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Certain elements in some (but not all) languages are allowed to vary between controlling morphologically based agreement and semantically based agreement.

### Morphological vs Semantic agreement

**Morphologically based agreement** = agreement that tracks the morphological shape of the controller.

**Semantically based agreement** = agreement that tracks the semantic interpretation of the controller.

Usually these line up, but we can notice mismatches between morphology and semantics.

(1) The committee is/are making the decision now.
Agreement Mismatches

- Mismatches in agreement implies that features are themselves internally complex, and split between a morphological half, and a semantic half (Wechsler & Zlatić, 2003; Smith, 2015).

- It is usually the case that the values for the morphology and semantics line up, but certain nouns have a mismatch between the two.

- Agreement with the morphological half of a feature appears to be the general case, but certain nouns in certain languages allow the semantic half to be targeted by agreement.

- Terminology: \( iF = \) the \textit{semantic} value of a feature, \( uF = \) the \textit{morphological} value of a feature.
Semantic Agreement

- Semantic Agreement (SA) is shown in Smith (2015) to operate under different structural conditions than regular agreement.

- SA is possible only when the controller of agreement c-commands the target of agreement at LF (i.e. a Reverse Agree configuration, see Wurmbrand, 2011; Zeijlstra, 2012 for Reverse Agree.).

(2)  Controller  B  Target  

SA Possible!

(3)  Target  B  Controller  

SA impossible!
Upwards only

(4)  a. There is a committee meeting in there.
    b. *There are a committee meeting in there.

(5)  a. A northern team is likely to be in the final.
    b. A northern team are likely to be in the final.
There is thus a representational aspect to SA.

We can understand this there are two positions of agreement: syntax and post-syntax (PF).

Agreement in the syntax looks only upwards.

Agreement in the post-syntax looks both upwards and downwards.

iFs are only in the syntax, not PF, so agreement targeting them can only look upwards.
The position of features in grammar

(6)

Syntax
Both $u$Fs and $i$Fs

PF       Spell-out       LF

$u$Fs  $i$Fs
The Agreement Hierarchy

- (Corbett, 1979, *et seq.* ) gives the Agreement Hierarchy.
- This is a corpus level generalization that describes how likely elements in a language are to show semantic or morphological agreement.

(7) attributive - predicate - rel. pronoun - pers. pronoun

\[
\text{←-- morphological agr} \quad \text{semantic agr} \quad \text{→→}
\]

- Elements to the right are more likely to show semantic agreement.
- Elements to the left are more likely to show morphological agreement.
The Agreement Hierarchy is also implicational regarding what elements show what type of agreement.

(8)  

(9)
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3/4 Agreement Patterns

■ With so-called ‘hybrid’ controllers, when there are two targets of agreement, we expect 4 configurations.

(10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target 1</th>
<th>Target 2</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$uF$</td>
<td>$uF$</td>
<td>Matching morphological agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$iF$</td>
<td>$iF$</td>
<td>Matching semantic agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$uF$</td>
<td>$iF$</td>
<td>Morphological – semantic mismatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$iF$</td>
<td>$uF$</td>
<td>Semantic – morphological mismatch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

■ In many cases, however, we see that only 3 out of the possible 4 patterns are found.
(11)  a. The government has offered itself up for criticism (with this policy).
    b. The government have offered themselves up for criticism.
    c. The government has offered themselves for criticism.
    d. *The government have offered itself up for criticism.
**Russian (Corbett, 1983)**

- *Vrač* has grammatical masculine gender.

(12) a. Novyj  
vrač  
skazal.  
new.MASC doctor said.MASC  
‘The new doctor said.’

b. Novaja  
vrač  
skazala.  
new.FEM doctor said.FEM  
‘The new doctor said.’

c. Novyj  
vrač  
skazala.  
new.MASC doctor said.FEM  
‘The new doctor said.’

d. * Novaja  
vrač  
skazal.  
new.FEM doctor said.MASC  
‘The new doctor said.’
- *be’alim* is morphologically plural, but can refer to singulars.

(13)  

a. ha-be’al-im ha-kodm-im maxru et ha-makom lifney šana  
the-owner-PL the-previous-PL sold.3.PL ACC  
the-place before year  
‘The previous owners sold the place a year ago.’

b. ha-be’al-im ha-kodem maxar et ha-makom lifney šana  
the-owner-PL the-previous.SG sold.3.SG ACC  
the-place before year  
‘The previous owner sold the place a year ago.’
(14) a. ? ha-be’al-im ha-kodm-im maxar et ha-makom lifney šana ‘The previous owner sold the place a year ago.’

b. *ha-be’al-im ha-kodem maxru et ha-makom lifney šana INTENDED: ‘The previous owner(s) sold the place a year ago.’
Mismatches and the Agreement Hierarchy

What is striking about these cases is that they are what one would predict if the Agreement Hierarchy controlled mismatches.

