

Reinstating the clausal analysis of first conjunct agreement

Evidence from complementiser agreement

Astrid van Alem

a.h.j.van.alem@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Leiden University

Agreement in Multivaluation Constructions

19–20 May 2021

Goethe University Frankfurt/online

1 Introduction

- Many languages have first conjunct agreement (FCA):

(1) **Mša** **ʃumar** w ʃali.
left.3SG.M Omar and Ali
'Omar and Ali left.'

Moroccan Arabic (Aoun, Benmamoun, & Sportiche, 1994)

- There is a debate on the underlying structure of FCA (Aoun et al., 1994, 1999; Munn, 1999):
 - Nominal coordination: **Left** [**Omar** and Ali]
 - Clausal coordination + ellipsis/RNR/ATB-movement:
[**Left Omar**] and [~~left~~ Ali]
- The nominal coordination analysis is generally favoured (cf. Nevins & Weisser, 2019)
- Goal of this talk: to show that the clausal analysis fares better than the nominal analysis for several cases of first conjunct complementiser agreement (FCCA)
- Structure of the talk:
 - The clausal analysis of FCA (§2)
 - FCCA in Frisian (§3)

- FCCA in Polish (§4)
- Conclusion and further issues (§5)

2 The clausal analysis of FCA

- Aoun et al. (1994, 1999)’s analysis:

(2) Is_i [John t_i t_j] and [Mary t_i t_j] sick_j. (cf. Aoun et al., 1999, p. 669)

- Main motivation: FCA cannot be used in clauses containing number-sensitive items:

- (3) a. *Raaḥ Kariim w Marwaan sawa.
left.3SG.M Kareem and Marwaan together
‘Kareem and Marwaan left together.’
- b. Raaḥo Kariim w Marwaan sawa.
left.PL Kareem and Marwaan together
‘Kareem and Marwaan left together.’
- c. *Bihibb Kariim w Marwaan baḥḍun.
love.3SG Kareem and Marwaan each.other
‘Kareem and Marwaan love each other.’
- d. Bihibbo Kariim w Marwaan baḥḍun.
love.3PL Kareem and Marwaan each.other
‘Kareem and Marwaan love each other.’

Lebanese Arabic (Aoun et al., 1994, pp. 211, 214)

- This follows if the underlying conjuncts are clauses containing singular subjects.
- However, this argumentation has been criticised: according to Munn (1999), number-sensitive items require syntactic plurality, rather than semantic plurality, cf. (4).

- (4) a. *el-jamaʿa raaḥet sawa
the-group left.3SG.F together
‘The group left together.’ Syntactic singular, semantic plural
- b. el-rijal raaḥu sawa
the-men left.3PL.M together
‘The men left together.’ Syntactic plural, semantic plural

Lebanese Arabic (Munn, 1999, p. 647)

- The data in (3) only show that these clauses lack a syntactic plural; the coordination can either be nominal (semantically plural) or clausal (semantically singular).
- Conclusion: number-sensitive items are not a diagnostic for the structure of coordination.

- However, the clausal coordination analysis is not excluded per se, and its semantic singularity predicts a two-event reading of the predicate (cf. Nevins & Weisser, 2019).
- Citko (2004) presents an additional argument against the clausal analysis of FCA: (2) requires ATB-movement of non-identical verbs, whereas ATB-movement generally requires total identity (although verbs sometimes behave differently, cf. Salzmann (2012)):

- (5) a. Do pokoju weszła Maria i Jan.
to room entered.F Maria and Jan.
‘Into the room walked Maria and Jan.’
- b. Do pokoju weszła Maria i do pokoju wszedł Jan.
to room entered.F Maria and to room entered.M Jan
‘Maria walked into the room and Jan walked into the room.’
- Polish (Citko, 2004, p. 94)

- However, in a context where the agreeing element is external to the conjuncts, there is no ATB-movement, so the identity requirement is not violated.
- One such context is complementiser agreement (CA) with a coordinated subject:

- (6) dat-st do en Marie dit wykein yn Rome west ha.
that-2SG you and Marie this weekend in Rome been have
‘that you and Marie have been to Rome this weekend.’
- Frisian (van Koppen, 2006, p. 126)

- I will argue that we need the clausal analysis to derive (some cases of) FCCA in Frisian and Polish.
- NB: I will not discuss the nature of CA, but follow analyses that argue that it is triggered by Agree (see Carstens (2003), van Koppen (2005), Haegeman and van Koppen (2012), van Alem (in prep.))

3 FCCA in Frisian

- Frisian has FCCA:

- (7) **dat-st do** en Marie dit wykein yn Rome west ha.
that-2SG you and Marie this weekend in Rome been have
‘that you and Marie have been to Rome this weekend.’
- (van Koppen, 2006, p. 126)

- Puzzle in Frisian: there is an asymmetry between FCA on verbs and complementisers. Complementisers can Agree with the first conjunct, but verbs cannot.¹

¹In contrast to other West Germanic varieties with complementiser agreement; see e.g. van Koppen (2005), van Alem (in prep.).

