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1. Introduction
The Western Armenian possessive plural data originally reported in Vaux (1998, 2003) have been asserted by Wolf 2011 to involve outwardly-sensitive phonologically conditioned allomorphy, a phenomenon widely argued to be unattested (Carstairs-McCarthy 1987; Paster 2006) and predicted to be impossible by the tenets of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993; Bobaljik 2000). We show that the full complexity of the Western Armenian system is better captured in an account that makes no reference to outwardly-sensitive phonological conditioning of this sort. The analysis is based on standard DM mechanisms of morpheme copying, displacement, and spellout (Harris and Halle 2005, Arregi and Nevins 2012), and thus relies on inwardly-sensitive phonological conditioning and outwardly-sensitive morphosyntactic conditioning. After presenting the relevant data in detail, we present an analysis based on morpheme copying and displacement, and compare this with the Optimal Interleaving alternative offered by Wolf (2011).

* Many thanks to Sebouh Aslanian, George Balabanian, Luc Baronian, Anaid Donabedian, Avedis Hadjian, Suzy Ishkhanian, Shoghig Mikaelian, Avik Topchian, Karine Tovmassian, and especially Hagop Hachikian for judgements on the Armenian data presented here, which though cited from numerous sources appear to have originated primarily from Arsen Aydanean (1825-1902) and Hrach'ya Acharyan (1876-1953), both of whom were born and raised in Istanbul. Armenian forms are transcribed in the IPA when cited for linguistic purposes and in the ALA-LC system (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romanization_of_Armenian) when cited for bibliographic purposes.
2. The data
Possessive phrases in colloquial Western Armenian are typically formed in one of two ways. If there is a possessive pronoun\(^1\) it precedes the noun and any demonstratives and adjectives, as in (1).

(1) im aj-s sev gadu-s
    my demonstr.adj-1\(^2\) black cat-1poss.
    ‘this black cat of mine’

One can also see in (1) that in such cases the possessed noun or postposition\(^3\) is marked with a possessive clitic\(^4\), in this case /-s/, which displays overt agreement in person with first and second person singular possessors. Third person singular and all plural possessors instead suffix underlying /-n/, which surfaces as [ə] when unable to syllabify as a Nucleus. Acharyan 1953 considers this /-n/ to be the definite article

---

\(^1\) The pronominal forms discussed here are called adjectives by e.g. Dönelean 1899 (stats’akan atsakanner ‘possessive adjectives’) and Sakayan 2000, but morphologically are subject pronouns in the genitive case.

\(^2\) We employ “1” to refer to the morpheme /-s/- that is used in various grammatical contexts to refer to things in the immediate environment of the speaker. (The 1st person possessive morpheme discussed here derives historically from this.)

\(^3\) Modern Armenian allows constructions like (SWA) metf\(^b\)-ɛɾ-ni-s (in-spurious.pl-poss.pl-1pers) ‘among us’ (lit. ‘our in’) (Riggs 1856:25).

\(^4\) Acharyan 1953 calls this a dimorosh yod ‘person-definite article’ when it overtly agrees in person with its coreferent (i.e. –s when used with the 1st person singular or plural, -d when used with the 2nd person singular or plural or –n/-ə when used with the 3rd person singular), and voroshich yod ‘definite article’ when it doesn’t (i.e. –n/-ə when used with anything other than the 3rd singular). Sakayan 2000:52 calls all of them “possessive articles”.
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rather than a possessive clitic homophonous with the article. The resultant system is shown in (2).

(2) possessive constructions in colloquial Western Armenian with overt pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular possessor</th>
<th>plural possessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st person</strong></td>
<td>im gadu-s</td>
<td>mɛɾ gadu-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘my cat’</td>
<td>‘our cat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd person</strong></td>
<td>kʰu gadu-tʰ</td>
<td>tsʰɛɾ gadu-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘thy cat’</td>
<td>‘y’all’s cat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd person</strong></td>
<td>ir gadu-n</td>
<td>iɾɛntsʰ gadu-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘his/her/its cat’</td>
<td>‘their cat’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a possessed noun is plural, one inserts the regular plural allomorph, i.e. -ɛɾ- for monosyllables and -nɛɾ- for polysyllables, after the nominal root and before the possessive clitic. Case endings surface between the plural morpheme and the possessive clitic, as illustrated with the ablative suffix -ɛ- in (3).

