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Why is there agreement?

- a puzzling imperfection

- Miyagawa (2010) proposes: that the purpose of agreement is to establish functional relations between lexical items and discourse related functions mediated by functional heads.

- Language achieves a rich expressiveness:
  - topic,
  - focus,
  - subject,
  - questions, etc. become possible.

- That is, agreement relates lexical items introduced into the syntax via lexical heads to the structurally higher functional layer of the clause.
Why is there movement? Miyagawa’s answer

- Miyagawa also proposes an answer for why movement exists:
  - necessary to retain a record of the functional relations that have been established by Agree but subsequently eradicated at the C-I interface when the semantically irrelevant $\phi$-probe is removed.

- Movement is motivated then by the existence of agreement.
Typology

- Agree/Move typology
  - discourse related elements must occur in the Left periphery.
  - is Agree expressed in terms of phi-features or other grammatical features?
Typology

- several areas of the typology that appear murky or problematic.
  - there are focus expressions related to the functional layer of the clause that appear to manifest neither phi-feature nor discourse-configurational agreement.
  - What does this typology predicts about languages where discourse related expressions remain in situ, or at least do not appear on the left edge.
    - How are such expressions then related to discourse notions such as topic and focus?
  - It is clearly empirically wrong, at least for Bantu languages, to propose, as Miyagawa does, that there is only one set of phi features on the left edge.
Proposed

- expand the empirical base upon which any Agree/Move typology could draw by exploring the realization of agreement and focus in a variety of languages.

- Focus is chosen as it is a discourse-configurational notion and thus is necessarily related to the functional layer of a sentence and hence by hypothesis is implicated in Agree and Move.
Proposed

- resources of Afranaph are particularly well suited to exploring this issue as it includes a significant number of languages that are rich in agreement morphology and in focus constructions such as the Niger Congo languages.

- it also includes Afro-Asiatic languages such as Berber and Amharic which display agreement in gender as well as person.
Why gender?

- Carstens (2010) proposes that these features behave differently with respect to movement

- Baker (2006) gender vs. person agreement
Focus is always associated with the left edge via Agree and Move. That is, with respect to focus, I will push Miyagawa’s thesis to the limit to see to what extent it can be maintained or must be revised to accommodate the empirical facts.
Correlative disjunction
correlatives and focus

- Correlative disjunctions involve contrastive focus, as convincingly established by Den Dikken (2006), Hendriks (2004), Johannessen (2005), and Lipták (2001).

- This is related to a discourse function; therefore, Agree/Move typology predicts Agree and Move here.
agreement?

- Since the core of agreement is reproducing apparently redundant information, we can perhaps extend the notion of agreement to reduplication of lexical items. However, this is not agreement in phi-features.
(correlative) disjunction in Kinande:

- **simple disjunction:**
  - a. Kámbale alyá ebíkené kútsy’ omutsérê
    Kambale ate yams or rice
    “Kambale ate either yams or rice.”

- **correlative disjunction:**
  - b. Kámbale alyá kútsy’ ebíkené kútsy’ omutsérê
    Kambale ate or yams or rice
    “Kambale ate either yams or rice.”
contrastive focus in correlative disjunction

- set of alternatives are introduced and one alternative is excluded.

- the simple disjunction can be interpreted collectively (cf. for English: Mary is taller than Jacky or Fusa. vs. Mary is taller than either Jacky or Fusa. (she could be taller than both of them))
reduplication forces the focus interpretation is illustrated by the fact that when kútse does not introduce a disjunction, it is interpreted with the adverbial meaning of “maybe:”

Kambale kutse asondire ini.alya amapome Kambale kutse wants that he.eat apples “Maybe Kambale wants to eat apples.”
locality

- the distance between the initial and second reduplicated disjunction is subject to the type of locality restrictions familiar from movement
negation (inner islands)

- a. Jakí, kútse mwagulá ebíkené kútsy’ omutsérê
  Jacky, or bought yams or rice
  “Jacky either bought yams or rice.”

- negative
  b. Yohani kutse mwatetalya mutsere kutse buhoti
     John kutse neg.ate rice or beans
     “John maybe/*either didn’t eat rice or beans.”
more islands

- a. Kambale kutse abuga [ng’ alya omutsere kutse obuhoti ]
  Kambale kutse said if 3s.could eat rice or beans
  *“Kambale either said if he could eat rice or beans.”
  ok:“Maybe Kambale said if he could eat rice or beans.”

- b. Motowir’ kutse [omwatsi w’ eribuga [ambu Amani akandisyabanira]
  we.heard kutse news of saying that Amani will.meet
  kutse baba wiwe kutse omwira wiwe y’ eRutgers
  either father her or friend her Linker at.Rutgers
  “Maybe we heard the rumor that Amani will meet her father or her
  friend at Rutgers.”
within the island

Motowir’ [omwatsi w’ eribuga [ambu Amani akandisyabanira we.heard kutse news of saying that Amani will.meet kutse baba wiwe kutse omwira wiwe y’ eRutgers either father her or friend her Linker at.Rutgers “We heard the rumor that Amani will meet either her father or her friend at Rutgers.”

