

Cliticization Feeds Agreement: A View from Quechua

**Claim:** Recent years have seen a surge in work on Person Hierarchy Effects (Béjar & Rezac 2009; Nevins 2010; Walkow 2009; Lochbihler 2009; Witschko 2008; Georgi 2011). In this talk, I make a novel argument for the superiority of (a version of) Nevins' (2010) "Multiple Agree with Clitics" (MAwC) view of such effects over the influential "Cyclic Agree" (CA) approach of Béjar & Rezac (2009). The evidence comes from a Person Hierarchy Effect which has been widely discussed in theoretical and descriptive work on the Quechua family (van de Kerke 1996; Lakämper & Wunderlich 1998; Milliken 1984; Muysken 1981; Weber 1976, 1983). I show that this effect can be readily assimilated into the typology of Person Hierarchy Effects predicted by the MAwC approach, but poses a number of problems for the CA theory. In addition, the talk will offer the first syntactic analysis of an agreement pattern that has been argued to pose fatal problems for syntactic theories of agreement morphology in general (van de Kerke 1996; Lakämper & Wunderlich 1998).

**Empirical Background:** The Person Hierarchy Effect in question, termed the [Addressee]-driven Subject Marking Anomaly (A-SMA), can be described as follows (the formulation and the name are both adapted from Weber 1976:16).

## (1) [Addressee]-driven Subject Marking Anomaly (A-SMA)

When a verb takes a 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject and an object with the feature [Addressee], the subject agreement morpheme spells out features of the object, not the subject. When the subject is 1<sup>st</sup> person and the object has the feature [Addressee], the subject agreement morpheme spells out the features of the object OR spells out as a portmanteau marking features of both the subject and the object.

The A-SMA manifests itself in many dialects of the Quechua family, spread out amongst almost all of the known sub-branches. I illustrate from Cajamarca Quechua (Coombs-Lynch et al. 2003; Quesada 1976), for space reasons restricting myself to examples with 3<sup>rd</sup> person subjects. The combination of a 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject and a 1<sup>st</sup> person object marker yields the usual 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject agreement morpheme, as in (2) (subject agreement morphemes are in bold; the object markers are underlined). On the other hand, if a 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject is combined with a 2<sup>nd</sup> person object (3) or a 1<sup>st</sup> person inclusive plural object (4), the features realized on the subject agreement morpheme are those of the object, not the subject.

## (2) Juan rika-wa-Ø-n (Cajamarca Quechua)

Juan see-1O-PRES-3S  
"Juan sees me"

## (3) Juan rika-shu-Ø-nki

Juan see-2O-PRES-2S  
"Juan sees you"

## (4) Juan rika-wa-Ø-nchiq

Juan see-1O-PRES-1INCL.S  
"Juan sees us(inclusive)"

The problems that this phenomenon generates for the CA approach are as follows. First, it is unexpected that there should be no anomaly when the object is 1<sup>st</sup> person exclusive (2), since the 1st person object should be able to satisfy the  $\phi$  features of  $v^*$ . Hence, there should be no need or possibility for agreement with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person external argument in this example. Secondly, affix ordering facts make it impossible to maintain that the affected subject agreement marker is in fact a manifestation of a  $\phi$ -bundle on  $v^*$ , as required by the CA theory. As shown in the affix order schema below (vastly simplified from Muysken 1981), the relevant marker surfaces outside of tense and aspect morphology, indicating that it is located in the IP domain (the position of the object markers is omitted from this schema and will be addressed presently).

## (5) Schematic representation of Quechua affix order in the verb

ROOT-ARGUMENT STRUCTURE-ASPECT-TENSE-SUBJAGR

**Analysis:** I propose that the A-SMA emerges from two interacting properties of Quechua grammar: (i) that the object markers are clitics rather than agreement morphemes; and (ii) that [Addressee]-related clitics raise higher in the clause than 1<sup>st</sup> person clitics do. This has the consequence that [Addressee]-related clitics end the derivation in the same phase domain as the subject and are thus eligible to undergo

Agree with the subject agreement probe, but this is not the case for 1<sup>st</sup> person exclusive clitics. This, in accordance with MAwC, produces the A-SMA pattern.