(3) declined possessed forms of plural nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular possessor</th>
<th>plural possessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st person</strong></td>
<td>im gadu-nɛɾ-ɛ-s</td>
<td>mɛɾ gadu-nɛɾ-ɛ-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘from my cats’</td>
<td>‘from our cats’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd person</strong></td>
<td>kʰu gadu-nɛɾ-ɛ-tʰ</td>
<td>tsʰɛɾ gadu-nɛɾ-ɛ-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘from thy cats’</td>
<td>‘from y’all’s cats’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd person</strong></td>
<td>ir gadu-nɛɾ-ɛ-n</td>
<td>iɾɛntsʰ gadu-nɛɾ-ɛ-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘from his/her/its cats’</td>
<td>‘from their cats’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 This intriguing syncretism of a 3rd person possessive form with the definite article is found in other languages, suggesting that it is not a case of accidental homophony and merits a morphosyntactically principled account; see in particular Simonenko 2012 on the Finno-Ugric languages Komi and Mari. We do not attempt such an account here.
The second means of forming possessive phrases appears superficially to differ from the construction just reviewed only in lacking an overt possessive pronoun, as in the singular and plural nouns with singular possessors in (4).

(4) singular possessor constructions without overt pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular noun</th>
<th>plural noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1sg possessor</strong></td>
<td>gadu-s</td>
<td>gadu-ներ-իս</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘my cat’</td>
<td>‘my cats’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2sg possessor</strong></td>
<td>gadu-թ</td>
<td>gadu-ներ-ութ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘thy cat’</td>
<td>‘thy cats’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3sg possessor</strong></td>
<td>gadu-ն</td>
<td>gadu-ներ-ե</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘his/her/its cat’</td>
<td>‘his/her/its cats’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situation becomes more interesting when the possessor is plural. Many Western speakers optionally allow the possessive pronoun to remain unexpressed in such cases, parallel to (4). When a plural possessive pronoun is unexpressed, most speakers require that the possessed noun or postposition take the possessive plural suffix /-ni-/, the descendant of one of the Classical Armenian nominal plural affixes, -ani- (Karst 1901:179). As shown in (5b), this ni- morpheme normally surfaces between the nominal plural and the case suffix.


a. nominative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular noun</th>
<th>plural noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1pl possessor</strong></td>
<td>gadu-նի-ս</td>
<td>gadu-ներ-նի-ս</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘our cat’</td>
<td>‘our cats’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Andonian 1966:85 states that “it is preferable to avoid using these suffixes especially in the plural cases as they are rather awkward.” Sakayan 2000:52 states that plural possessives are limited to colloquial speech.
Forms like gadunis ‘our cat’ in (5a) show that in the absence of an overt possessive pronoun, 1st plural and 2nd plural possessors take the 1st and 2nd person possessive suffixes respectively, rather than the default 3rd person suffix that we saw in mɛɾ gadu-n and tsʰɛɾ gadu-n in (2).

Aydanean 1883 mentions that plural nouns with plural possessors can optionally drop the nominal plural suffix “when there’s no confusion of meaning”, so for example bardez-ni-s can mean both ‘our garden’ and ‘our gardens’.

(6) optional nominal plural (Aydanean 1883:37)

bardez-ni-s  our garden

bardez-ɛɾ-ni-s  our gardens

One final subtlety is that the possessive plural suffix /-ni-/ is subject to a prosodic minimality effect, requiring that the base it attaches to contain at least two syllables. As can be seen in (7b), monosyllables normally satisfy this requirement by
inserting the regular nominal plural affix for monosyllabic bases, -ɛɾ-, before the possessive plural.\(^7\) We refer to this semantically unmotivated morpheme henceforth as the “spurious plural”.\(^8\)

(7) possessive constructions with non-overt plural pronoun and monosyllabic possessee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. singular noun</th>
<th>b. plural noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1pl possessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘our house’</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-s</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘their house’</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-n</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2pl possessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘y’all’s house’</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-tʰ</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-tʰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3pl possessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘their house’</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-n</td>
<td>dun-ɛɾ-ni-n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The insertion of the spurious plural in such cases makes them homophonous with forms where both the possessor and possessee are plural (Riggs 1856:25, K’irēchchean 1864:91-2, Aydanean 1883:37, Dönelean 1899:83, Gulian 1902:26, Asatur 1902:156, Andonian 1966:85); dun-ɛɾ-ni-s in (7) can therefore mean either ‘our house’ or ‘our houses’, and so on.

Despite the appearance of the spurious plural morpheme, verbs agree with the semantic number of the possessed noun, as we can see in the expression kʰɛɾɛɾniʰ æɾɛ ɛ ‘how are you?’ in (8a). This idiom literally means ‘is your well-being good?’. One can

\(^7\) This phenomenon already surfaces in Middle Armenian (11th-15th centuries AD), as in Զուգիսք յուներենէդ տարած tsakers punernēn daradz ‘my children [were] taken from their nests’ (2Ud 215, cited in Petrosyan 1972).

