Michael Yoshitaka ERLEWINE

mitcho@nus.edu.sg

Argument ellipsis (AE)

Some null arguments allow non-pronominal (sloppy) readings:

- Turkish null objects allow sloppy readings (=argument ellipsis) (1)Can [*pro* anne-si]-ni eleştir-di-Ø. а.
 - John his mother-3sg-Acc criticize-PST-3SG 'John_i criticized his_i mother.'
 - Mete-yse *e* öv-dü-Ø. b. Mete-however praise-PST-3SG
 - 'But Mete praised John's mother.'
 - 'But Mete_i praised his_i mother.' (ii)
- ... but Turkish disallows subject AE (Sener & Takahashi 2010). (2)
 - Can [[*pro* oğl-u] İngilizce öğren-iyor-Ø diye] John his son-3sg English learn-prs-3sg c 'John_i knows [that his_i son learns English].'
 - [**e** Fransızsa öğren-iyor-Ø Meye-yse Frenchlearn-prs-3sg c Mete-however
 - 'But Mete knows [that John's son learns French].'
 - 'But Mete_i knows [that his_i son learns French].'

The Anti-Agreement Hypothesis

Question: How can you learn if a language has AE or not?

- Not unambiguous in child-directed speech (Sugisaki 2009).
- AE must correlate with some other factor that is observable.

Anti-Agreement Hypothesis for Argument Ellipsis (Saito 2007) (3) Argument ellipsis is possible iff the argument is not φ -Agreed with.

For example, Japanese lacks subject and object agreement and indeed allows argument ellipsis for both subjects and objects (cf Turkish (2)).

Φ-agreement is observable and position-specific.

(3) predicts availability of AE if a DP is exceptionally not Agreed with.

Turkish ECM subjects are not Agreed with and permit AE!

- (4) Exceptional AE in Turkish ECM (cf (2))
 - a. Pelin [[*pro* yegen-i]-ni lise-ye Pelin her niece-3sg-ACC high.school-DAT start-FUT 'Pelin_i thinks her_i niece will start high school.'
 - b. Suzan-sa [**e** ikokul-a başla-yacak] san-ıyor-Ø. Susan-but grade.school-DAT start-FUT
 - (i) 'But Susan thinks [Pelin's niece will start grade school].'
 - (ii) 'But Susan_i thinks [her_i niece will start grade school].'

(Turkish examples from Şener & Takahashi 2010)

NB: Japanese also disallows AE with subject-honorific agreement.

On the unavailability of argument ellipsis in Kaqchikel

Theodore LEVIN

tedlevin@umd.edu

= strict = sloppy

bil-iyor-Ø. know-prs-3sg

diye] bil-iyor-Ø. know-prs-3sg = strict = *sloppy

başla-yacak]san-ıyor-Ø. think-prs-3sg

> think-prs-3sg = strict = sloppy

Background: Agreement and argument ellipsis in Kaqchikel (Otaki et al. 2013)

Kaqchikel (Mayan; Guatemala) has null arguments, and transitive verbs agree with both objects (Set B marker) and subjects (Set A marker) :

Kaqchikel agreement and null argume (5)nimamaixku' a Xwan, iwir. a. X-**e-ru**-tij PRF-**B3PL**-**A3sg**-eat apple 'Juan ate apples yesterday.'

Null subjects do not allow AE

- Ri a Xwan n-Ø-u-na'ojij [chi ri c the the CL X. knows 'Juan_i thinks his_i cat can catch mi
- Chuqa' ri a Karlux n-Ø-u-na'ojij also the CL K. knows
- 'Carlos also thinks Juan's cat can
- (ii) * 'Carlos_i also thinks his_i cat can cat

Argument ellipsis (sloppy null arguments) are unavailable in Kaqchikel even when those arguments are not Agreed with. This contradicts predictions of the prominent Anti-Agreement Hypothesis for argument ellipsis (3) (Saito 2007).

Kaqchikel lacks exceptional AE

In Agent Focus, just one argument is agreed with (e.g. Preminger 2014).

- Kichean Agent Focus 'salience' hierarchy (Dayley 1978) (8) 1st / 2nd person > 3rd person plural > 3rd person singular
- 3rd plural controls agreement over 3rd singular (9) a. Ja rje' x- **e** / ***Ø** -tz'et-ö FOC them PRF-**B3PL/*B3sg**-see-AF 'It was THEM who saw him.'
 - b. Ja rja' x- **e** / ***Ø** -tz'et-ö FOC him PRF-**B3PL/*B3sg**-see-AF 'It was HIM who saw them.'