Point (i) is supported by many diagnostics which have been independently argued to distinguish clitics from agreement affixes. First, the object markers are able to undergo clitic climbing in restructuring contexts.

(6) a. Maqa-**wa**-y-ta muna-Ø-n (Cuzco Quechua)

Beat-1O-INF-ACC want-PRES-3S

b. Maqa-y-ta muna-**wa**-Ø-n

Beat-INF-ACC want-1O-PRES-3S

Both: “He wants to beat me” (Adapted from Lefebvre and Muysken 1988:246; their (134))

Second, the object markers are, in many varieties, not obligatory in the presence of an overt strong pronoun, which is unexpected of agreement but compatible with a clitic analysis (see Preminger 2009). Additionally, in some dialects structures where both a full pronoun and an object marker are present have special discourse interpretations reminiscent of Romance CLLD (Arregi 2003; Rizzi 1986, 1997; Cinque 1990). Imbabura Quechua exhibits both of these properties.

(7) a. Marya-ka riku-wa-rka-Ø (Imbabura Quechua)

Maria-TOP see-1O-PAST-3S

b. Marya-ka ñuka-ta riku-rka-Ø

Maria-TOP I-ACC see-PAST-3S

Both: “Maria saw me.”

c. Maria-ka ñuka-ta-mi riku-wa-rka-Ø

Maria-TOP I-ACC-EVID. see-1O-PAST-3S

“It was me that Maria saw.” (Cole 1982:103-4)

Finally, despite the fact that they frequently appear adjacent to tense markers, the Quechua object markers never display allomorphy conditioned by the features of T. The subject agreement markers, on the other hand, do show such allomorphy. This is an argument for the cliticness of Quechua object markers given Nevins’ (2010) observation that clitics never vary allomorphically for tense.

Point (ii) is supported by data from various dialects showing that the 2<sup>nd</sup> person clitic systematically occurs further away from the root in the verb word than 1<sup>st</sup> person clitics do. For space reasons I illustrate only from Cuzco Quechua, where the 2<sup>nd</sup> person clitic follows the tense morpheme, but the 1<sup>st</sup> person one precedes it.

(8) a. maylla-**rqa**-su-nki-chis (Cuzco Quechua)

wash-PAST-2O-2S-PL

“S/he washed you.”

b. maylla-wa-**rqa**-nki-ku

wash-1O-PAST-2S-PL

“You washed us(exclusive).” (Adapted from van de Kerke 1996:126, his (13))

Adapting a methodology pioneered in the cartographic literature on Romance, in which different heights of clitic movement are diagnosed with respect to adverb placement (Tortora 2002; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005), I argue that this indicates that 2<sup>nd</sup> person *-su* is raising to a position outside the vP phase, whereas 1<sup>st</sup> person *-wa* raises to a relatively low vP-internal position. This is schematized in (9) (AddrCIP is the position to which [Addressee] clitics are assumed to raise).

(9) [AGRSP [ADDRCLP [TP pro [VP...maylla-...-(wa)] -rqa] -(su)] nki-ku/chis]

wash (1O) PAST (2O) 2S-PL

**Take-home message:** Because it differs from CA in deriving Person Hierarchy Effects as a case of cliticization “feeding” agreement, MAwC implicitly predicts that Person Hierarchy Effects might apply selectively if there is differentiation in how high different types of clitic raise in a language. The Quechua A-SMA confirms this prediction, and poses problems for the CA approach. Thus we have an argument for MAwC over CA. **Selected References:** Béjar, Susana and Milan Rezac (2009) *Cyclic Agree* (Linguistic Inquiry 40:35-73) / Nevins, A. (2010) *Multiple agree with clitics: Person Complementarity vs. Omnivorous Number* (LingBuzz/ 001090)