\(^8\) It is worth mentioning here that some dialects satisfy the same prosodic requirement by inserting an epenthetic vowel between the base and the possessive plural morpheme. Agulis for example inserts -ə- after monosyllabic bases, and Old Julfa inserts -ɛ- (Acharyan 1954). We thus appear to have at least two different strategies for dealing with the prosodic requirement, one morphological and one phonological.
tell the addressee is plural/polite because the possessive plural -ni- is used; if the addressee were singular, the form would be khɛf-atʰ. Since khɛf is monosyllabic, though, the prosodic constraint mentioned above forces insertion of the spurious plural suffix ɛɾ, giving the final form khɛf-ɛɾ-ni-tʰ. The verb ɛ ‘is’ nevertheless remains singular.

(8) number agreement with possessive plurals
a. khɛf-ɛɾ-ni-tʰ ɑŋɡ ɛ-Ø
   well.being-spurious.pl-poss.pl-2pl.poss good be-3sg
   ‘how are you?’ (lit. ‘is your (pl./polite) well-being good?’)
   Anonymous 1835:83 (from Smyrna or Istanbul)

b. khɔrdz-ɛɾ-ni-s ɬav ɡ-ɛrtʰa-Ø
   work-spurious.pl-poss.pl-1 good imf.-go-3sg
   ‘our work is going well’
   Přoshean 1899 (1837-1907; from Ashtarak)

c. dɛɛ-ɛɾ-ni-s ɲɛɛ ɛ-Ø ɬɛv ɡəɾiv-ə an-havasar
   place-spurious.pl-poss.pl-1 narrow be-3sg and battle-def. un-equal
   ‘our location is narrow and the battle is unequal’
   P’aːp’azean 1891 (1866-1920; from Van)

For at least some speakers, the plural suffix for monosyllabic nouns, -ɛɾ-, is not the only morpheme that can be inserted to satisfy the prosodic requirement imposed by –ni-. Several older grammars mention that monosyllabic nouns with irregular plurals employ their irregular plural suffix rather than -ɛɾ- when forming plural possessives, as shown in (9).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Xes</th>
<th>our X</th>
<th>our Xes</th>
<th>gloss of X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mad</td>
<td>mad-ʋə-ɛɾɛ</td>
<td>mad-ʋə-ni-s</td>
<td>mad-ʋə-(ɛɾɛ)-ni-s</td>
<td>finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsʰɛɾ-kʰ</td>
<td>tsʰɛɾ-ʋə-ɛɾɛ</td>
<td>tsʰɛɾ-ʋə-ni-s</td>
<td>tsʰɛɾ-ʋə-(ɛɾɛ)-ni-s</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
atʃʰ-kʰ  atʃʰ-və-ner  atʃʰ-və-ni-s  atʃʰ-və-(ner)-ni-s  eye
[vod-kʰ]  vod-və-ner  vod-və-ni-s  vod-və-(ner)-ni-s  foot

K'irêchchean (1864:91-2) mentions that ‘our eye(s)’ may optionally be either atʃʰ-və-ni-s, as in (9), or the expected atʃʰ-kʰ-er-ni-s; Acharyan (1954:369) states the same for ‘our finger(s)’, mad-və-ni-s ~ mad-ɛɾ-əs.

Also interesting in this connection is a form mentioned by Petrosyan 1972¹⁰, hɛd-və-ni-s ‘with us’. Since postpositions like hɛd ‘with’ do not otherwise have plural forms, it is not clear why the irregular plural -və- rather than the regular -ɛɾ- is inserted here.

The -və- suffix descends from one of the Middle Armenian plural affixes, -vi, which is still used in many varieties of modern Armenian as a marker for paired body parts. Double plurals like -və-ner are fairly common in Armenian; some other examples are given in (10).

(10) double plurals in Western Armenian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. mad</td>
<td>mad-vi (rare), mad-və-ner</td>
<td>finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ḏəa</td>
<td>ḏəa-kʰ, ḏəa-kʰ-ner</td>
<td>boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. marth</td>
<td>marth-ig, marth-ig-ner</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms like mad-və-ner ‘fingers’ and hɛd-və-ni-s ‘with us’ suggest that the possessive plural morpheme -ni- is not requiring that it attach to the plural of the possessed noun or postposition; were this the case, with the former we would expect *mad-və-ner-ni-s rather than mad-və-ni-s for ‘our finger’, and with the latter we should not expect any output at all, as postpositions do not have plural forms.

