Agree on C: case and agreement at the left-periphery in Inuktitut
Richard Compton, Université du Québec à Montréal

Background: φ-agreement is generally argued to occur on T (with Nevins 2011 arguing exclusively so), concomitant with nominative/absolutive case. However, in Eastern Canadian Inuktitut (Eskimo-Aleut), tense marking and agreement are discontinuous, with aspect, negation, and clause-type/mood marking intervening between:[1]

(1) taku-**lauq**-sima-nngip-**pi-nnga(a)**?
     see-**DIST.PAST**-PERF-NEG-**INTERR-2SG.1SG**
     'Haven't you seen me before?'

Claim: I argue that φ-agreement in Inuktitut occurs high on C (i.e., ForceP) instead of on T, following analyses of *wh-* and $\bar{A}$-agreement on C in other languages (Deal 2014 and van Urk 2015) and Béjar & Rezac's (2009) Cyclic Agree and their proposal of multiple probes on v^0. This analysis is used to explain (i) the relative position and exponence of φ-indexing morphemes (which co-vary with clause-typing morphology, called "mood" throughout), as in (1); (ii) the default word order and high scope of structural case arguments; (iii) the fact that structural case in Inuktitut is licensed by C, not T; and (iv) how such an analysis makes the right predictions for the syntax of switch reference in the agreement system. These findings extend other proposals for multiple loci for φ-agreement in the clausal spine, including Oxford's (2014) and Coon's (2013) proposals for agreement on v^0 in Algonquian and Mayan languages, respectively.

Bittner & Hale (1996a,b) make a similar proposal involving government and case competition, but for the related West Greenlandic dialect, which crucially lacks (overt) tense, thereby allowing them to assume a high (null) T head. They propose that NOM/ABS agreement is on C and ERG agreement is on T, claiming that ERG/T agreement is closer to the verb in Inuit. But data from Inuktitut and other dialects show that this is not the case, with exponents of NOM/ABS agreement at times closer to the verb and at other times fused with ERG/T agreement, suggesting both are the result of probes on a single head, discontinuous from T.

Position and exponence of φ-features: φ-indexing morphemes occur either fused with clause-typing morphology on C or immediately thereafter. In cases where separate morphemes are distinguishable, both may condition the other, such that the exponents of the φ-features of both ERG and ABS arguments depend on the clause type, as in (2), or vice versa, where the form of the interrogative marker is conditioned by particular combinations of features, as in (3):

(2) taku-gu-**viuk**   ikajuq-langa-ja-**it**
     see-COND-2SG.3SG help-NEAR.FUT-DECL-2SG.3SG
     'If you see him/her, you'll help him/her.'

(3) a. -**vi**-ttigit
         -INTERR-1PL.**2SG**
     b. -**va**-ttik
         -INTERR-1PL.**2DU**

Evidence from word order and scope: An analysis in which both ERG and ABS arguments move to the left-periphery for case and agreement will derive the default SOV order of these arguments (versus the antipassive's SVO order, in which the internal argument (IA) bears oblique case). Furthermore, Wharram (2003) observes that absolutive arguments obligatorily scope over clausal negation, as in (4), while oblique-marked IAs scope under negation. A high landing site for absolutive case in the left-periphery offers a potential explanation for the unavailability of low scope for absolutives, particularly given the position of NEG above TP.

(4) Taqqialu-up tuktu   taku-lau-nngit-ta(ng)a
     T.-ERG   caribou(ABS) see-PAST-NEG-DECL.3SG.3SG

     a. #Taqqialuk didn't see a (single) caribou
     b. There is a (certain) caribou Taqqialuk didn't see   (Wharram 2003:39)

---

[1] Evidence for this being genuine agreement and not pronominal clitics, though not the focus here, include the relative position of genuine clitics outside of agreement, mutually-conditioned allomorphy between mood and agreement, diachronically related possessor agreement in the nominal domain, and default agreement phenomena (following Preminger's 2014 diagnostics).

