

Studies on Agreement

Edited by

João Costa

Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva

FCSH - Universidade Nova de Lisboa

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

299
A35S78
2006
web



TM The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Studies on Agreement / edited by João Costa and Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva.

p. cm. (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, ISSN 0166-0829 ; v. 86)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

I. Grammar, Comparative and general--Agreement. I. Costa, João, 1972- II. Silva, Maria Cristina Figueiredo, 1961- III. Linguistik aktuell ; Bd. 86.

P299.A35S78 2006

415--dc22

2005054716

ISBN 90 272 2810 8 (Hb; alk. paper)

© 2006 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

Introduction	1
<i>João Costa and Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva</i>	
Capeverdean DP-internal number agreement: Additional arguments for a distributed morphology approach	11
<i>Ana Castro and Fernanda Pratas</i>	
Nominal and verbal agreement in Portuguese: An argument for Distributed Morphology	25
<i>João Costa and Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva</i>	
Proleptic agreement as a good design property	47
<i>Norbert Corver</i>	
Anti-agreement: Features and locality	75
<i>Aniko Csirmaz</i>	
The acquisition of the standard EPP in Dutch and French	99
<i>Jacqueline van Kampen</i>	
A new view on first conjunct agreement: Evidence from Dutch dialects	121
<i>Marjo van Koppen</i>	
Agreement: The (unique and local) syntactic and morphological licenser of subject Case	141
<i>Jaklin Kornfilt</i>	
Probes: Lack of agreement in Romance	173
<i>Guido Mensching and Eva-Maria Remberger</i>	
Syntactic agreement across language modalities: American Sign Language	203
<i>Carol Neidle and Robert G. Lee</i>	
On the relation of [gender] Agreement: Evidence from Friulian	223
<i>Sandra Paoli</i>	

The (dis)association of Tense, <i>phi</i> -features EPP and nominative Case: Case studies from Romance and Greek <i>Ioanna Sitaridou</i>	243
Head-Level and Chain-Level constraints on spellout <i>Jochen Trommer</i>	261
Index	283

Introduction

João Costa and Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva

1. The status of agreement

Everyone approaching syntax learns that there can be manifestations of agreement between different syntactic elements in a given language. Typically, verbs agree with one or more of their arguments (see Béjar 2003 for a review of agreement patterns, and Sigurðsson 2004 for a discussion of agreement patterns in Germanic). Just to observe a simple manifestation of agreement, consider the English sentence in (1):

(1) John {loves/*love} Mary.

The verb in (1) must bear the 3rd person singular ending, because of the presence of the 3rd person singular subject. This illustrates one of the most salient properties of agreement: it is a redundant feature in the languages, since it repeats information expressed in some other category, not contributing thus for the interpretation of the sentence. Its existence, therefore, is not justified by semantics; it is just a formal device.

Agreement is, *par excellence*, an interface phenomenon, since it is a morphological manifestation of a syntactic relation. For this reason, it becomes legitimate to ask how much of the agreement relations must be established in syntax proper, and how much has to be seen just as a morphological reflex of a syntactic relation, for which syntax proper has no significant explanation to offer.

Throughout this introduction, we aim at providing the reader with some background on the theoretical status of agreement in the recent syntactic literature, and to discuss some of the open issues to be dealt with.

2. The theoretical status of agreement

There is a vast amount of literature on agreement.¹ We would like to emphasize two major theoretical trends on the analysis of agreement that emerged during the last decade: agreement as the overt manifestation of a functional head (starting with Pollock's 1989 work) and agreement as an indirect reflex of a local syntactic relation (Chomsky 2001).

2.1 Agreement and functional heads

A well-known correlate between morphology and syntax is that languages with rich morphology² have overt V-to-I movement, displaying V-Adv-O orders, as illustrated in (2) for French:

- (2) Jean embrasse souvent Marie.
Jean kisses often Marie
'Jean often kisses Mary'

This correlation between morphology and syntactic movement makes some sense, assuming that the target of movement is the I head, arguably the locus of information concerning inflectional features. There is however less consensus as to what the precise content of I is: is this a head containing abstract features or are the tense and agreement morphemes generated in this position, affixation being established through syntactic movement? This is an important question for the analysis of agreement, since if morphemes are the instantiation of syntactic heads, the syntax-morphology connection is quite direct.

The lack of consensus on this issue has to do with the fact that for certain verbal forms it is not obvious how to segment verbal stem and morphemes, to make sure that affixation is syntactic. Likewise, languages with poor morphology such as English posit a problem to such approaches, because there is no verb movement, but yet there are some morphemes. Recent advances in the framework of Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz 1993) offer some solutions for this problem, since in this model, each morpheme corresponds to a syntactic slot, but affixation may be established independently of verb movement.

The observation that verb movement correlates with tense and agreement morphology and the positional need for two independent heads between CP and VP led Pollock (1989) to label such heads T and Agr. From this very influential work, many scholars worked on the idea that agreement is a direct manifestation of the syntactic category Agr. Since, in some languages, there

is overt object agreement, and assuming that Case is uniformly assigned in a Spec-head configuration, Chomsky (1993), following Kayne (1989), proposed a split between AgrS(ubject) and AgrO(bject). According to Chomsky and the followers of this idea, these two heads are responsible for Case licensing, and agreement is established whenever an XP and a head enter a Spec-head relation in the domain of these categories.

It is important to note that, under this set of assumptions, agreement does not necessarily appear overtly whenever the relevant configuration occurs. In the framework of Chomsky (1993), agreement is a collection of abstract (phi-)features present on the Agr heads and on the elements surfacing at their specifier positions, and there may or there may be not an overt correlate of such features.

