

Anti-agreement Effects as (Anti)-connectivity

Noureddine Elouazizi

Leiden University, ULCL research institute

1. Introduction

In this paper, I analyze some of the mechanics of anti-agreement effects (Henceforth AAE) in Berber. Namely, I will show that the process of agreement suppression and under-specification of phi-features and which accompanies the process of (WH)-subject extraction in Berber is reminiscent of a deeper asymmetry in (WH)-extraction. In particular, I propose that AAE in Berber is a case of connectivity failure (anti-connectivity) *à la* Higgins (1979), Akmajian (1979), Heycock and Kroch (1999) and Ross (2000, 2004), among others. It is a clefting strategy used by Berber to establish non-movement connectivity between a ‘dislocated’ (WH)-subject and its corresponding gap. This paper is organized into two main sections. In section one I characterize the phenomenon of anti-agreement briefly in Berber, with a special focus on the syntactic contexts which manifests AAE. Section two introduces a brief analysis of (WH)-subject and (WH)-object extraction in Berber and teases apart the properties of both movement processes by showing the existence of a WH-movement asymmetry in the two types of (WH)-extraction in Berber.

2. Characterizing the phenomenon and its properties

Anti-agreement is the phenomenon whereby verbal/inflectional morphology is sensitive to WH-subject extraction from a postverbal position in A-bar movement contexts. The phenomenon is attested in a wide range of genetically unrelated languages (See, e.g. Chung 1982 for Chamorro, Ouhalla 1993, 2004 for Berber, Schneider-Zioga 2000 for Kinande Bantu, a.o.) and encoded relatively differently in terms of the way the copy which marks the extraction site is spelt out. While in some languages, the extraction site is marked by the occurrence of a partially specified resumptive clitic or a weak pronoun (e.g. Northern Italian dialects, Salish, etc.) in others it is marked by a zero agreement inflection (e.g. Berber, Cf. Elouazizi 2005.d). In Berber, the canonical subject agreement inflectional morphology that is found in a declarative matrix clause undergoes a process of *radical agreement suppression* and cannot occur if one of the A-bar processes of relativization or clefting takes place. That is, AAE is accompanied by a process of *suppressing phi-features’ specifications* in the sense that once the process of (WH)-subject extraction has taken place, full subject-verb agreement switches into zero agreement.

To gain a clear view into the workings of AAE in Berber, it is necessary to introduce some preliminaries about the canonical subject-verb agreement patterns, the syntactic device which signals the surfacing of AAE process and the syntactic contexts in which it manifests. This will allow us a reasonable characterization of the syntactic process-es as well as the syntactic environment-s which trigger AAE. The pattern of subject-verb agreement in Berber is signaled by the affixation of subject agreement affixes to the verbal stem. This is illustrated by the table in (1).

* I would like to thank the people who helped me shape some of the ideas in this paper into their current form by their comments, objections, discussions and suggestions. My thanks go first and foremost to Johan Rooryck and Lisa Cheng for hours of discussions as well as for their encouragements. Thanks also to Martina Wiltschko, Rose Marie Déchaine, Réjean Canac-Marquis and the audience at WCCFL 24 (Vancouver) for useful comments and questions. Acknowledgement is due also to ULCL institute at Leiden University and LUF foundation for providing financial support to make this work possible. Any errors of facts or interpretation are mine.

(1)	Distribution of subject affixes	Illustration with the verb <i>ʃʃ</i> ‘eat’, conjugated into the perfective
1.sg.m/f	X - x	ʃʃi- x
2.sg.m/f	θ - X - ð	θ - ʃʃi- ð
3.sg.m.	i - X	i - ʃʃa
3.sg.f.	θ - X	θ - ʃʃa
1.pl.	n - X	n - ʃʃa
2.pl.m.	θ - X -m	θ - ʃʃi-m
2.pl.f.	θ - X -nt	θ - ʃʃi-nt
3.pl.masc.	X -n	ʃʃi-n
3.pl.f.	X - nt	ʃʃi-nt

In addition to the affixation of the subject agreement affixes in (1), Berber¹ encodes subjecthood by the optional occurrence of a postverbal or preverbal lexical subject.² The postverbal lexical subject in GTB fully agrees in its phi-features with the subject agreement affixes on the verbal stem as illustrated by the examples in (2.a-b) and (3.a-b). Let us call this normal agreement (henceforth NA).