(15) attributive – predicate – personal pronoun

\[ \text{attributive} \rightarrow \text{morphological} \]  \quad \text{semantic} \rightarrow \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attributive</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grammatical

Ungrammatical
Mismatches and the Agreement Hierarchy

The Agreement Hierarchy is stated over a corpus level. To see it apparently at work at a sentential level is surprising. We can say that it is a (rather clucky) sentential level constraint:

3/4 Implicational Rule

When a controller controls agreement on two targets, the value assigned to the two targets can mismatch only if among the targets, the target which is to the right on the agreement hierarchy agrees with the $iF$ of the controller and the target to the left on the hierarchy targets the $uF$ value.
Mismatches without the Agreement Hierarchy

Such a rule, aside from being relatively uninsightful offers no explanation as to what would happen if the two targets come from the same spot on the hierarchy.

Such mismatches do exist, and again we find 3/4 patterns instead of 4/4 or 2/4.
(16)  

a. ? ha-be’alim ha-pratiy-im ha-axaron šel ha-tmuna  
the-owner the-private-PL the-last.SG of the-painting  
haya ha-psixo’analitika’i Jacques Lacan  
was.3SG the-psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan  
‘The last private owner of the painting was the  
psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan.’

b. *ha-be’alim ha-prati ha-axron-im šel ha-tmuna  
the-owner the-private.SG the-last-PL of the-painting  
was.3.SG/ was.PL the-psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan  
INTENDED: ‘The last private owner of the painting was  
the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan.’
Chichewa (Corbett, 1991)

- *Ngwazi* is class 9, but can show class 1 agreement (default animate class).

(17) a. ngwazi y-athu y-oyamba
   hero 9-our 9-first
   ‘Our first hero.’

b. ngwazi w-athu w-oyamba
   hero 1-our 1-first
   ‘Our first hero.’

c. ngwazi y-athu w-oyamba
   hero 9-our 1-first
   ‘Our first hero.’

d. *ngwazi w-athu y-oyamba
   hero 1-our 9-first
   **INTENDED:** ‘Our first hero.’
The DP-internal word order of Hebrew and Chichewa is different.

Hebrew left to right order represents low to high structure (Sichel, 2002).

Chichewa left to right order represents high to low structure (Carstens, 1991, 1993).

This means that in the case of mismatches, the *higher* modifier in Hebrew shows semantic agreement, but the *lower* modifier in Chichewa shows semantic agreement.
These two patterns from Hebrew and Chichewa are not readily amenable to Agreement Hierarchy.

Thus, they seem to show something deeper at play than a sentential level AH constraint.
Summary

- Elements to the right on the AH restrict elements on the left.
- If the righter element shows semantic agreement, then either semantic or morphological agreement is possible to lefter elements. BUT.
- If the righter element shows morphological agreement, then only morphological agreement is possible for lefter elements.
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Towards an explanation: Schema

- We can capture the British English 3/4 pattern in the following schema.

(20)  a. The order of agreements is: anaphor < verb, where < implies precedence

b. If agreement targets both iFs and uFs on a controller, the iF must be agreed with first.

- This is very abstractly the approach offered in Smith (2013).

- But, the (finer points of the) approach offered there does not generalize to Russian or Hebrew.
Towards an explanation: Schema

- Again, looking somewhat abstractly, we can derive all patterns of the hierarchy if we add in adjectives.

(21) a. The order of agreements is: anaphor ≺ verb ≺ adjective, where ≺ implies precedence

b. If agreement targets both $i$Fs and $u$Fs on a controller, the $i$F must be agreed with first.

- These assumptions put together allow agreement to switch between semantic and morphological agreement, in such a way that rightward elements on the hierarchy will show semantic agreement.
Why anaphor \( \prec \) verb \( \prec \) adjective?

- The trick to all this is to make the ordering of agreement fall out from more general properties, rather than simply encode it as grammatical knowledge.
Anaphor ≺ verb

- I propose here that the reason why anaphors apparently restrict verbal agreement is because they merge into the structure before verbs.
- Anaphors are canonically objects, and will merge within the VP.
- The agreement features on the verb only merge in T.
- If \textit{Agree} happens at the first derivational step that target and controller are in the structure, then we can understand why anaphors precede verbs.
Following Benmamoun et al. (2009); Arregi & Nevins (2012); Bhatt & Walkow (2013); Marušič et al. (2015), I propose that \textbf{ Agree} is split into two steps.

**Agree**

Agreement between a controller and target proceeds in two steps:

a. \textbf{Agree-Link}: a target has unvalued $\phi$-features that triggers \textbf{ Agree} with controller. The result is a link between controller and target.

b. \textbf{Agree-Copy}: the values of the $\phi$-features of controller are copied onto target linked to it by \textbf{Agree-Link}.
   i. if \textbf{Agree-Copy} happens at transfer, this requires that controller c-command the target.
Further Assumptions

- **AGREE-LINK** happens at the first possible derivational step.
- In order for semantic agreement to be possible, *iFs* on a target must be *active* for agreement.
- If an *iF* is active, it cannot be ignored for agreement.
- *iFs* can be optionally deactivated through **AGREE-LINK**.
- They must enter the derivation as active (i.e. they cannot be activated).
- A mismatch between targets occurs when the controller enters the derivation with an active *iF*, which gets deactivated through **AGREE-LINK** with the first target, crucially before the second target undergoes **AGREE**.
Deriving British English

(22)  a. The government is stabbing each other in the back.
     b. *The government are stabbing itself in the back.