- (8) * **Hast** **do** en Marie dit wykein yn Rome west?
 have.2SG you and Marie this weekend in Rome been
 ‘Have you and Marie been in Rome this weekend?’
 (van Koppen, 2006, p. 128)

- The asymmetry is surprising under the nominal coordination analysis: the structural configurations for V-Agreement and C-Agreement are the same (Probe c-commands the Goal); the structure of the coordinated subject is the same.
- We can make sense of it under the following assumptions:
 - Superficial coordination can be real nominal coordination, or the result of clausal coordination and RNR.
 - A Probe Agrees with the closest Goal with fully specified φ -features.
 - * Nominal coordination with φ -complete &P: Agreement with &P
 - * Nominal coordination with φ -deficient &P (cf. Bošković, 2009; Bhatt & Walkow, 2013): Agreement with first conjunct possible
 - * Clausal coordination: no φ -features on &P; Agreement with the subject of the first clause
 - The Frisian nominal coordination phrase is φ -complete.
- Given these assumptions, the Frisian pattern follows:

- (9) * **Hast** [**do** en Marie] dit wykein yn Rome west?
 have.2SG you and Marie this weekend in Rome been
- (10) * **dat-st** [**do** en Marie] dit wykein yn Rome west ha.
 that-2SG you and Marie this weekend in Rome been have

⇒ Because nominal &P is φ -complete, the Probe cannot Agree into the coordination.

- (11) **dat-st** [**do** —] en [Marie —] dit wykein yn Rome west ha.
 that-2SG you and Marie this weekend in Rome been have

⇒ Because the clausal &P does not have φ -features, the Probe Agrees with the subject of the first clause.

- (12) * **Hast** [**do** —] en [Marie —] dit wykein yn Rome west?
 have.2SG you and Marie this weekend in Rome been

⇒ The verb cannot ATB-move out of the conjuncts because it is non-identical. The structure crashes.

- Prediction: FCCA is optional and corresponds to a two-event reading.
- This prediction is borne out:

- (13) a. Ik tink **dat-st-o** en Jan de wedstriden winne sille.
 I think that-2SG-you and Jan the games win will.PL
 ‘I think that you and Jan will win the games.’
 (preferred reading: you and Jan are each playing their own games)
- b. Ik tink **dat do en Jan** de wedstriden winne sille.
 I think that you and Jan the games win will.PL
 ‘I think that you and Jan will win the games.’
 (preferred reading: you and Jan playing one game as a team)
- Remaining question: plural agreement on the verb.
 - Grosz (2015), Shen (2018, 2019): languages vary in how agreement under RNR is resolved.
 - Summative agreement: [Sue’s proud that **Bill** ___] and [Mary’s glad that **John** ___] **have** traveled to Cameroon
 - Distributive agreement: [Sue’s proud that Bill ___] and [Mary’s glad that **John** ___] **has** traveled to Cameroon
 - In Frisian, agreement under RNR is resolved as summative agreement:
- (14) Ik tink [dat-st-o ___] en [dat Jan ___] de wedstriden winne **sille**
 I think that-2SG-you and that Jan the games win will.PL
 ‘I think that you and that Jan are going to win the games.’
- Plural agreement on the verb in the context of FCCA is therefore expected.

4 FCCA in Polish

- Polish also has FCCA (unless indicated, all data in this section are from Citko (2018)):
- (15) Maria chce, **żebym** **ja** i mój sąsiad wyszli.
 Maria wants that.COND.1SG I and my neighbor.M.SG left.VIR.PL
 ‘Maria wants me and my neighbor to leave.’
- Puzzle in Polish: interactions between CA and verbal agreement. Resolved verbal agreement is possible both in the context of FCCA and with resolved CA. Last conjunct agreement (LCA) on the verb is possible exclusively in the context of first conjunct agreement on the complementiser:
- (16) a. Maria chce, **żebym** **ja** i mój sąsiad wyszli.
 Maria wants that.COND.1SG I and my neighbor.M.SG left.VIR.PL
 ‘Maria wants me and my neighbor to leave.’

- b. Maria chce, **żebyśmy ja i mój sąsiad** wyszli.
 Maria wants that.COND.1PL I and my neighbor.M.SG left.VIR.PL
 ‘Maria wants me and my neighbor to leave.’
- c. Maria chce, **żebym ja i mój sąsiad** wyszedł.
 Maria wants that.COND.1SG I and my neighbor.M.SG left.M.SG
 ‘Maria wants me (F) and my neighbor to leave.’

- Citko (2018) derives the pattern in a nominal coordination analysis using Singular and Multiple Agree. Singular Agree (SA) results in closest conjunct agreement, and Multiple Agree (MA) results in resolved agreement.

- (16a): $C_{SA} V_{MA}$
- (16b): $C_{MA} V_{MA}$
- (16c): $C_{SA} V_{SA}$
- (unattested): $C_{MA} V_{SA}$

- I propose to analyse the interaction between CA and VA using clausal and nominal coordination.