This view on agreement raises a set of problems, partly acknowledged in Chomsky (1995):

- a) Agr heads differ from other functional heads in that they do not contribute to the interpretation of the sentence. Since the spirit of the Minimalist Program is to eliminate from syntax proper all information that does not contribute to the interpretation of the structure, does it make sense to posit the existence of Agr functional categories?
- b) Is Case a property associated with Agr or with T? If T is the head responsible for licensing Case, is it legitimate to associate Case with Agreement?³
- c) Agreement is found in domains for which it is not obvious that there are Spec-head relations being established. For instances, in the DP-domain, determiners and nouns agree, adjectives and nouns agree. Although it is possible to propose analyses in which these elements enter Spec-head relations (see e.g. Cinque 1994 for adjectives), it is less clear that there are Agr-heads in all domains in which Agreement is found.
- d) Moreover, the proposal is weakened by cases in which there is overt agreement between elements, in the lack of Spec-head relations and in the absence of evidence for stipulating that such Spec-head relations are established covertly. The following sentence from European Portuguese illustrates such a context:

- (3) Ninguém provavelmente leu o livro.
 Nobody probably read the book
 "Probably, nobody read the book"

In (3), the subject and the verb are not in a Spec-head relation, since the adverb intervenes. According to Costa (1996), the subject in SpecAgr, and the

verb is in T. If this analysis were correct, this would constitute a case in which agreement is established independently of the surface Spec-head relation being established in the domain of Agr.

Finally, an approach to agreement proposing that the functional head Agr enters the derivation endowed with phi-features matching the value of a certain XP fails to accommodate the fact that the agreement controller is always the XP, and not the head itself.

2.2 Uninterpretable agreement and AGREE

The proposals put forward in Chomsky (1995, 1998, 2000, 2001) solve some of the problems just listed. Chomsky argues that since Agr heads do not contribute for the interpretation of the sentence, and since agreement relations are parasitic on other syntactic configurations, there is no need for positing the existence of this type of functional categories. The consequence of this proposal is that agreement is no longer the reflex of a syntactic category, but rather the 'side-effect' of certain syntactic configurations.

Chomsky proposes that agreement features are uninterpretable, and for this reason must be eliminated, since they do not contribute to any of the interfaces. Elimination is done by valuation. According to these ideas, T is endowed with unvalued phi-features, for which no specification is yet established. For a feature to be valued and eliminated, it must find an appropriate match – in this sense, the unvalued feature 'probes' for an appropriate goal. The feature valuation may be established under Move or Agree, so that a local relation is established between the two categories. Chomsky defines Agree as in (4):

(4) AGREE

A and B agree iff:

- i. A and B match;
- ii. B is in the domain of A (A c-commands B and B is accessible to A)
- iii. Both A and B are active.
- iv. No goal C intervenes between A and B

Note that Agree is an operation for which a matching relation is a condition. Matching is defined as a relation in which there is feature identity between the probe and goal, and a local relation between the two. The locality relation is reduced to c-command, and sisterhood becomes a relevant relation. In other words, unlike in Chomsky (1993), it becomes possible to predict the existence of agreement relations in the absence of surface Spec-head configurations.

The proposal just outlined introduces new ways of thinking of agreement and raises new research questions. In particular, it defines agreement as a purely relational notion, dispensing with functional categories from referring to it. Nonetheless, the positional arguments that motivated the postulation of Agr heads remain, and must be accounted for. Likewise, it becomes necessary to check whether there are consequences for morphological agreement of valuing phi-features under Spec-head and Move or under Agree, since the syntactic configurations obtained are different. A significant improvement lies on the fact that the distinction between probes and goals makes it possible to distinguish agreement controllers from agreeing elements. Also, the positing of new structural conditions for agreement to obtain opens up possibilities for accounting for agreement relations other than subject-verb agreement. The nature of Agree is discussed at length in Sigurðsson (2004) in its relations with the role played by Merge. This author illustrates the type of debate on the structural conditions for agreement, showing that the variation in agreement patterns follows from parametric options in the visibility of the structures generated by Merge.

2.3 The consequences of agreement

Visible agreement has syntactic import. This is a well-known fact. At least the following syntactic properties are known to relate to the presence of a certain type of agreement morphology: i) the availability of null subjects; ii) V-to-I movement; iii) N-movement.

As mentioned above, although these correlations are well established, it is not clear what their underlying reason is. Let us consider one example. For some authors (e.g., Barbosa 1995; Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998), agreement and null subjects correlate, because Agr morphology is pronominal, and able to check EPP-features. It is therefore a relevant question to know how to interpret the syntactic consequences of agreement in a framework in which agreement is seen as an imperfection of the syntactic component, more precisely, as the manifestation of features that must be valued to become invisible for the interfaces.

For this type of reason, it becomes an important question to evaluate the role played by agreement morphology and agreement features in the syntactic component.

3. The problems

This volume collects papers presented at the Lisbon Workshop on Agreement, held at Universidade Nova de Lisboa in July 2003. The aim of the workshop, and the aim of the papers collected in this volume, is to provide answers to the following set of questions:

- i) What is the relation between syntax and morphology in determining agreement relations?
- ii) Which (if any) syntactic configurations are relevant for determining agreement?
- iii) How relevant is verbal agreement for the purposes of Extended Projection Principle? In other words, is the obligatory presence of a subject conditioned by the occurrence of a specific type of agreement morphology?
- iv) Are there connections between verbal and DP-internal agreement?
- v) How are person, number and gender agreement to be distinguished both morphologically and syntactically?
- vi) Do AGREE and Spec,head relations trigger different agreement effects? If so, why?
- vii) What type of relation is there between head-movement and morphological agreement?

