

Notes

Chapter 1

1. In the literature, there is a debate as to what triggers last-resort movement. For “EPP”-type A-movement, some linguists have argued that Case is responsible (Bošković 1997, 2002 and Martin 1999). There are other studies that assume that movement correlates with agreement (e.g., Chomsky 2000, 2005, 2007, 2008; Kuroda 1988; Miyagawa 2010; Pesetsky and Torrego 2001).

2. See Sano (2005) for related discussion on the acquisition of topicalization in Japanese.

3. See McCloskey (2000) for an analysis that has *wh*-movement (*A'*-movement) being compatible with FQs in West Ulster English.

4. An anonymous reviewer notes that in (19b), if the resumptive pronoun does not occur, one gets a contrastive focus interpretation instead of a topic interpretation. If what I say in chapter 4 is correct, that the focus feature in Spanish stays at C, this may mean that the contrastive focus is due to *A'*-movement instead of A-movement.

5. The most well-known kind of agreement at C is what we find in languages such as West Flemish.

(i) a. Kpeinzen **dan-k** (ik) morgen goan.

I-think that-I (I) tomorrow go

‘I think that I’ll go tomorrow.’

b. Kpeinzen **da-j** (gie) morgen goat.

I-think that-you (you) tomorrow go

‘I think that you’ll go tomorrow.’

(Haegeman 1992, Haegeman and van Koppen 2012)

The complementizer agrees with the subject, thus indicating agreement at C. At the same time, there is subject-verb agreement. I will not deal with this type of agreement at C. See, for example, Miyagawa (2010) and Haegeman and van Koppen (2012) for possible analyses.

6. In the *wh*-movement construction, the agreement is impoverished; there is no person agreement. In certain tenses the agreement disappears altogether. See van Urk (2015).

7. More recently, Kim (2002, 2006) argues that the intervention effect is due to the focus feature on the *wh*-phrase being blocked from being associated with the focus feature on C by another focus-bearing item. Beck (2006) presents a formal semantic analysis based on the assumption that intervention is an instance of the failure of focus agreement. See also Miyagawa (2010).

Chapter 2

1. In most dialects of Basque that have allocutive agreement, the agreement is limited to 2nd person singular colloquial masculine and feminine. This is similar to Japanese, where the allocutive (*-des/-mas-*) is limited to just one register of speech—in Japanese, only the formal. For detailed treatment of agreement in Basque, see, for example, Arregi and Nevins (2012) and Laka (1993).

2. In the appropriate contexts, the allocutive agreement is obligatory, another sign that it is a true form of agreement.

3. An anonymous reviewer raises the issue of why the allocutive probe at C isn't blocked by the occurrence of the other grammatical feature, the δ -feature at C. Apparently the restriction against the allocutive probe occurring at C has to do with overt occurrence of some element, such as a complementizer or a question particle.

4. The pattern of grammaticality in (19)–(20) holds only for *wh*-questions. For yes-no questions, which may also have the question particle *ka*, the *ka* can appear with or without *-mas-*.

- (i) Kimi-wa asita soko-ni iku ka?
 you-TOP tomorrow there-to go Q
 'Are you going there tomorrow?'

If we turn this into a *wh*-question, the question without *-mas-* is degraded.

- (ii) *Kimi-wa asita doko-ni iku ka?
 you-TOP tomorrow where-to go Q
 'Where are you going tomorrow?'

5. For some speakers, the contrast is clearer if the sentences are turned into yes-no questions.

- (i) Bill-wa [_{CP} dare-ga kuru **ka**] itta no?
 Bill-TOP who-NOM come Q said Q
 'Did Bill say who will come?'
- (ii) ?*Bill-wa [_{CP} dare-ga kuru **ka**] donatta no?
 Bill-TOP John-NOM come Q shouted Q
 'Did Bill shout who will come?'

6. In Souletin, the allocutive agreement occurs with both colloquial and formal forms, but in Japanese, the allocutive agreement only occurs with the formal (polite) form. I presume that this is simply a difference in the types of agreement, like the variety of ϕ -feature agreements found across languages.

7. The *sa* head is analyzed by Speas and Tenny (2003) as equivalent to a predicate head. This, then, parallels the bridge verb construction that takes *ka*. In both cases a predicate, or a predicate-like head, licenses *ka*. Thanks to a reviewer for raising this point about the parallel between bridge verbs and *-mas-*.

8. One issue that remains is that while the rhetorical *ka* can license an indefinite NPI, as we saw, it cannot license other negative-sensitive items. The following shows that exceptive *-sika* 'only' and minimizer *rokuna* 'decent' cannot be licensed by this *ka*.

