Syntactic vs Morphological agr.

• Syntactic vs morphological agreement
• Do we need morphology to know that Agree has taken place?

(1) Jij loop\text{t}  
you walk-2.sg  
‘ You walk’

(2) You walk

Is there agreement in English? How do we know?
Syntactic vs Morphological agr.

Maori

- No morphological marking for Case
- The most prominent DP does NOT receive any preposition marking
- All other DPs do

Transitive clause

(1) E here ana a Huia i ngā kurī
T tie PROG PERS Huia OBJ the-PL dog

‘Huia (Nom) was tying up the dogs’

(from Bauer 1997:477 in Chung 2013:255)
Syntactic vs Morphological agr.

Transitive active clause
(1)E here ana a Huia i ngā kurī
T tie PROG PERS Huia OBJ the-PL dog
‘Huia (NOM) was tying up the dogs’
(from Bauer 1997:477 in Chung 2013:255)

Passive clause
(2)E here-a ana ngā kurī e Huia
T tie-PASS PROG the-PL dog by Huia
‘The dogs (NOM) were being tied up by Huia’
(from Bauer 1997:477 in Chung 2013:255)
Negation in Maori

Negation is a raising structure: only the DP subject can raise

(3)a. \[ \text{E} \text{ kore a ia e hoki mai} \]
\[ \text{T not PERS she T return t-.here} \]
\[ i \text{ a Ponga} \]
\[ \text{from PERS Ponga} \]
‘She (NOM) will never return from Ponga’
(from Bauer 1997:459 in Chung 2013:256)

b. Kaua \[ \text{tētahi wakatūranga e hanga-ia ki runga} \]
\[ a \text{ construction T build-PASS to top} \]
\[ i \text{ te whenua} \]
\[ \text{OBJ the land} \]
‘No construction (NOM) shall be built on the land’
(from Ngata 1994:68 in Chung 2013:256)
Agreement at PF

- Agreement is necessarily post-syntactic (Bobaljik 2008)
- It happens in the morphological subcomponent
- It accesses the output of operations that are invariably defined as postsyntactic, like morphological case assignment
- Only morphological (m-) case is accessed by agreement

Recall: Ergativity

![Ergative alignment](image1) ![Accusative alignment](image2)
Agreement at PF

- Moravcsik’s grammatical function Hierarchy
  a. no agreement (Dyirbal, Lezgian)
  b. ABS only (Tsez, Hindi)
  c. ABS ERG (Eskimo-Inuit, Mayan)
  d. ABS ERG DAT (Basque, Abkhaz)
  e. * ERG only
  f. * ERG DAT, no ABS
  g. * DAT only
  h. (*ABS DAT, w/o ERG)

Absolutive > Ergative > Dative
Agreement at PF

- Absolutive > Ergative > Dative

- Hindi/Urdu: the agreement controller is the highest caseless (unmarked) DP
- Ergative markers appear on the external argument of transitives ONLY in the perfective
- Dative marks the experiencer
- The remaining arguments are caseless
### Hindi/Urdu agreement

| (8) Perfective: | a. SUBJ-ne  | OBJ-Ø | V  |
|                | b. SUBJ-ne  | OBJ-ko | V default |
| Imperf.:       | c. SUBJ-Ø  | OBJ-Ø | V  |
|                | d. SUBJ-Ø  | OBJ-ko | V  |
| Psych:         | e. SUBJ-ko | OBJ-Ø | V  |

| (9) | Raam-ne | RoTii | khaayii | thii |
| (M) | bread-Ø(FEM) | eat.PERF.FEM | be.PAST.FEM |

‘Ram had eaten bread.’
Hindi/Urdu agreement

• In the imperfective, no argument is marked for Case
• Agreement takes place with the highest m-case element (according to Moravcsik’s hierarchy)

(10)siitaa kelaa khaatii thii
   Sita-∅ (F) banana-∅ (M) eat.IMPERF.FEM be.PAST.FEM
   ‘Sita (habitually) ate bananas.’

Compare with (9):

(9) Raam-ne RoTii khaayii thii
   Ram-ERG (M) bread-∅(FEM) eat.PERF.FEM be.PAST.FEM
   ‘Ram had eaten bread.’
Nepali quirky subjects

(11) malāī timī man par-ch-au. (*parch-u)

1SG.DAT 2MH.NOM liking occur-NPT-2MH(occur-
NPT-1SG)

‘I like you.’

(Bickel & Yādava 2000:348 in Bobaljik 2008:311)

• The nominative object, noy the dative subject, controls agreement

• It is the morphological case, not the grammatical function, that determined agreement
Agreement within PF domains


(12) **Recoverability**

Rules of suppression operate under agreement

(A&N 2003:688)

(if you wish to delete or impoverish morphologically a terminal node (say, an agreement ending) this node must be in an agreement relation with something else, from which you can recover its full value.)

Recoverability can happen only within a prosodic phrase Φ
Agreement within PF domains

(13) jij loopt
     you walk-2.sg
‘you walk’

In inversion structures or adverb-initial V2

(14) [CP Dagelijks [C, loop [ jij tAdv met een hondje
     daily walk-2.sg you-2.sg with a dog
over straat
     tV] on street
‘You walk daily on the street with a dog’
Prosodic domains

(14) \([_{cp} \text{Dagelijks} \, _{c'} \text{loop} \, _{t_{adv}} \text{jij} \, \text{met een hondje}}\)

\begin{align*}
\text{daily} & \quad \text{walk-2.sg} \quad \text{you-2.sg} \quad \text{with a dog} \\
\text{over straat} & \\
\text{t}_v & \text{on street}
\end{align*}

‘You walk daily on the street with a dog’

Prosodic phrasing for (14):

(15) \{\text{Dagelijks} \, \{\text{loop} \, \text{jij}\} \, \{\text{met een hondje}\} \, \{\text{over straat}\} \}

\begin{align*}
\text{daily} & \quad \text{walk-2.sg} \quad \text{you-2.sg} \quad \text{with a dog} \quad \text{on street}
\end{align*}
Agreement at NS /the PIC

Phases are characterized by a Phase Impenetrability Condition, which is defined as follows:

- In a phase $\alpha$ with head $H$, the domain of $H$ is not accessible to operations outside $\alpha$; only $H$ and its edge are accessible to such operations.

