

Madelyn Kissock
Linguistics Department
Harvard University
77 Dunster Street
Cambridge, MA 02138 USA

Evidence for T⁰ Raising to AgrS⁰

This paper argues that it is possible to deduce independent raising of T⁰ to AgrS⁰ based on verbal reflexive constructions in Telugu. Part I of the paper presents an analysis of Telugu reflexive/middle (r/m) morphology (indicated by a r/m marker which appears between the verb and [tense+p/n/g] agreement suffixes) which provides an explanation for the following empirical facts.

First, that unaccusatives/passives and reflexives are both formed with an r/m verbal marker as in:

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) a. <i>talupu terucukondi</i>
door open-r/m-past.3sg.n/f
'The door opened/was opened.' | b. <i>Ravi_i tanani_i kōsukonnāḍu</i>
R. self-acc cut-r/m-past.3sg.m
'Ravi cut himself.' |
|---|--|

Second, that pronouns cannot receive 'reflexive interpretation' within a clause without the presence of the r/m marker (2).

- | | |
|---|--|
| (2) a. * <i>Ravi_i tanani_i pōḍucāḍu</i>
R-nom self-acc stab-past3sgm
'Ravi stabbed himself.' | b. <i>Ravi_i tanani_i pōḍucukonnāḍu</i>
R-nom self-acc stab-r/m-past-3sgm
'Ravi stabbed(r/m) himself.' |
|---|--|

And third, that only structurally case-marked/checked reflexives are ungrammatical without the r/m marker (3).

- | | |
|---|--|
| (3) a. * <i>Ravi_i tanani_i cūsāḍu</i>
R-nom self-acc see- past-3sgm.
'Ravi saw himself.' | b. <i>Ravi_i tanadaggira_i pāmuni cūsāḍu</i>
R-nom self-near snake-acc see -past-3sgm
'Ravi saw a snake near himself.' |
|---|--|

The analysis proposes that the role of the r/m marker is purely syntactic--it mediates agreement between constituents in Spec,AgrO and Spec,AgrS via raising and successive adjunction (with the verbal complex) to these Agr heads, checking the agreement features of the constituents in Spec. If the features of the element in Spec,AgrO are a subset of the features of the element in Spec,AgrS, the derivation converges. For unacc./pass. types, the nominative-marked theme raises to Spec,AgrO checking agreement against the r/m marker on its way to Spec,AgrS (cf. Kayne's (1989) analysis of French participle agreement). Reflexives not bearing/checking structural case, as adjuncts, fall outside the INFL agreement system and are not subject to the same constraints. This analysis reduces reflexive-antecedent relations mediated by verbal morphology to an LF interpretation that is similar to that proposed in Chomsky (1986, 1993) for English wherein the reflexive raises at LF and adjoins to the verbal complex in the head of AGrS where it enters into a Spec-Head agreement relation with its antecedent, the only difference being that in the case of Telugu, the r/m marker borne by the verb contains the necessary agreement features so only the verbal complex bearing the r/m marker needs to adjoin to AGrS; the reflexive itself need not raise. The desirable results obtained by this analysis are that: 1) it supports the claim that cross-linguistic variation is limited to surface morpho-syntax but that LF representation is universal; and 2) it provides a one-to-one correspondence between r/m morphology and syntactic derivation, allowing the various interpretations (reflex. and pass/unacc) to fall out from irreducible lexical properties of individual verbs (i.e. single argument or multiple argument). The latter may be useful in explaining why we find that cross-linguistically a single type of surface string

representation (a verbal inflection class, a verb plus clitic sequence, or a verb plus reflexive pronoun sequence) is associated with not only a reflexive reading but also with (some combination of) middle/unaccusative/passive readings as shown in:

- | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (4) | Icel. | <i>Jón sest</i> | <i>Dyrnar opnað</i> |
| | | 'Jon seats himself' | 'The door opens' |
| | Fr. | <i>Jean s'est coupé</i> | <i>Pierre s'oublie facilement</i> |
| | | 'Jean cut himself' | 'Pierre is easily forgotten' |

Once this type of agreement relation has been hypothesized, Part II of the paper discusses the mechanism by which such agreement can take place within the adjunction structure produced by raising of the V, Agr, and T, heads. Assuming, in accordance with Chomsky (1993, p.28), that Baker's (1985) Mirror Principle is accurate and that it is possible within Checking Theory to "...capture generalizations that hold across morphology and syntax.", this section shows that the necessary agreement relation between r/m object features and subject features can hold only if T⁰ has independently adjoined to AgrS⁰ forming the complex [_{AgrS} T AgrS⁰]. Evidence from Telugu double object reflexive r/m constructions reveals the asymmetry exhibited in (5b) where an accusative object cannot be reflexive if there is a (non-reflex. or reflex.) dative object present (although no such constraint holds with other obliques (5c)).

- (5) a. *Ravi_i tanaki_i paṇḍuni kōsukonnāḍu*
 R-nom self-dat fruit-acc cut-r/m-past.3sg.m
 'Ravi cut (some/the) fruit for himself.'
- b. **Sridhar_i Pallaviki/tanaki_i tanani_i pōḍucukonnāḍu*
 S-nom Pallavi/self-dat self-acc stab-r/m-past-3sgm
 'Sridhar stabbed himself for himself/his own benefit.'
- c. *Sridhar_i Pallavikōsam tanani_i pōḍucukonnāḍu*
 S-nom P-benefic. self-acc stab-r/m-past-3sgm
 'Sridhar stabbed himself for Pallavi.'

Thus it appears that the key syntactic relation here is established by merger of (the highest) AgrO and [_{AgrS} T AgrS⁰], rendering them sisters. The alternative, that [_{AgrO} V AgrO] adjoins first to T⁰ and then the T complex adjoins to AgrS⁰, which results in a final merger of T and AgrS⁰, will, on the other hand, preclude agreement between AgrS and AgrO. The paper concludes by suggesting that the syntactic correlate of the Mirror Principle holds between paired syntactic categories, here AgrO and AgrS, whereas the corresponding morphological ordering is established at the level of X⁰ categories (where the order r/m marker-T-Agr still holds at the X⁰ levels of the adjunction structure).

- Baker, Mark (1985) "The Mirror Principle and Morphosyntactic Explanation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 373-415.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986b) *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. Praeger, New York.
- Chomsky, Noam (1993) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," in K. Hale & S.J. Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Kayne, Richard (1989) "Facets of Past Participle Agreement in Romance." in P. Beninca, ed., *Dialect Variation in the Theory of Grammar*. Foris, Dordrecht.