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Nishnaabemwin

(1) hierarchy: \(2 \succ 1 \succ 3\)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
[u_3] \\
[u_1] \\
[u_2]
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(2) \textit{Probe:} \[
\begin{bmatrix}
[u_3] \\
[u_1] \\
[u_2]
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3) \textit{Transitive paradigm:}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>g-see-it</td>
<td>g-see-aa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-see-DFLT.1</td>
<td>2-see-DFLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>g-see-in</td>
<td>n-see-aa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-see-1.INV</td>
<td>1-see-DFLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>g-see-ig</td>
<td>w-see-igw-n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-see-3.INV</td>
<td>3-see-3.INV-OBV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Cyclic Agree for the Nishnaabemwin singular agreement paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EA→IA</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>EA Agr IA</td>
<td>EA Agr IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[3] [u3]—[3]</td>
<td>[3] [u3]—[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1] [u1]—[1]</td>
<td>[1]—[u1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[2]—[u2]</td>
<td>[2]—[u2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA Agr IA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>EA Agr IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3] [u3]—[3]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[3] [u3]—[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1] [u1]—[1]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1]—[u1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[u2]—[2]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[u2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA Agr IA</td>
<td>EA Agr IA</td>
<td>EA Agr IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3] [u3]—[3]</td>
<td>[3] [u3]—[3]</td>
<td>[3] [u3]—[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[u1]—[1]</td>
<td>[u1]—[1]</td>
<td>[u1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[u2]—[2]</td>
<td>[u2]</td>
<td>[u2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) **Transitive paradigm:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>g-see-it</td>
<td>2-see-DFLT.1</td>
<td>g-see-aa</td>
<td>2-see-DFLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>g-see-in</td>
<td>2-see-1.INV</td>
<td></td>
<td>n-see-aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>g-see-ig</td>
<td>n-see-ig</td>
<td>1-see-3.INV</td>
<td>w-see-igw-n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blue cells: only one agreement cycle (with IA) = inverse context
Red cells: two agreement cycles (with IA and EA) = direct context
- Inverse contexts:
  second agreement slot (suffix) realizes features of the EA
- Direct contexts:
  second agreement slot filled by default exponent -aa
  (exception: $2 \succ 1$)
Additional assumption:

(5) **Person Licensing Condition (PLC):**
A \( \phi \)-feature \([F]\) must be licensed by Agree of some segment in a feature structure of which \([F]\) is a subset. (i.e.: every DP must enter into \( \phi \)-Agree)

**Emergence of the second agreement slot**

- PLC is violated in inverse contexts: no agreement with EA
- repair strategy: a \( \pi \)-probe is added to Agree with the EA
- *Property P (holds of the core probe, optional):*  
  If the core probe \( \alpha \) on \( v \) has property P, a probe is added to \( v \) upon Agree by \( \alpha \).
Additional assumption:

(5) *Person Licensing Condition (PLC)*: A $\phi$-feature $[F]$ must be licensed by Agree of some segment in a feature structure of which $[F]$ is a subset. (i.e.: every DP must enter into $\phi$-Agree)

**Emergence of the second agreement slot**

- PLC is violated in inverse contexts: no agreement with EA
- repair strategy: a $\pi$-probe is added to Agree with the EA
- *Property P (holds of the core probe, optional)*: If the core probe $\alpha$ on $v$ has property P, a probe is added to $v$ upon Agree by $\alpha$. 
Inverse contexts, hierarchy 1 ≿ 2 ≿ 3:

a. Agree v – IA:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{v} & \text{IA} \\
[u3] & [1] \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Merge of EA

c. Addition of the second probe to v'

d. Agree added probe – EA:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{v'} & \text{EA} & \text{v} & \text{IA} \\
\end{array}
\]
Inverse contexts

- P is added to $v'$ and agrees with EA $\rightarrow$ features of the EA are realized (compare second cycle effects)
- Core probe: valued by IA, added probe: valued by EA
- Languages without a second agreement slot (e.g. Georgian): added probe is not realized
- Added probe is convergent only in inverse contexts
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- P is added to $v'$ and agrees with EA $\rightarrow$ features of the EA are realized (compare second cycle effects)
- core probe: valued by IA, added probe: valued by EA
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Inverse contexts