□ (not particularly natural, but grammatical)
subjects form islands!

- kútse Jakí mwagulá ebíkené kútsy’ omutsérê
  kutse Jacky bought yams or rice
  “*either/ ok: maybe Jacky bought yams or rice.”

- dislocated XP’s intercept moved ones

- kutse lacks phi-features, therefore, cannot push the dislocated XP out of the left edge to overcome the intervention.
correlative disjunction of clauses

Kinande does allow *kutse* to be interpreted as a contrastive focus marker just in case two complete clauses are disjoined:

- *kutse* [Eric akandisoma echapitre ya kasatu] [kutse Nadine y’
  kutse Eric will.read chapter of four or Nadine Wh-agr’
  ukandisoma yo]
  antiagr.read it
  “Either[/maybe] [Eric will read chapter four] or [Nadine will read it].”

- *kutse* [Valinande akandiha esyofranga siwe sy’ abasama] [kutse iniaha
ebitabu biwe by’euniversite]].
either Valinande will.give money his Lk’ poor or he(foc).give books
his
Lk university
“Either [Valinande will give his money to the poor] or [he will give his books
to the university].”
two possibilities for the origin of kutse

- kutse+kutse, as a single “reduplicated” expression

- also: [kutse ....] & [kutse ....].
semantic but not structural parallelism?

[Mobafungire kutse iyo Kambale] [kutse Valinande yo bafunga]
3pl.locked.up either focus Kambale or Valinande wh-agr(focus) 3pl.locked.up
“They either locked.up Kambale or they locked.up Valinande.”

□ To what extent can this be a possible heuristic for discovering discourse functionally similar or identical structures via a coordination test?
Subject/object asymmetry

- SUBJECT:

  - a. * [Kutse Amani kutse Josh] a.gula e ordinateur or Amani or Josh 3s.bought computer

  b. ok: Kutse Amani kutse Josh yo w.agula e ordinateur or Amani or Josh wh-agr antiagr.bought computer “Either Amani or Josh bought a computer.”

  return
Subject/object asymmetry

- **OBJECT:**

- don’t have to occupy the far left edge:
  
  Kambale agula [kutsy’ ebikene kutsy’ omutsere]  
  Kambale bought or yams or rice  
  “Kambale bought either yams or rice.”

- **but recall:**

  Mobafungire[v_p kutse iyo Kambale] kutse Valinande yo bafunga  
  3pl.locked.up either focus Kambale or Valinande wh-agr(foc)  
  3pl.locked.up  
  “They either locked.up Kambale or they locked.up Valinande.”
cf. Baker and Collins 2006
*"kutsy' ebikene kutsy' omutsere], byo Kambale agula or yams or rice WH-agr K. bought “Either yams or rice, Kambale bought ___.”

Instead, the following construction must be used:

"mulí byabyá bíkené, mulí abyá mutséré], wo/byo Kámbale ágúla there.is CL8.is yams there.is CL3.is rice, wh-agr K bought “Either yams or rice, Kambale bought ___.”
LIT:“Exist yams, exist rice, Kambale bought.”

suppose that correlative disjoined objects would occupy the left edge of vP, as by hypothesis they must. If agreement features are no longer active after participating in an agreement relation on the Left Edge of vP, the correlative disjunction construction can move no higher.
feature resolution in coordination
A different aspect of this research will be of interest to morphologists, typologists, and anyone who is concerned about issues of feature resolution.

subject/verb agreement

a. abalwana babiri n’ omusika muguma bahika
CL2.boys CL2.two and CL1.girl CL1.one CL2.arrived
“Two boys and a girl arrived.”

b. Obuki n’ ebiribwa bibiri byahirawaoko mesa
CL14.honey and CL8.yam CL8.two CL8agr.put.pass on table.
“Honey and 2 yams were put on the table”
feature

- **focus (wh-) agreement**
  a. omwana n’ embene **bo** natsumanga
     CL1 and CL9 CL2.wh-agr 1s.scolded
  *omwana n’ embene **syo** natsumanga
     CL1 and CL9 CL10.wh-agr 1s.scolded
  “It is the child and the goat that I scolded.”

  b. obuki n’ ebiribwa **byo** nanzire
     CL14.honey and CL8.sweet potatoes CL8.wh-agr 1s.like
  “It is honey and sweet potatoes that I enjoy.”