As can be understood by the way the questions are formulated, the primary goal of the contributions in this volume is to address the nature of the relation between syntactic configurations and syntactic operations and the overt manifestation of agreement. In this sense, the papers collected here contribute to a deeper understanding of the ways agreement morphology contributes to our knowledge of the syntactic component.

The papers by Castro and Pratas and by Costa and Figueiredo Silva deal with the overt nature of agreement, arguing that, in some instances, overt verbal and nominal morphology are not necessarily derived in the syntax, but rather a consequence of different choices in terms of the nature of agreement morphology. In particular, it is proposed that in Brazilian Portuguese and in Capeverdean, plural number morphology is a singleton morpheme, while in European Portuguese many manifestations of agreement derive from the dissociated nature of number morphemes.

Corver's paper studies anticipatory agreement in degree expressions in Dutch, arguing for a derivational analysis of the degree expressions able to accommodate the relevant data under a syntactic approach. Under this view, agreement is, in fact, a reflex of syntax.

The paper by Csirmaz discusses two types of anti-agreement phenomena. A structured view of morphology is proposed, along with cyclic spell-out and the requirement that agreement be triggered by nominals with full feature specification.

Van Kampen studies the correlations between EPP and acquisition, arguing that EPP is the outcome of the acquisition program, rather than its source. A longitudinal analysis of Dutch and French child language is used to show how the subject-requirement is well-established before the systematic appearance of ϕ -features. This leads to the conclusion that licensing morphology, for example ϕ -agreement, may underline the EPP principle, but should not define it.

The contribution of Koppen deals with differences between full agreement and first conjunct agreement, proposing that the different overt agreement markers do not correlate with different mechanisms for feature checking. Instead, it is proposed that Full Agreement results when phi-feature checking and case assignment working in tandem, whereas First Conjunct Agreement comes about when phi-feature checking is dissociated from case assignment.

Kornfilt's paper argues that there is a clear correlation between morphological Agr and overt subjects with genuine, licensed subject Case, and that this correlation is independent from mood and/or epistemic modality. It is proposed that nominal Agr is licensed as a subject Case licenser, either internally, in a homogeneously nominal domain, or else by raising into the *n*-head of an *nP*-shell that dominates categorially hybrid domains.

Mensching and Remberger's paper analyze several constructions in Romance in which there is only partial agreement between the verb and a postverbal subject, hypothesizing that Chomsky's theory of *probes* and their impact on movement, Case checking and agreement provides a natural explanation to the data under discussion.

The paper by Neidle and Lee presents an account of the expression of syntactic agreement in American Sign Language arguing that the optional head tilt is, in fact, a focus marker that incorporates expression of subject agreement. Thus, its occurrence is dependent on the semantics of the sentence, but when it does occur, it serves to mark not only focus but also subject agreement.

Paoli's paper focuses on the nature of agreement specified for [gender, number] features and gives empirical support to Chomsky's rejection of Agr(O) as a functional category. It is proposed that the agreement relation established between a past participle and its direct object, and in general all instances of agreement specified for [gender] features, exploit the relation of c-command, suggesting that the latter is indeed active within the narrow syntax.

It is further claimed that agreement specified for [gender] and agreement specified for [person] are instantiated through different configurational structures.

In Sitaridou's contribution it is claimed that *phi*-incompleteness should be dissociated from T-defectiveness because of comparative evidence from raising constructions involving *na*-clauses in Greek and inflected infinitives in Portuguese. The paper shows that agreement may reflect EPP or Case, in different languages.

Trommer refutes the complementary distribution of cross-referencing clitics and agreement, proposing that clitics and agreement affixes are the spell-out of underlying chains already containing (identical) *phi*-features for clitics and agreement. Non-cooccurrence of clitics and agreement follows from spell-out restrictions on the chain domain, while cooccurrence reflects high-ranked faithfulness constraints in more local domains.

Notes

1. Consult http://www.surrey.ac.uk/LIS/SMG/projects/agreement/agreement_bib_unicode.htm for an annotated bibliography on agreement.
2. Cf. Vikner (1997) for a definition of richness.
3. In spite of this reasoning, Raposo (1987) provides evidence from the syntax of inflected infinitives in European Portuguese for associating Case with agreement.

References

- Alexiadou, A. & Agnostopoulou, E. (1998). Parametrizing Agr: Word order, verb movement and EPP Checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 16 (3), 491–539.
- Barbosa, P. (1995). Null Subjects. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Béjar, S. (2003). *Phi-Syntax. A theory of agreement*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Costa, J. (1996). Adverb positioning and V-Movement in English: Some more evidence. *Studia Linguistica*, 50 (1), 22–34.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In M. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The View from Building 20* (pp. 1–52). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1998). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. *MIT Occasional papers in linguistics*, 15.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, & J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik* (pp. 89–155). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in linguistics* [Current studies in linguistics 36] (pp. 1–52). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. (1994). On the evidence for partial N-movement in the romance DP. In G. Cinque, J. Koster, J.-Y. Pollock, L. Rizzi, & R. Zanuttini (Eds.), *Paths towards Universal Grammar* (pp. 85–110). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Halle, M. & A. Marantz (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of iInflection. In M. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The View from Building, 20* (pp. 111–176). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1989). Facets of past participle agreement in Romance. In P. Benincà (Ed.), *Dialectal Variation and the Theory of Grammar* (pp. 85–103). Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1989). Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of inflection. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 365–424.
- Raposo, E. (1987). Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18, 85–109.
- Sigurdðsson, H. (2004). Agree and agreement: Evidence from Germanic. In W. Abraham (Ed.), *Topics of Germanic Typology* [Studia Typologica 6]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Vikner, S. (1997). V^o-to-I^o Movement and inflection for person in all tenses. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax* (pp. 189–213). London: Longman.

