

Agreement without Agree

Jan-Wouter Zwart
University of Groningen

Generative Initiatives in Syntactic Theory 6, Ghent, October 17, 2012

1. Agree

- (1) [John_{3SG} [probably [_{VP} love-s linguistics]]]
- (2) [_{TP} John_{3SG} T_{φ:unvalued} [probably [_{VP} John_{φ:3SG} [love-s linguistics]]]]
- (3) a. John's friends { love/*loves } linguistics
b. Friends of John { love/*loves } linguistics
- (4) a. There { seems/*seem } to be a man in the room
b. There { seem/*seems } to be several people in the room
- (5) *Feature sharing*
In a dependent-nondependent pair, the nondependent shares its features with the dependent.

2. Exceptional agreement

1 Addressee agreement

- (6) a. Pettek lan egin d-i-k-∅ Basque
Peter:ERG work:ABS do:PERF 3SG.ABS-AUX-ALLOC:MASC.INFRML-3SG.ERG
'Peter worked' (to a male friend)
- b. Pettek lan egin d-i-n-∅
Peter:ERG work:ABS do:PERF 3SG.ABS-AUX-ALLOC:FEM.INFRML-3SG.ERG
'Peter worked' (to a female friend)
- c. Pettek lan egin d-i-zü-∅
Peter:ERG work:ABS do:PERF 3SG.ABS-AUX-ALLOC:FRML-3SG.ERG
'Peter worked' (formal)

2 Speaker agreement

- (7) a. ma-yana Ignaciano
3SG.MASC-go
'he must go' (spoken by a male)
- b. ñí-yana
3SG.MASC-go
'he must go' (spoken by a female)

- (8) a. ema má-imaha ema apana
 3SG.MASC 3SG.MASC-see 3SG.MASC other
 ‘He saw the other guy.’ (spoken by a male)
- b. eñí ñ-ímaha eñí apana
 3SG.MASC 3SG.MASC-see 3SG.MASC other
 ‘He saw the other guy.’ (spoken by a female)

3 Possessor agreement

- (9) a. huni ok-raa dekh-al-ak-**hin** (object agreement in secondary slot) Angika
 3:HON he-OBJ see-PAST-3SU-3OB
 ‘He saw him.’
- b. huni ok-raa dekh-al-ak-**hō** (addressee agreement in secondary slot)
 3:HON he-OBJ see-PAST-3SU-2:HON
 ‘He saw him.’

- (10) a. tō ok-ra beta-ke dekh-l-əhik Maithili
 2:NHON 3:NHON-GEN son-OBJ see-PAST-2NHON>3NHON
 ‘You saw his son.’
- b. toh-ər beta ok-ra dekh-l-əhik
 2:NHON-GEN son 3:NHON-OBJ see-PAST-3NHON>2NHON
 ‘Your son saw him.’

- (11) a. é-yshú Maasai
 3-be.alive
 ‘She is alive.’
- b. áa-yshú en-titó
 3>1-be.alive FEM.SG-girl:NOM
 ‘My girl is alive.’

4 Agreement *ad sensum*

- (12) alma-h kuá’láást-ava/eh onne Inari Sami
 man-NOM.PL fish-3DU/3PL today
 ‘The (two) men are fishing today.’
- (13) toda la familia fuimos Spanish
 all the family go:PAST.1PL
 ‘We went with the whole family.’
- (14) ki-jana a-me-anguka Swahili
 7-youth SU:1-PERF-fall
 ‘The young man fell.’

- (15) The people who Clark { think/thinks } are in the garden
 (4b) There { seem/%seems } to be several people in the room

3. Complementizer agreement

- (16) a. de meid gaa-t uit as ze zin heb South Hollandic
 the maid go-3SG out if 3SG.FEM liking have:SG
 'the maid goes out when she feels like it'
 b. de meid-e gaa-n uit as-se ze zin heb-be
 the maid-PL go-PL out if-PL 3PL liking have-PL
 'the maids go out when they feel like it'
- (17) a. heit sei **dat-st** do soks net leauw-e **moa-st**
 dad say:PAST.3SG that-2SG 2SG such NEG believe-INF must-2SG
 'Dad said that you shouldn't believe such things.' Frisian
 b. heit sei **dat(*-st)** do **moa-st** soks net leauw-e
 dad say:PAST.3SG that-2SG 2SG must-2SG such NEG believe-INF
 'Dad said that you shouldn't believe such things.'

narrow syntactic analyses

- (18) [_{CP} C° [_{AgrSP} subject AgrS° [_{TP} T° ... [_{VP} V°]]]] Zwart
- (19) [_{CP} C°_{φ:unvalued} [_{TP} subject T°_{φ:unvalued} [_{VP} subject_{φ:valued} V°]]]] Carstens