The attested forms can be accounted for if we assume that both /-vi-/ and /ner/ are plural morphemes; this being the case, insertion of either one of them should

---

⁹ Forms from Asatur 1902:156; we have supplied the bare form.

¹⁰ He states that it comes from ՀԱ, ՀԲ, Ն, 195, but we haven’t yet figured out what text this refers to.
suffice to satisfy the prosodic requirement imposed by -ni-, which is precisely what we find with alternations such as atʃʰ-və-ni-s ~ atʃʰ-kʰ-ɛɾ-ni-s.

The forms in (9) suggest furthermore that the -ɛɾ- in dun-ɛɾ-ni-s ‘our house’ is actually actually a plural morpheme, rather than a purely phonological phenomenon consisting of say a default epenthetic vowel [e] à la Spanish and a default epenthetic consonant [r] as some have proposed for English. An analysis of this type would run afoul of the fact that the epenthetic vowel in Western Armenian is [ə], and the epenthetic consonant is [j], and would fail to account for the insertion of spurious -və- in (9).

We can think of at least three additional arguments for the prosodic requirement imposed by –ni- being satisfied specifically by insertion of a plural morpheme, rather than phonological epenthesis or stem suppletion:

i. The ancestor of possessive plural –ni- in Middle Armenian was a regular nominal plural affix –ni-, which like both Modern –ni- and Modern -ɛɾ- (itself composed of Middle Armenian –ni- and the ancestor of the Modern monosyllabic plural affix, -ɛɾ-) required that its host contain at least two syllables (Karst 1901:187). It seems reasonable to assume that this requirement was inherited unchanged by colloquial Western Armenian.

ii. Acharyan 1954:372 mentions that one normally cannot combine a possessive pronoun with the possessive plural –ni-, so that forms like *mɛɾ kʰini-ni-s ‘our wine’ in (11) are ungrammatical; one must say either mɛɾ kʰini-n or kʰini-ni-s.

(11) ‘our wine’

✗ mɛɾ kʰini-ni-s
✓ mɛɾ kʰini-n
✓ kʰini-ni-s

This distribution matches with what we have seen thus far in this paper. Interestingly, though, Acharyan adds that one can combine a possessive pronoun with -ni- if the
regular plural morpheme intervenes, so forms such as mɛɾ kʰini-nɛɾ-ni-s ‘our wines’ in (12) are grammatical.

(12) mɛɾ kʰini-nɛɾ-ni-s ‘our wines’

This makes possible a test for whether the spurious -ɛɾ- is a plural marker or part of a secondary stem, the key cases being constructions like Achařyan provides in (13):

(13) mɛɾ a-n  dun-ɛɾ-ni-s  
     our  demonstr-3  house-spurious.pl-poss.pl-1  
     ‘that house of ours’

Here the -ɛɾ- must count as a plural morpheme in order for Achařyan’s generalization to hold and make this construction grammatical. If the -ɛɾ- were phonologically epenthetic, or part of a suppletive stem dunɛɾ-, we would expect the construction in (13) to be ungrammatical.

iii. Our third and final argument involves the behavior of the instrumental suffix –ov-. In the varieties of Armenian that use the possessive plural -ni-, case suffixes generally follow the pattern we saw in (5b): they surface between the possessive plural –(a)ni- and the possessive clitics, as shown in (14) (cf. Karst 1901:187 on Middle Armenian).

(14) morpheme ordering in the New Julfa dialect (Achařyan 1940:§269)  
nominative  χatsʰ-ɛɾ-ani-s  ‘our bread(s)’  
genitive/dative  χatsʰ-ɛɾ-an-u-s  
ablative  χatsʰ-ɛɾ-an-utsʰ-əs  
instrumental  χatsʰ-ɛɾ-an-ovv-əs  
locative  χatsʰ-ɛɾ-an-um-əs

Several older grammars of Western Armenian, however, specify that the instrumental suffix -ov- differs from the rest of the case suffixes in surfacing before the possessive
plural -ni-, so for example ‘with our garden’ in (15) is bardez-ov-ni-s, not the expected *bardezn-ov-əs.

(15) bardez-ov-ni-s, not *bardezn-ov-əs  

Aydānean, Dōnelean, and Asatur add that singular and plural possessed nouns do not merge in the instrumental, so for example ‘by our father’ is hajr-ov-ni-s (16b), whereas ‘by our fathers’ is hajr-ər-ov-ni-s (16c).

(16) selective merger in possessive plurals  
a. hajr-ər-ni-s ‘our father, our fathers’  
b. hajr-ov-ni-s ‘by our father’  
c. hajr-ər-ov-ni-s ‘by our fathers’

For speakers with the system just described, the situation is summarized paradigmatically in (17).