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| (2) | a. | i-ʃʃa | w-a ^r yaz | ağrum |
| | | 3S.M-eat.PERF | CS-man.S.M | bread |
| | | ‘The/a man ate bread.’ | | |
| | b. | ʃʃi-n | y-a ^r yazn | ağrum |
| | | eat.PERF-3PL.M | CS-men.PL | bread |
| | | ‘The men ate bread.’ | | |
-
- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| (3) | a. | θ-ʃʃa | θa ^r bat | ağrum |
| | | 3S.F-eat.PERF | girl.S.F | bread |
| | | ‘The/a girl ate bread.’ | | |
| | b. | ʃʃi-nt | θa ^r baθin | ağrum |
| | | eat.PERF-3PL.F | girls.PL.F | bread |
| | | ‘The girls ate bread.’ | | |

The normal agreement pattern (NA) which shows up on the verb in (2.a-b and 3.a-b) and which is encoded by the occurrence of subject agreement affixes in (1), disappears in case the postverbal subject is A-bar moved as illustrated by the contrast between the (a) and (b) examples in (4) and (5) below. Instead of the usual subject agreement affixes, as (4.b) and (5.b) show, an invariable affix /y-X-n/ encapsulates the verbal stem.³ This is the affix which marks the anti-agreement contexts.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--|----------------------|-------|---------------------|---------------------|------|---------------------------|
| (4) | a. | y-sqad | w-a ^r yaz | rfrus | i | w-a ^r ba | (NA) | |
| | | 3S.M-send.PERF | CS-woman.S.M | money | to | CS-boy | | |
| | | ‘The/a man sent money to the boy.’ | | | | | | |
| | b. | a ^r yaz | i | (g) | y-sqad-n | rfrus | i | w-a ^r ba (AAE) |
| | | Man.S.M | RM | X | PART-send.PERF-PART | money | to | CS-boy |
| | | i-xʃʃd | | | | | | |
| | | 3S.M-arrive.PERF | | | | | | |
| | | ‘The man who sent money to the boy has arrived.’ | | | | | | |

¹ The variety of Berber referred to in this work is Guezenaya Taryfit Berber (Henceforth GTB). It is spoken in the north of Morocco. Most of the data comes from this variety unless indicated and documented otherwise.

² See, Galand (1977) Elouazizi (2005.d), among others for how the notion of subjecthood is encoded in Berber.

³ There is a consensus among Berber descriptivists that the participial verbal inflection /y-X-n/ does not belong to the five classes of verbal stems which constitute the Tense/Aspect/Mood (henceforth TAM) system of Berber and which is formed of the perfective, imperfective, perfective negative, imperfective negative and the aorist.

- (5) a. θ -sqad θ amatu θ rfrus i w-a^rba (NA)
3S.F-send.PERF woman.**S.F** money to CS-boy
 ‘The/a woman sent money to the boy.’
- b. θ amatu θ i (g) y-sqad-n rfrus i w-a^rba (AAE)
 woman.**S.F** RM X PART-send.PERF-PART money to CS-boy
 θ -xjfd
3S.F-arrive.PERF
 ‘The woman who sent money to the boy has arrived.’

The discontinuous affix described in (4.b) and (5.b) does not encode any of the phi-features. It is a zero agreement marker. That this is the case is shown by the data-samples in (6.a and b) where the fact of forcing subject-verb agreement in A-bar movement contexts triggers ungrammaticality.

- (6) a.* (ð) a^ryaz i (g) y-sqad rfrus i w-a^rba (NA)
 COP man.**S.M** RM X **3S.M-send.PERF** money to CS-boy
 ‘It is the man who sent money to the boy.’
- b.* (ð) θ amatu θ i (g) θ -sqad rfrus i w-a^rba (NA)
 COP woman.**S.F** RM X **3S.F-send.PERF** money to CS-boy
 ‘It is the woman who sent money to the boy.’

Now that I have identified the syntactic device which encodes AAE in Berber, next I provide a brief overview of the context-s which trigger-s its occurrence. The syntactic contexts which attest to the occurrence of AAE are the wh-sentences (Cf. 7.a-b), relative clauses (Cf. 8.a-c) and cleft constructions (Cf. 9.a-c).

