Selective Handout for
Harmonic Alignment in Morphosyntax: Subject Selection
Judith Aissen

Harmonic Alignment

(13)   Harmonic Alignment ($\mathcal{HA}$) applies to a pair of scales. [1]

A structural, binary scale	An n-ary scale, usually substantive, e.g.
Syllable Structure Positions: Peak > Margin	Sonority Scale: $a > \dots > t$

Grammatical Functions:
      Subject > NonSubject
            Subject > Object
            Subject > Oblique
	Role Scale: Agent > Patient
	Topicality Scale: T > t
	Person Scale: Local > 3rd
	                         $1^{st} > 3^{rd}$
	                         2nd > 3rd

(14) … and derives harmonic alignments and constraint subhierarchies

$\mathcal{HA}$ (X, Y)	Harmonic Alignments	Constraint Subhierarchies

$\mathcal{HA}$ (GF, Role)	Su/Agent ≻ Su/Patient
	   Oj/Patient ≻ Oj/Agent
	   Obl/Patient ≻ Obl/Agent
		*Su/Patient » *Su/Agent
		   *Oj/Agent » *Oj/Patient
		   *Obl/Agent » *Obl/Patient

$\mathcal{HA}$ (GF, Topicality)	Su/T ≻ Su/t
	   Oj/t ≻ Oj/T
	   Obl/t ≻ Obl/T
		*Su/t » *Su/T
		   *Oj/T » *Oj/t
		   *Obl/T » *Obl/t

$\mathcal{HA}$ (GF, Person)	Su/Local ≻ Su/3
	   Oj/3 ≻ Oj/Local
	   Obl/3 ≻ Obl/Local
		*Su/3 » *Su/Local
		   *Oj/Local » *Oj/3
		   *Obl/Local » *Obl/3

---

[1] Alignment. Suppose given a binary dimension D_1 with a scale X > Y on its elements {X, Y}, and another dimension D_2 with a scale a > b ... > z on its elements. The harmonic alignment of D_1 and D_2 is the pair of Harmony scales:

H_X : X/a > X/b > ... > X/z
H_Y: Y/z > ... > Y/b > Y/a

The constraint alignment is the pair of constraint hierarchies:

C_X: *X/z >> ... >> *X/b >> *X/a
C_Y : *Y/a >> *Y/b >> ... >> *Y/z

(Prince and Smolensky 1993, 136)

Some Case Studies from Aissen 1999

(20)   Simplifying assumptions:
Since neither active nor passive violates *Oj/Agt, this constraint is ignored.
Syntactic obliques are restricted here to AGENT obliques.

Subject selection determined solely by semantic role

(21)   Fox (Algonquian): All clauses with syntactically realized AGENT and PATIENT
are active (Dahlstrom 1995)

*<u>Su/Pat</u> » $\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$

x: Agent /3rd /t y: Patient/Local/T	*<u>Su/Pat</u>	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
☞ ACT: Su/Agt/3/t Oj/Pat/Local/T		******
PSV: Su/Pat/Local/T Obl/Agt/3/t	*!	*****

Discourse status plays a role in subject selection

(22)   "English": Passive occurs when patient is topical (Tomlin 1985; Thompson 1987)

*Su/t » *<u>Su/Pat</u> » $\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$

a.

x: Agent /3rd/t y: Patient/3rd/T	*Su/t	*<u>Su/Pat</u>	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
ACT: Su/Agt/3/t Oj/Pat/3/T	*!		*****
☞ PSV: Su/Pat/3/T Obl/Agt/3/t		*	*****

b.

x: Agent /3rd/t y: Patient/3rd/t	*Su/t	*<u>Su/Pat</u>	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
☞ ACT: Su/Agt/3/t Oj/Pat/3/t	*		*****
PSV: Su/Pat/3/t Obl/Agt/3/t	*	*!	****

Person plays a role in subject choice -- Salish (Jelinek and Demers 1983)

(23) Lushootseed

a) Like English except that passives with local person agents are excluded (a common constraint).

	Active	Passive
$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ A, 3rd P	yes	no
3rd A, 3rd P	yes	yes
$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ A, $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ P	yes	no
3rd A , $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ P	yes	yes

b) Ranking: *Obl/Local » *Su/t » *<u>Su/Pat</u> » *$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$

c)

x: Agent/1st/t y: Patient/3rd/T	*Obl/Local	*Su/t	*<u>Su/Pat</u>	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
☞ ACT: Su/Agt/1/t Oj/Pat/3/T		*		*****
PSV: Su/Pat/3/T Obl/Agt/1/t	*!		*	****

(31) Lummi

a)   Like Lushootseed except that active clauses with local person patients are ungrammatical.

	Active	Passive
$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ A, 3rd P	yes	no
3rd A, 3rd P	yes	yes
$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ A, $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ P	yes	no
3rd A , $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ P	no	yes

b)   *Obl/Local » *Oj/Local » *Su/t » *<u>Su/Pat</u> » *$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$

c)

x: Agent/3/T y: Patient/1st/t	*Obl/Local	*Oj/Local *or *Su/3*	*Su/t	*<u>Su/Pat</u>	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
ACT: Su/Agt/3/T Oj/Pat/1/t		*!			*****
☞ PSV: Su/Pat/1/t Obl/Agt/3/T			*	*	****

d)

x: Agent/2nd y: Patient/1st	*Obl/Local	*Oj/Local *or *Su/3*	*Su/t	*<u>Su/Pat</u>	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
☞ ACT: Su/Agt/2 Oj/Pat/1		*			*****
PSV: Su/Pat/1 Obl/Agt/2	*!			*	****

(25)   Squamish (Salish)   (Jelinek and Demers 1983)

a)   Like Lummi except that 1st and 2nd person patients behave differently…

	Active	Passive
1st/2nd A, 3rd P	yes	no
3rd A, 3rd P	yes	yes
1st/2nd A, 1st/2nd P	yes	no
3rd A , 1st P	yes	yes
3rd A, 2nd P	no	yes

b)   *Obl/Local » *Oj/2 » *Su/t » *Su/Pat » *$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$

c)

x: Agent/3rd/T y: Patient/2st/t	*Obl/Local	*Oj/2	*Su/t	*Su/Pat	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
ACT: Su/Agt/3/T Oj/Pat/2/t		*!			*****
☞ PSV: Su/Pat/2/t Obl/Agt/3/T			*	*	****

x: Agent/3/t y: Patient/1st/t	*Obl/Local	*Oj/2	*Su/t	*Su/Pat	*$\mathcal{GF}$ /$\mathcal{X}$
☞ ACT: Su/Agt/3/t Oj/Pat/1/t			*		*****
PSV: Su/Pat/1/t Obl/Agt/3/t			*	*!	****

References for *selective handout***:**

Dahlstrom, A. (1995). Morphology and syntax of the Fox (Mesquakie) language, Manuscript, University of Chicago.

Jelinek, E. and R. Demers (1983). "The agent hierarchy and voice in some Coast Salish languages." International Journal of American Linguistics **49**: 167-85.

Prince, A. and P. Smolensky (1993). Optimality theory: constraint interaction in generative grammar. Piscataway, NJ, Rutgers University Center for Cognitive Science.

Thompson, S. (1987). The passive in English: a discourse perspective. In honor of Ilse Lehiste. R. Channon and L. Shockey. Dordrecht, Foris**:** 497-511.

Tomlin, R. (1985). Interaction of subject, theme, and agent. Beyond the sentence: discourse and sentential form. J. Wirth. Ann Arbor, Karoma Publishers**:** 61-80.