

Switch Reference in Washo as Multiple Subject Agreement*

Karlos Arregi & Emily Hanink
University of Chicago
karlos@uchicago.edu, eahanink@uchicago.edu

NELS 48 - University of Iceland
October 29, 2017

1. Introduction

Washo: Hohan/isolate, Lake Tahoe (CA/NV, USA), ≈ 10 native speakers (≥ 80 years old).¹

- **Switch reference (SR)** tracks whether subjects of two clauses are the same: (Jacobsen 1964, 1967, McKenzie 2015)

(1) *Different subject (DS) -š*: subjects don't refer to same individual

[_{CP} **daʔmóʔmoʔ** [_{DP}[_{CP} **k'ák'aʔ** dá: gé:gel-i -[š]] -ge] yá:m-aʔ]
woman heron there 3.sit-IND -DS -NOM 3.speak-DEP

'The woman spoke to a heron who was sitting there.'

Jacobsen 1981

(2) *Same subject (SS) -∅*: subjects refer to same individual

[_{CP} **Adele** [_{DP}[_{CP} **daláʔak ʔ-ígi-yi** -[∅]] -ge] hámp'áy-e:s-i]
Adele mountain 3-see-IND -SS -NOM 3.forget-NEG-IND

'Adele remembers that she saw the mountain.'

Hanink & Bochnak, to appear

Proposal: Multiple agreement and feature conflict

Syntax:

- DS/SS are realizations of embedded C, which **agrees with matrix and embedded subject**.
- **Agreement is for the referential index**.

Postsyntax:

- Postsyntactically, if subjects have different indices, **feature conflict** is realized as DS -š.
- If subjects have the same index, absence of feature conflict realized as null SS.

Outline

§2: Switch reference as a syntactic phenomenon

§3: Switch reference in the postsyntactic component

§4: Binding and previous accounts

*We would like to thank Adele James and the late Ramona Dick for working with Emily Hanink on the Washo data, as well as the audience at WSCLA 22 for their feedback on an earlier version of this project. This work was partially funded by the Rella Cohn Research Funds from the University of Chicago and The Jacobs Funds of the Whatcom Museum in WA, USA.

¹Glosses: 1/2/3: 1st/2nd/3rd person; ATTRibutive; COPula; DEPENDent mood; DS: different subject; INDEPENDent mood; LOCative; NEGation; NM: clausal nominalizer; NMLZ: deverbal nominalizer; OBJect agreement; REC.PAST; SS: same subject; UNEXPRESSED object prefix. IPA-deviating symbols are L [l]; š [ʃ]; y [j] (Jacobsen 1964). Data come from Hanink's fieldnotes unless otherwise noted.

2. Switch reference as a syntactic phenomenon

2.1. Only occurs across subordinate clause boundaries

Clausal nominalizations: some complement clauses and internally headed RCs (see also (1–2)):

- (3) [_{DP} [_{CP} **sísu ʔ-íšim-i** -[š]] -ge] **di-dámal-i**
bird 3-sing-IND -DS -NM **1**-hear-IND
'I hear the bird singing.'

Temporal adjuncts:

- (4) [**I-émlu-ya** -[š]] ʔ-í:meʔ-leg-i
1-eat-DEP -DS **3**-drink-REC.PAST-IND
'He was drinking while I was eating.'

Washo Archive

No switch reference in independent clauses

- (5) [... udi Dresslerville ʔ-íšge-gulay-g-i lí:ujil ...]
then Dresslerville **3**-move-PAST-IND long.ago
[**t'éliwhu gí:** Dresslerville dé-itde-yiʔ **k'-éʔ-i**]
husband 3.PRO Dresslerville NMLZ-country-ATTR 3.UN-COP-IND

'... then she moved to Dresslerville, a long time ago... her husband, he lives in Dresslerville.'

⇒ SR clauses are not reduced, and SS/DS are not markers of height of coordination (cf. Keine 2013).

2.2. Switch reference only cares about DP reference

Copy-raising triggers SS, with no change in meaning:

- (6) a. *No matrix copy of embedded subject: DS marking*
[**1-éšim-dugá:gu-ʔi** -[š] -gi] **k'-éʔ-i**
1-sing-not.understand-IND -DS -NM **3**.UN-COP-IND
'I don't know how to sing.'
- b. *Matrix copy of emedded subject, signaled by agreement: SS*
[**1-éšim-dugá:gu-ʔi** -[∅] -gi] **L'-éʔ-i**
1-sing-not.understand-IND -SS -NM **1**.UN-COP-IND
'I don't know how to sing.'

⇒ It's not topic-tracking or scene-shift (cf. Dahlstrom 1982, Stirling 1993, McKenzie 2012).

2.3. Switch reference obeys clause-bound locality

In double embedding, most deeply embedded marker tracks intermediate, not matrix subject:

- (7) [[**súkuʔ** baŋáya ʔ-éʔ-i -[š] -ge] **daʔmóʔmoʔ** bóŋi-yi -[š] -gi] p'á:š-ug-i
dog outside 3-COP-IND -DS -NM **woman** 3.call-IND -DS -NM **3**.enter-hither-IND
'The dog who was outside who the woman called came in.'