Capeverdean DP-internal number agreement

Additional arguments for a distributed morphology approach*

Ana Castro and Fernanda Pratas

Université Paris 8 / Universidade Nova de Lisboa

In the Capeverdean DP, the plural marker surfaces as a singleton suffix on the D head: if there is an overt element on D, it attaches to that element; if there is no overt element on D, it “lowers” to the head of the complement.

Assuming Roberts (1999) proposal according to which the V-feature of I is the relevant parametric value (languages can vary according to this feature being strong or weak), it is our intuition that it also has implications in the DP-internal number agreement. We show that, being the V-features of T (the only relevant functional head in this language) weak, the relation between Spec,TP, the category where the subject moves to, and T does not trigger overt subject-verb agreement. Within the DP-subject some minimal plural marker is required for the correct interpretation at LF. Being D the locus of plural marking, linking the DP to its LF-interpretation, the minimal marker surfaces on it.

1. Introduction

Assuming, under a generativist approach, that human language is governed by abstract laws, most of the crosslinguistic investigation conducted by linguists working within this approach in the last decades has tried to search for *these* laws. Adding to all the theoretical advances in this respect, deriving new structures from some already known structures of the same language, the description and analysis of more and more new data from different and less familiar languages have brought some hints to be followed in this search.

We firmly believe that the Capeverdean data presented in this paper may bring some new hints to an important question of debate: what are the abstract laws that govern subject-verb agreement? And in which way is this abstract

Nominal and verbal agreement in Portuguese

An argument for Distributed Morphology

João Costa and Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva

This paper provides evidence for an approach to number expression in terms of Distributed Morphology. It will be argued that verbal morphology cannot be explained in terms of verb movement alone, since different registers of Portuguese, while exhibiting important distinctions in the verbal paradigm, have the same extension of verb movement. Moreover, concerning the expression of plurality, it can be shown that an approach dealing with facts both from the verbal and nominal domains is more adequate to explain intralinguistic variation in a straightforward way. The predictions of the analysis are fruitful and felicitous when applied to a large range of empirical facts of the language.

Introduction

Some traditions in generative syntax try to explain verbal morphology in purely syntactic terms. One of the tenets of such approaches is visible in the correlation supposed to exist between some notion of “rich morphology” and V-to-I movement. The most straightforward way for explaining this correlation is laid out in Belletti’s (1990) work, in which it is assumed that cyclic head movement to the topmost functional head explains the order of tense and agreement morphemes (which follows from the mirror principle of Baker 1985). Although this type of correlation proves fruitful in some domains, several problems have been noticed in the literature, questioning the direct relation between V-to-I movement and verbal morphology. We emphasize two of these problems:

- a) The few visible morphemes in a language without V-to-I movement, such as English, must involve some kind of affix-lowering. However, the latter does not comply with general syntactic constraints (Halle & Marantz 1993; Bobaljik 1995).

Proleptic agreement as a good design property

Norbert Corver

This article investigates the phenomenon of proleptic (i.e. anticipatory) agreement, more specifically the anticipatory occurrence of the Dutch inflectional morpheme *-e* on degree modifiers that modify a gradable attributive adjective carrying the bound morpheme *-e* (e.g. *een [erg-e leuk-e] auto*; a very-AGR nice-AGR car; ‘a very nice car’). Although at first sight the appearance of this proleptic agreement morpheme, which enters into an agreement relationship with the noun, seems to be highly imperfect, it turns out to be a property of natural language that satisfies the design specifications of human language. An analysis is proposed according to which the sequence ‘degree modifier – gradable adjective’ is a derived word order. More specifically, it is argued that the degree modifier originates as a post-adjectival predicate contained within a DegP-internal small clause configuration and undergoes predicate displacement to the left periphery (i.e. edge) of the (attributive) extended adjectival projection (i.e. DegP). This phrasal movement to [Spec,DegP] goes together with a head movement operation that raises the small clause head, which is instantiated by the proleptic inflection (*-e*), to the left peripheral head position Deg. Occupying the left peripheral Deg-position (i.e. edge position) after head movement, the proleptic inflection is able to enter into an agreement relation with the noun.

1. Proleptic (‘anticipatory’) agreement and (im)perfection

The Minimalist Program explores the thesis that human language may be a “perfect system,” a system that is optimally designed for interaction with other cognitive systems that are internal to the mind. As noted in Chomsky (2000), one may explore the perfection of the language system by means of the quest for potential “imperfections” of language, i.e. properties that language should not have. Chomsky notes that apparent imperfections come in several varieties. More in particular, one may identify a property P of language L, where:

Anti-agreement

Features and locality*

Aniko Csirmaz

The paper discusses two types of anti-agreement phenomena. In the first type, anti-agreement arises with R-expressions in certain environments, where pronouns show full agreement. It is argued that these cases are best handled by allowing certain elements to be inherently feature defective and by assuming a cyclic default feature insertion process. The second type of anti-agreement is determined by locality rather than features. Languages can either ban or license full agreement in a local domain, and allow or ban agreement outside of the domain, respectively. A surface account is suggested for this type of anti-agreement, where languages can vary in the identity of the local domain and in whether agreement is permitted or banned there. The two types of anti-agreement can arise and interact within the same language, such as Welsh. The different anti-agreement phenomena are illustrated by data from Hungarian, Fiorentino and Berber.

