Unifying species of C-agreement

Sandhya Sundaresan (U. of Göttingen) & Thomas McFadden (ZAS, Berlin)
NELS 51, 6-8 November 2020, UQAM

We undertake one of the first detailed comparisons of clause-peripheral complementizer agreement ("C-agreement") and argue that it is *splintered* across distinct heads which stand in agreement with dedicated extra-clausal arguments. In this, the heterogeneity of C-agreement parallels that of clause-internal agreement, which is also typically understood to involve distinct functional heads (e.g. T or *v*) in agreement with (often distinct) nominal arguments (e.g. a subject or object). "C-agreement" is thus a misnomer, masking a slew of disparate agreement phenomena that are rarely discussed in unison or compared (but see Baker, To Appear).

Here, we propose that the heterogeneity of C-agreement is merely epiphenomenal of the CP itself being articulated across a *sequence* of C-heads in a rigid, monotonic order (cf. the functional sequence in Cinque, 1999, a.o.) — again paralleling the standard notion of a functional sequence within the TP (minimally, T > *v*> V). Differences in C-agreement, we will argue, fall out solely from differences, parametrized across individual structures and languages, wrt.: (i) the presence vs. absence of a probe; (ii) the height of a probe relative to the embedded CP phase; and (iii) the structure of the CP which, in turn, influences the availability of certain goals.

THREE TYPES OF C-AGREEMENT: Setting aside, for now, cases of switch-reference, some of which may not involve agreement with C (and pace proposals like that in Diercks et al., 2020, which argue that other instances of what look like C-agreement should be reanalyzed as cases of anaphora), C-agreement may be minimally classified into three sub-types.

I. Downward complementizer agreement (DCA): In DCA (van Koppen, 2017), C Agrees with the embedded subject, as in West Flemish (1) and (2):

(1) K peinzen da-$\boxed{\text{n}}$ $\boxed{\text{die studenten}}$ nen buot gekocht ee-n.
     I think   that-3PL those students a   boat bought have-3PL

     'I think that those students have bought a boat.' (van Koppen, 2017)

(2) Subj$_{Matrix}$ ... C ... Subj$_{Embedded}$ ...

II. Upward complementizer agreement (UCA): With UCA (Diercks, 2013; Carstens, 2016, a.o.), C Agrees with the matrix subject, as in Lubukusu (3) and (4):

(3) $\boxed{\text{ba-ba-ndu}}$ ba-bol-el-a   Alfredi $\boxed{\text{ba}}$-li a-kha-khil-e
     2-2-people 2-said-AP-FV 1Alfred 2-that 1-FUT-conquer

     'The people told Alfred that he will win.' (Diercks, 2013),

(4) Subj$_{Matrix}$ ... C ... Subj$_{Embedded}$ ...

III. Allocutive agreement (AA): With AA (Oyharçabal, 1993; Miyagawa, 2017; McFadden, 2020), C Agrees with the addressee, as in Basque (5) and (6):

(5) Pettek   lan   egin   di-$\boxed{\text{n}}$.
     Peter.ERG work.ABS do.PRF 3.S.ABS.3.S.ERG-2.S.C.FM.ALLOC

     'Peter worked.' *Uttered to a close female friend* (Oyharçabal, 1993)

(6) (Subj$_{Matrix}$) ... C ... Subj$_{Embedded}$ ...
              Addressee

STRUCTURAL IMPLICATIONS: Assume that all three involve a C probe with unvalued ϕ-features. With DCA and UCA, but not AA (Miyagawa, 2017; McFadden, 2020), agreement is with an **argument**. UCA & AA probe **upward**, DCA probes **downward**. We thus have three

	ARGUMENTAL GOAL	NON-ARGUMENTAL GOAL
PROBES DOWNWARD	DCA	_
PROBES UPWARD	UCA	AA

Table 1: Structural parameters of C-agreement

disparate phenomena (cf. Table 1) that seem to resist a unified analysis.

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS: **1: (U/D)CA is restricted to embedded clauses; AA is a root phenomenon:** Embedded CPs in e.g. Frisian seem to disallow CA just in case they have root syntax (de Haan, 2001), as in embedded V2 in Frisian (7):

(7) Heit sei dat [*-st] [do] **moa-st**   soks net leauwe.
     dad said that-2P.SG you must-2P.SG such not believe
     'Dad said that you should not believe such things.'