- Since anaphors are in the structure with the controller at a derivational point before T is, then agreement can shift from $iF$ on anaphors to $uF$ on verbs.
- With the $iF$ active, $\text{AGREE-LINK}$ links the anaphor to the $iF$ on the CNP.
- If the $iF$ is deactivated, then the verb will have to show agreement with the $uF$.  

(23) *Firstly, the anaphor merges with V:* 
\[ \text{VP} \] 
\[ \text{V anaphor} \]

(24) *Merge of v* 
\[ \text{v'} \]
\[ \text{v} \]
\[ \text{VP} \]
\[ \text{V anaphor} \]

(25) *Merge of CNP subject into Spec,vP.* 
\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \text{CNP} \]
\[ \text{v'} \]
\[ \text{v} \]
\[ \text{VP} \]
\[ \text{V anaphor} \]
(26) *T merges into the structure*

\[
T' \\
\downarrow \\
T \\
\downarrow \\
\text{CNP} \\
\downarrow \\
v' \\
\downarrow \\
v \\
\downarrow \\
VP \\
\downarrow \\
V \text{ anaphor}
\]

- The crucial point of the derivation is (25), where the anaphor and CNP undergo *Agree-Link*.
- This deactivates the iF before T undergoes *Agree-Link*. 
The same logic will capture the same facts form Russian and Hebrew.

Though the question arises why (attributive) adjectives should merge into the structure after verbs.

We can explain it if adjuncts obligatorily undergo late adjunction into the structure (Stepanov, 2001).

Since T is not an adjunct, and attributive adjectives are, then verbal agreement will precede adjectival agreement.

Thus, we can see a shift from semantic verbal agreement to morphological adjectival agreement, but not vice versa.
Russian: Derivation

(27) **Merge of v with V**

$$v' \quad v \quad V$$

(28) **Merge of vrač into Spec,vP**

$$vP \\ NP \\ doctor \quad v' \quad v \quad V$$

(29) **Merge of T**

$$T' \\ T \quad vP \\ NP \quad v' \\ doctor \quad v \quad V$$
(30) *Remerge of vrač into Spec, TP*

(31) *Late merger of adjunct*
The above explanation can be extended to understand why there are constraints among multiple attributive elements.

In case of mismatch, the element showing SA should merge before the element showing MA.

However, recall the point of difference between Hebrew and Chichewa: in Hebrew the higher element showed SA, and in Chichewa the lower element showed SA.
Adjuncts always undergo countercylic (late) adjunction. There thus seems no reason for them to merge in a ‘cyclic’ countercylic manner.

Let’s suppose that there is variation across languages on this point.

Specifically, I propose the following point of variation.

(34) In case of adjunction, adjoin to the {highest/lowest} segment of the adjunction site.
(35) In case of adjunction, adjoin to the {highest/lowest} segment of the adjunction site.

- This means that structurally higher adjectives will have merged into the derivation before structurally lower ones.
- The addition of new adjectives targets a position below existing adjectives.
Hebrew: Merge adjectives at lowest segment

(36) NP
   | owner

(37) Merge axaron
     NP
     NP
     axaron
     | owner

(38) Merge pratiy
     NP
     NP
     axaron
     |
     NP
     pratiy
     | owner
(39) In case of adjunction, adjoin to the \{highest/lowest\} segment of the adjunction site.

- This means that structurally higher adjuncts will have merged into the derivation after structurally lower ones.
- The addition of new adjectives targets a position above existing adjectives.
Chichewa: Merge adjectives at the highest segment

(40)  
\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{hero} \quad \text{NP}
\]

(41)  
\[
\text{Merge ordinal} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{hero} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{Ordinal} \quad \text{NP}
\]

(42)  
\[
\text{Merge poss} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{hero} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{Poss} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{Ordinal} \quad \text{NP}
\]
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Conclusions

- This talk has offered an analysis of apparent sentence-internal Agreement Hierarchy effects.
- The 3/4 patterns summarised are derived through considerations of timing of agreement and merge.
- In terms of merge: anaphor \(\prec\) verb \(\prec\) adjective.
Conclusions

- Non-Agreement Hierarchy 3/4 patterns can be captured by assuming a parametric difference between languages in terms of adjunction.

(43) In case of adjunction, adjoin to the \{highest/lowest\} segment of the adjunction site.

- Setting the parameter to HIGHEST results in lower adjuncts showing semantic agreement in case of mismatches.
- Setting the parameter to LOWEST results in higher adjuncts showing semantic agreement in case of mismatches.
Conclusions

- By splitting \textsc{Agree} into multiple operations of \textsc{Agree-Link} and \textsc{Agree-Copy}, we can understand why SA shows both representational and derivational characteristics.

- It is derivational in the sense that \textsc{Agree-Link} happens throughout the derivation.

- However, \textsc{Agree-Copy} is representational, in that it seems to happen only once during the syntactic derivation, at the point of transfer (hence why SA is possible in a Reverse Agree configuration.
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