(i) *Hanako-sika kuru ka!

Hanako-only come Q

'Only Hanako will come!'

(ii) *Rokuna-mono-o taberu ka!

decent-thing-ACC eat Q

'I don't eat anything decent!'

This suggests that the negation in rhetorical questions is not the full-fledged negation we get with the negative morpheme *-nai*. It is possible that rhetorical *ka* in conjunction with the question environment is licensing the indefinite NPI. I leave this problem open.

9. See Heycock (2006) for criticism of Hooper and Thompson; see Sawada and Larson (2004) for a formal-semantic characterization of assertion in reason clauses. In a series of works, Haegeman (e.g., 2006, 2010) and Haegeman and Ürögdi (2010) argue that the asserted/non-asserted distinction follows from proposals that postulate movement in those structures that block root transformations. Temporal adjunct clauses, for example, have been argued to involve the movement of the *wh*-phrase (*when*, etc.) (e.g., Larson 1987, 1990). Haegeman argues that this movement causes an intervention effect for root transformations such as NCP and topicalization, in turn suggesting, as Hooper and Thompson do, that there is no inherent and independent distinction to be made between root and non-root clauses. I will support this general approach of using syntactic intervention to account for the absence of root transformations in certain environments. Also see Kastner (2015) for an approach to Hooper and Thompson's categorization of verbs and complements based on categorial distinctions among the complements (DP vs. CP).

10. See Emonds (2004, 2012) for an extension of his earlier work that addresses Hooper and Thompson (1973). He draws data from English and German, which are in many ways similar. These languages do not show the kind of limited distribution we see with allocutive agreement in Japanese and in Basque.

11. See also Jackendoff (1972), Cinque (1999, 2004), and Giorgi (2010) among others for studies related to these adverbs.

12. See Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010, 82) for a different view of the distribution of the various topics in English.

13. The notion of competition at the level of C recalls den Besten's (1983) proposal for root transformations in Germanic. In a later work, Haegeman (2012, 107) suggests that intervention effects are computed on feature sets, where an entity with a richer

feature set can cross one that has an impoverished feature set. I will continue to adopt the more simple notion of intervention in her earlier work.

14. Thanks to Ángel Jiménez-Fernández and Carlos Muñoz Pérez for providing the Spanish data.

Chapter 3

1. I have found that speakers in the Osaka region unexpectedly allow the VP-ellipsis reading in which the manner adverb is contained in the elided portion. No other speakers allow it as far as I know, and I will take Oku's observation as the general rule, leaving aside the question of why Osaka-area speakers allow the VP-ellipsis interpretation.

2. See Raposo (1989) for related discussion.

3. See Abe (2014) and Park (2014), among many others, for other approaches that do not assume argument ellipsis.

4. A very different approach to the availability of sloppy interpretation is found in Otaki (2012). Otaki links it to differences in the morphological types of nominal phrases, the analysis of which is based on Neeleman and Szendrői (2007). I will not take up this alternative approach.

5. This section owes a great deal to Jim Huang, who went through it and gave me detailed comments that helped with the analysis and helped me to avoid some embarrassing mistakes. I regret that I could not respond satisfactorily to all his points.

6. In this chapter I am primarily concerned with the subject empty element; for discussion of the object empty element, see, for example, J. Huang (1984), Li (2014), and references therein.

7. In a related article, Sato (2015b) develops his analysis in detail using Javanese.

8. Huang (2001) notes that in certain cases number apparently also shows the effect of blocking.

(i) a. Tamen_i shuo Zhangsan_j piping-le ziji_{1*_{ij}}.
 they say Zhangsan criticize-PRF self
 'They said that Zhangsan criticized *them/himself.'

b. Tamen_i **dou** shuo Zhangsan_j piping-le ziji_{1_{ij}}.
 they all say Zhangsan criticize-PRF self
 'They **each** said that Zhangsan criticized them/himself.'

In (a) the matrix subject is plural while the lower subject is singular, and *ziji* cannot have long-distance construal with the matrix subject. In (b), *dou* 'all' has been added to the matrix subject, which adds a distributive reading. While the subject is still plural, *dou* makes it semantically singular. From this, Huang concludes that blocking is not due to agreement, but due to the long-distance *ziji* being logophoric and logophoric antecedents being semantically singular. I note this as a challenge to the agreement-based approach to the blocking effect of *ziji*.

Another challenge to the agreement-based approach to blocking is found in Huang and Liu (2001) (see also Li 2014 and references therein). Huang and Liu note that in certain cases, a non-subject may trigger blocking.