1. Introduction

Two kinds of anti-agreement phenomena are explored in this paper. On the one hand, anti-agreement can arise as the consequence of defective feature specification. If a constituent is not fully specified for ϕ -features, then it can trigger anti-agreement (default agreement). This type of anti-agreement is exhibited by Hungarian and Welsh. On the other hand, anti-agreement can result from a language-particular licensing or ban of agreement within a local domain. In this case, agreement is licensed (or banned) only if both the trigger of agreement and the agreeing element are within the local domain. If either of these moves outside of the domain, then anti-agreement or agreement arises, respectively. Fiorentino licenses agreement in the local domain, while Welsh and Berber ban it in local environments. Both anti-agreement phenomena are operative in Welsh, and only the first one is observed in Hungarian. This

The acquisition of the standard EPP in Dutch and French*

Jacqueline van Kampen

The standard EPP (Extended Projection Principle) stands for the obligatory co-occurrence of a <+I>-head and its DP specifier as subject. In minimalist terms, <+I>-head carries a ϕ -feature set that requires the presence of the DP subject in Spec, I. Chomsky (@2001:6) contends that the <+I>-head will only have the EPP-effect when it is ϕ -complete, i.e. when it carries a complete set of person/number features.

The subject obligation for <+I>-marked predicates is a high-ranking candidate for Universal Grammar. As such, one might expect that the EPP will guide the child's grammar acquisition program. In this paper, I will argue that this is nevertheless unlikely. The full EPP is the outcome of the acquisition program, rather than its source. A longitudinal analysis of Dutch and French child language shows how the subject-requirement is well-established before the systematic appearance of ϕ -features. This leads to the conclusion that licensing morphology, for example ϕ -agreement, follows. It may underline a principle, but should not define it.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, I will apply to the 'Extended Projection Principle' (EPP) the notion 'acquisition'/'learning'. This may strike some people as a bit odd for the following reason. The standard EPP in generative grammar must be any grammatical arrangement that serves to guarantee that a predicate is "anchored", due to the presence of a subject (Chomsky 1981, 2001).

The subject obligation for all (or most) predicates is a high-ranking candidate for universal grammar (UG). As such, Chomsky's view on the matter implies that the EPP must be part of an inborn a priori frame. The EPP will guide the child's acquisition program rather than being the outcome of such a program. The notion 'learning' does not apply to an a priori guidance system. The EPP, as UG principles in general, is not supposed to be something that the

A new view on first conjunct agreement

Evidence from Dutch dialects

Marjo van Koppen

ULCL/Leiden University & Meertens Institute/Sand-project

This paper discusses First Conjunct Agreement in Dutch dialects, a phenomenon whereby a head does not agree with a coordinated argument as a whole, but only with the first conjunct of this coordinated argument. The agreement morphology on the complementizer reflects the features of the first conjunct of the subject only, whereas the agreement morphology on the verb reflects the features of the coordinated subject as a whole. It is argued that the pattern of Full Agreement versus First Conjunct Agreement in Dutch dialects results from the different relations both heads have with respect to case assignment.

1. Introduction¹

For various languages it has been noted that agreement relations involving a certain argument do not always have the same morphological reflex on the head this argument agrees with (cf. a.o. Guasti & Rizzi 2000; Samek-Ludovici 2003). This general pattern falls out in two situations that can be formulated more precisely: (i) a head H can show a different morphological realisation of the agreement relation with a certain argument A in situation S than it will in situation P, or (ii) a head H can show a different morphological realisation of the agreement relation with a certain argument A than the head K does when it is in an agreement relation with this same argument A.

An example of the first situation is for instance found in Standard Arabic. A subject agrees with the finite verb of the clause. The agreement relation between this subject and the verb can either be expressed by agreement morphology on the verb for person, number and gender (as in (1a)) or by agreement morphol-

Agreement: The (unique and local) syntactic and morphological licenser of subject Case*

Jaklin Kornfilt

Syracuse University

This paper claims that overt Agr in Turkish determines subject Case – but only where Agr is itself licensed as a subject Case licenser. In line with some recent work (e.g. Rubin 2003), I propose here that adjunct clauses are merged as a special kind of functional projection, i.e. as Mod(ifier) P(hrase) (under pair-Merge, rather than the “regular” set-Merge). I further argue that the morphological Agr that licenses subject Case is a direct reflex of syntactic phi-features and category features, rather than of mood and/or epistemic modality, as has been claimed recently (e.g. Aygen 2003). I show, based on detailed contrasts, that there is a clear correlation between morphological Agr and overt subjects with genuine, licensed subject Case, and that this correlation is independent from mood and/or epistemic modality. I propose that nominal Agr is licensed as a subject Case licenser, either internally, in a homogeneously nominal domain, or else by raising into the *n*-head of an *nP*-shell that dominates categorially hybrid domains. *nPs* can’t undergo pair-Merge, as they are in complementary distribution with ModPs, which are pair-Merged. A nominal Agr in a categorially hybrid ModP domain thus has no *n*-head to raise to and consequently remains unlicensed as a (nominal) subject Case (= Genitive) licenser. Default Case applies instead, as a last resort. The paper also considers two rival accounts of (part of) similar facts and shows that they have severe shortcomings which are avoided by the proposed account with its wider coverage.

1. Introduction and summary

This paper is a case study in the interactions of morphology and syntax, as it claims that overt, morphological *Agr*(reement) determines subject Case in Turkish¹ (but only where *Agr* is licensed itself in this capacity – an idea reminiscent of Raposo’s (1987) proposals for European Portuguese *Agr* in inflected in-

Probes

Lack of agreement in Romance*

Guido Mensching and Eva-Maria Remberger

The paper explores Chomsky's (2000 et seq.) approach to agreement (cf. the operation AGREE) applying it to several Modern and Old Romance structures; in particular, we deal with structures which show lack of overt agreement. The basic property of the constructions discussed is the fact that the verb appears in the 3rd person singular, while the subject, which is in postverbal position, is in the plural. The main hypothesis is that Chomsky's theory of *probes* and their impact on movement, Case checking and agreement provides a natural explanation for the data under discussion. However, we also uncover a problem for the Case-checking mechanism hypothesized by Chomsky which will lead us to postulate a special parameter for Nominative Case assignment: There is some evidence (given also by data from Romance infinitive constructions) which strengthens the claim that ϕ -completeness is not a necessary condition for Case assignment.

