



Predicate adjectives in French

Same form across all person values of the controller:

Je suis belle.

I be.PRES.1SG beautiful.FEM.SG

'I [female] am beautiful.'

Tu es belle.

You be.PRES.2SG beautiful.FEM.SG

'You [female, singular] are beautiful.'

Elle est belle.

She be.PRES.3SG beautiful.FEM.SG

'She is beautiful.'



Person insensitivity despite person morphology

Imagine that under normal syntactic conditions, the target distinguishes person, but in certain constructions, it does not:

Reduced paradigm

	SG	PL
1	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
2	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
3	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>

Full paradigm

	SG	PL
1	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>
2	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>
3	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>

Possible under Separatism; impossible under Bundling.

Person-conditioned effability: Schema

	SG	PL
1	*	*
2	*	*
3	3SG	3PL



E.g. PCC effects, e.g. Shambala

1st person recipient, 3rd person theme OK:

A -za -m -ni -et -e -a.
 she -PAST -him -me -bring -APPL -FV
 'She has brought him to me'

3rd person recipient, 1st person theme bad:

*A -za -ni -mw -et -e -a.
 she -PAST -me -him -bring -APPL -FV
 'She has brought me to him [intended]'

(Duranti 1979: 36, cited in Baker 2008: p. 97)

Icelandic simple dative subject constructions

The verb agrees with the nominative object (in number):

Henni leidd-**ust** **Þeir**.
 her.DAT was.bored.by-3PL they.NOM
 'She was bored with them'

Henni leið-**ist** **bókin sín**.
 her.DAT was.bored.by-3SG book self's
 'She finds her own book boring'

(Sigurðsson 1996, i.a.)

Icelandic simple dative subject constructions

But local person nominative objects are disallowed:*

*Henni leidd-umst við.
 her.DAT was.bored.by-1PL we.NOM
 'She was bored with us.'

*Ég veit að honum lík-ið þið.
 I know that him.DAT like-2PL you.NOM.PL
 'I know that he likes you all.'

*with some exceptions

Non-agreement: Schema

	SG	PL
1	<i>def</i>	<i>def</i>
2	<i>def</i>	<i>def</i>
3	<i>def</i>	<i>def</i>



Icelandic ECM constructions

Default 3SG form occurs with all persons (see Sigurdsson and Holmberg 2008):

Honum mund-**i** virðast **við** vera hæfir.
 him.DAT would-3SG seem we.NOM be competent

Honum mund-**i** virðast **þið** vera hæfir.
 him.DAT would-3SG seem you.PL.NOM be competent

Honum mund-**i** virðast **þeir** vera hæfir.
 him.DAT would-3SG seem they.NOM be competent

This is *lack of agreement*, not *partial agreement*.

No partial agreement in Icelandic

Verbs cannot show partial agreement in Icelandic. The controlled verb shows agreement in number if and only if it has the same value for the feature [person] as its controller...

(D'Alessandro, Fischer and Hrafnbjargarson 2008: p. 7)

Summary

Full agreement

	SG	PL
1	1SG	1PL
2	2SG	2PL
3	3SG	3PL

Person insensitivity

	SG	PL
1	(3)SG	(3)PL
2	(3)SG	(3)PL
3	(3)SG	(3)PL

Person-conditioned effability

	SG	PL
1	*	*
2	*	*
3	3SG	3PL

Non-agreement

	SG	PL
1	<i>def</i>	<i>def</i>
2	<i>def</i>	<i>def</i>
3	<i>def</i>	<i>def</i>

Dualism and bundling

Wechsler and Zlatić (2003): 2 different types of agreement:

- ▶ *Index*: includes person, number, and gender (typically verbs)
- ▶ *Concord*: includes number, gender and case (typically adjectives, determiners)

Wechsler (to appear): Index derives historically from incorporation of personal pronouns; Concord does not.

Bundling: These feature bundles agree *all at once* (cf. Chomsky's 2000 'all-or-nothing' view (Béjar 2008: 132)).

Predicted person restrictions under dualism/bundling

Two predicted types of agreement in number but not in person:

- ▶ Concord agreement (e.g. French adjectives)
- ▶ Index agreement where Person has been lost (e.g. Northern Ostyak; cf. Coppock and Wechsler 2010)

But if the target is a *person target*, and it agrees at all, then it should agree in person. No agreement in number, with mismatching person values.



Person-conditioned effability & dualism/bundling

Person-conditioned effability is consistent with the Bundling Hypothesis, because the number and person features of the target and the controller *both* match.

	SG	PL
1	*	*
2	*	*
3	3SG	3PL

Why 1/2 ruled out? Maybe person hierarchy (Silverstein 1986).



Sakha ECM

In Sakha ECM, full agreement possible (Vinokurova 2005):

Kini **ehigi(-ni)** kyajtar-dy-**gyt** dien isti-bit.
 He you(-ACC) become.defeated-PAST-2PL COMP hear-PAST
 'He heard that you lost.'