Unlike Turkish (4), arg's that aren't agreed with still disallow AE!

The 3rd singular null object in (10b) is not agreed with due to Agent Focus, but still disallows the sloppy (AE) reading!

- (10) A: Ja [ri ma Kab'la i ri ya Ixtoj] x-e-kano-n FOC the CL K. and the CL I. PRF-B3PL-LOOK.FOR-AF 'It's [KAB'LA AND IXTOJ]_i that looked for their_i child.'
 - B: Manäq, ja [ri ma Q'anil i ri ya Nikte] x-e-kano-n No
 - (i) 'No, it's [Q. AND N.] that looked for K. and I.'s child.'
 - (ii) * 'No, it's [Q. AND N.]_i that looked for their_i child.'





| ents | (Otaki | et | al | . 2013) |
|------|------------|----|----|---------|
| | \ / | | • | • |

| a | xwan, | |
|----|-------|-----------|
| CL | Juan | yesterday |

| • | Po e | man | x- Ø-u- tïj |
|---|-------------|-----------|--------------------|
| | but | NEG | PRF-B3sg-A3sg- |
| | 'But (h | e) didn't | eat (it) today.' |

Otaki et al (2013): (agreeing) null subjects and objects cannot be argument ellipsis, as predicted by the Anti-Agreement Hypothesis (3).

a.

| ru-mes tikirel | y-e-ru-chäp | ch'oy]. |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| A3sg-cat can | IMPF-B3pL-A3sg-catc | h mice |
| ice.' | | |
| [chi e tikirel y- | e-ru-chäp | ch'oy]. |
| c can ıм | IPF-B3PL-A3sg-catch | mice |
| r catch mice.' tch mice.' | = * | = strict sloppy |

(7) Null objects do

- Ri a Xv the CL X.
- 'Juan_i loc
- Chuqa' r b.
- also
- 'Carlos al
- (ii) * 'Carlos_i al

| rja'. | Set B = subject (3pl) |
|-------|-----------------------|
| him | |
| | |

- rje'. them
- Set B = object (3pl)

ri k-ak'wal. the A3PL-child е. FOC the CL Q. and the CL N. PRF-B3PL-LOOK.FOR-AF = strict = *sloppy

Against the logic of Anti-Agreement

Kaqchikel provides a conceptual argument against (5) as well.

- 'It was you that heard me.'

To capture (8), Preminger concludes that 3rd singular DPs are *not Agreed with*; they lack φ-features entirely (Harley & Ritter 2002).

- (13) Lack of agreement is grammatical: Ja ri a Xwan x-**Ø**-kano-n 'It's JUAN that looked for his child.'
- Agreement Hypothesis (11c) fails apart.





e, wakami. ta NEG now -eat

|) | not | al | low | AE |
|---|-----|----|-----|----|
| | | | | |

| wan | x-Ø-u-ka | noj | ri | r-ak'wal. |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------|------------|
| , | prf-B3sg | -A3sg-look.for | the | A3sg-child |
| oked | for his _i ch | ild.' | | |
| ri a | Karlux | x-Ø-u-kanoj | | е. |
| the ci | _ K. | PRF-B3SG-A3SG | j-loo | k.for |
| so looked for Juan's child.' = strict | | | | |
| lso lo | oked for l | his _i child.' | | = *sloppy |
| | | | | |

(11) The logic of the Anti-Agreement Hypothesis (Saito 2007): a. In AE, the e position is unaccessible to φ -probing. b. Its semantic content has yet to be copied or it's already elided. c. <u>If φ-agreement probes do not successfully Agree, they crash.</u>

BUT in AF at most one argument is Agreed with. AF with two participant DPs is ungrammatical (12), as one of the two arguments is not Agreed with, in violation of Person Licensing (Béjar & Rezac 2003).

(12) AF ungrammatical with two participants; only Agrees with one Ja rat x- **in / at / Ø** -ax-an yïn. FOC you.sg prf-**B1sg/B2sg/B3sg**-hear-AF me

(Preminger 2014)

ri r-ak'wal. FOC the CL X. PRF-**B(DEFAULT)**-look.for-AF the A3sg-child

 \rightarrow If failure to Agree does not induce a crash, (13), the logic of the Anti-