1. Introduction

In this paper we explore Chomsky's (1998 ss.)¹ approach to agreement in the light of the several Modern and Old Romance structures in which agreement phenomena are involved, in particular structures which show lack of overt agreement. Some of the relevant data are presented in (1):²

- (1) a. Classical Spanish³
No causó poca admiración las palabras del
Not caused.3SG few admiration the word.PL.DEF of.the
pastor.
shepherd
'The words of the shepherd caused quite a lot of admiration.'

Syntactic agreement across language modalities

American Sign Language*

Carol Neidle and Robert G. Lee

Boston University

This paper presents an account of the expression of syntactic agreement in American Sign Language (ASL). In ASL, phi-features – associated not only with number and person, but also with referential information – are instantiated spatially through both the manual articulation of lexical items and non-manual markings (gestures of the upper body that co-occur in parallel with manual signing). The morphological expression of agreement on a subclass of verbs, so-called *agreeing verbs*, has been studied for some time (Padden 1983, e.g.), but the discovery of the systematic non-manual component is relatively recent (Bahan 1996; MacLaughlin 1997). In transitive clauses and possessive DP's, head tilt toward the location in space associated with the subject marks subject agreement, whereas object agreement is marked by an eye gaze toward the location associated with the object. In intransitive clauses and non-possessive DP's, agreement with the main NP is expressed by head tilt or eye gaze or both. One unresolved puzzle has been the seeming optionality of these markings. In this paper, we reconsider the function of head tilt, arguing that it is, in fact, a focus marker that incorporates expression of subject agreement. Thus, its occurrence is dependent on the semantics of the sentence, but when it does occur, it serves to mark not only focus but also subject agreement.

1. Syntactic organization of ASL

Signed languages like American Sign Language (ASL) have the same essential hierarchical structures that have been found in spoken languages.

On the relation of [gender] Agreement

Evidence from Friulian

Sandra Paoli

University of Cambridge

Pollock (1989) initiated a paradigm of research within the Principles and Parameters framework where Agreement (Agr) as a functional projection has played an increasingly significant role. The legitimacy of this programme has been called into question by Chomsky's (1995) Minimalist Program. Chomsky rejects Agr on conceptual grounds, so that in his system only those functional projections with clear semantic content such as Tense and Negation are retained. Agree is analysed in terms of feature movement and a concept of matching that is left unclear. In Chomsky (1998, 2000) Agree is further defined as a relation that holds between a goal and a probe within a minimal domain that leads to feature deletion under matching.

This paper focuses on the nature of agreement specified for [gender, number] features and gives empirical support to Chomsky's rejection of Agr(O). Exploiting Cinque's (1999) adverb hierarchy, the paper shows that the presence of a functional projection devoted to object agreement cannot be empirically justified. It is proposed that the agreement relation established between a past participle and its direct object, and in general all instances of agreement specified for [gender] features, exploits the relation of c-command, suggesting that the latter is indeed active within the narrow syntax, contra Chomsky (2000). Finally, we suggest that not all instances of agreement are to be subsumed under the same mechanism: it seems plausible to claim that agreement specified for [gender] and agreement specified for [person] are instantiated through different configurational structures.

Introduction

'Agreement' is a concept widely used in various syntactic frameworks that differ rather substantially from one another. In each of them, the term 'agreement' refers to the same general phenomenon, i.e. a 'systematic co-variation of lin-

The (dis)association of Tense, *phi*-features EPP and nominative Case

Case studies from Romance and Greek

Ioanna Sitaridou

University of Cambridge

The aim of the paper is to shed light to the licensing mechanism of nominative Case-marked subjects and to assess current developments within the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995) pertaining to subject licensing, *phi*-features, Case and the EPP. Data are drawn from Portuguese inflected infinitives, Spanish personal infinitives and Greek subjunctive clauses. The comparative study of these constructions enables us to observe that T-defectiveness should not be exclusively associated with *phi*-incompleteness. Instead, a dissociation is necessary. It is then proposed that Tense, rather than agreement correlates with nominative Case despite the fact that agreement is morphologically visible and tense morphologically invisible.

1. Introduction

Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001a, 2001b) argues that T is defective when selected by V, and therefore has an incomplete set of *phi*-features. In such a way, he connects T-defectiveness with *phi*-incompleteness. This accurately captures the data for raising constructions in English, for instance. This claim makes also the prediction that a defective T by virtue of being *phi*-incomplete cannot check the nominative Case of an attracted DP, instead it can only license PRO. However, this approach might be too simplistic. In languages such as Greek, in raising constructions, a *phi*-complete T fails to license a nominative Case subject suggesting that it can be T-defective without being *phi*-incomplete. On the other hand, Portuguese, in raising predicates with an inflected infinitive manages to license a nominative Case subject. So far, a dissociation of *phi*-features and T-completeness seems to be compelling. To reinforce this claim, further evi-

Head-Level and Chain-Level constraints on spellout

Jochen Trommer

Woolford (2003) argues that clitics and agreement crossreferencing the same argument are always in complementary distribution. This paper discusses data from Menominee, an Algonquian language, which show that this claim is too strong: Clitic-Agreement Doubling is often restricted, but in principle possible. This situation is captured by a model where clitics and agreement markers combine freely in syntax, but their morphological realization is restricted by specific optimality-theoretic constraints on Spellout. A crucial consequence of this account is that spellout constraints can not only apply at word-size domains ('Head Level'), but also at chains comprising coindexed clitics and agreement ('Chain Level').

