Unorthodox C-Domain Agreements: Complementizer Agreement vs. Allocutive Agreement

Thomas McFadden (ZAS) & Sandhya Sundaresan (Leipzig)
CGSW 33, Georg-August Universität Göttingen
September 27th, 2018

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG
Leibniz-Zentrum
Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

3 kinds of C-domain agreement

1. Downward complementizer agreement (DCA); C agrees with embedded subject; known from West Germanic, as in (1) from West Flemish (van Koppen, 2017):

   (1) *K peinzen da-n   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.'

2. Upward complementizer agreement (UCA); C agrees with matrix subject; known from Bantu, as in (2) from Lubuksu (Diercks, 2013):

   (2) *ba-ba-ndu ba-bol-el-a Alfredi 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.'

3. Allocutive Agreement (AA); peripheral affix agrees with addressee; known from Tamil, Japanese and Basque, as in (3) Oyharçabal, 1993):

   (3) *Pettek lan   egin din.*
        Peter.erg work.abs do.prf 3.s.abs-2.s.c.fm.alloc-3.s.erg
        'Peter worked.' *Utterance to a close female friend*

The theoretical challenge

Simple theories of these three phenomena are mutually incompatible.

▶ For DCA, assume (along the lines of e.g. Carstens, 2003; van Koppen, 2005) that C° bears unvalued ϕ; following (Chomsky, 2000, etc.) it probes **downward** and Agrees with the embedded subject, which it minimally c-commands.

▶ Miyagawa (2017); McFadden (To appear) also assume C° with unvalued ϕ for Japanese and Tamil, but there it Agrees **upward** with the representation of the addressee in the left periphery yielding AA.

▶ For UCA we need unvalued ϕ to Agree upward (unlike DCA), but with the matrix subject rather than the addressee (unlike AA).

This presents a challenge if we want a principled account that covers all three:

▶ We need to deal with the variation in upward vs. downward sensitivity, ideally without resorting to parametrization of directionality of Agree a là Baker (2008).

▶ And we need a story about why the representation of the addressee is a potential agreement target in some languages but not in others.

(4) **DCA** ... Subj_{Matrix} ... C ... $\text{Subj}_{Embedded}$ ...

(5) **UCA** ... Subj_{Matrix} ... C ... $\text{Subj}_{Embedded}$ ...

(6) **AA** ... (Subj_{Matrix}) ... C ... $\text{Subj}_{Embedded}$ ...
     Addressee

Observation I: embedded vs. root clauses

▶ A key difference between AA and both types of CA:

CA is restricted to embedded clauses.

   ▶ This is not (just) about the presence of an overt complementizer — in Bavarian, CA can attach to a *wh*-phrase in Spec-CP in an embedded clause with no overt C as in (7) (Bayer, 1984).

   ▶ And embedded clauses with root syntax, like the embedded V2 in Frisian (8b), seem to disallow CA (de Haan, 2001):

   (7) *Du sollst song [[an wäichan Schuah]-st du wui-st]*
        you should say   [[the which   shoe]-2sg you want-2sg]
        'You should say which one of the shoes you want.'

   (8) a. *Heit sei **dat-st**   do soks net leauwe **moa-st.***
          dad said that-2p.sg you such not believe must-2p.sg

       b. *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.'

AA is a root phenomenon.

   ▶ AA in embedded clauses is famously impossible in Basque and highly restricted in other languages (Antonov, 2015).

   ▶ In Japanese and Tamil, it is found embedded only in complements of typical bridge verbs and certain adverbial clauses with root clause syntax (Miyagawa, 2012; McFadden, To appear).

Observation 2: UCA vs. DCA is about more than directionality

▶ There is evidence that the 'complementizer' of UCA is different from and structurally higher than that of DCA.

1. While Germanic DCA doesn't have a semantic effect, Bantu UCA does. Agreeing *a-li* in Lubukusu (9) is only possible if the speaker considers the reported information reliable (Diercks, 2013), otherwise non-agreeing *bali* appears.

   (9) *Mosesi a-lom-ile a-li Sammy k-eb-ile   chi-rupia.*
        1Moses 1-say-prf 1-C 1Sammy 1-steal-pst 10-money
        'Moses has said that Sammy stole the money.'

2. In some Bantu languages, the complementizer (with UCA) can appear overtly in the matrix clause, replacing the matrix verb, as in the Kipsigis example (10) from (Diercks et al., 2017)

   (10) *kɔ-lɛ-ndʒin Kiproono ko-∅-ruuja tuɣa amut.*
        3-C-2sg.obj Kiproono pst-3-sleep cows yesterday
        'Kiproono told you that the cows slept yesterday.'

3. Indeed, at least some of the relevant complementizers seem to be grammaticalized from verbs meaning 'say', i.e. at least historically they belong more to the matrix than the embedded clause.

Proposal part I: different probe locations plus locality

▶ The differences between UCA and DCA derive from a difference in the height of the ϕ-probe in the C domain (building on Carstens, 2016; Diercks et al., 2017).

West Germanic complementizers and their accompanying ϕ probes are relatively low in the left periphery, something like Rizzi (1997)'s Fin°.

▶ Following Carstens (2016), we propose that this is **below** the CP phase boundary, meaning they can probe material in TP, yielding (downward) Agree with the embedded subject.

▶ The relevant head is also present in all types of finite embedded clause, hence the presence of CA doesn't diagnose any special left-peripheral structure and so isn't associated with particular semantics.

Bantu complementizers and their accompanying ϕ probes are relatively high in the left periphery, something like Rizzi (1997)'s Force°.

▶ Again following Carstens (2016), we propose that this is **above** the CP phase boundary, meaning they cannot Agree downward with the embedded subject. Instead, they must find an appropriate goal in the structure above them.

▶ Something beyond the assumption of simple upward Agree is needed here, since they crucially target the matrix subject, not necessarily the closest higher DP. See Carstens (2016); Diercks et al. (2017) for discussion and proposals.

▶ The presence of this Bantu CA diagnoses the projection of a relatively elaborated left periphery, with concomitant intepretive consequences — e.g. the presence of Krifka (2017)'s CommitmentP, explaining the effects in (9).

Proposal part II: root clauses, SAP and minimality

▶ The differences between AA and CA derive from the structural representation of the Speech Act characterizing Root clauses.

Root clauses are distinguished by the presence of a SpeechActP at the top of the left periphery, including representations of Author and Addressee (Speas and Tenny, 2003; Hill, 2007; Sundaresan, 2012; Krifka, 2017).

AA ϕ-probes are even higher in the left periphery than Bantu CA probes.

▶ This again makes them non-local to any ϕ-bearing material in the clause below, forcing them to find something higher to Agree with.

▶ It also implies the presence of the extended left-peripheral structure that is only available in root clauses, explaining their restricted distribution.

▶ The SAP, with its syntactic representation of the Addressee, provides them with something local to Agree with, pre-empting Agree with anything higher and yielding AA (building on Miyagawa, 2017; McFadden, To appear).

(11) **DCA** Subj_{Matrix} $[_{phase} [\phi:] \text{Subj}_{Embedded}]$

(12) **UCA** $\text{Subj}_{Matrix} [\phi:] [_{phase}$ $\text{Subj}_{Embedded}]$

(13) **AA** $(\text{Subj}_{Matrix}) [_{SAP}$ Addressee $[\phi:] [_{phase}$ $\text{Subj}_{Embedded}]]$