4. Peculiar aspects of complementizer agreement

1 inversion morphology

- (20) a. wy speul-t b. speul-e wy East Netherlandic
 1PL play-PL play-PL:INV 1PL
 'We are playing.' 'Are we playing?'
 c. dat-te wy speul-t
 that-PL:INV 1PL play-1PL
 'that we are playing'

2 no tense morphology

- (21) wandel-∅-en > wandel-d-en
 walk-PRES-PL walk-PAST-PL
 'we/you/they walk' 'we/you/they walked'
- (22) de meid-e ging-e uit as-se/*as-t-e ze zin had-de
 the maid-PL go:PAST-PL out if-PL/if-PAST-PL 3PL liking have:PAST-PL
 'the maids go out when they feel like it'

3 Tense/agreement consistency

(23)	PRESENT	speul-e	wy	speul-t	ze
		play-1PL:INV	1PL	play-3PL	3PL
		'we play'		'they play'	
	PAST	bet-e	wy	beet-n	ze
		bite:PAST-1PL:INV	1PL	bite:PAST-3PL	3PL
		'we bit'		'they bit'	
C-agr?		YES		NO	

4 type of subject

<i>complementizer agreement</i>	pronominal subject	full noun phrase subject
3rd person plural	123	38

TABLE 1 (Barbiers et al 2005:1.3.8.2-3)

<i>complementizer agreement (C=if) in Flemish dialects</i>	pronominal subject	full noun phrase subject
3rd person plural	44	20

TABLE 2 (Barbiers et al 2005:1.3.8.4)

NB, full noun phrases > (i) optionality (ii) prosodic effects

5 on specifiers

- (24) a. jonge-s **die-e** werk-e will-e South Hollandic
 boy-PL REL-PL work-INF want-PL
 'guys who want to work'
- b. ik zel es hor-e **wat-te** ze zeg-ge
 1SG will:SG PRT hear-INF what-PL 3PL say-PL
 'Let me find out what they say.'

6 adjacency effect

- (25) a. volgens mij loop-t/*lop-e op den warmsten dag
 according.to 1SG:OBJ walk-1PL/1PL:INV on the hottest day
 van 't joar ook wiej noar 't park
 of the year also 1PL to the park
 'I think that on the hottest day of the year, we, too, go to the park.' Hellendoorn

- b. dat/*dat-te op den warmsten dag van 't joar
 that/that-PL on the hottest day of the year
 ook wiej noar 't park loop-t
 also 1PL to the park walk-PL
 'that on the hottest day of the year, we, too, go to the park'

7 first conjunct agreement

- (26) a. de-s doow morge kum-s Tegelen
 that-2SG 2SG tomorrow come-2SG
 'that you are coming tomorrow'
 b. de-s doow en ich ôs tref-fe
 that-2SG 2SG and 1SG 1PL:OBJ encounter-PL
 'that you and I meet'

5. Proposal

morphophonological units

- (27) a. had ik > hak (28) a. zat ik > *zak
 have:PAST.SG 1SG have:PAST.1SG sit
 'had I'
 b. heb ik > hek b. schep ik > *schek
 have:1SG 1SG have:1SG create
 'have I'
 c. zal ik > zak c. bal ik > *bak
 shall:SG 1SG shall:1SG play.ball
 'shall I'
 d. moet ik > moek d. groet ik > *groek
 must:SG 1SG must:1SG greet
 'must I'
 (29) dat ik > dak
 that 1SG that:1SG
 'that I'
 (30) a. zul-len we > zuwwe b. lul-len we > *luwwe
 shall-PL 1PL shall:1PL talk-PL 1PL talk:1PL
 'shall we' 'do we talk'
 c. dat we > dawwe
 that 1PL that:1PL
 'that we'

analogical generalization

- (31) had ik : hadde we :: dat ik : datte we

secondary generalization

(32) dat ik : datte we :: dat John : datte John en Mary

6. Revisiting the peculiar aspects of complementizer agreement

1 *inversion morphology*

2 *no tense morphology*

(33) *past tense of auxiliaries in Dutch (1SG)*

a. have heb > had

b. be ben > was

c. shall zal > zou

d. must moet > moest

3 *Tense/agreement consistency*

4 *type of subject*

5 *on specifiers*

(34) dat_C-ie : dat_C-te ze :: dat_{REL}-ie : dat_{REL}-te ze

dat_C-ie : dat_C-te ze :: wat_Q-ie : wat_Q-te ze

6 *adjacency*

7 *first conjunct agreement*

(35) det ich : des doow :: det ich en doow : des doow en ich

that I that you that I and you that you and I

7. Some further problems

1 *embedded root clauses (cf. (17))*

opacity

(36) a. Hy sei dat dizze oersetting net maklik lêst
3SG.MASC say:PAST.3SG that this translation NEG easy read-3SG
'He said that this translation doesn't read easily.' Frisian

b. Hy sei dat dizze oersetting lêst net maklik
3SG.MASC say:PAST.3SG that this translation read-3SG NEG easy
'He said that this translation doesn't read easily.'