1. Introduction

Woolford (2003) discusses languages where pronominal clitics and verb agreement are dynamically in complementary distribution: If cross-referencing of an argument by a clitic is not possible, this is taken over by otherwise impossible agreement. She proposes an optimality-theoretic account of these facts which is based on a general constraint requiring cross-referencing of arguments and different markedness constraints for clitics and agreement. Crucially, this account predicts that an argument should never be cross-referenced by both a clitic and by agreement at the same time.

In this paper, I argue that this conclusion is too strong: Languages can have cross-referencing by clitics *and* agreement at the same time (e.g., Piatino, Gerlach 2001; and Bavarian, Weiss 1998). The article focuses on Algonquian, especially Menominee (Bloomfield 1962) which shows cooccurrence of clitics and agreement, spelling out features of the same argument, but also evidence for constraints against such cooccurrence in specific contexts. I propose to maintain the basic insight behind Woolford's approach by assuming that clitics

Index

A

- Accusative 72, 144, 147, 157, 163, 164, 181, 185, 186, 253, 280
- Acquisition 7, 99–102, 105–109, 111–117, 210, 238
- Adjectives 3, 14, 27–29, 34, 35, 39, 48, 49, 55
- adverb 3, 26, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 62, 63, 68, 69, 71, 223, 233
- Affix 262, 264, 274
- Agree 6, 28, 29, 48, 83–86, 92, 121–123, 125, 132–135, 180–182, 194–195, 256
- AgrP 145, 150, 168, 229, 233
- Algonquian 261, 266, 267, 269, 274, 277, 280
- American Sign Language 7, 203
- Arabic 80, 121–123, 139, 175, 177–179, 183–185, 189, 191
- Aspect 22, 31, 71, 114, 136, 143, 144, 194, 204, 233

B

- Bavarian 261, 266, 280
- Berber 75, 76, 91, 92, 94, 95
- bound morpheme 47, 49

C

- c-command 4, 123, 124, 130–132, 180, 204, 223, 236, 238
- Capeverdean 6, 11, 22
- Catalan 174–177, 184, 189, 191, 199
- Chain 8, 102, 261, 262, 270–276, 280
- Clitics 8, 100, 105, 109, 111, 192, 239, 261–270, 272, 274, 276–280

- Complement 11, 13, 14, 21, 22, 67, 68, 83, 125, 135, 136, 138, 162, 166, 229, 240, 245, 246, 250, 256
- Complementizer 121, 122, 125–129, 132–138, 280
- completeness 91, 190, 194
- Conjunct 7, 79–82, 96, 121, 122, 125–130, 133, 134, 136–138, 268, 269, 272–274, 280
- Conjunction 81, 249
- Copula 61–68
- Cyclic 7, 25, 75, 76, 82, 85, 87, 95, 249

D

- Default 75, 76, 82, 84–87, 91, 95, 96, 122, 141, 142, 154–158, 167, 169, 182, 183, 185, 194, 235, 263, 274
- Defective 75, 76, 82, 84, 91, 95, 96, 138, 183–188, 193, 243, 247, 249, 256
- Degree 6, 47, 49–55, 58, 59, 62–65, 67–71, 151, 161, 277
- Determiner 27–29, 33, 36, 37, 39, 107, 220, 280
- Discourse 68, 104, 117
- Distributed morphology 2, 11–13, 25, 36, 84
- Dutch 6, 7, 47, 49, 51, 55, 56, 61, 63, 64, 67, 68, 70–72, 99–103, 105–109, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 121–123, 125–129, 131–139

E

- ECM (Exceptional Case Marking) 143, 145, 163, 164, 168, 183, 186, 188, 193–195

- edge 21, 22, 47, 59, 61, 62, 67–70, 87, 280
- English 1, 2, 13, 16–20, 25, 42, 49, 58, 157, 166, 181, 185, 189, 192, 194, 208, 209, 213, 216, 217, 219, 220, 229, 238, 243
- Epistemic 7, 141, 142, 162–164, 167
- EPP (Extended Projection Principle) 6–8, 99–102, 104–107, 112–115, 177–179, 181–184, 187–190, 192, 193, 243, 248, 249, 251–258
- Exclamative 61, 68
- Expletive 17–19, 23, 39–42, 174, 177–179, 181, 182, 185, 190–193

F

- Faithfulness 8, 262, 272
- Finiteness 168, 194, 244, 257, 258
- Fiorentino 75, 91, 93–96, 194
- Focus 7, 41, 42, 68, 71, 174, 192, 203–206, 213–219, 228, 244, 267
- French 2, 7, 19, 37, 38, 44, 58, 96, 99–103, 105–112, 115, 174, 177–181, 189, 191–193, 196, 250, 252
- Frisian 57, 125–138
- Full agreement 7, 75–79, 86, 87, 91, 93, 95, 121, 122
- Functional category 7, 113, 181, 187

G

- Gender 6–8, 80, 96, 121, 122, 179, 183–185, 189, 192–194, 207, 223, 225, 227, 229, 238, 239

Genitive 141, 142, 146–150,
152–156, 158, 159, 161, 162, 164,
166, 167
Germanic 1, 56
Goal 4, 6, 12, 26, 48, 49, 68,
84–87, 92, 95, 123, 130–135,
138, 180, 181, 185, 186, 188, 189,
193, 195, 223
Greek 8, 169, 243–245, 247–249,
251, 253–255, 257–259

H

head movement 25, 47, 60, 61,
67, 68, 213, 271
Hungarian 75–78, 80, 82, 84,
86–92, 95, 96

