AGREEMENT and LOCALITY
OUR ROADMAP

- Linear order and agreement
  - Pre and post-verbal subjects cross-linguistically
- Conjunctions
- Long distance agreement
  - Hindi
  - Tsez
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Reminder

**Controller**: nominative DP

**Target**: verb

**Domain**: the sentence

**Features and Conditions**
- Person, gender, number when the subject is preverbal
- Person and gender when the subject is post-verbal.

Samek-Lodovici 2003, EX 5
The observation:
Agreement under c-command (extended agreement) is either:
- The same as spec-head agreement or
- Impoverished with respect to spec-head agreement

Agreement under c-command is never (in this survey) richer than spec-head agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>spec-head agreement</th>
<th>extended agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>ps, num</td>
<td>ps, num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>ps, num</td>
<td>ps, num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Arabic</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps, gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>ps, num</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fassan</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps, (num)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoese</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps, (num)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampezzan</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps, (num)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romagnol</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps, (num)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trentino</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiorentino</td>
<td>ps, num, gen</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samek-Lodovici 2003, EX 2
**Standard Italian:**
No change
• Person and number agreement with pre and post-verbal subject

**Urbino** (Southern Italian dialect):
• Number agreement when pre-verbal
• No number agreement when post-verbal

(4)  
\[\text{a. Io ho / *ha / *abbiamo camminato} \]
\[I \text{ have.1sg / *3sg / *1pl} \text{ walked}\]
\[I \text{ walked}\]

(8)  
\[\text{b. Ho / *ha / *abbiamo camminato io} \]
\[Have.1sg / *3sg / *1pl \text{ walked} \]
\[I \text{ walked}\]

\[\text{b. Deˈla ˈdɔmmə ki burˈdɛi} \]
\[Of there sleeps.sg those children\]
\[Those children sleep there\]
CONJUNCTIONS
LINEAR ORDER and AGREEMENT in SLOVENIAN
(spoken by appr 2.5 million people, mostly in Slovenia)
The Structure of Conjunctions

Internally hierarchical but behave like a constituent.

The higher phrase c-commands the lower phrase.

John’s dog and he go/*goes for walks.

• *John doesn’t c-command he, so coreference is OK. (Principle C of binding theory)

*He and John’s dog go for walks.

• He c-commands John, coreference is out.
The Slovenian Pattern

• Nominative-accusative
• Other cases: dative, genitive, locative, instrumental
• Nominative can be pre or post-verbal
• Verbs agree in person and number with nominatives
• Participles agree in gender and number with nominatives
• When there’s a nominative conjoined DP, the verb can agree with the closest conjunct…

\[
\begin{align*}
(7) & \quad \text{Včeraj so odšla} \quad /\* \text{odšle} \quad [\text{teleta in krave}] \quad \text{na pašo.} \\
& \quad \text{yesterday aux} \quad \text{went}_{N,\text{PL}} \quad \text{went}_{F,\text{PL}} \quad [\text{calf}_{N,\text{PL}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cow}_{F,\text{PL}}] \quad \text{on graze} \\
& \quad \text{‘Yesterday calves and cows went grazing.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & \quad \text{Včeraj so odšle} \quad /\* \text{odšle} \quad [\text{krave in teleta}] \quad \text{na pašo.} \\
& \quad \text{yesterday aux} \quad \text{went}_{F,\text{PL}} \quad \text{went}_{N,\text{PL}} \quad [\text{cow}_{F,\text{PL}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{calf}_{N,\text{PL}}] \quad \text{on graze} \\
& \quad \text{‘Yesterday cows and calves went grazing.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) & \quad [\text{Krave in teleta}] \quad \text{so odšla} \quad /\* \text{odšle} \quad \text{na pašo.} \\
& \quad [\text{cow}_{F,\text{PL}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{calf}_{N,\text{PL}}] \quad \text{aux} \quad \text{went}_{N,\text{PL}} \quad \text{went}_{F,\text{PL}} \quad \text{on grazing} \\
& \quad \text{‘Calves and cows went grazing.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad [\text{Teleta in krave}] \quad \text{so odšle} \quad /\* \text{odšla} \quad \text{na pašo.} \\
& \quad [\text{calf}_{N,\text{PL}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cow}_{F,\text{PL}}] \quad \text{aux} \quad \text{went}_{F,\text{PL}} \quad \text{went}_{N,\text{PL}} \quad \text{on grazing} \\
& \quad \text{‘Calves and cows went grazing.’}
\end{align*}
\]
…or appears in the default.