(37) Hokker oersetting sei hy
which translation say:PAST.3SG 3SG.MASC
dat (*lêst) net maklik (lêst)
that read-3SG NEG easy read-3SG

- (38) a. Pyt sei dat hy my sjoen hie
 Pete say:PAST.3SG that 3SG.MASC 1SG.OBJ see:PART have:PAST.3SG
 ‘Pete said that he saw me.’
 > dat-er my sjoen hie
 that-SCL:3SG.MASC 1SG.OBJ see:PART have:PAST.3SG
- b. Pyt sei dat hy hie my sjoen
 Pete say:PAST.3SG that 3SG.MASC have:PAST.3SG 1SG.OBJ see:PART
 ‘Pete said that he saw me.’
 > * dat-er hie my sjoen
 that-SCL:3SG.MASC have:PAST.3SG 1SG.OBJ see:PART

CP-recursion?

- (39) [_{CP} C° [_{CP} subject C° [_{TP} T° ... [_{VP} V°]]]]

- (40) a. Pyt woe siz-ze dat
 Pete want:PAST.3SG say-INF that
 hy (*hie) my sjoen (hie)
 3SG.MASC have:PAST.3SG 1SG.OBJ see:PART have:PAST.3SG
 ‘Pete wanted to say that he saw me.’
- b. Pyt leau net dat
 Pete believe:3SG NEG that
 hy (*hie) my sjoen (hie)
 3SG.MASC have:PAST.3SG 1SG.OBJ see:PART have:PAST.3SG
 ‘Pete does not believe that he saw me.’
- (41) a. Jan zei dat hij (ken-de) dat boek (ken-de)
 John say:PAST.SG that 3SG.MASC know-PAST.SG that book know-PAST.SG
 ‘John said that he knew that book.’ Colloquial Dutch
- b. Jan betreur-de dat hij (*ken-de) dat boek (kende)
 John regret:PAST.SG that 3SG.MASC know-PAST.SG that book know-PAST.SG
 ‘John regretted that he knew that book.’
- c. Jan betwifel-de of hij (*ken-de) dat boek (kende)
 John doubt:PAST.SG if 3SG.MASC know-PAST.SG that book know-PAST.SG
 ‘John doubted if he knew that book.’
- (42) a. Zei Jan dat hij (*ken-de) dat boek (ken-de) ?
 say:PAST.SG John that 3SG.MASC know-PAST.SG that book know-PAST.SG
 ‘Did John say that he knew that book?’
- b. Waarom zei Jan
 why say:PAST.SG John
 dat hij (*ken-de) dat boek (ken-de) ?
 that 3SG.MASC know-PAST.SG that book know-PAST.SG
 ‘Why did John say that he knew that book?’

> layered derivation analysis: matrix clause = output of separate derivation

2 Agreeing conjunction

- (43) ich ving det Marie of-s toow d'n ierste môs sien
1SG find that Marie or-2SG you the first must:3SG be:INF
'I think that Marie or you should be the first.'
- (44) ich vroog of-s toow komp-s
1SG ask:PAST.SG if-2SG 2SG come-2SG
'I asked if you are coming.'

(45) of_C doow : of_C-s doow :: of_{CONJ} doow : of_{CONJ}-s doow

- (46) dien broor is 'n stök slummer den-s toow
2SG.POSS brother be:3SG a piece smarter than-2SG 2SG
'Your brother is much smarter than you.'

(47) Marie of(-s) toow môs d'n ierste sien
Mary or-2SG 2SG must:3SG the first be:INF
'Mary or you must be the first.'

- (48) dat Har in Mestreech mot goan woene
that Har in Maastricht must:3SG go:INF live:INF
en-s toow in Hèrle
and-2SG 2SG in Heerlen
'that Har must go and live in Maastricht and you in Heerlen'

3 external possessor complementizer agreement

- (49) omda-n die vent-en toen juste
because-3PL DEM.PL guy-PL then just
underen computer kapot was
3PL.POSS computer broken be:PAST.SG
'because those guys' computer was broken then'

- (50) a. aux + subject pron. agr > compl + subject pron. agr
b. compl + subject pron. agr > compl + subject NP agr
c. compl + subject NP agr > compl + external poss. agr

8. Conclusion

- > complementizer agreement is not narrow syntax
> narrow syntax relations can be kept maximally simple