

# Agreement and dependency marking typology

Jan-Wouter Zwart  
University of Groningen

Agreement Workshop, Leiden, April 14 2005

*Head-marking vs. dependent-marking (Nichols 1986): agreement = prototypical head-marking.*

*Today: **marking** does not express dependency in any straightforward way.*

## 1. Concealed dependent-marking

- affix migration
- dependent head-marking
- floating agreement

### 1.1 Affix migration

(1) *head dependent*

- |    |       |           |                              |
|----|-------|-----------|------------------------------|
| a. | kop   | koffie    | <i>no dependency marking</i> |
| b. | cup   | of coffee | <i>dependent marking</i>     |
| c. | cuppa | coffee    | <i>head marking</i>          |

(2) the morphological marker may simply register the presence of syntactic dependency (Nichols 1986:58)

(3) *linkers (izafet elements): marking the presence of syntactic dependency*

- |    |           |     |    |                  |        |           |
|----|-----------|-----|----|------------------|--------|-----------|
| a. | mard-e    | pir | b. | asb-e            | pedar  | (Persian) |
|    | man-EZ    | old |    | horse-EZ         | father |           |
|    | 'old man' |     |    | 'father's horse' |        |           |

(4) *Agreement*

[A] morphological affix may (..) index particular inflectional or lexical categories of either the head or the dependent, **marking them on the other constituent** (*op.cit.*, 58)

- |        |                                 |       |    |                                |      |           |
|--------|---------------------------------|-------|----|--------------------------------|------|-----------|
| (5) a. | <u>kur-ê</u>                    | mezin | b. | <u>keç-a</u>                   | baş  | (Kurdish) |
|        | boy <sub>MASC</sub> -EZ:MASC.SG | big   |    | girl <sub>FEM</sub> -EZ:FEM.SG | nice |           |
|        | 'the big boy'                   |       |    | 'the nice girl'                |      |           |

(6) *affix migration*

if any adposition or piece of affixal morphology moves, it will go from the dependent to the head, not vice versa (*op.cit.*, 84)

(7) *head dependent*

- |      |           |  |
|------|-----------|--|
| cup  | =a coffee | <i>dependent marking cum cliticization</i> |
| mard | =e pir    |  |

(PHONOLOGICAL) HEAD-MARKING MAY BE (SYNTACTIC) DEPENDENT MARKING

## 1.2 Dependent head-marking

(8) *head dependent*

ki-ti      *ch-a*    *m-ti*  
 7-chair    7-LINK 3-wood  
 'wooden chair'

(Swahili)

(9) N      [<sub>AP</sub> a NP ]  
 ↑      ↑      ↑  
 head   dependent   head-marking

(10) 'dependent head-marking' = marking of a dependent on its head = dependent-marking

(11) *dat wij*      *in het bos*      *wandel-en*  
 that 1PL:NOM in the forest walk-PL  
 'that we are walking in the forest' (Dutch)

(12) Agr      [<sub>TP</sub> PP [<sub>VP</sub> V ]]  
 ↑      ↑      ↑  
 head   dependent   head-marking

(13) dependent-marking typically affects a head contained in the dependent

## 1.3 Floating agreement

(14) a. xinär-en    *lavaš*      *u-ne-k-sa*  
 girl-ERG    bread:ABS    eat-3SG-\$-PRES  
 'The girl EATS bread.'  
 NB, \$ designates the part of the stem following the clitic.

b. xinär-en    *lavaš-ne*      *uk-sa*  
 girl-ERG    bread:ABS-3SG    eat-PRES  
 'The girl eats BREAD.'

(15) realization of agreement is sensitive to focus (Schulze 2004)

(16) if (14b) is not head-marking, then neither is (14a)

(17) Agr      [<sub>TP</sub> NP      V ]  
 ↑      ↑      ↙      ↘  
 head   dependent   marking

(18) agreement is typically fixed on one element or the other (not necessarily the verb)

(19) *i*      *si*      *cu*      *atavéa* *e?hó?h-i*    *no*      *cmói*  
 REC.PAST    3SG    COMPL.ASP    finally    tear off-LT    SU:INVIS    bear

*na*      *sapcí-si*  
 OB:INVIS    face-POSS

(Tsou)

'The bear finally mauled his face.'