A corpus study reveals that:

• SV order: Default is preferred. Agreement with the closest conjunct (lower DP) is OK.

• VS order: Agreement with the closest conjunct (higher DP) is preferred.

➢ Not consistent with Samek-Lodovici’s generalization.
  ➢ We’d expect the default to be better with post-verbal subjects.
  ➢ But speakers don’t like agreeing with the lower conjunct, so the default “wins” most times, but not always.
Linear order isn’t the only factor

- A DP inside of a relative clause is not an agreement trigger for the matrix verb
- No long-distance agreement with conjuncts

(14) Šotori in postelje, ki so jih dali vojaki, so smrdele. tent$_{M\text{-}PL}$ and bed$_{F\text{-}PL}$ that aux them gave soldiers$_{M\text{-}}$ aux stank$_{F\text{-}PL}$
‘Tents and beds that were given by the soldiers stank.’

(15) Trditev, da je Peter odšel, je absurdna. claim$_{F\text{-}SG}$ that aux Peter$_{M\text{-}SG}$ left$_{M\text{-}SG}$ is absurd$_{F\text{-}SG}$
‘The claim that Peter left is absurd.’
Other intervening material also doesn’t interfere

(16) Teleta in krave so (včeraj zjutraj) odšle na pašo
calves\textsubscript{N} and cows\textsubscript{F} aux (yesterday morning) went\textsubscript{F,PL} on grazing
‘Calves and cows went grazing yesterday early morning.’

And, split closest conjunct agreement is allowed, though odd.

(17) Včeraj so bile [krave in teleta ] prodana.
yesterday aux been\textsubscript{F,PL} [ cow\textsubscript{F,PL} and calf\textsubscript{N,PL} ] sold\textsubscript{N,PL}
‘Yesterday cows and calves were sold.’
One Previous Proposal:
Ellipsis

(17) Včeraj so bile [krave in teleta ] prodana.
yesterday aux been[F-PL] [cow[F-PL] and calf[N-PL] ] sold[N-PL]
‘Yesterday cows and calves were sold.’

(17) is actually…

yesterday aux been.fem cows.fem sold and yesterday aux been.neut calves.neut sold.neut

- Clauses are conjoined, not the DPs
- MNS will argue against this
Collective predicates…

- …are allowed in SV and VS constructions = (25)/(27)

- If there were ellipsis, we would have a semantically nonsensical underlying construction = (26)
Scope Effects

Two interpretations:
• For all geese and for all calves, it is not the case that they survived the winter. Every animal died. Preferred interpretation

• It is not the case that all geese and all calves survived the winter. Some animals died.

(21) Vse goske in vsa teleta niso preživela zime.
    All geese_{F,PL} and all calves_{N,PL} didn’t survive_{N,PL} the winter.
    ?All > Neg, Neg > All

(22) Zime niso preživele vse goske in vsa teleta.
    Winter didn’t survive_{F,PL} all geese_{F,PL} and all calves_{N,PL}
    ?All > Neg, Neg > All

All geese_{fem} didn’t survive_{fem} the winter and all calves_{neut} didn’t survive_{neut} the winter

• If this were right…

• …each DP should be able to scope under negation within its own clause, so that we necessarily get “it is not the case that all geese survived the winter and it is not the case that all calves survived the winter.”
  – Some geese and some calves died