WH-sentences

- (7) a. uw (g) y-wji-n />(*y-wja) lktab i Mena? (AAE)
 Who X PART-give.PERF-PART/(***3S.M-give.PERF**) book to Mena
 ‘Who gave the book to Mena?’
- b. min y-wja />(*y-wji-n) Jamal i Mena? (NA)
 what **3S.M-give.PERF**/(***PART-give.PERF-PART**) Jamal to Mena
 ‘What did Jamal give to Mena?’

Relative clauses

- (8) a. y-ssqad w-a^r yaz θ abrat i Mena (NA)
3S.M-send-PERF CS-man.**S.M** letter to Mena
 ‘The man sent the letter to Mena.’
- b. zri-x a^r yaz i (g) y-ssqad-n />(*y-ssqad)
 see.PERF-1S man. **S.M** RM X PART-send.PERF-PART/(***3S.M-send.PERF**)
 θ abrat i Mena (AAE)
 letter to Mena
 ‘I saw the man who sent the letter to Mena.’
- c. θ abrat i (g) y-ssqad />(*y-ssqad-n) w-a^r yaz
 letter RM X **3S.M-send.PERF**/(***PART-send.PERF-PART**) CS-man **S.M**
 i Mena θ -xjfd d
 to Mena **3S.F-arrive.PERF** CLdir
 ‘The letter which the man sent to Mena has arrived.’ (NA)

Cleft constructions

- (9) a. y-sqad w-a^r yaz θ abrat (NA)
3S.M-send.PERF CS-man.**S.M** letter
 ‘The man sent the/a letter.’
- b. (t) tabrat i (g) y-sqad w-a^r yaz (NA)
 COP letter CM X **3S.M-send.PERF** CS-man.**S.M**
 ‘It is a letter that the man sent.’

c.	(ð)	a ¹	yaz	i	(g)	y-sqad-n		/([*] y-sqad)	θabrat
	COP	man.S.M	CM	X	PART-send.PERF-PART/	([*] 3S.M-send.PERF)			letter
	'It is the man who sent the letter.'								(AAE)

Note that the syntactic contexts illustrated in (7-9) and which exhibit the occurrence of AAE show that the /y-X-n/ morphology which encodes the appearance of AAE is found only in the contexts of the extraction of the (WH)-subject (Cf. 7.a; 8.b and 9.c), all of which register the extraction of the (WH)-subject in WH sentences, in relative clauses and in cleft constructions, respectively. However, if it is the (WH)-object which is extracted, AAE does not surface and the extraction site is marked by a fully agreeing affix, witness (8.c) and (9.b).

The empirical picture which emerges from the facts described above indicates that the surfacing of the AAE is bound to the syntactic process of (WH)-subject but not (WH)-object extraction in A-bar movement contexts (Cf. Ouhalla 1993). This asymmetry is further reinforced by another correlation, namely the fact that the extraction sites (gaps) in the (WH)-object and the (WH)-subject are marked differently. While the extraction of the (WH)-subject is recorded by the occurrence of AAE, which is a suppression process of the phi-features which mark the agreement of the subject and verb, that of the (WH)-object is recorded differently as the antecedent maintains a full agreement with the resumptive elements which marks the extraction site.

This state of affairs poses a challenge for the by now standard assumption about the mechanics of the copy-theory-of-movement (Chomsky, 1993, 1995, 2000). In terms of copy-theory-of-movement, the copy of the moved constituent needs to be identical to its antecedent and as such allow for: (i) the marking of the content of the gap and (ii) the recoverability of its referential properties. Likewise, under a pronounce-minimal-copy approach (Pesetsky 1998), the mismatch in the features of the gap (extraction site) and the filler (antecedent) is also unexpected, as copies, by definition, must have identical phi-features. If copy features' mismatch is allowed among copies of the same lexical item, then it will not be clear how reconstruction can operate in AAE contexts.