In contrast, AA in embedded clauses is famously impossible in Basque and highly restricted in other languages (Antonov, 2015). In Japanese & Tamil, it is found embedded only in complements of typical bridge verbs and certain root adverbials (Miyagawa, 2012; McFadden, 2020).

2: UCA involves a higher C head than DCA: (i) UCA *a-li* in Lubukusu is, for many, only possible if the speaker considers the reported information reliable (Diercks, 2013), otherwise non-agreeing *bali* appears. Similarly, subject UCA in Kipsigis (Diercks et al., 2017) tracks the source of information. These suggest the involvement of a high C head (such as a high evidential or similar, Speas, 2004). (ii) The complementizer in UCA can also appear overtly in the matrix clause, replacing the matrix verb (e.g. in Kipsigis). At least some of these complementizers also seem to be grammaticalized from verbs meaning 'say', i.e. at least historically they belong more to the matrix than the embedded clause. (iii) Patterns (i)-(ii) have not, to the best of our knowledge, been observed for DCA, suggesting that this involves a lower C.

PROPOSAL: **I. Deriving DCA vs. UCA:** Following Carstens (2016), we propose that DCA and UCA involve ϕ-probes on Fin & Force heads (Rizzi, 1997), respectively, with Fin being below the embedded CP phase and Force being above it. Fin can thus probe material inside embedded TP, and Agrees with the closest c-commanded nominal = the embedded subject, yielding DCA. Force cannot probe the embedded TP, due to phasal opacity. We depart from Carstens here, assuming that when Force fails to Agree with the embedded TP, its search domain is expanded (Béjar and Rezac, 2009, and also Clem, 2019), allowing it to probe upwards within its phase in the matrix CP. The high C probe in UCA must be further featurally distinguished (e.g. be case-discriminating) so as to probe the subject (the most common pattern), even across a closer matrix object (for Kipsigis, which has subject + object C-marking, Diercks et al., 2017, suggests that the object marker may be a clitic, not agreement).

II. Deriving (D/U)CA vs. AA: The (embedded) root clauses displaying AA are characterized by the projection of a SpeechActP (SAP), high in the left periphery, which hosts representations of Author & Addressee (Speas and Tenny, 2003; Hill, 2007; Sundaresan, 2012; Krifka, 2017). The AA ϕ-probe is *as high as or higher than* the UCA ϕ-probe — we will say that it occupies a High-C head. Thus as with UCA it is non-phase-local to any ϕ-Goal in the embedded CP, yielding failed downward probing which results in search expansion for upward probing. The key difference between UCA and AA is that the SAP provides the AA probe with a closer Goal to Agree with — namely the Addressee — which pre-empts Agree with any matrix arguments.

(8) **DCA** [$_{phase}$ Subj$_{Matrix}$ [$_{phase}$ [Fin $_{[\phi:\ ]}$]] Subj$_{Embedded}$]]

(9) **UCA** [$_{phase}$ Subj$_{Matrix}$ [Force$_{[\phi:\ ]}$] [$_{phase}$ Subj$_{Embedded}$]]
                                                ②   ① ×

(10) **AA**   [$_{phase}$ (Subj$_{Matrix}$) [$_{SAP}$ Addressee [High-C$_{[\phi:\ ]}$] [$_{phase}$ Subj$_{Embedded}$]]]
                                              ②   ① ×

The internal heterogeneity of C-agreement (cf. Table 1) thus falls out of a conspiracy of independent structural properties which can vary both across languages and clauses. The directionality (upward vs. downward) of probing falls out solely as a function of the relative position of the probe wrt. the CP phase. ϕ probes are thus not inherently differentiated for directionality: a ϕ-probe that is below the CP phase will end up probing downward; a ϕ-probe above the CP phase will end up probing upward. Further variation results from the presence vs. absence of a particular $\phi-$probe or -goal, which in turn depends on: a) the size of the CP selected under a given predicate, in a given language; and b) a given C head hosting a ϕ-probe in one language but not another. English, with neither CA nor AA, has no ϕ-probes in the C domain. West Flemish has a ϕ-probe on Fin but not Force, and Lubukusu has a ϕ-probe on Force but not Fin.

<u>EMPIRICAL PREDICTIONS:</u> Ⓐ Since both Fin and High-C can host a ϕ-probe, DCA and AA can both be attested in a single language, as shown for Upper Austrian German in (11a) and (11b), respectively (Wiltschko and Heim, 2016; Wiltschko, 2014).