(17) singular and plural possessive paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>polysyllables</th>
<th>monosyllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘our garden’</td>
<td>bardez-ni-s</td>
<td>dun-ər-ni-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘our gardens’</td>
<td>bardez-ner-ni-s</td>
<td>dun-er-ni-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘our house’</td>
<td>dun-ər-ni-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘our houses’</td>
<td>dun-er-ər-ni-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forms in (16) and (17) suggest that monosyllabic bases augmented by the instrumental suffix –ov- are able to satisfy the prosodic requirement imposed by the

11 Hagop Hachikian (born in Istanbul in the 1960s) states that he prefers gadu-ner-n-ov-s over gadunerovnis.
possessive plural –ni-, and insertion of the spurious plural morpheme is therefore unnecessary, which enables the singular and plural forms to remain distinct in the instrumental case.

Note that the stem allomorphy analysis of the appearance of spurious -ɛɾ-, wherein –ni- requires selection of a polysyllabic stem allomorph, does not provide a satisfying account for a form like dun-ov-ni-s ‘by our house’, which on this account should still surface with the spurious -ɛɾ-, as *dunɛɾ-ov-ni-s.

Interestingly, Andonian 1966:85 appears to describe a slightly different system, in which the instrumental case suffix precedes the possessive plural suffix, but the spurious -ɛɾ- is still inserted after monosyllabic singular nouns. We return to this later.

3. Analysis
We analyse the Armenian facts as follows. In the syntax the possessive marker is a pronominal clitic that attaches to N, as in (18), with exemplification in (19):

(18) Structure of possessed nouns

```
N
  \---+---+
   \-\---/\---
      |     |
      |     |
  N    D_{pose}
        \---+---+
           \-\---/\---
              |     |
              |     |
  Num [±plural]    Person poss
                      poss 1/2/3

```

(19) Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>NumPoss</th>
<th>PrsPoss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gadu-s</td>
<td>gadu</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>my cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadu-ɛɾ-œs</td>
<td>gadu</td>
<td>ɛɾ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadu-ni-s</td>
<td>gadu</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>our cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadu-ɛɾ-ni-s</td>
<td>gadu</td>
<td>ɛɾ</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>our cats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spurious plurals result from the copying rule in (20):

(20) **Possessive Plural Reduplication (PPR)**

\[ \text{X [poss, +plural]} \rightarrow \text{X [poss, +plural] [poss, +plural]} \]

where X is monosyllabic

PPR applies before Vocabulary Insertion at the plural possessive node; its two copies are spelled out differently, due to contextual restrictions on the relevant vocabulary entries in (21).

For a formalization of copying rules in DM, see Harris and Halle 2005. They discuss copying rules that apply after VI (and therefore operate on spelled-out terminal nodes), but Arregi and Nevins (2012) extend the formalism to apply to linearized structures before VI, and provide evidence from Basque and other languages. This extension accounts for copying phenomena in which the resulting copies are spelled out differently due to contextual restrictions on vocabulary entries. We argue that this is precisely what is going on with spurious plurals in Armenian.

(21) Vocabulary entries for plural morphemes (1st version):

a. /ni/ ↔ [+plural, poss] / ___ [poss]

b. /ɛɾ/ ↔ [+plural] / σ

c. /nɛɾ/ ↔ [+plural]

(On ɛɾ/nɛɾ alternation in plural nouns, see Vaux 2003.)

PPR (20) and the entries in (21) account for all cases of spurious plurals that do not involve an irregular plural suffix. Consider first a non-spurious case in (22):

(22) dun-ɛɾ-ni-s 'our houses'

\[
\begin{align*}
dun & \cdot [+\text{plural}] - [\text{poss, +plural}] - [\text{poss, 1}] & \rightarrow \text{VI at [+plural]} \\
dun & \cdot ɛɾ - [\text{poss, +plural}] - [\text{poss, 1}] & \rightarrow \text{VI at [poss, +plural]} \\
dun & \cdot ɛɾ - \text{ni} - [\text{poss, 1}] & \rightarrow \text{VI at [poss, 1]} \\
dun & \cdot ɛɾ - \text{ni} - s & \rightarrow \text{VI at [poss, 1]}
\end{align*}
\]
PPR does not apply: the material preceding the plural possessive node is not monosyllabic, due to the plural suffix.