3. The analysis

3.1. Previous accounts

Let us first briefly discuss some of the AAE-related proposals that have been made within the principles and parameters/minimalist framework. Note that some of these proposals just touched on Berber AAE in passing (e.g. Boeckx 2003) and others dealt with it as a research issue on its own (e.g. Ouhalla 1993 and partially in Ouhalla 2004).

3.1.1. Binding theoretic view of AAE

The first analysis of Berber AAE in Ouhalla (1993) attributes the obligatory lack of agreement between the verb and the subject to the local extraction of the latter. Ouhalla (1993) argues that AAE is a strategy used by Berber (and some other null subject languages) to avoid the licensing of a resumptive *pro* in the closest subject position. The necessity of this strategy follows from the fact that a resumptive *pro* in this position would be accessible to A-bar binding by the moved (WH)-subject, in violation of A-bar disjointness requirement on the distribution of pronominal elements. I will depart from this analysis (yet keep its fundamental observations about AAE) as I do not build on concepts pertaining to Binding theory. I assume along the lines of Kayne, (2002), Dechaine and Wiltschko (2004) that the effects of Binding theory within the Minimalist program are to follow from movement properties. Opting for this line of reasoning about AAE implies a reinterpretation of its fundamental properties in terms of movement. However, as I will shortly show in what follows, explaining AAE by movement is the wrong option.

3.1.2. Deriving AAE by sub-extraction and (non-)agreeing complementisers

In his general analysis of resumption, Boeckx (2003) assumes that extraction depends on complementiser agreement. He assumes that the anti-agreement facts can be explained by making recourse to the interaction of sub-extraction and agreement on the complementisers. It is possible to

extract freely as far as there is no agreement and in such cases no island effect emerges. Hence, non-agreement correlates with extractability. The “resumptive” chains which are formed by non-agreeing complementiser are insensitive to both of weak and strong islands (Boeckx, 2003:69). Though the intuition behind this idea is appealing, yet it is not possible to replicate this analysis for the AAE facts of Berber. For, in this variety, the nature of the agreement on the complementiser is invariable, regardless of the manifestation of AAE. That is, though the complementiser is inflected with zero agreement for both of (WH)-subject extraction and (WH)-object extraction (Cf. 10.b and 10.c), yet there is an asymmetry with respect to extraction in the sense that island effect emerges with (WH)-object extraction but not with (WH)-subject extraction.

- (10) a. wa θ -wji θ amgha^f θ lktab i Mina (NA)
 NEG 3S.F-give.NEG.PERF woman.S.F book to Mina
 ‘The woman did not give the book to Mina.’
- b. man θ amgha^f θ i wa y-wji-n (AAE)
 which woman.S.F RM NEG PART-give.NEG.PERF-PART
 /(* θ -wji) man lktab i Mina
 /(*3S.F-give.NEG.PERF) which book to Mina
 ‘Who is the woman who did not give which book to Mina?’
- c. man lktab i wa θ -wji (NA)
 which book RM NEG 3S.F-give.NEG.PERF
 /(*y-wji-n) man θ amgha^f θ i Mina
 /(*PART-give.NEG.PERF-PART) which woman.S.F to Mina
 ‘Which book which woman did not give to Mina?’

3.1.3. Deriving AAE by verb movement

Phillips (1998) and Ouhalla (2004) share the view that AAE is derived by the inability of the verb to move to a position where it agrees with the subject agreement affix. To articulate the essence of their proposals, consider the examples in (11) and (12).

- (11) min y-sğa manwn (NA)
 what 3S.M-buy.PERF who.3S.M
 ‘What who bought?’
- (12) manwn y-sği-n manayn (AAE)
 who PART-buy.PERF-PART what
 ‘Who bought what?’

What (11) shows is that the verb is in a higher position than the (WH)-subject. This becomes apparent once (11) is compared with (12). In (12), the verb exhibits AAE. Hence, in this case it might be tempting to claim that the verb is somehow in a position lower than AGRP. However, though this line of reasoning about AAE is attractive, yet it incorrectly predicts that in the cases which attest the inability of the verb to raise to an agreement projection and where the verb always follows the cluster of object clitics (hereafter OCC), for example, the order [CL-V] is expected to always induce AAE effect. As the examples in (13.a-b) show, this is not born out.