(11)   a. Wonn-ts nua es   kumm-ts.   b. Ea hot an neichn Hund, goi-ts.
       if-2PL   only you.PL come-2PL   He has a   new   dog,   CONF-2PL.ALLOC
       'If only you guys would come.'   'He has a new dog, right (you guys)?'

Similarly, since both Fin and Force can host a ϕ-probe, DCA and UCA should be able to co-occur (which is plausibly a way to analyze switch-reference systems, like in Washo, Arregi and Hanink, 2018, and Amahuaca, Clem, 2019).

Ⓑ But while UCA & AA can both be attested in a given language, they should be in complementary distribution in a given structure. In a UCA language like Lubukusu, the ϕ-probe on Force in an embedded root CP should Agree with the Addressee which will always be closer than a matrix argument. (i) Thus, all else being equal, AA should bleed UCA. (ii) But if UCA nevertheless obtains in such a configuration, it suggests either that: (a) the Addressee argument in SAP is featurally invisible to the UCA probe; or (b) UCA does not instantiate real agreement in this language, but something else, e.g. clitic doubling Diercks et al. (or anaphora, as proposed e.g. by 2020); or (c) there are no root embedded clauses in this language that project as high as SAP (with Addressee). Option (i) as well as the alternatives in ((ii) a-c) should leave clear empirical reflexes that can be tested.

References

Antonov, Anton. 2015. Verbal allocutivity in a crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 19:55–85.

Arregi, Karlos, and Emily Hanink. 2018. Switch reference in Washo as multiple subject agreement. In *Proceedings of NELS 48*, 39–48.

Baker, Mark. To Appear. Toward a shared syntax for shifted indexicals and logophoric pronouns. In *Volume to honor Lisa Travis*, ed. Jessica Coon et al. McGill Working Papers in Linguistics.

Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35–73.

Carstens, Vicki. 2016. Delayed valuation: A reanalysis of goal features, "upward" complementizer agreement, and the mechanics of case. *Syntax* 19:1–42. URL https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/synt.12116.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. OUP.

Clem, Emily. 2019. Cyclic expansion in Agree: Maximal projections as probes. Ms. University of California, Berkeley.

Diercks, Michael. 2013. Indirect Agree in Lubukusu complementizer agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31:357–407.

Diercks, Michael, Marjo van Koppen, and Michael Putnam. 2017. Agree probes down: Anaphoric feature valuation and phase reference. Ms. Pomona College, Utrecht University and Penn State University.

Diercks, Michael, Marjo van Koppen, and Michael Putnam. 2020. Agree probes down: Anaphoric feature valuation and phase reference. In *Agree to Agree: Agreement in the Minimalist Programme*, ed. Peter W. Smith, Johannes Mursell, and Katharina Hartmann, 347–389. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.354176.

de Haan, Germen. 2001. More is going on upstairs than downstairs: embedded root phenomena in West Frisian. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4:3–38.

Hill, Virgina. 2007. Vocatives and the pragmatics-syntax interface. *Lingua* 117:2077–2105.

van Koppen, Marjo. 2017. Complementizer agreement. In *The wiley-blackwell companion to syntax – second edition*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 923–962. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Krifka, Manfred. 2017. Assertions and judgements, epistemics, and evidentials. Workshop 'Speech Acts', Leibniz-ZAS.

McFadden, Thomas. 2020. The morphosyntax of allocutive agreement in Tamil. In *Agree to Agree: Agreement in the Minimalist Programme*, ed. Peter W. Smith, Johannes Mursell, and Katharina Hartmann, 391–424. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in main clauses. In *Main clause phenomena: New horizons*, ed. Lobke Albrecht, Liliane Haegeman, and Rachel Nye, 79–112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2017. *Agreement Beyond Phi*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Oyharçabal, Beñat. 1993. Verb agreement with non arguments: On allocutive agreement. In *Generative studies in basque linguistics*, ed. José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Speas, Margaret. 2004. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114:255–276.

Speas, Peggy, and Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In *Asymmetry in grammar*, ed. Anna Maria DiSciullo, 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sundaresan, Sandhya. 2012. Context and (co)reference in the syntax and its interfaces. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tromsø (CASTL)/Universität Stutgart.

Wiltschko, Martina. 2014. *The universal structure of categories: towards a formal typology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wiltschko, Martina, and Johannes Heim. 2016. The syntax of confirmationals. In *Outside the clause: Form and function of extra-clausal constituents*, ed. Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer, and Arne Lohmann, 305–340. John Benjamins.