## 2. The expression of dependency

- (20) Dependency is which must be can be and
- |                                     |                   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| a. a <i>semantic</i> relation       | e.g. predication  |
| b. <i>syntactically</i> realized,   | sisterhood        |
| c. <i>morphologically</i> marked,   | by agreement      |
| d. <i>phonologically</i> expressed. | via cliticization |
- (21) The relations  $((SEM \rightarrow SYN) \rightarrow MORPH) \rightarrow PHON$  need not be homomorphic
- (22) *Disturbances*
- a.  $SEM \rightarrow SYN$  **movement**  $[S] \leftrightarrow [VO] \rightarrow V[S] \leftrightarrow [tO]$
- b.  $\rightarrow MORPH$  **dependent head-marking (1.2), floating agreement (1.3), multiple agreement**
- c.  $\rightarrow PHON$  **affix migration (1.1)**
- (23) *What are the syntactic relations we wish to mark?*
- a. classical view: X'-relations: head-complement, head-specifier, head-adjunct
- b. minimalist view: merge relations: sisterhood

THE MINIMALIST DEFINITION OF SYNTACTIC DEPENDENCY  
REVOLVES AROUND SISTER PAIRS, NOT HEADS

- (24) New opposition: dependent-marking vs. nondependent-marking

## 3. How much nondependent-marking is there?

- (25) *Relations to consider (sample)*
- possessor—possessum
  - adposition—complement
  - noun—adjective
- (26) *possessor—possessum*
- |     |                        |   |   |
|-----|------------------------|---|---|
| a.  | <b>poss/or poss/um</b> | possessor = subject = nondependent                        |   |
| i   | (Ewe)                  | fia                      dadá                             | <i>no marking</i>                         |
|     |                        | chief                     mother                          |   |
| ii  | (Ewe)                  | fia                      fé      xɔ                       | <i>dependent marking</i>                  |
|     |                        | chief                    POSS   house                     |   |
| iii | (English)              | the chief              =s house                           | <i>dependent marking, affix migration</i> |
| iv  | (Abkhaz)               | à-č'k <sup>o</sup> ən                yə-y <sup>o</sup> nè | <i>dependent marking</i>                  |
|     |                        | DEM-boy                his-house                          |   |
| v   | ⊛ (Lezgian)            | Ahmeda-n              wan                                 | <i>nondependent marking?</i>              |
|     |                        | Ahmed-GEN            voice                                |   |
| b.  | <b>poss/um poss/or</b> | possessor = complement = dependent                        |   |
| i   | (English)              | the house              of the chief                       | <i>dependent marking</i>                  |
| ii  | (Persian)              | asb                      =e pedar                         | <i>dependent marking, affix migration</i> |
|     |                        | horse                    EZ father                        |   |

- iii (Latin) vox voice popul-i people-GEN *dependent marking (cf. a.v)*
- (27) *adposition—complement*
- a. **standard cases** adposition = nondependent
- i. (Russian) bez without brat-a brother-GEN *dependent marking*
- ii. (Hixkaryana) i-hyaye 3SG-from 'from him' *dependent marking, cliticization*
- b. **relational noun constructions** reduce to possessive constructions
- i. (Burushaski) ja 1SG:OBL a-płči 1SG-side 'with me, beside me' *poss/or-poss/um, dependent marking*
- ii. ✱ (Tz'utujil) r-umaal 3SG-by aa CL Yaax 'by Yaax' *poss/um-poss/or, nondependent marking? or movement?*
- (28) *noun—adjective*
- a. **adjective as complement** adjective = dependent, noun = nondependent
- i. (Swahili) ki-ti 7-chair ch-a 7-LINK m-ti 3-wood 'chair of wood, wooden chair' *dependent marking*
- ii. (Kurdish) kur boy =ê EZ:MASC.SC mezin big *dependent marking, affix migration*
- b. **adjective as modifier** adjective = nondependent, noun = dependent
- i. ✱ (Russian) zelen-yj green-NOM.SG.MASC dom house<sub>MASC</sub> *nondependent marking for gender (other features not inherent to N)*
- ii. (Shushwap) wist high t-citx<sup>o</sup> REL-house *dependent marking?*