Consider next its spurious plural counterpart in (23); since the noun is monosyllabic and it is not plural, PPR applies:

(23) dun-ɛɾ-ni-s ‘our house’

dun - [-plural] - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1] → [ + pl] spelled out as Ø
dun - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1] → PPR
dun - [poss, + plural] - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1] → VI at 1st [poss, + pl]
dun - ɛɾ - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1] → VI at 2nd [poss, + pl]
dun - ɛɾ - ni - [poss, 1] → VI at [poss, 1]
dun - ɛɾ - ni - s

Crucially, /ni/ is contextually restricted to be adjacent to a (person) possessive terminal node, which prevents it from spelling out the leftmost copy of the possessive plural. In addition, /ɛɾ/ is an underspecified plural entry, which can thus spell out a plural possessive morpheme.

In nouns with irregular plurals, e.g. mad-va-ɛɾ, a different copying rule (24) accounts for the double plural marking:

(24) *Irregular Plural Reduplication (IPR*)

X [ + plural] → X [ + plural] [ + plural]

where X is one of several nominal roots: /mad, tsʰɛɾ, atʃʰ, .../

Like PPR, it applies before VI at the plural terminal node. We also require an additional plural entry, in (25b):

(25) Vocabulary entries for plural morphemes:

a. /ni/ ↔ [ + plural, poss] / __ [poss]
b. /və/ ↔ [ + plural] / mad, tsʰɛɾ, atʃʰ, ... 
c. /ɛɾ/ ↔ [ + plural] / σ 
d. /nɛɾ/ ↔ [ + plural]
(26) mad-və-ner 'fingers'

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mad - [+ plural]} & \rightarrow \text{IPR} \\
\text{mad - [+ plural] - [+ plural]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at 1st [+ plural]} \\
\text{mad - və - [+ plural]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at 2nd [+ plural]}
\end{align*}
\]

mad - və - ner

(27) mad-və(-ner)-ni-s 'our fingers'

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mad - [+ plural] - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{IPR} \\
\text{mad - [+ plural] - [+ plural] - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at 1st [+ pl]} \\
\text{mad - və - [+ plural] - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at 2nd [+ pl]} \\
\text{mad - və - ner - ni - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at [poss, + pl]} \\
\text{mad - və - ner - ni - s} & \rightarrow \text{VI at [poss, 1]}
\end{align*}
\]

Only the leftmost plural copy is adjacent to the noun, and is thus realized as root-specific /və/; the rightmost copy is not, so it is realized as elsewhere plural /ner/. Note that PPR does not apply, since the plural possessive morpheme is preceded by more than one syllable.

This analysis provides a straightforward account of spurious plurals with irregular nouns, as outlined in (28):

(28) mad-və-ni-s 'our finger'

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mad - [-plural] - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow [-\text{pl}] \text{ spelled out as } \emptyset \\
\text{mad - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{PPR (IPR is blocked)} \\
\text{mad - [poss, + plural] - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at 1st [poss, + pl]} \\
\text{mad - və - [poss, + plural] - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at 2nd [poss, + pl]} \\
\text{mad - və - ni - [poss, 1]} & \rightarrow \text{VI at [poss, 1]} \\
\text{mad - və - ni - s} & \rightarrow \text{VI at [poss, 1]}
\end{align*}
\]

As in the previous spurious plural case (23), /ni/ cannot spell out the leftmost copy of the possessive plural morpheme, which is instead realized by root-specific plural /və/.
Application of PPR and IPR is governed by the Elsewhere Condition (Kiparsky 1973): both could apply in (28), but PPR (which applies only to possessive plurals) is more specific than IPR, so application of the former blocks application of the latter. This explains why (28) does not involve three plural morphemes: ‘mad-və-ner-ni-s for 'our finger'.

Finally, consider the interaction of PPR with the placement of case morphemes. We saw earlier that case suffixes surface between plural possessive -ni and the person possessive marker, as in (29):

(29)  N - Plural - PlPoss - Case - PrsPoss  (e.g. bardež-ner-n-e-s, ‘our gardens, Abl’)

However, the instrumental suffix surfaces to the left of the plural possessive in colloquial Western Armenian, as in (30):

(30)  N - Plural - Inst - PlPoss - PrsPoss  (e.g. bardež-ner-ov-ni-s, ‘our gardens, Instr’)

We assume that (29) is the default order delivered by the syntax. Evidence for this is the fact that in all other dialects of Modern Armenian, this is true even for the instrumental.

