexander Jahraus, Stefan Keine, Jana Kellersmann, Maria Mammen, Patrick Schulz, Tilman van der Wall, and Philipp Weisser. I am also grateful to Balthasar Bickel and Jochen Trommer for helpful discussions. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for any mistakes or misrepresentations.

[2] That said, arguments should be readily available. If, for example *stolovaja* and *Angestellte(r)* are adjectives accompanied by an empty noun, one would *ceteris paribus* expect typical adjectival modifiers to be able to optionally co-occur with them. However, this does not seem to be possible; so it looks as though additional assumptions would be called for under this approach.

[3] A side remark: one of the many examples discussed by Spencer is that of the German honorific personal pronoun *Sie*, which is third person in the non-honorific use but second person (singular or plural) in the honorific use, and which Spencer treats as an instance of deponency. However, things may be slightly more complicated here because the honorific pronoun *Sie* requires an agreeing verb form to also have a third-person exponent. Compare,

for example, **Sie störst mich* 'You-HON disturb-2.SG me' with *Sie stören mich* 'You-HONdisturb-3.PL me'. This poses non-trivial problems for standard approaches to deponency but might be amenable to an analysis in terms of property deponency, an alternative concept suggested by Gregory Stump in his contribution to which I will come momentarily.

Still, closer inspection suggests that some more general phenomenon may underlie the use of third person pronouns (and verb forms) for honorific second person contexts: it turns out that, given appropriate contexts, ALL formal person-number combinations can be used to express reference to second person singular in German, except arguably for first person singular forms. Here is a list: *Du schläfst* 'You.2.SG sleep-2.SG', 'You are sleeping' (the regular use); *Hat Madame gut geschlafen?* 'Has-3.SG. madame-3.SG well slept', 'Did you sleep well?' (to a woman, friendly mocking); *Wie geht es uns denn heute; haben wir gut geschlafen?* 'How goes it us then today; have we slept well', "How are you-2.SG today? Did you-2.SG sleep well?' (question by doctor in a hospital context); *Ihr seid mächtig, Majesttät* 'You-2.PL are powerful, majesty', 'You-2.SG are powerful, majesty' (honorific context); *Sie stören mich* 'They-3.PL disturb-3.PL me', 'You-2.SG disturb me' (honorific use).

[4] Stump suggests that it is the 'morpho-syntactic property set' with which an exponent's features are matched, and the regularity can presumably be expressed by a rule of referral. Assuming a Distributed Morphology approach (Halle & Marantz 1993), this role could be played by the syntactic representation after impoverishment has applied in the relevant contexts, thereby rendering middle and passive indistinguishable for the purposes of morphological realization.

[5] It is also worth noting that it corresponds to recent trends in grammatical theory. See, for instance, the nanosyntax approach developed as part of the *Castl* project at Tromsø University (cf. Starke 2009 and references cited there).

[6] That said, the two further types I will introduce do in fact not postulate a genuine mismatch;

assuming that deponency refers to form/function mismatches, omitting these kinds of approaches is, in a sense, justified. Furthermore, it should be noted that Stump actually briefly discusses one of the two types (p. 91).

[7] This much also seems to be presupposed in Stump's discussion on p. 73, when, after describing form deponency, he introduces property deponency by stating that '[t]here is, however, another imaginable perspective.'

[8] Would one expect that, for example, number and person features are also purely syntactic, with form class features responsible for the morphological exponence? If not, why not?

[9] Some theories of grammar seem better equipped to accomodate form deponency than others. In particular, it seems to me that Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky 2004) might provide a suitable framework for such an analysis because it recognizes constraint violation as a basic concept. See Müller (2010) for an optimality-theoretic analysis in terms of form deponency that relies on ranked faithfulness constraints which can be minimally violated in cases of deponency.

[10] Hippisley's analyses of case deponency in Archi and deponent verbs in Latin have also made it into the present volume. Curiously, though, Brown's (2006) analyses of antipassive deponency in Chukchi, verbal case on nouns in Kayardild, and the polarity effect with telic and atelic verb stems in Tübatulabal did apparently not result in a published article. The reasons for this are unclear to me. These case studies would certainly have further strengthened the present volume, especially in view of the fact that all the relevant data also show up elsewhere in the book.