#### 4. Agreement theory

(29) Chomsky (2001): probe-goal relation

PROBE		GOAL	
T <sub>i</sub>	[ <sub>XP</sub>	DP	[ <sub>YP</sub> V <sub>i</sub> ]]
[uφ]		[φ]	

(30) *problems*

- Probe and goal are not in a minimalist dependency relation (are not sisters)
- The probe's sister (XP) arguably lacks the relevant φ-features
- Status of unvalued features on T unclear
- Agreement marking on V can be a function of the direct dependency of DP and its sister YP.

<b>AGREEMENT IS NOT MEDIATED BY FUNCTIONAL HEADS</b>
--



- (39) a. verbal agreement determined by *rule* (dependent head-marking plus movement)  
b. complementizer agreement determined by *analogy* → overgeneralization possible

## 6. Conclusion

- agreement is not head-marking but dependent-marking
- complementizer agreement does not fit into the picture at all
- possibly, complementizer agreement is an analogical extension of the morphology of auxiliaries in inversion contexts when followed by a weak pronoun

## References

- Ackema, Peter and Ad Neeleman. 2002. Interfaces in word-formation. Ms., Nijmegen and UCL.
- Ackema, Peter and Ad Neeleman. 2003. PF agreement checking. Paper presented at CGSW 18, Durham, 19-20 September.
- den Besten, Hans. 1977. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. Ms., MIT and Amsterdam.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: a life in language*, Michael Kenstowicz, ed., 1-52. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cremers, Crit and Marjo van Koppen. Forthcoming. Boolean agreement in Tegelen Dutch. Ms., Leiden University.
- den Dikken, Marcel and Pornsiri Singhapreecha. 2004. Complex noun phrases and linkers. *Syntax* 7, 1-54.
- Goeman, Ton. 1980. COMP-agreement? In *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1977-1979*, Wim Zonneveld and Fred Weerman, eds., 291-306. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Goeman, Ton. 1997. De zeldzaamheid van Comp-agreement in taaltypologisch en historisch opzicht. Voorkomen buiten de Germania en datering van voegwoordcongruentie-vormen in het Nederlands. In *Vervoegde voegwoorden*, Eric Hoekstra and Caroline Smits, eds., 87-111. Amsterdam: P.J. Meertens-Instituut.
- Goeman, Ton. 2000. Structurele aspecten van de morfologie van voegwoordvervoeging: mogelijkheden en beperkingen, morfologisch gewicht en MCGG. In *Nochtans was scherp van zin: huldealbum Hugo Ryckeboer*, Veronique de Tier, Magda Devos, and J. van Keymeulen, eds., 269-294. Gent: Universiteit Gent.
- van Haeringen, Coenraad B. 1939. Congruerende voegwoorden. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal en Letterkunde* 58, 161-176.
- Hoekstra, Eric and Caroline Smits. 1997. Vervoegde voegwoorden in de Nederlandse dialecten. In *Vervoegde voegwoorden*, Eric Hoekstra and Caroline Smits, eds., 6-30. Amsterdam: P.J. Meertens-Instituut.
- Kathol, Andreas. 2001. Syntactic categories and positional shape alternations. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 3, 59-96.
- van Koppen, Marjo. 2003. First conjunct agreement: Frisian, Tegelen Dutch and Hellendoorn Dutch. Paper presented at CGSW 18, Durham, 19/20 September.
- van Koppen, Marjo. 2005. *One probe—two goals: aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects*. Dissertation, Leiden University.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1986. Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar. *Language* 62, 56-119.
- Schulze, Wolfgang. 2004. Review article of Alice C. Harris, *Endoclitics and the origins of Udi morphosyntax* (Oxford, 2002). *Studia Linguistica* 28, 419-441.
- Tung, T'ung-ho. 1964. *A descriptive study of the Tsou language, Formosa*. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica.
- Vanacker, Valeer F. 1949. Over enkele meervoudsvormen van voegwoorden. *Taal en Tongval* 1, 32-45, 77-93, 108-112.