- P is added to v’ and agrees with EA → features of the EA are realized (compare second cycle effects)
- Core probe: valued by IA, added probe: valued by EA
- Languages without a second agreement slot (e.g. Georgian): added probe is not realized
- Added probe is convergent only in inverse contexts
Questions/problems with the added probe

- added probe: must crash in direct contexts
- suggestions:
  (i) crash because two identical values on a single phrase-structure locus $v_2$ and are not distinguishable
  (ii) crash because of the Activity Condition: EA is deactivated upon Agree with the core probe; the added probe is thus unvalued
- default morphology in direct contexts might suggest that there is a 2nd probe, too (probe insertion is no repair?)
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### Case Split in Kashmiri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Split in Kashmiri</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present/Future</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, N-clitic</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, E/A-clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past/Perfective</td>
<td>Ergative, E/A-clitic</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, N-clitic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kashmiri Case/agreement system, direct context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Split in Kashmiri</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present/Future</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, N-clitic</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, E/A-clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past/Perfective</td>
<td>Ergative, E/A-clitic</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, N-clitic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kashmiri Case/agreement system, inverse context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Split in Kashmiri</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>IA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present/Future</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, N-clitic</td>
<td>R-Case (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past/Perfective</td>
<td>Ergative, E/A-clitic</td>
<td><em>Unmarked</em>, N-clitic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Split in Kashmiri

(9) a. Hierarchy: 1 ⋈ 2 ⋈ 3
   b. Probe: [u3 - u2 - u1]

(10) Examples
   a. bi chu-s-ath tsi parina:va:n
      I.NOM am-1SG.NOM-2SG.ERG/ABS you.NOM teaching
      I am teaching you. 1st → 2nd
   b. tsi chu-kh me parina:va:n
      you are-2SG.NOM me.DAT teaching
      You are teaching me. 2nd → 1st
Kashmiri: case/agreement in present tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/Ø</td>
<td>1/Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/D</td>
<td>2/Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R-Case in Kashmiri

- R-Case in the same contexts as the second agreement slot in Nishnaabemwin
- Proposal: the probe on v can have property P; if it does, a probe is added (at v_{II} and agrees with the EA; only the probe on v_{II} is realized)
- P on v modifies the case v assigns under Agree with the IA:
R-Case in Kashmiri

- R-Case in the same contexts as the second agreement slot in Nishnaabemwin
- Proposal: the probe on v can have property P; if it does, a probe is added (at v// and agrees with the EA; only the probe on v// is realized)
- P on v modifies the case v assigns under Agree with the IA:

Property P can have two different consequences: second agreement slot (inverse marking), alternation of case values (case split)
Problems

- manipulation of v’s case feature and addition of a probe apply at different stages in the derivation (\(v_I\) and \(v_{II}\), respectively) but are said to be consequences of the same property \(P\).
- How exactly is the case value on \(v\) fixed? feature changing operation, two different \(v\)s in the lexicon, exchange of the lexically specified case feature on \(v\) during the derivation?
- B&R (p. 66): “In both direct and inverse configurations, the sole agreement slot of Kashmiri tracks the EA.”

But in (10-a) both the EA and the IA agree (in a direct context – contrary to the predictions of their account)! The same holds in another language with a global case split, e.g. in Yurok (Algic).
Problems

- Manipulation of v’s case feature and addition of a probe apply at different stages in the derivation (\(v_I\) and \(v_{II}\), respectively) but are said to be consequences of the same property P.

- How exactly is the case value on v fixed? Feature changing operation, two different vs in the lexicon, exchange of the lexically specified case feature on v during the derivation?
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- How exactly is the case value on v fixed? feature changing operation, two different vs in the lexicon, exchange of the lexically specified case feature on v during the derivation?
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Summary

- **TAAOH-approach**

- Hierarchies are epiphenomenal; they are encoded in the feature specifications of features on the arguments: the higher on the hierarchy, the more features

- Hierarchy effects follow from the (cross-linguistically constant) specification of goals and the (under)specification of probes

- **Cyclic Agree**: preference for Agree with the closest DP

- Depending on the specification of the probe and the arguments either only the IA or the IA and the EA value features on the probe.

- Due to the PLC, a probe is added in inverse contexts, which leads to a second agreement slot / the assignment of a special case.