- (13) a. mri δ arba i s t id (AAE)
 if COP boy.S.M CM CL_{DAT} CL_{ACC} CL_{DIR}
 y-nda-n iri y-ttffi t
 PART-throw.PERF-PART then 3S.M.catch.PERF CL_{ACC}
 ‘If it was the boy who threw it to him, he could have been able to catch it.’ [OCC-V]
- b. mri s t id y-nda w-arba (NA)
 if CL_{DAT} CL_{ACC} CL_{DIR} 3S.M-throw.PERF CS-boy.S.M
 iri i-ttffi t
 then 3S.M.catch.PERF CL_{ACC}
 ‘If the boy threw it to him, he could have been able to catch it.’ [OCC-V]

The distribution of object clitics cluster in (13.a-b) indicates that the (in-)ability of verb movement to a higher position does not trigger AAE. OCC in (13.a) and (13.b) is in exactly the same position with respect to the verb, despite the appearance of AAE in (13.a/A-bar context (clefting) of (WH)-subject extraction) and its absence in (13.b/context of non-extraction).

3.2. An alternative view: Anti-agreement effects as anti-connectivity effects

Recall that one of the striking properties of AAE in Berber is that the copy in the gap position and the antecedent to which it is referentially linked do not share any of their phi-features' specifications and that this stands in contrast with the extraction of (WH)-object. With the latter the phi-features of the gap fully match the ones of its antecedent, with which it establishes a referential and a syntactic chain. I take it that the apparent asymmetry of <filler>-<gap> in AAE and non-AAE contexts is reminiscent of a much more abstract asymmetry; namely that the <filler>-<gap> connection is not established only by movement and confined to the syntactic component of the grammar.

I propose that AAE in Berber is a case of connectivity failure (anti-connectivity). It is a clefting strategy used by Berber to establish a non-movement connectivity between a 'dislocated' (WH)-subject and its corresponding gap.⁴ That is, AAE constructions attest to the absence of movement-based connectivity effects. In AAE contexts, (WH)-subjects' interpretative dependencies do not follow entirely from syntactic movement. If this line of reasoning is correct in claiming that the relation between the trace variable and the (WH)-subject in AAE contexts is not due to movement, then it would be expected that the AAE constructions will not exhibit the usual A-bar movement dependencies. I will introduce four arguments to show that this exactly the case.

3.2.1. Absence of phi-features on the subject, the verb and on the relative pronoun

Consider the example in (14-15).

- (14) a. θ -sqad θ amatu θ rfrus i w-a^rba (NA)
 3S.F-send.PERF woman.S.F money to CS-boy
 'The woman sent money to the boy.'
- b. (t) θ amatu θ i (g) y-sqad-n rfrus i w-a^rba
 COP woman.S.F RM X PART-send.PERF-PART money to CS-boy
 'It is the woman who sent money to the boy.' (AAE)
- (15) a. ζ arrajul-u huwa ζ lla θ i arrsala ζ nnuq θ da ζ ila llw θ ladi (NA)
 man.NOM him.3S.M who.3S.M send.PERF.3S.M money to the boy
 'It is the man who sent the money to the boy.' (Standard Arabic)
- b. ζ lmar ζ t-u hiya ζ llatti arrsalat ζ nnuq θ da ζ ila llw θ ladi (NA)
 woman.NOM she.3S.F who.3S.F send.PERF.3S.F money to the boy
 'It is the woman who sent the money to the boy.' (Standard Arabic)

If the main stream view that the surfacing of agreement marking on different heads which can separate the original site from the landing site of a moving constituent is an indication of the movement path of the latter (Cf. Pollock 1989, Belletti 1991, Chung 1998 a.o.) is correct, then it is possible to read the AAE facts in (14.b) and (15) as attesting to the absence of movement of the extracted (WH)-subject. The extracted (WH)-subject, the relative/cleft particle and the subject agreement on V do not show any phi-features agreement in Berber (Cf. 14.b). This becomes clearer when compared with its equivalent in

⁴ For reasons of space, I deliberately ignore the clefty character of the A-bar movement constructions which exhibit AAE. I argue in Elouazizi (2005.d) that all the operator-movement constructions which constitute an operational domain of AAE are actually clefts in disguise. Among the arguments, I advance to support this stance is the fact that all the operator movement constructions in Berber attest to the occurrence of the same invariable cleft marker *i*