- (ii) a. Zhangsan_i gaosu wo_j Lisi_k hen ziji_{i*/j/k}.
 Zhangsan tell me Lisi hate self
 ‘Zhangsan told me that Lisi hated *him/*me/himself.’
- b. Zhangsan_i dui wo_j shuo Lisi_k chang piping ziji_{i*/j/k}.
 Zhangsan to me say Lisi often criticize self
 ‘Zhangsan said to me that Lisi often criticized *him/*me/himself.’

These examples show that an object 1st person can block long-distance construal of *ziji* despite the fact that the local subject is 3rd person and the matrix subject is also 3rd person. Huang and Liu (2001) conclude that examples such as these point to the blocking effect arising from the logophoric nature of long-distance *ziji*. However, Giblin (2015) proposes an agreement-based approach to blocking that takes into account these types of examples as well. Although the kind of agreement approach in this chapter is different, I assume that with revision, such as that suggested by Giblin (2015), this type of blocking can also fall under an agreement-based approach. In addition, we will see in the last section of this chapter that even in Japanese, which has no agreement within the TP region, we see a kind of blocking of *zibun* ‘self’ in certain Point of View contexts. There is a possibility that in Chinese, while the subject-triggered blocking is governed by agreement, the triggerer of non-subject blocking may be some sort of POV. As we will see later in the chapter, Japanese—which does not evidence the kind of blocking we see in languages such as Chinese and Malayalam, blocking that is primarily triggered by a participant subject—nevertheless shows some form of blocking triggered by POV considerations. Cole, Hermon, and Huang (2006) have already noted the possibility that in Chinese, the source of blocking may not be uniform, with participant subjects triggering a grammatical relation-based blocking and non-subjects triggering POV blocking, the latter felt to be weaker in effect. This is true in Japanese, where the blocking effect solely involves POV, and it is weaker, as far as I can tell, compared to the blocking effects found in languages such as Chinese. In this regard, it is interesting that when I asked a number of native speakers of Chinese about the following, the reaction was often, though not always, different for the two examples.

- (iii) a. Lisi juede [wo dui ziji mei xinxin].
 Lisi think I have self no confidence
 ‘Lisi thinks that I have no confidence in self.’
- b. Lisi dui wo shuo Zhangsan chang piping ziji.
 Lisi to me say Zhangsan often criticize self
 ‘Lisi said to me that Zhangsan often criticized self.’

(a) is an example of a typical blocking effect caused by a “participant” subject, in this case ‘I’. (b) is an example of blocking due to a non-subject participant entity. All agreed that (a) is ungrammatical with the intended meaning of Lisi being the antecedent of *ziji*, but many noted that while (b) is degraded on that reading, it isn’t as severe in its unacceptability as (a). One speaker gave (a) “*” while giving “??” to (b); another said that on a scale of 1 to 10, (a) is 1 (worst) while (b) is 3; and a third said that while the intended construal is impossible in (a), it is “easier” in (b). This may suggest that the two types of blocking are due to different properties, something that requires further

careful study. Lisa Cheng asked the eight native Chinese speakers from the mainland in her University of Leiden class about these examples, with the following reaction: while all rejected (a) with *ziji* interpreted as Lisi, four of the eight accepted this interpretation for (b) while the other four rejected it. According to Lisa Cheng, the four who accepted (b) with the intended reading are from south of the Yangtze River while those who rejected it are from north of it. This implies a regional difference.

9. An anonymous reviewer raises the question of how Progovac's anaphoric AGR relates to feature inheritance, which assumes that all grammatical features originate at C. I presume that the ϕ -feature on the matrix AGR starts out at C, as is standardly assumed, but the anaphoric AGR's ϕ -feature is inherited directly from the higher AGR.

10. Jim Huang (personal communication) points out that there are instances in which the subject *pro* may refer to a non-subject.

- (i) Zhangsán dàiyìng Lìsì shuō [*pro* míngtiān kěyǐ zài jiā xiūxi].
 Zhangsán promise Lisi that tomorrow can at home rest
 'Zhangsan promised Lisi that *pro*_(ij) can take a rest at home tomorrow.'

Given that the literature on the Chinese subject *pro* typically states that the antecedent is the subject, I leave this as an exception to be dealt with in a future study.

11. Jim Huang (personal communication) notes that (49) could have an alternative structure in which 'linguistics' is vP-adjoined instead of being in the CP topic region. Such an alternative structure would not cause a problem for Liu's analysis. I presume that prosody marks 'linguistics' as topicalized, hence in the CP region, but I will leave this for later study.