Evidence from case licensing: If T were the locus of Agree in Inuktitut, we would expect a correlation between the presence of (finite) T and case positions. And yet, although a closed class of verbs in the language allow overtly tensed TPs to undergo "verb" incorporation, these additional tense markers do not allow any additional structural case positions. Example (5), with two overt finite T heads, can still only admit one ergative and one absolutive argument:

(5) Jaani-up niri-**qqau**-nira(q)-**lauq**-taa tuktu Miali-mu(t)
John-ERG eat-**REC.PAST**-say-**DIST.PAST**-DECL.3SG.3SG caribou(ABS) Mary-ALLAT
'(A while ago) John said that Mary was eating the caribou.' (Pittman 2009)

(Crucially, Hayashi 2011 demonstrates that Inuktitut has overt tense, unlike West Greenlandic.)

Application to switch reference: One result of analyzing φ-agreement in Inuktitut as being the result agreement probes on C is that it offers a potential structural explanation for why adjoined clauses bearing subordinate (clause-typing) moods exhibit a phenomenon of switch reference whereby a same-subject and different subject third person are distinguished with respect to the matrix clause.

(6) a. niri-lu-**ni** pisu-langa-juq
eat-CONTEMP-**3SG.SS** walk-NEAR.FUT-DECL.3SG
'while s/he$_i$ is eating, s/he$_i$ will walk'
b. niri-tillu-**gu** pisu-langa-juq
eat-CONTEMP.DS-**3SG.DS** walk-NEAR.FUT-DECL.3SG
'while s/he$_j$ is eating, s/he$_i$ will walk' (Dorais 1988)

If agreement in the language occurs high on C, it is possible that the search domain for the probe(s) includes both the complement of C, (i.e., the rest of adjunct clause itself), as well as the arguments in the matrix clause (assuming the adjunct CP is adjoined high and that its search space includes what this *maximal* projection c-commands). Such a configuration allows for the possibility of probes on C being sensitive to matching arguments in both clauses, yielding sensitivity to joint/disjoint reference (see also Hanink & Arregi's 2017 treatment of switch reference in Washo as being inverse agreement using an IDENTITY feature).

Summary: Positing φ-Agree on C in Inuktitut, with arguments raising high to check structural case, provides an account of word order, scope, and the correlation between availability of case and clause-type marking (as well as the lack of correlation between the availability of case positions with T). In addition, if Agree occurs at the clause edge, this offers an insight into why cross-clausal switch-reference interacts with agreement. Finally, such an account correctly predicts that it is C that should condition the exponence of agreement, and vice versa, not T. As such, this work extends the typology of where Agree can occur in the clausal spine.

Selected References: Bittner, M. & K. Hale (1996a). The Structural Determination of Case and Agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.1:1–68. ● Bittner, M. & K. Hale (1996b). Ergativity: Toward a Theory of a Heterogeneous Class. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.4:531-604. ● Coon, J. (2013). Aspects of Split Ergativity. OUP. ● Deal, A. R. (2014). Properties of probes: Evidence from Nez Perce complementizer agreement. Presentation at NELS 45, MIT. ● Dorais, L.-J. (1988) *Tukilik: An Inuktitut Grammar for All.* Inuit Studies Occasional Papers 2. ● Halle, M. & A. Marantz (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In *The View from Building 20.* MIT Press. ● Nevins, A. (2011). Multiple agree with clitics: person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29(4). ● Oxford, W. 2014. Microparameters of agreement: A diachronic perspective on Algonquian verb inflection. PhD thesis, University of Toronto. ● Pittman, C. (2009). Complex verb formation revisited: Restructuring in Inuktitut and Nuu-chah-nulth. *Variations on Polysynthesis: The Eskaleut languages*, 19-34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. ● van Urk, C. (2015). Agreement and the left periphery in Dinka. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. ● Wharram, D. (2003) On the interpretation of (un)certain indefinites in Inuktitut and related languages. Doctoral dissertation, UConn. ● Yuan, M. (2017). Decomposing transitive agreement in Inuktitut. LSA 2017, Austin, Texas.