12 Interestingly, this analysis predicts that nouns that have irregular plural suffixes smaller than one syllable have spurious plurals in which plural possessive /ni/ attaches to a monosyllabic stem. A relevant example would be /hay/ ‘Armenian’, which used to have the irregular plural /hay-kʰ/ (Aydanean 1883). Our prediction for ‘our Armenian’ is /hay-kʰ-ni-s/, with a single application of PPR, as in (28). If correct, this would be evidence against the claim in Vaux 2003 and Wolf 2011 that spurious plurals are due to a prosodic requirement on the possessive plural morpheme to the effect that it must attach to a minimally disyllabic stem. Unfortunately, we do not have access to the relevant data, since -kʰ is no longer used as a plural marker in colloquial Western Armenian. The prediction might be testable in dialects that still have this plural marker, such as Nor Nakhichevan and New Julfa.
We account for the exceptional behavior of the instrumental with the Local Dislocation rule in (31), based on Embick and Noyer 2001:

(31) *Instrumental Displacement*  
\[ \text{[poss, +plural] [instrumental] } \rightarrow \text{ [instrumental] [poss, +plural]} \]

Dialects like New Julfa in which the instrumental surfaces in the same position as other case suffixes simply lack this rule.

*Instrumental Displacement* bleeds Possessive Plural Reduplication in colloquial Western Armenian, which lacks spurious plurals in the instrumental, as in (32):

(32) \text{tsʰajn-ov-ni-s ‘by our voice’ tsʰajn-er-ov-ni-s ‘by our voices’}

However, given the logic of rule ordering in DM we can also imagine a dialect in which *Instrumental Displacement* applies *after* our Possessive Plural Reduplication rule and counterbleeds Possessive Plural Reduplication. The variety described by Andonian (1966:85), in which the “singular and plural are the same” for instrumental forms such as kirkerovnis in (33), may be such as system.

(33) \text{kʰir-kʰ-er-ov-ni-s ‘by our book(s)’}

If this is the right interpretation of what Andonian is saying, then we have evidence for both ordering possibilities for these rules across Armenian dialects, which strengthens the case for both rules.

4. Discussion: Comparison with Wolf (2011)  
We now compare our analysis to the one developed by Wolf 2011. Recall that the basic data are as follows: the suffix -\text{er}, usually an allomorph of the nominal Number head which appears with monosyllabic noun stems in the plural (34), appears unexpectedly in the context of a singular noun before the possessive plural agreement morpheme –\text{ni}. This unexpected -\text{er} is inserted only when –\text{ni} would otherwise be adjacent to a monosyllabic stem (compare (35) with (36)). This implies that –\text{ni} requires at least a
bisyllabic foot to its left, and that this prosodic selection requirement of \(–ni\) forces the co-opting of a plural allomorph of the Number head despite the fact that Number is morphosyntactically singular.

\[(34)\] gov ‘cow’  gov-\(\varepsilon r\) ‘cows’; cf. bisyllabic gadu ‘cat’ gadu-\(\varepsilon r\) ‘cats’

\[(35)\] gadu-s ‘my cat’  gadu-\(n\)i-s ‘our cat’
   gadu-\(\varepsilon r\)-\(\acute{\text{a}}\)s ‘my cats’  gadu-\(\varepsilon r\)-\(ni\)-s ‘our cats’

\[(36)\] gov-\(\acute{\text{a}}\)s ‘my cow’  gov-\(\varepsilon r\)-\(ni\)-s ‘our cow’ (unexpected \(-\varepsilon r\) underlined)
   gov-\(\varepsilon r\)-\(\acute{\text{a}}\)s ‘my cows’  gov-\(\varepsilon r\)-ni-s ‘our cows’

Wolf 2011 analyzes this pattern as a case of outwardly-sensitive phonologically conditioned allomorphy on the grounds that the Number head’s \(plural\) -\(\varepsilon r\) allomorph is chosen over its usual \(Ø\) \(singular\) allomorph because of the prosodic requirements of \(–ni\). This can be characterized as outwardly-sensitive conditioning because \(–ni\) is further away from the root than the Number head.

However, since \(–ni\) is the only allomorph of the possessive plural in the language, the apparent \(phonological\) condition is in fact confounded with the \(morphosyntactic\) condition of the presence of possessive plural agreement. The generalization can thus be formulated equally well in terms of the morphosyntactic feature bundle corresponding to possessive plural agreement, which is what our copying analysis does. On such an analysis, the “outward” part of the conditioning is morphosyntactic, and the phonological part of the conditioning is “inward-looking”, in line with standard DM.

