PF-Compounds in Sanskrit and the Architecture of Grammar
(Sanskrit, Compounding, Distributed Morphology, PF, Lexicalism)

Gillon (1993) claims that Sanskrit compounds present evidence in favor of the traditional divide between Lexicon and Syntax. Nonetheless, he points out a potential problem in (1), where the non-head of the compound, *snigdha* 'fixed', a derivative of the verb *snih* 'to fix', subcategorizes for a locative argument, *tasyām* 'on her', at the phrasal level. He reconciles this fact with the Lexicalist approach by modifying the feature percolation mechanism in Sanskrit to allow the transmission of the argument structure not only of the head, but also of the non-head (cf. Di Sciullo & Williams 1987, Selkirk 1982). Nevertheless, other properties of Sanskrit compounds are not considered in his analysis. For instance, the fact that a non-head of a compound can also be modified by an external element at the phrasal level. For example, in (2), the genitive *devānām* 'of the gods' modifies the non-head *citta* 'mind'. Since modifiers are not part of the argument structure, Gillon's Lexicalist analysis fails to account for structures like (2). Also notice that the external element is (case)marked as a syntactic dependent of the non-head, *citta* 'mind', not of the compound.

(1) tasyām   ($_N$ ($_A$ **snigdha**)-($_N$ dr̥styā))
     she.LOC   fixed   gaze.INSTR

     'by his gaze fixed on her'

(2) ($_A$ ($_N$ **citta**)- ($_A$ pramāthinī))   bālā   devānām
         mind   disturbing.ADJ   girl.NOM   gods.GEN

     'A girl who disturbs the minds of the gods'

I argue that constructions (1) and (2) can be explained if we assume that compound formation in Sanskrit operates on the output of syntactic processes, i.e. PF stage of derivation. If case marking and movement occur before compounding, we can explain why in Sanskrit the external element of the compound is morphologically and syntactically marked as a dependent of only one member of the compound; also why either the head or the non-head can be in a relationship with an external element; as well as why the modifier (*devānām* 'of the gods') in (2) is not adjacent to the noun it modifies (cf. Schäufele 1991). This account also explains the anaphoric island violation in (3), given that the referential relations between the pronoun *yat* 'which' and the demonstrative *saḥ* 'that' in the relative-correlative construction were established before compounding occurred.

(3) [$_{RC}$ ($_N$ ($_N$ yat$_i$) -($_N$ arthaḥ))   dr̥stāntaḥ   ucyate]   [$_{MC}$ saḥ$_i$ arthaḥ   siddhaḥ   ]
         which.REL-saked-NOM   example.NOM   say.PRES.PASS.3.s.   that.DEM.NOM   sake.NOM   established.NOM

      'The thing for the sake of which the example is stated (is) established'

My analysis is based on the assumption of Distributed Morphology that there is no component specially designed for word formation (Lexicon), some aspects of word formation arise from syntactic operations such as head movement (Harley 2009), while others are accounted for at PF (Embrick & Noyer 2007, Halle & Marantz 1993). This paper not only contributes to the discussion on compounding in Distributed Morphology, but also to other approaches which argue for post-syntactic compounding such as Shibatani & Kageyama's (1988) analysis of Japanese compounds. It also has relevant implications for the study of the interaction of morphology and syntax in other free-word order languages.

References

Di Sciullo, A., and E. Williams. 1987. *On the definition of word*. MIT Press.

Embick, D., and R. Noyer. 2007. "Distributed morphology and the syntax/ morphology interface". In G. Ramchand and Ch. Reiss (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic interfaces*, 289-324, Oxford University Press.

Gillon, B. 1993. "Bhartṛhari's solution to the problem of *asamartha* compounds". In S. Bhate, and J. Bronkhorst (Eds.), *Bhartṛhari: philosopher and grammarian*, *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Bhartṛhari, University of Poona*, 117-133, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Halle, M., and A. Marantz. 1993. "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection". In K. Hale and S.J. Keyser (Eds.), *The View from Building 20. Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 111-176, MIT Press.

Harley, H. 2009. "Compounding in Distributed Morphology". In Lieber, R., and P. Štekauer (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, 129-144, Oxford University Press.

Selkirk, E. 1982. *The syntax of words*. MIT Press.

Schäufele, S. 1991. "Single-word topicalization in Vedic Prose: A challenge to Government & Binding?" In Hans Henrich Hock (Ed.), *Studies in Sanskrit. A volume in honor of the centennial of Speijer's Sanskrit Grammar*, 153- 175, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ldt.

Shibatani, M., and T. Kageyama. 1988. "Word formation and modular theory of grammar: Postsyntactic compounds in Japanese", *Language 64 (3)*, 451- 484.