• But, (21)/(22) can mean that either at least one goose or at least calf did not survive
  ➢ Suggests that there is only one negation
Ndebele also has last CA

Ndebele is spoken by about 4.5 million people in Zimbabwe and South Africa

And so does English in *neither...nor* sentences
Analysis

- ConjP (as a whole) is the controller for person/number agreement
- One of the conjuncts inside of ConjP may be the controller for gender agreement

- ConjP looks inside at its conjuncts and computes what features will reside at the maximal projection level.
- Person is assigned according to whether one/both conjuncts has an author or participant feature. (In general, Person doesn’t apply to participal agreement.)
- Number is dual or plural.
- “Importantly, ConjP does not compute a gender value.” (p.14)
- The agreement target can either:
  - Appear in the default.
  - Search within the projection of for a trigger.
- If there is $\geq$ possible trigger, “…resolve the tie by agreeing with the closest projection-sister in terms of precedence.” (p.15)
How it works

Step 0:
• The participle needs a number value and a gender value

Step 1:
• The participle looks to its sister to value its unvalued features
• Number is valued to plural
• Gender cannot be valued
• Stop here: Default OR

Step 2:
• Copy the gender value of the closest DP in terms of linear order
  • If ConjP is preverbal, this will be the 2nd conjunct
  • If ConjP is postverbal, this will be the 1st conjunct
Back to Standard
Arabic: another analysis of features behaving differently

- Nom, person, and gender can look up to the specifier or down under c-command
- Number can only look up to the specifier.

(Ussery 2012, EX 13)
Interim Summary

The fact that linear order interacts with agreement suggests that features on the same head/phrase can act somewhat independently of each other.
LONG-DISTANCE AGREEMENT in Hindi and Tsez
Remember Hindi

(i) Nominative subject: Not perfective. We don’t know if the action was completed.
   Agreements with subject

Rahul  kitaab  parh-taa  thaa
Rahul.masc.\textbf{nom}  book.fem.acc  read-hab.masc.sg  be.past.masc.sg
‘Rahul used to read (a/the) book.’

(ii) Ergative subject: Perfective. The action has been completed.
   Agreements with object

Rahul-ne  kitaab  parh-ii  thii
Rahul-\textbf{erg}  book.fem.abs  read-\textbf{pfv}.fem.sg  be.past.fem.sg.
‘Rahul had read the book.’  \cite{Bhatt 2005, EX 2}

\textbf{NOTE}: I’ve reglossed the object in (ii) as abs based on the agreement pattern. It’s glossed as acc in the paper. There’s no morphological marker for nom/abs and objects are marked only if they’re specific.
When the object is marked, the verb does not agree with it.

**Descriptive Generalization** (for Hindi): The verb agrees with the highest DP that is not overtly case-marked.

default agreement:
Mona-ne is kitaab-ko pařh-aa
Mona.F-Erg this.Obl book.F-Acc read-Pfv.MSg thaa
be.Pst.MSg
‘Mona had read this book.’

[Bhatt 2005, EX 18c]
Long Distance Agreement

- In long distance agreement (LDA), the verb agrees with an argument that is not its own.
- LDA can only occur in Hindi-Urdu if the matrix clause has an Ergative subject.
- If the matrix clause has a Nominative subject, the matrix verb has to agree with it (because the Nominative is the highest unmarked argument).

1. Verbs in the main clause agree with the subject in the main clause.
   Shahrukh [tehnii kaat-naa/*nii] chaah-taa thaa
   Shahrukh.masc branch.fem cut-inf.masc/*fem want-impfv.masc.sg be.past.masc.sg
   ‘Shahrukh wants to cut the branch.’

2. Main clause verbs cannot agree with embedded object.
   *Shahrukh [tehnii kaat-naa] chaah-tii thii
   Shahrukh.masc branch.fem cut-inf.masc want-impfv.fem.sg be.past.fem.sg
   ‘Shahrukh wants to cut the branch.’ [Bhatt 2005, EX 7]

- There’s not actually long-distance agreement here…
• ...but there is LDA here.