- Assumption:

- The Polish nominal coordination phrase is φ -defective. Evidence: Polish allows for FCA on verbs:

- (17) Do pokoju **weszła młoda kobieta i chłopiec**.
 to room entered.SG.F young woman and boy
 ‘Into the room walked a young woman and boy.’ (Citko, 2004, p. 91)

⇒ Probe can Agree into nominal coordination

- However, this is optional; resolved (semantic?) agreement is also possible:

- (18) Do pokoju **weszli kobieta i chłopiec**.
 to room entered.PL woman and boy
 ‘Into the room walked a woman and boy.’ (Citko, 2004, p. 91)

- The Polish agreement interaction can be derived as follows.

- Nominal coordination:

- (19) Maria chce, **żebym [ja i mój sąsiad]** wyszli.
 Maria wants that.COND.1SG I and my neighbor.M.SG left.VIR.PL

- (20) Maria chce, **żebyśmy [ja i mój sąsiad]** wyszli.
 Maria wants that.COND.1PL I and my neighbor.M.SG left.VIR.PL

⇒ The complementiser (optionally) Agrees with the first conjunct of the nominal coordination.

⇒ The verb Agrees with the whole coordination.

(21) Maria chce, **żeby** [ja ___] i [**mój sąsiad** ___] **wyszedł**.
Maria wants that.COND.1SG I and my neighbor.M.SG left.M.SG

⇒ The complementiser Agrees with the subject of the first clause.

⇒ Verbal agreement is resolved according to language-specific rules of agreement resolution under RNR.

- Shen (2018, 2019): Polish has distributive agreement under RNR:

(22) [Jan myśli że Maria ___] a [Bill wierzy że **Sue** ___] **podróżowała**
Jan thinks that Maria and Bill believes that Sue travel.SG.F
do Chin.
to China
'Jan thinks that Maria, and Bill believes that Sue, travelled to China.'
(Shen, 2018, p. 221)

⇒ Distributive agreement resolution under RNR results in LCA on the verb in (21)

- The interactions between CA and VA are derived using independently motivated principles of agreement, conjunction, and RNR.
- Prediction: FCCA and LCA correspond to a two-event reading.
- Not clear if this prediction is borne out, but there seems to be idiosyncratic variation in which of the three options are allowed by a single speaker.

5 Conclusion and further issues

- FCCA patterns in Frisian and Polish can be successfully analysed using both the nominal and clausal coordination.
- Prosodic differences?
- Coordinator agreement in Tegelen Dutch (van Koppen & Cremers, 2008):

(23) Hè dink det Marie en-s **toow** idder apart langskomme.
he thinks that Mary and-2SG you each separate by.come
'He thinks that Marie and you each come by separately.'
(van Koppen & Cremers, 2008, p. 1068)

- Underlying structure:

(24) Hè dink [det Marie ___] en [∅-s **toow** ___] idder apart langskomme.
he thinks that Mary and C-2SG you each separate by.come

References

- van Alem, A. (in prep.). *Life of Phi* (Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University).
- Aoun, J., Benmamoun, E., & Sportiche, D. (1994). Agreement, word order, and conjunction in some varieties of Arabic. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 195–220.
- Aoun, J., Benmamoun, E., & Sportiche, D. (1999). Further remarks on first conjunct agreement. *Linguistic inquiry*, 30(4), 669–681.
- Bhatt, R., & Walkow, M. (2013). Locating agreement in grammar: An argument from agreement in conjunctions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 31(4), 951–1013.
- Bošković, Ž. (2009). Unifying first and last conjunct agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 27(3), 455–496.
- Carstens, V. (2003). Rethinking complementizer agreement: Agree with a case-checked goal. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 34(3), 393–412. doi:10.1162/002438903322247533
- Citko, B. (2004). Agreement asymmetries in coordinate structures. In O. Arnaudova, W. Browne, M. L. Rivero, & D. Stojanović (Eds.), *Proceedings of FASL* (Vol. 12, pp. 91–109). Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Citko, B. (2018). Complementizer agreement with coordinated subjects in Polish. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 3(1), 1–25. doi:10.5334/gjgl.588
- Grosz, P. G. (2015). Movement and agreement in Right-Node-Raising constructions. *Syntax*, 18(1), 1–38.
- Haegeman, L., & van Koppen, M. (2012). Complementizer agreement and the relation between C0 and T0. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 43(3), 441–454.
- van Koppen, M. (2005). *One Probe, two Goals: Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects* (Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University, Leiden).
- van Koppen, M. (2006). A new view on first conjunct agreement. *Studies on agreement*, 86, 121.
- van Koppen, M., & Cremers, C. (2008). Boolean agreement in Tegelen Dutch. *Lingua*, 118(8), 1064–1079. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2008.01.004
- Munn, A. (1999). First conjunct agreement: Against a clausal analysis. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30(4), 643–668. doi:10.1162/002438999554246
- Nevins, A., & Weisser, P. (2019). Closest conjunct agreement. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 5, 219–241.
- Salzmann, M. (2012). A derivational ellipsis approach to atb-movement. *The Linguistic Review*, 29(3), 397–438.
- Shen, Z. (2018). *Feature arithmetic in the nominal domain* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut).
- Shen, Z. (2019). The multi-valuation Agreement Hierarchy. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 4(1), 1–29. doi:10.5334/gjgl.585