

Agreement Domains

Sentences such as (1a) demonstrate that a subject may control agreement on the finite verb in English even when that subject is embedded in an infinitival clause (i.e., and thus does not visibly occupy the specifier position of the finite verb / Infl). Compare (1b) in which the subject has overtly undergone A-movement to the relevant specifier position.

- (1) a. There are/*is likely [to be many children at the movie].
 b. Many children are/*is likely to be *trace* at the movie.

Both A-movement and agreement are impossible out of, e.g., a finite clause (even when *that*-trace is not at issue) (2). This has been taken as evidence that agreement and A-movement obey the same locality domains and underlie a series of attempts to unify these phenomena (Chomsky 1991 proposes to reduce agreement to A-movement, possibly covert, and in more recent work proposes that A-movement is dependent in part on AGREEMENT).

- (2) a. *There are likely [that many children are at the movie].
 b. *Many children are likely (that) *trace* are at the movie.

Preliminary work on object agreement seems consistent with this research program. The example in (3) is from Itelmen.

- (3) kma kza t'-utu-z-in əlčqu-ał-it.
 I you 1SG.SUBJ-unable-PRES-2SG.OBJ see-FUTURE-NON.FIN
 'I am unable to see you.' (Itelmen, Field notes 1996, S3:19 (77a))

The range of matrix predicates allowing object agreement across a (non-finite) clause boundary is essentially the same as the "restructuring" predicates which in other languages clearly allow A-movement of the underlying object across a (non-finite) clause boundary (Wurmbrand 2001b). This is illustrated here with German long passive - only the matrix verb is passivized, but the embedded object raises to matrix subject position.

- (4) [Die Traktoren] sind/*ist zu reparieren versucht worden.
 the tractors are/*is to repair tried AUXILIARY
 Lit: 'The tractors were tried to repair.'
 'They/someone tried to repair the tractors.' (adapted, Wurmbrand 2001b, 19)

In this paper, I consider three recent apparent counter-examples to the claim that A-movement and Agreement obey identical locality domains. Examples are long-distance object agreement in Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001) and in Algonquian languages (Branigan & MacKenzie, to appear, Bruening 2001) and VP-fronting and restructuring constructions in German Wurmbrand 2001a. I will argue, in part following Wurmbrand, that consideration of these examples reveals the following generalizations:

- An agreement domain of a head (V, Infl) extends to the specifier of the next clause down (cf. Chomsky's *Phases*)
- Within a single agreement domain, agreement is independent of movement.
- Agreement only occurs within an Agreement Domain. (Apparent) long-distance agreement requires (is parasitic on) movement and blocks reconstruction.

Branigan, Phil & Marguerite MacKenzie. To appear. 'Altruism, A-bar movement and object agreement in Innu-aimûn', *Linguistic Inquiry*.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. *Syntax at the Edge: Cross-Clausal Phenomena and the Syntax of Passamaquoddy*, Ph.D. Dissertation M.I.T., Cambridge Mass.(MITWPL)

Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam. 2001. 'Long distance agreement and topic in Tsez', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **19.3**, pp. 583-646.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001a. 'How far can Agree see?', Paper presented at GLOW 24, Universidade do Minho, Braga, Portugal (April 2001).

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001b. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.