12. According to Patel-Grosz and Grosz (in press), this judgment of ungrammaticality is not shared among all native speakers of German.

13. See Patel-Grosz and Grosz (in press) for a different proposal in which both forms of the pronoun contain an NP. In their work the strong/weak difference arises from the strong/weak articles proposed by Schwarz (2009). See also Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) for related discussion.

14. The idea that the subject *pro* in Chinese is featurally defective recalls Li's (2014) True Empty Category for Chinese pronouns. She postulates a position that simply lacks any relevant features. She identifies the object empty slot with the TEC.

15. According to Amanda Swenson (personal communication), the native speakers she consulted were split as to whether the sloppy interpretation is possible for the subject *pro* (see Simpson, Choudhury, and Menon 2013 for a different outcome). We will see a similar result from a large-scale survey conducted for Chinese.

16. See Duguine (2008) for related discussion on Basque.

17. Yip (1995) and Jiang (2012) argue that the subject undergoes vacuous movement to Spec,Top to get the topic interpretation. This may be the case, or it may simply be that Spec,TP can be a topic position, similar to Romance.

Chapter 4

1. I have changed the example to 'look at/watch' from Ochi's original 'see'. Thanks to Carlos Muñoz Pérez for the suggestion.

2. Thanks to João Costa for the analysis and the data. Brazilian Portuguese works slightly differently, although similar arguments can be made; thanks to Cilene Rodrigues for the information.

3. An anonymous reviewer notes that French has two lexical items, *pourquoi* and *parce que* ('why' and 'because', respectively), which may correspond to the focused and unfocused 'why' that we see in languages such as Portuguese. The interesting thing is that you can use both of them in embedded contexts, in a similar way as you can in English.

(i) Je crois qu'il va pleuvoir, c'est pourquoi je prends le parapluie.
'I believe that it's going to rain, that's why I take the umbrella.'

(ii) Je prends le parapluie (, c'est) parce que je crois qu'il va pleuvoir.
'I'm going to take the umbrella, because I think it's going to rain.'

According to the reviewer, these examples seem to show quite clearly that we are on the right track regarding the fact that 'why' is higher (and focused) and 'because' is lower and unfocused, and perhaps moved.

4. Rizzi (1992) earlier observed some of the intervention effects in German studied by Beck (1996a) on the basis of data given in McDaniel (1989). See Hoji (1985) for the first study of what we today would call intervention effects.

5. An alternative is that what is fronted is a full CP instead of a vP, so that the *naze* in this example is in Spec,CP in the fronted CP, reflecting Ko's approach. However, that this cannot be the case is shown by the fact that if we put the intervenor *-sika* 'only' on the subject, the anti-intervention holds (see (63) later). If the fronting is of a full CP, this would not be expected since it would be a long-distance movement of *naze*, which does not have an anti-intervention property. Thanks to David Pesetsky for mentioning the CP-fronting possibility.

6. One speaker continued to allow the pair-list reading in the 'everyone'-'why' order. He mentioned that to get this reading, he had to heavily emphasize 'everyone'. This may indicate that in this person's case, 'everyone' has moved by focus movement above ReasonP, so that it can c-command the variable of 'why' in the specifier of ReasonP. Ochi (2004) also states that an example similar to (77a) is ambiguous.

7. As Kurafuji (1997) and others have observed, the 'what' adjunct question is often most natural in the progressive form.

8. Linguists have debated the nature of the two causatives (*-o* and *-ni*) from the earliest studies; see Miyagawa (1999), among others, for a summary of this debate. One aspect of this debate is the analysis of "syntactic" versus "lexical" causatives; see, for example, Miyagawa (1998) and references therein. In this chapter we will only deal with the syntactic *-(s)ase*.

Chapter 5

1. Miyagawa (2013) is reproduced as sections 5.2–5.6.

2. For a very different reason, Watanabe (1996) also assumes that the genitive subject stays in Spec,vP.

3. Harada's (1971) original point was that in (9b), having two items between the genitive subject and the verb leads to ungrammaticality. However, having even one of the items is awkward (Miyagawa 2011).

- (i) ??*kodomo tati-no minna-de kake-nobotta kaidan*
 children-GEN together run-climb up stairway
 'the stairway which those children ran up together'

Also, if the intervening element is part of the VP, so that the genitive subject can stay in Spec,vP, we predict that it should be perfectly grammatical; this is shown below (Miyagawa 2011).

- (ii) *Koozi-no mattaku sir-anai kakudo*
 Koji-GEN at.all know-NEG angle
 'an angle that Koji doesn't know at all'

Mattaku 'at all' is a VP adverb.