- **linker agreement**
  Monaha obuki n’ebiribwa **byo** Kambale
  1s.gave CL14.honey and CL8.sweet potatoes CL8.Linker Kambale
  I gave a book and honey to Kambale.
exclusive and additive focus elements
exclusive focus

- sa only construction, agrees with focalized noun in gender

- Jackí mwágúla ebíkene bi.sá (by’ omosóko)
  Jacky bought CL8.yams CL8.only (L’ LOC.market)
  “Jacky bought only sweet potatoes at the market.”

- b. Jacky mu.sá yo wagula ebíkene
  Jacky CL1.only wh-AGR antiAGR.bought yams
  “Only Jacky bought sweet potatoes.”
additive particle na...

- a. na Kambale
  b. Kambale naye
  c. Kambale.....[naye]

- strategy:
  - a. the simple additive construction,
  - b. the locally anaphoric construction,
  - c. the distant anaphoric construction.
anaphoric properties

- a. c-command is required between antecedent and additive particle
- b. split antecedents are not possible
- c. the relation cannot be established across clause boundaries.
- d. the additive construction involves an element that agrees with the antecedent.
the local anaphoric strategy is completely impossible in active sentences. When the additive meaning is desired the simple additive construction must be used:

*Kambale mwalire [eBikene₁ na.Byo₁]
   Kambale ate       CL8.yams and.AGRCL8

Kambale mwalire n'eBikene
   Kambale ate       and-yams
   "Kambale ate yams also." (with "also" modifying "yams")
possible use of anaphoric strategies for logical D.O

- passive
  
  \[\text{[Ebikene}_i \text{ naByo}_i] \text{ moByalirwe} \text{ yams and-AGr eat.pass} \]
  
  “The yams were also eaten.”

- \[\text{[eBikene}_j \text{ moByalirwe [nabyo}_i] \text{ yams eat.pass and.AGR} \]
  
  “The yams were eaten also.”
possible use of anaphoric strategies for logical D.O

- possible for D.O. in DOC’s provided it is the local anaphoric strategy

- a. Kambale aha [eBikene, naByo] By'esyombwa Kambale gave yams and-AGR Lk’

- b. *Kambale aha [eBikene], By'esyombwa [naByo]

- generalization: a theme can be in an anaphoric relation with a focus particle only if it agrees with something
contrasts with I.O’s

- Kambale aha [aBana₃ naBo₃] B’eBikene
  Kambale gave children and-AGR L’ yams
  (cl.2) (cl.2) (cl.2) (cl.8)
  "Kambale gave also the children yams."

- Kambale aha [aBana₃] B’eBikene [naBo₃₃]
  Kambale gave children L’ yams and-AGR
  (cl.2) (cl.2)(cl.8) (cl.2)
  "Kambale gave the children the yams also." (with "also" modifying "the children")

- Kambale aha eBikene By'[aBana₃ naBo₃₃]
  Kambale gave yams L’ children and-AGR
  (cl.8) (cl.8) (cl.2) (cl.2)
  "Kambale gave the yams to the children also."(with "also" modifying "the children")
the functional structure of vP

- Assume the structure for VPs proposed by Baker and Collins (2006) where a projection is assumed for the linker in between vP and VP and the goal is projected in the specifier of VP.

- I propose that the local anaphoric additive construction involves adjunction of the NP to the additive *na* or to a projection immediately dominating it under the right circumstances.
the functional structure of vP

- Na as a conjunction/comitative element doesn’t tolerate movement away from it and so the movement must be repaired with a resumptive pronoun. Adjunction is only possible if the immediately dominating projection to the adjunction site is not a recipient of theta.

- never possible for a theme that is not in an agreement relation, as only when it is in the spec of the linker phrase is it not immediately dominated by a theta marking projection, but rather only a functional category
The goal, in contrast, as a specifier can adjoin to VP when it is in a theta position and so participate in a local anaphoric construction.

The goal, like the theme, can move into the functional periphery in the vP and has done so whenever we see it in an agreement relation in vP. In this situation, it can participate in both distant anaphoric constructions and local ones.
This preliminary examination of the additive focus construction has confirmed part of the intuition of the Agree/Move typology; namely when a relation to clausal functional structure (including vP) is established, it is marked by the grammar somehow.

However, we do not necessarily find Agree/Move signified in the form of spec/head agreement involving phi-features of some type.
The data can be expanded by including applicative constructions as well as small clauses and seeing how well they stand up to the generalizations just made. It will be particularly interesting to see if languages that lack the linker yet are otherwise similar share the same about of functional structure on the vP periphery. Moreover, the behavior of the additive particle can be compared to reflexive pronouns and reflexive adverbs for which a fair amount of documentation currently exists.
concluding thoughts

- there is plentiful evidence supporting the function of Agree as relating lexical items to the establishment of functional structure. The imperfect existence of Move does not however, appear illuminated by the Agree/Move link.