# Low nominative agreement in Uab Meto

Tyler Lemon
University of California, Berkeley
tylerlemon@berkeley.edu
WCCFL 39, 04/10/2021

## 1 Background & The main claim

- Across languages, agreement in transitive clauses may target the external argument (higher) or internal argument (lower). This correlates with the height of the φ-probe.
- Assuming that probes agree with the highest argument in their c-command domain (Chomsky 2000), a probe on T agrees with the higher argument (Woolford 2010, Legate 2014, Coon 2017), while a probe on v agrees with the lower one (Béjar & Rezac 2009).
- Notably, consistent agreement with the higher argument (i.e. nominative agreement) is almost always assumed to arise from a probe on T.

**Claim:** Nominative agreement may arise from a low probe immediately above Voice. The probe need not be on T.

#### 2 Uab Meto: The basics

- Uab Meto (Austronesian; Indonesia) exhibits subject agreement on verbs and case marking on pronouns in a NOM-ACC alignment (Arka 2001).
- Unaccusative (1), unergative (2), and transitive (3-4) verbs all agree with nominative subjects.
- I gloss nominative as (N) and accusative as (A).
- (1) Ina n-móóf. 3SG.N 3-fall 'He/she falls.'10
- (2) lin n-aen. 3SG.N 3-run 'He/she ran.'1
- (3) lin na-tiik kau. 3SG.N 3-kick 1SG.A 'He/she kicked me.'1
- (4) Au 'u-tiik=e. 1SG.N 1SG-kick=3SG.A 'I kicked him/her.'1
- These patterns are typical of a NOM-ACC language.

## 3 Agreement is below TAM/Neg

- The Uniformity Principle (Chomsky 2001) would place the φ-probe on T, but additional data suggest that it is lower.
- Only lexical verbs agree. Auxiliaries like lof (FUT) (5), bisa 'can' (6), he (irrealis mood) (7), ka=...(=f(a)) (NEG) (10), lo 'must', and =en (inceptive aspect) do not agree or block it.
- (5) Atóin'-in-i ok~oke' **lof** na-tika-n bol. man-PL-DEF all.RED~all FUT 3-kick-SFX ball 'All the boys will play soccer.'15
- (6) Au **bisa** '-éék oto. (7) Hai **he** m-nao.

  1SG.N can 1SG-bring car
  1PL.EXC.N IRR 1PL.EXC-go
  'I can drive a car.' 14 'We wanted to go.' 14
- These elements are not adjuncts. Uab Meto auxiliaries and adjuncts can be distinguished via ellipsis licensing. *bisa* 'can' licenses ellipsis (8). The adjunct *fe*' 'still' does not (9).
- (8) lin **bisa** na-hana 'maka' ka? lin **bisa**. 3SG.N can 3-cook rice NEG 3SG.N can 'Can he cook rice? He can.'15
- (9) lin **fe'** na-hana 'maka' ka? \* lin **fe'**. 3SG.N still 3-cook rice NEG 3SG.N still 'ls he still cooking rice? \*He still.'15
- Furthermore, bisa 'can' occurs inside of negation (10).
   Assuming ka= marks the left edge of NegP, bisa 'can' is inside/below NegP. Agreement must be below NegP too.
- (10) Au **ka= bisa** '-korban a|'-nesi **=f**.

  1SG.N NEG= can 1SG-sacrifice EPEN|1SG-more =NEG
  'I couldn't offer any more.'6

## 5 Analysis

- Uab Meto has consistent subject agreement above Voice but below TAM markers and negation. I propose that the φ-probe is on an Agr head immediately above Voice that takes VoiceP complements.
- External arguments are introduced in Spec, VoiceP (Harley 2013, Legate 2014). The φ-probe on Agr probes into its c-command domain and agrees with the closest DP.
- The agreed-with DP moves to Spec,TP, to the left of TAM/Neg.

#### 4 Agreement is above V, v, and Voice

- · Agreement is low, but it is still higher than V, v, and Voice.
- First, the stative prefix m(a)- intervenes linearly between the agreement prefix and verb root (11-12). If agreement were on V, this intervention would be surprising.
- (11) lin ase na-**m**-iup.
  3SG.N axle 3-STAT-break
  'Its axle was broken.'14
- (12) Au '-iup pena' ii. 1SG.N 1SG-break corn this 'I break off this corn.'11
- Second, verbs transitivized with the suffix -b switch to agreeing with the external argument (13-14). This follows if the probe is higher than v but is surprising otherwise.
- (13) Au '-sae. 1SG.N 1SG-rise 'I rise.'15

TP

DP<sub>1</sub> T'

T ...

Agr

 $\Phi:\Phi_1$ 

... AgrP

 $DP_1$ 

VoiceP

Voice

 $m(a)-l\emptyset$ 

V DP<sub>2</sub>

- (14) Hoo **mu**-sae-b kau. 2SG.N 2SG-rise-TR 1SG.A 'You raise me.'15
- Third, nominalized verbs do not show agreement, including those with stative m(a)- (15-16). Assuming m(a)- is a stative Voice head, agreement is higher than Voice.
- (15) Au 'u-hóin au aanh-in-i. ( 1SG.N 1SG-birth 1SG.N child-PL-DEF 'I gave birth to my children.'<sup>13</sup>
  - (16) neon ma-hóni-**t** day stat-birth-nmz 'birthday'<sup>7</sup>

#### 6 Conclusion

- Previous work has generally assumed that nominative agreement is associated with a high φ-probe on T.
  - Uab Meto broadens the typology of agreement. It shows that nominative agreement can also be low.
  - Uab Meto affirms the prediction that a φ-probe does not need to be on a particular head at a particular height.
    - Nominative agreement can be obtained with a φ-probe anywhere above the Merge site of external arguments.

Link to references