4. Another argument given for the difference between the two structures involves the licensing of adverbs. If the nominative subject is contained in a CP, while the genitive subject is contained only in a TP, as proposed, we predict that CP-level adverbs such as speech act, evaluative, and evidential adverbs (*honestly, unfortunately, evidently*) (Cinque 1999) may only occur with the nominative subject.

- (i) a. [*saiwai-ni Taroo-ga/*-no yomu*] hon
 fortunately Taro-NOM/-GEN read book
 'the book that Taro will fortunately read'
 b. [*kanarazu Taroo-ga/-no yomu*] hon
 for.certain Taro-NOM/-GEN read book
 'the book that Taro will read for certain'

(ia) shows that a CP-level adverb is compatible only with the nominative subject as predicted, while (ib) demonstrates that both types of subjects are fine with 'for certain', an adverb that occurs lower in the structure. I should also note that, more recently, I have consulted with a large number of speakers about this difference, and I found that while some got the distinction, many did not; the latter found (ia) with *-no* not so bad.

5. I'm grateful to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out that this *v*, which I described as "weak" *v* in the 2013 publication of this chapter, should instead simply be designated as *v*.

6. Akaso and Haraguchi (2014) provide additional evidence for the GDT based on the *yooni* construction.

7. In the original publication of this chapter (2013), I stated that the reason why the GDT does not occur on the object of an active transitive verb but does occur on the object of a stative transitive verb has to do with the requirement that the GDT must occur with a "weak" *v*, that is, a *v* that does not assign Case. However, as an anonymous reviewer points out, the system proposed in fact ends up assuming that this *v* does license Case, the genitive Case, hence it is difficult to consider it as weak *v*. I will leave this issue open.

8. Note that we have now revised our initial assumption that the GDT only occurs with a T that is selected by C. The GDT's co-occurrence with the D-licensed genitive in (53b) shows that the GDT can in fact occur in a TP without CP, since that is the structure that the D-licensed genitive requires. Since we also saw evidence in (30) that the GDT can occur with CP, our revised assumption is that it is compatible with both structures.

9. An anonymous reviewer pointed out that the description of this v as "weak" was less than transparent. Despite being a weak v it licenses Case, which would be a contradiction. One way out of this conundrum, as the reviewer suggests, is to view the v as strong and, along the lines of Icelandic, able to assign quirky case. Under this analysis the v that can assign GDT is assigning quirky case in the environment of dependent tense.

10. A question that comes up is, what if v does not assign Case?

- (i) ?(*)Hanako-no furansugo-dake-ga hanas-e-ru koto
 Hanako-GEN French-only-NOM speak-can-PRS fact
 'the fact that Hanako can speak only French'

Speakers generally accept this, although one speaker did not, and this speaker noted that it becomes worse if some adverbial is placed before the genitive subject. If, however, the example is fine, one way to account for it is to say that the occurrence of focus identifies v as a phase head. This is speculation, and more work is needed to understand both the grammatical nature of this example and how to account for it.

11. The novels are *Byakuya Soshi* (1976) by Itsuki Hiroyuki, *Hoshibosi no Kanashimi* (1984) by Miyamoto Teru, *Koibumi* (1987) by Renjo Mikihiko, and *Fukai Kawa* (1996) by Endo Shusaku.

12. Nambu (2007) presents another extensive corpus study of *ga/no* conversion based on the minutes of the national Diet. While the percentage of genitive subjects is smaller than in Kim's study (27.8%), Nambu's results echo Kim's in showing that the genitive subject occurs far more frequently with adjectives than with verbs (10.6%). The lower percentage in Nambu's study may reflect the formal style of the Diet minutes.

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/10958.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10958.001.0001)

Agreement Beyond Phi

By: Shigeru Miyagawa

Citation:

Agreement Beyond Phi

By: Shigeru Miyagawa

DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/10958.001.0001

ISBN (electronic): 9780262338639

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2017



The MIT Press

© 2017 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

This book was set in Times LT Std by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited. Printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Miyagawa, Shigeru, author.

Title: Agreement beyond Phi / Shigeru Miyagawa.

Description: Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press, [2017] | Series: Linguistic inquiry monographs ; 75th | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016030743 | ISBN 9780262035880 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780262533324 (pbk. : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Grammar, Comparative and general--Agreement. | Japanese language--Agreement. | Japanese language--Syntax. | Grammar, Comparative and general--Agreement. | Discourse markers. | Government-binding theory (Linguistics) | Minimalist theory (Linguistics)

Classification: LCC PL597.A35 M48 2016 | DDC 495.6/5--dc23 LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016030743>

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1