4. Is it binding?

An alternative, updating Finer 1985: C agrees with lower subject, but is **bound by higher subject**.

- “Half” of C would be a Local Subject-Oriented Reflexive (i.a. Ahn 2015).
- Accounts for subject orientation and clause-bound locality (Diercks 2013 on C agreement in Bantu).

Our objections:

- This would be a reflexive with no semantics.
- Wrong prediction: matrix C should be DS, since there’s no higher subject to bind it (McKenzie 2012). Multiple Agree analysis: matrix C has no higher subject to agree with, so it only has one [ID] value.

5. Conclusion

The proposal contributes to the understanding of switch reference in Washo, and to the wider study of Multiple Agree and the effect it can have on feature conflict and the use of inverse morphology.

- The SR head in Washo **agrees for index feature with both matrix and embedded subject**.

⇒ All the syntactic mechanisms involved are independently motivated.

- DS is the realization of **feature conflict** resulting from agreement with disjoint subjects.

⇒ Independently motivated by inverse number-marking in Kiowa.

Related constructions in which C mediates a relation between matrix and embedded nominals:

- Control (i.a. Landau 2002): PRO and matrix controller. See Souza’s (2016) analysis of SS marking in Panoan.
- Logophors (i.a. Koopman and Sportiche 1989): logophoric pronoun and matrix argument.

References

- Ahn, Byron. 2015. Giving reflexivity a voice. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Baker, Mark C. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mark C., and Livia Camargo Souza. 2017. Switch reference in (North) American languages: A syntactic overview. Ms., Rutgers University.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 2005. Long distance agreement in Hindi-Urdu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:757–807.
- Bjorkman, Bronwyn, and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2014. Upward agree is superior. Ms., University of Toronto and University of Göttingen.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2008. Where’s Phi? Agreement as a Post-Syntactic Operation. In *Phi-theory: Phi features across interfaces and modules*, ed. Daniel Harbour David Adger and Susana Béjar, 295–328. Oxford University Press.
- Camacho, José. 2010. On case concord: The syntax of switch-reference clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28:239–274.
- Dahlstrom, Amy. 1982. A functional analysis of switch-reference in Lakhota discourse. In *Papers from the Eighteenth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 15–16, 1982*, ed. Kevin Tuite, Robinson Schneider, and Robert Chametsky, 72–81. University of Chicago.

- Diercks, Michael. 2013. Indirect agree in Lubukusu complementizer agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31.2:357–407.
- Finer, Daniel L. 1985. The syntax of switch-reference. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:35–55.
- Hanink, Emily. 2016. Internally headed relatives and event nominalizations in Washo. In *The Proceedings of BLS 42*, ed. E. Clem, V. Dawson, Al. Shen, A.H. Skilton, G. Bacon, A. Cheng, and E.H. Maier, 119–134. UC Berkeley.
- Hanink, Emily, and M. Ryan Bochnak. To appear. Factivity and two types of embedded clauses in Washo. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 47*. GLSA Publications.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2007. *Morphosemantic number: From Kiowa noun classes to UG number features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2011. Valence and atomic number. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42.4:561–594.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001. Multiple agree and the defective intervention constraint in Japanese. In *MIT Working papers in Linguistics*, volume 40, 57–80. MITWPL, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Jacobsen, William. 1964. A Grammar of the Washo Language. Doctoral Dissertation, UC Berkeley.
- Jacobsen, William. 1967. Switch-Reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan. In *Studies in Southwestern Linguistics*, ed. Dell Hymes and William Bittle, 238–263. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jacobsen, William. 1981. Headless Relative Clauses in Washo. *Conference on the Syntax of Native American Languages, University of Calgary, March*.
- Keine, Stefan. 2013. Deconstructing switch-reference. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 31:767–826.
- Kennedy, Chris. 2014. Predicates and formulas: Evidence from ellipsis. In *The Art and Craft of Semantics: A Festschrift for Irene Heim*, volume 1, 83–136. MITWPL.
- Koopman, Hilda, and Dominique Sportiche. 1989. Pronouns, logical variables, and logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:555–588.
- Landau, Idan. 2002. *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht.
- McKenzie, Andrew. 2012. The role of contextual restriction in reference-tracking. Doctoral Dissertation, UMass Amherst.
- McKenzie, Andrew. 2015. A survey of switch reference in North America. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81.3:409–448.
- Peachey, Robert M. 2006. On switch-reference and the internally-headed relative clause construction in Washo. Ms., University of Chicago.
- Rezac, Milan. 2004. Agree and Merge. Ms., University of the Basque Country.
- Souza, Livia Camargo. 2016. Agree as coindexation: The case of switch-reference. Ms., Rutgers University.
- Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Koppen, Johanna Maria. 2005. One probe – two goals: Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects. Doctoral Dissertation, Leiden University.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2000. Feature Copying and Binding: Evidence from Complementizer Agreement and Switch Reference. *Syntax* 3.3:159–181.