- When there is an embedded infinitival clause and the subject in the main clause is ergative, the main clause verb *may* agree with the embedded object.

And...

- When the main clause verbs agree, so do the infinitive. = 1
- When the main clause verbs are in the default, so is the infinitive. = 2

1. **Main clause verb and infinitive agree with embedded object**
Shahrukh-ne [tehni kaat-nii/*naa] chaah-ii thii.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.fem/*masc want-pfv.fem be.past.fem.sg
‘Shahrukh had wanted to cut the branch.’

2. Main clause verb and the infinitive are in the default
Shahrukh-ne [tehni kaat-naa/*nii ] chaah-aa thaa.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.masc/*fem want-pfv.masc.sg be.past.masc.sg
‘Shahrukh had wanted to cut a/the branch.’ [Bhatt 2005, EX 6]
Proposal for Hindi LDA (Bhatt 2005)

LDA when the infinitival complement is not a CP.

- It’s a “smaller” clause, so it’s “permeable.” The matrix T and the embedded object are in the same domain.

Shahrukh-ne [XP tehnii kaat-nii/*nii] chaah-ii thii.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.fem/*masc want-pfv.fem be.past.fem.sg

‘Shahrukh had wanted to cut the branch.’

NOTE: There is also a slight meaning difference. In the LDA construction, there is slight emphasis on the embedded object, even though it’s not case-marked.

Shahrukh-ne [CP tehnii kaat-naa/*nii] chaah-aa thaa.
Shahrukh-erg branch.fem cut-inf.masc/*fem want-pfv.masc.sg be.past.masc.sg

‘Shahrukh had wanted to cut a/the branch.’

No LDA when the embedded clause is a CP.

- The CP is a blocker. The matrix T and the embedded object are not in the same domain → All verbs appear in the default form.
Big Picture: CP creates a new domain in Hindi and makes the embedded object too far away from the matrix T.

But, CP isn’t always a blocker…
Enter Tsez

Spoken by appr. 16,000 people in Dagestan

- Tsez is ergative (I’m not sure what kind of ergative) and has noun classes.

- Verbs agree in noun class with the absolutive argument.

- The subject is dative with psychological verbs, verbs of perception, and experiencer verbs.
  - The object is absolutive and the verb agrees with it

Agreement prefixes for verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>ø-</td>
<td>b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>y-</td>
<td>r-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>b-</td>
<td>r-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>r-</td>
<td>r-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Polinsky and Potsdam 2001, EX 3-6)
As in Hindi, LDA is allowed when the matrix verb can’t agree with the matrix subject.

- The matrix subject isn’t nom/abs

(a): No LDA

- The matrix verb agrees with the embedded clause, which is the absolutive argument
- The embedded verb agrees with the absolutive embedded object.

(b): LDA

- The matrix verb agrees with the embedded object
- The embedded verb agrees with the absolutive embedded object.
In Tsez LDA, the embedded object is a topic covertly moves to the specifier of the Topic Phrase, making it sufficiently close to the higher T.

- The CP isn’t a blocker. The object has to be “close enough.”
Evidence for the “covertly moved topic” analysis

No LDA if the absolutive has a focus marker. Topic ≠ Focus

Verb agrees with the clause

LDA if the embedded object has overt topic marking.

Verb agrees with the clause

NO LDA if a non-absolutive has overt topic marking.

Proposal for Tsez LDA: Tsez optionally overtly marks topics. Either way, an embedded absolutive topic forces LDA.

(Corbett 2006:198)
There are various conditions on agreement which affect whether the controller-target relationship will be established and if so, which features will be realized.

These conditions include:

- **Linear order** and whether an agreement controller is part of a conjunction.
- **Structural factors**, such as whether there is a domain boundary between the controller and the target.
- **Semantic factors**, such as topicalization, which force a particular structural configuration which brings the controller and target into the same domain.