Or number agreement only:

Kini **ehigi-ni** kyajtar-dy-**lar** dien isti-bit.
 He you-ACC become.defeated-PAST-PL COMP hear-PAST
 'He heard that you lost.'



Does Sakha disprove dualism/bundling?

It would appear so:

- ▶ The verb can inflect for person.
- ▶ 1/2 controllers OK (\Rightarrow person insensitivity).

But no:

- ▶ *-LAR* is not a person target; rather it is a Concord plural marker.



-LAR is the plural ending on nouns in Sakha

knige-**ler**
 book-PL
 'books'

Can have a non-3rd person controller:

Bihigi balyksyt-**tar** buol-a-byt.
 we fisherman-PL be-AOR-1PL
 'We are fishermen.'

(Vinokurova 2005, p. 141, ex. 25a)



-LAR appears on 2nd person pronouns in Turkish

Siz get-di-niz
 you.PL come-PAST-2PL
 'You [formal or plural] came.'

Siz-**ler** get-di-niz.
 you.PL-PL come-PAST-2PL
 'You [plural] came.'

(Hahm 2010)



Origin of *-LAR* not pronominal

Old Turkic: pronouns were placed after the predicate:

(ben) kel-ür ben.
 I come-IMPERF I
 'I am coming'

But not in third person:

(Anlar) bay-durur(-lar).
 they rich-*durur*-PL
 'They are rich'

(Hahm 2010; Adamović 1985; Good and Yu 2005)



3PL= 3SG+ -LAr in Sakha

Present tense paradigm for 'eat':

	SG	PL
1	ahiibin	ahiibit
2	ahiigin	ahiigit
3	ahiir	ahiillar

In the 3rd p. pl., the endings are the same as those of the 3rd p. sg., to which the regular plural in -lar/-ler has been added. The only change is that regressive assimilation functions in such a way that the final -r of the 3rd p. sg. assimilates to the plural morpheme.

(Krueger 1962: pp. 126–7)



3PL= 3SG+ -LAr in Sakha

Present imperative paradigm:

	SG	PL
1	-I:m	-Iaying
2	-0	-(I)ng
3	-TIn	TInnAr

(Pakendorf 2007: p. 208)



Our proposal

- ▶ *-LAr* is not 3rd person plural; just plural.
- ▶ It is not part of the person agreement paradigm, but rather attaches freely as long as it is non-redundant (so it is blocked by 1PL or 2PL).
- ▶ **I.e., it is a non-inflectional plural marker.**
- ▶ It marks Concord rather than Index agreement (like other NP-internal agreement markers).
- ▶ Number agreement without person agreement in Sakha ECM constructions is made possible by the existence of a non-inflectional plural marker.



- Coppock, E. and Wechsler, S. (2010). Less-travelled paths from pronoun to agreement: The case of the Uralic objective conjugations. In King, T. H., editor, *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Lexical Functional Grammar Conference*. CSLI On-line Publications.
- D'Alessandro, R., Fischer, S., and Hrafnbjargarson, G. H. (2008). On agreement restrictions. In D'Alessandro, R., Fischer, S., and Hrafnbjargarson, G. H., editors, *Agreement Restrictions*, volume 15 of *Interface Explorations*, pages 1–14. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Good, J. and Yu, A. C. L. (2005). Morphosyntax of two Turkish subject pronominal paradigms. In Heggie, L. and Ordóñez, F., editors, *Clitic and Affix Combinations: Theoretical Perspectives*, pages 315–342. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Hahm, H.-J. (2010). *A Cross-linguistic Study of Syntactic and Semantic Agreement: Polite Plural Pronouns and Other Issues*. PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Krueger, J. R. (1962). *Yakut Manual*, volume 21 of *Uralic and Altaic Series*. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Nichols, L. (2001). The syntactic basis of referential hierarchy phenomena: Clues from languages with and without morphological case. *Lingua*, 111:515–537.



- Nikolaeva, I. (1999). Object agreement, grammatical relations, and information structure. *Studies in Language*, 23:331–376.
- Pakendorf, B. (2007). *Contact in the Prehistory of the Sakha (Yakuts): Linguistic and Genetic Perspectives*, volume 170 of *LOT Dissertation Series*. LOT, Utrecht.
- Sigurdsson, H. and Holmberg, A. (2008). Icelandic dative intervention: Person and number are separate probes. In D'Alessandro, R., Fischer, S., and Hrafnbjargarson, G., editors, *Agreement restrictions*, pages 251–280. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Sigurðsson, H. (1996). Icelandic finite verb agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 57:1–46. University of Iceland.
- Silverstein, M. (1986). Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In Muysken, P. and van Riemsdijk, H., editors, *Features and Projections*, pages 163–232. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Taraldsen, K. T. (1995). On agreement and nominative subjects in Icelandic. In Haider, H., Olsen, S., and Vikner, S., editors, *Studies in Comparative German Syntax*, volume 31 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, pages 307–27. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Vinokurova, N. (2005). *Lexical categories and argument structure: a study with reference to Sakha*. PhD thesis, University of Utrecht.