I

Identity 4, 75, 82
infinitives 8, 101, 102, 114, 195,
243–247, 249, 255–258
Inflection 16, 18–20, 43, 47, 49,
50, 54, 67–72, 131, 177, 219,
238, 244
Interface 1, 40, 43, 50, 59, 83,
193
Interpretable 48, 49, 68, 71, 114,
123, 130–133, 135
Inversion 19, 32, 35, 41, 42, 61,
62, 64, 66, 68–70
Italian 57, 76, 93, 115, 175,
177–179, 189, 191, 192, 196,
199, 225, 226, 240, 250, 252,
265

L

Lexicon 13, 182, 189, 192, 195
LF (Logical Form) 11, 14, 20,
39, 83, 158, 193
Locality 4, 13, 22, 54, 60, 69, 75,
76, 92, 123, 124
Lowering 13

M

Matching 4, 48, 68, 123, 132,
153, 166, 180, 185, 194,
223–225, 239, 256
Menominee 261, 262, 267, 268,
270, 271, 274–276, 279, 280

Merge 5, 59, 92, 96, 154, 169, 233
Minimalist Program 3, 47, 187,
223, 225, 243
Modality 7, 141, 142, 162, 164,
165, 168, 206, 207, 219
Morpheme 2, 6, 14, 18, 20, 22,
27, 28, 36–41, 43, 47, 49, 50,
66, 70, 78, 83, 88, 90, 146, 147,
157, 167, 169, 229–231, 267,
271, 272

N

Negation 192, 204, 223, 280
Null subject 182, 212, 219, 251,
254

O

Object 3, 7, 48, 96, 109, 154,
176, 192, 203, 207, 210–212,
216, 219, 220, 223–228, 230,
253–255, 262–265, 267, 268,
271, 276–279
optionality 50, 175, 195, 203,
206, 215

P

Paradigm 16, 17, 25, 31, 106, 126,
127, 129, 130, 132–134, 137, 138,
147, 150, 152, 165, 194, 223, 266
Parameter 12, 15, 173, 174, 178,
185, 189, 195
Partial agreement 7, 79, 195
Participle 7, 38, 96, 97, 177–180,
191, 192, 194–196, 199, 223,
225, 227, 228, 239, 240
Phase 85–88, 91, 95, 105, 138,
194, 255, 256
Phi-features 4, 5, 8, 49, 124,
125, 129–132, 141, 142, 149, 153,
157, 165, 168, 194, 203,
206–208, 210, 218, 243, 247,
254, 256, 258, 262
Plural 6, 11–18, 20–23, 26, 28,
29, 31, 33, 35, 37–40, 43, 44,
48, 62, 66, 78, 87–90, 105,
109, 111–116, 122, 126, 128, 131,
132, 134, 135, 173, 174, 179, 192,
209, 210, 219, 266, 280

Portuguese 3, 6, 8, 14, 22,
25–32, 34–44, 141, 174–177,
179, 191, 192, 194, 195, 199,
237, 243–246, 249–255, 257,
258
Possessive 12, 28, 40, 43, 76, 83,
87, 88, 90, 92, 96, 152, 153,
203, 210, 219, 220
Possessor 78, 80–83, 85, 88, 89,
96, 100, 152
predicate 41, 47–49, 59–64,
66–71, 81, 99–104, 106, 107,
111, 112, 114, 143–145, 147, 148,
163, 164, 213–219, 248
pro 17–20, 22, 90, 96, 147, 148,
155, 157, 161, 169, 178, 182, 235,
243, 244, 256
Probe 4, 48, 49, 68, 69, 84–87,
95, 123, 130–133, 135, 174,
180–186, 188–190, 193, 195,
223
Pronominal 5, 44, 67, 76–82,
84, 87–91, 261, 262, 265–268,
280
Pronoun 77, 82, 88, 90, 96, 110,
116, 127, 132, 138, 179, 209,
220, 239, 244, 266

Q

quantifier 12, 13, 20, 21, 44

R

raising 7, 8, 18, 61, 141, 143–145,
154, 156, 158, 168, 183, 188,
193–195, 234, 239, 240, 243,
244, 247–250, 252–254, 257,
258
Romance 7, 27, 37, 43, 57, 114,
173–184, 186–189, 192, 194,
195, 198, 199, 225, 236, 237,
239, 243, 244, 246, 247
Romanian 59, 62–65, 69

S

Semantics 1, 7, 147, 151, 160,
164, 203, 215, 219
Singleton 6, 11, 14, 18, 20, 22,
27, 36–38, 40, 43

- Small clause 30, 34, 35, 41, 47,
60–62, 66–68, 235
- Spanish 57, 115, 175, 186, 189,
191, 196, 197, 237, 243, 244,
246, 255–259
- Specifier 3, 49, 61, 83, 99, 107,
114, 125, 131, 135, 136, 138, 153,
154, 158, 177, 192, 206, 224,
230–233, 271
- Spell-out 7, 36, 76, 84–87,
94–96, 179, 262, 269
- Subjunctive 142, 145–153, 157,
160, 162, 164, 165, 169, 176,
197, 243–245, 247–249, 251
- T
- TP 11, 18, 20, 23, 83, 132, 133,
135, 138, 145, 204, 211, 220,
247, 254
- Turkish 76, 88–90, 95, 96, 141,
143, 145, 152, 154–159, 162,
167–169
- U
- Uninterpretable 4, 48–50, 68,
71, 123, 132, 135, 153–155, 167,
180, 181, 183, 192, 193, 195
- W
- Welsh 75–77, 90–92, 94–96, 178
- Wh-movement 68, 206, 215,
216
- Wh-phrase 72, 216