

## Asymmetries in Agreement

Rajesh Bhatt and Martin Walkow

{bhatt,mwalkow}@linguist.umass.edu

Even though most treatments of agreement in Hindi-Urdu have used the same formal mechanism for handling subject and object agreement, subject and object agreement differ in the features they involve (Bhatt (2005), Boeckx (2008)): object agreement never involves person features while subject agreement can. Bhatt (2005) relates the absence of person agreement to what he calls ‘dissociated agreement’ - a situation where a head agrees with an element whose case it does not license - but does not explain why such a correlation exists. We introduce some new facts from Hindi-Urdu concerning Closest Conjunct Agreement (CCA) which provide another point at which subject and object agreement differ. Using the same formal mechanism for subject and object agreement, we offer an analysis for the CCA facts that also explains the person-asymmetry.

Object agreement in Hindi-Urdu allows for CCA. Given Hindi-Urdu word order, this means that the last conjunct triggers agreement. For most speakers, CCA is the only option. Agreement with the first conjunct is ungrammatical and agreement with the entire coordinated object is severely degraded (1). CCA does not require a distributive reading. It is perfectly compatible with adverbs that force a collective reading such as *ek saath* ‘together’ (2). CCA also does not require surface adjacency. Adverbs and other arguments can freely intervene between the agreeing verb and the coordinated object without blocking agreement (3).

Given the above pattern, one might expect to find CCA in Hindi-Urdu more generally. But this turns out not to be the case. Unlike direct objects (= arguments case-licensed by  $\bar{v}$ ) which trigger CCA, arguments case-licensed by T never trigger CCA. The only option is full agreement. There are two cases here. The first concerns canonical subjects of non-perfective clauses (4). The second case concerns the unmarked nominative argument in psych predicate constructions (5).

It is tempting to derive CCA from Right Node Raising (RNR). As (6) shows, RNR would give us the right word order. Since the rightmost verbal sequence is the one that is realized in RNR, what we are calling CCA would fall out as the rightmost verb agreeing with its own object, the so-called ‘closest conjunct’. However, a RNR analysis would make exactly the wrong predictions for arguments licensed by T. When we uncontroversially have RNR involving such elements, there is agreement with the second DP (7). However, as we saw above, CCA is never an option with such arguments (4, 5). We assume that the availability of a DP coordination parse blocks a RNR parse. Therefore we need a different way to explain CCA.

We provide a unified analysis of CCA and the person restriction on object agreement in Hindi-Urdu. Our analysis adopts (i) the proposal that D is the locus of person features while gender and number features are located at the NP level, and (ii) the Activity Condition (Chomsky (1999)), according to which XPs that have had their case-feature checked can not enter into further (A-)syntactic relationships. Bhatt (2005) rejected the Activity Condition on the grounds that there are clear cases where T enters into an agreement relationship with DPs that have been case-licensed by  $\bar{v}$ . We believe that this was too hasty a conclusion; in the relevant cases, T enters into a relationship not with the inactive DP but with a still active subpart of it.

The cases where T agrees with a DP it case-licenses are unexceptional: T case-licenses the DP and agrees with its full set of features which include person features. When the T-licensed DP is a coordinated DP, then as one might expect T agrees with the entire coordinated DP. Next we turn to ‘dissociated’ agreement - cases where T seemingly agrees with a DP that has already been case-licensed by  $\bar{v}$ . For us, such cases involve the T agreeing not with the DP but with the NP. The NP is not ruled out as a Goal for Agree by the Activity Condition. But the NP does not have person features and hence dissociated agreement is limited to gender and number. Finally we turn to cases where the direct object is a coordinated DP. T cannot agree with the DP and hence it must probe a subpart of the DP. In the case of coordinated DPs, this rules out full agreement with the coordinated DP. The only possibility is agreement with an NP inside one of the coordinated DPs. Our proposal does not explain why the NP that triggers agreement is the NP inside the last conjunct. We expect the explanation to be external to the Agree mechanism, possibly following from the kind of linearization considerations discussed in Marusic et al. (2007).

- (1) CCA is strongly preferred:  
 Ram-ne ek thailii aur ek baksaa uṭhaa-yaa/\*uṭhaa-yii/???uṭhaa-ye  
 Ram-Erg a small.bag.F and a box.M lift-Pfv.MSg/\*lift-Pfv.F/???lift-Pfv.MPI  
 ‘Ram lifted a small bag and a box.’
- (2) no distributivity entailment:  
 Ram-ne ek saath (ek haath-se) ek baksaa aur ek thailaa uṭhaa-yaa  
 Ram-Erg together one hand-with a box.M and a bag.M lift-Pfv.MSg  
 ‘Ram lifted a box and a bag together (with one hand).’
- (3) no adjacency requirement:  
 mĒ-ne ek chaataa aur ek saari kal khariid-ii  
 I-Erg an umbrella.M and a sari.F yesterday buy-Pfv.F  
 ‘I bought an umbrella and a sari yesterday.’
- (4) canonical subjects: no CCA  
 Ram aur Ramesh gaa rahe/\*rahaa hĒ/\*hai  
 Ram.M and Ramesh.M sing Prog.MPI/\*Prog.MSg be.Prs.PI/\*be.Prs.Sg  
 ‘Ram and Ramesh are singing.’
- (5) NOM argument in DAT NOM: no CCA  
 mujhe Ram aur Shyam dikh-e/\*dikh-aa  
 me.Dat Ram.M and Shyam.M appear.Pfv.MPI/appear.MSg  
 ‘I saw Ram and Shyam.’
- (6) Right Node Raising treatment of CCA in (1):  
 Ram-ne ek thailii uṭhaa-yii aur ek baksaa uṭhaa-yaa  
 Ram-Erg a small.bag.F lift.Pfv.F and a box.M lift-Pfv.MSg  
 ‘Ram lifted a small bag and a box.’
- (7) Right Node Raising and T-licensed arguments:  
 Ram aaj jaa-egaa aur Atif kal jaa-egaa/\*jaa-egaa  
 Ram.M today go-Fut.3MSg and Atif.M tomorrow go-Fut.3MSg/\*go-Fut.3MPI  
 ‘Ram will go today and Atif will go tomorrow.’

## References

- Bhatt, R. (2005) “Long Distance Agreement in Hindi-Urdu,” Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 23:4, 757–807.
- Boeckx, C. (2008) Aspects of the Syntax of Agreement, Routledge Leading Linguists 15, Routledge, London.
- Chomsky, N. (1999) Derivation by Phase, MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18, MITWPL, Cambridge, MA.
- Marusic, L., A. Nevins, and A. Saksida (2007) “Last-Conjunct Agreement in Slovenian,” in Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 15, The Toronto Meeting, Ann Arbor, Michigan Slavic Publications, 210–227.