4.1. More on Wolf 2011

Wolf 2011 on the other hand, taking the Armenian facts to be phonologically conditioned, proposes an Optimal Interleaving approach to what he believes to be a case of outward sensitivity. Optimal Interleaving (OI) is a version of Optimality Theory with Candidate Chains (OT-CC), a version of OT in which whole derivations (conceived of as chains of basic operations) are compared with each other, rather than surface
forms alone. OI differs from standard OT-CC in that morphological operations, including the insertion of Vocabulary Items, are included in the set of basic operations that can be performed. A leading idea of the OI approach in Wolf 2011 is that outwardly-sensitive phonologically conditioned allomorphy becomes possible when candidate derivations which differ only in their choice of allomorph for a particular morpheme are constructed. For reasons that hinge the Local Optimality constraint on what constitutes a valid derivation, a property of OI which we do not have time to introduce in full here, it is usually impossible for a set of candidate derivations that differ in exactly this way to be constructed. Such a set can be constructed only if the two (or more) different choices of allomorph do not compete for Local Optimality, for instance if they violate different morphological faithfulness constraints. Wolf argues that the Armenian facts constitute precisely such a case.

Wolf 2011:10 proposes the two “morphs” (roughly equivalent to VIs in DM) in (37) for the abstract Number morpheme:

(37) <SINGULAR, -Ø>
    <PLURAL, -ɛɾ>

In a case like our cow, in which an unexpected plural –ɛɾ appears, these morphs allow for derivations to be constructed which differ only in which of these allomorphs is chosen. This is because inserting –ɛɾ violates a different set of morphological faithfulness constraints than inserting the null singular morpheme (in particular, inserting the plural morpheme violates DEP-MM([PLURAL])), a constraint against inserting a [PLURAL] morph in a non-plural context). Therefore, inserting a [PLURAL] morph does not count as a version of “the same” operation as inserting a [SINGULAR] morph; the two choices do not compete for the purposes of Local Optimality, and are thus the basis of two separate derivations which can be compared by EVAL.

In this final comparison, EVAL chooses the candidate with the spurious plural, giving rise to the apparent outwardly-sensitive phonological conditioning, so long as the constraint requiring more than one syllable to –ni’s left is more highly ranked than DEP-MM([PLURAL]). This is shown in Wolf’s tableau (10), reproduced here in (38).
Beyond the fact that taking the outwardly sensitive part of the generalization here to be phonological is unnecessary, there are a number of problems for this analysis, summarized in (39)-(41).

(39) First, it is not clear how to account for the Instrumental Displacement in (31), and the different ordering interactions between this process and the insertion of spurious plurals seen across the dialects.

(40) Second, no account is offered of Irregular Plural Reduplication, and relatedly no link is made between the presence of plural features on the possessor and the appearance of the spurious plural—in principle, any morph could be epenthetic.

(41) Finally, Wolf's two proposed implementations of his cover constraint *[σ.ni are problematic from the point of view of the rest of Armenian phonology.

To see this, consider each proposal in turn:

i. "One possibility is that it wants to be aligned with the right edge of a foot (McCarthy & Prince 1993)"

However, Western Armenian has primary final stress and secondary initial stress. To account for this, it is necessary to postulate exhaustive footing, at least at the left and...
right edges of words. This means that monosyllabic bases will have a degenerate foot, which should satisfy his constraint and therefore not trigger insertion.

ii. "another is that it wants to not immediately follow a stressed syllable, since most modern Armenian dialects have word-initial secondary stress"

This is problematic for possessive plurals that undergo the widespread rule of unstressed high vowel reduction/deletion, e.g. some speakers have dun ‘house’ ➞ dan-er-ni-s ‘our house’, with the root /u/ reduced to schwa when unstressed (others have dun-er-ni-s, which doesn’t pose the same problem). Since Wolf assumes a sort of cyclic insertion scheme, the plural insertion should refer to the stress pattern as it stands at that point in the derivation. At this intermediate stage it should be the case that either (a) there is no stress yet (if stress is done post-cyclically), or (b) the final syllable of the base is stressed (if stress is done cyclically). If (a), then the constraint does no work. If (b), it should trigger insertion in all forms. Neither of these yields the desired result.

5. Conclusions
To conclude, the Western Armenian data threaten neither the empirical generalization that outwardly-sensitive phonologically conditioned allomorphy is impossible, nor the DM tenets concerning Vocabulary Insertion which stand on it.

• The relevant generalization can be formulated as being outwardly sensitive only to morphosyntactic features, and inwardly sensitive to phonological ones (in accordance with standard DM- Halle and Marantz 1993; Bobaljik 2000).
• An implementation in terms of copying of a plural feature (a) accounts for the source of the spurious plural, and (b) provides a link to other parts of Armenian grammar in which such copying appears, specifically Irregular Plural Reduplication.
• These feature copying rules are ordered in different ways with respect to Instrumental Displacement across the dialects, supporting a DM model in which PF operations are ordered (Arregi and Nevins 2008, 2012).
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