(Chomsky 2000:108)
Agreement and the PIC

- Insensitivity

(16) ənan qəlyiļu ləŋərkə-nin-et [Chukchee]
he regrets-3.PL

[iŋqun Ø-rətəmŋəv-nen-at qora-t]
that 3SG-lost-3-3PL reindeer-PL

‘He regrets that he lost the reindeers’ (Bošković 2007:613)
PIC insensitivity

Existentials

(17) [IP There I \( \text{seem} \) to have \( \text{two problems} \)], (don’t there)?

(Bošković 2007: 615)

Wh- in situ

(18) John-ga Peter-ga nani-o kat-ta
    John-NOM Peter-NOM what-ACC buy-PAST
to omotteiru no?
COMP think Q

‘What does John think that Peter bought?’

(Bošković 2007: 616)
PIC insensitivity -

(19) weil die Traktoren zu reparieren versucht wurden
since the tractors-NOM.PL to repair tried were-PL
‘since they tried to repair the tractors’

(Bobalijk & Wurmbrand 2005: 815)
PIC sensitivity

• PIC = prosodic domains

Recall Kayne’s generalization re: movement and agreement

(23 )a. Le ragazze sono arrivate. [Italian]
   the girls-fem.pl are arrived-fem pl
   ‘The girls have arrived.’

   b. Le ragazze sono state arrestate.
      the girls-fem.pl are been-fem.pl arrested-fem.pl
      ‘The girls have been arrested.’

   c. Si sono viste le ragazze.
      SI are seen-fem.pl the-fem.pl girls-fem.pl
      ‘We have seen the girls/the girls have been seen.’
PIC sensitivity

(24) Le ragazze si sono guardate
the girls selves are looked-f.pl

allo specchio
at-the mirror
‘The girls have looked at themselves in the mirror.’

(25) Le abbiamo salutate.
them-fem pl we-have greeted-fem pl
‘We have greeted them.’
PIC sensitivity

(26)  a.* Abbiamo salutato le ragazze.
      have-1.PL greeted-F.PL the-fpl girls-F.PL

      b. * Le abbia salutato

      Kayne: movement triggers agreement
Wrong prediction! The pp should agree with the *in situ* object.
Pp agreement in Italian

CONDITION ON THE MORPHOPHONOLOGICAL REALIZATION OF AGREEMENT

• A. Given an Agree relation A between Probe P and Goal G, morphophonological agreement between P and G is realised iff P and G are contained in the complement of the minimal phase-head H.

• B. XP is the complement of a minimal phase head H iff there is no distinct phase head H’ contained in XP whose complement YP contains P and G.

(D’Alessandro & Roberts 2008:482)
Pp agreement in Italian

(35)

\[
\begin{align*}
    & \text{CP} \\
    & \quad \text{TP} \\
    & \quad \quad \text{EA} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \text{T} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{cl-T} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{vP} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{EA} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{v} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{V} \\
    & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{IA} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Spell-Out domain

\[
\begin{align*}
    & \text{PF} \\
    & \quad \text{EA} \quad \text{cl} \quad \text{T} \quad \text{v (pp)} \\
    & \quad \quad \text{V} \quad \text{IA}
\end{align*}
\]
Pp agreement in Italian

(I have eaten the apple.)

Ho mangiato la mela.

(38)
Pp agreement in Italian

(39) Sono arrivate le ragazze.
    are arrived-fem pl the girls-fem pl
'The girls have arrived.'

The derivation for (39) is as follows:

(40) \[
\text{CP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{Aux}_{[uN, uP]} \text{ vP} \\
\text{arrivat-} \text{ [uN,uG]} \text{ VP} \\
\text{arrivat-} \text{ [uN,uG]} \text{ le ragazze [f,pl]} \\
\]
PIC domains $\neq$ prosodic d.

(25)  

a. \(\text{bá-níké ú-Síphó íí-maali}\)  
2SUBJ-give CL1-Sipho CL9-money  
‘They gave Sipho money.’

b. \(\text{ín-kósíkaazi í-théngel’ ábá-fán’ ízím-baatho}\)  
CL9-woman 9SUBJ-buy.for CL2-boy CL10-clothes  
‘The woman is buying clothes for the boys.’

c. \(\text{ú-Síph’ ú-phékél’ ú-Thánd’ in-kúukhu}\)  
CL1-Sipho 1SUBJ-cooked.for CL1-Thanди CL9-chicken  
‘Sipho cooked chicken for Thandi.’

d. \(\text{bá-ník’ ú-Síph’ í-bhayisékii ili (namhláanje)}\)  
2SUBJ-gave CL1-Sipho CL5-bicycle today  
‘They gave Sipho a bicycle today.’

(Cheng & Downing 2012: 7)
Zulu

\[(26)[_{CP \ [_{TP \ subject \ verb \ [vP \ [_{vP \ IO \ DO}]]}]]}\]

Tone spreading is insensitive to the upper boundary
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