- (i) a. COP [f. XP_{Subject}] [CP Op_i i zero agreement [vP zero agreement t_i]]] (Subjectcleft construction)
 b. ~~COP~~ [f. XP_{Subject}] [CP Op_i i zero agreement [vP zero agreement t_i]]] (Subject relative clauses)
 c. ~~COP~~ [f. XP_{Subject}] [CP Op_i i zero agreement [vP zero agreement t_i]]] (Subject wh-clauses)

Standard Arabic (Cf. 15. a and b). In Standard Arabic, the (WH)-subject moves successive cyclically and the intermediate landing sites are marked by agreement which shows up on the verb as well as on the complementiser, both of which agree with the dislocated (fronted subject). Moreover, in case the copy/trace which marks the extraction site (gap) in AAE context is generated by the movement of the (WH)-subject (antecedent), it is expected that it matches the phi-features of its antecedent. This is not the case in AAE context, however.

3.2.2. Extraction of WH-object across WH-subject

On the face of it, the evidence presented in (14-15) is circumstantial. Hence follows the necessity of putting forward additional evidence. The second piece of evidence for the analysis I put forward comes from islands effects and subjacency. Consider the following examples.

- (16) a. sqssa-n ma y-wja Jamal lktab i w-arba
ask.PERF-3PL.M whether 3S.M-give.PERF J. book to CS-boy
'They asked whether Jamal gave the book to the boy.'
(NA)
- b. man lktab ixef sqssa-n ma ð Jamal i *(θ)
which book about ask.PERF-3PL.M whether COP J. RM CL_{ACC}
y-wji-n i w-arba
PART-give.PERF-PART to CS-boy
'Which book did they wonder whether it is Jamal who gave it to the boy?'
(AAE)

In (16.b) the extraction of the (WH)-subject does not block the extraction of the (WH)-object. Under the classical analysis of WH-island effects that attributes them to the Subjacency Condition, the fact that (16b) does not exhibit an island effect indicates that the (WH)-subject in the embedded clause does not occupy a [SPEC CP], thereby does not block successive-cyclic movement of the (WH)-object *which book* (man lktab). Moreover, that the (WH)-object *which book* in (16.b) has moved successive cyclically is shown by the data in (17.a-d) and where the (WH)-object *which book* appears in different intermediate positions.

- (17) a. y-sqssa Jamal ma i-ġir w-arba qa
3S.M-ask.PERF Jamal whether 3S.M-believe.PERF CS-boy that
y-ssjfmð Omar **man lktab**
3S.M-burn.PERF Omar which book
'Jamal asked the boy whether he believed that Omar burned which book.'
- b. y-sqssa Jamal ma i-ġir w-arba qa
3S.M-ask.PERF Jamal whether 3S.M-believe.PERF CS-boy that
y-ssjfmð **man lktab** Omar
3S.M-burn.PERF which book Omar
'Jamal asked the boy whether he believed that Omar burned which book.'
- c. y-sqssa Jamal x **man lktab** i g i-ġir
3S.M-ask.PERF Jamal about which book RM X 3S.M- believe.PERF
w-arba qa y-ssjfmði *(θ) Omar
CS-boy that 3S.M-burn.PERF CL_{ACC} Omar
'Jamal asked about which book did the boy believe that Omar burned it.'
- d. **man lktab** ixef y-sqssa Jamal ma i-ġir
which book about 3S.M-ask.PERF Jamal whether 3S.M-believe.PERF
w-arba qa y-ssjfmð *(θ) Omar
CS-boy that 3S.M-burn.PERF CL_{ACC} Omar
'Which book did Jamal ask the boy whether he believed that Omar burned it.'

Note that the occurrence of the object clitic in the embedded clause in (17. c and d) is obligatory. It corefers with the moved (WH)-object antecedent. It has a resumptive function and attests to the cyclic character of the movement of (WH)-object *which book* (man lktab). Next, consider the way AAE tests with respect to weak crossover effect.

3.2.3. Weak crossover effect

The lack of WCO in AAE contexts (Cf. 18) confirms the nature of the extracted subject as an adjoined position, which can not hold a semantic variable, since it is not a theta position. Adjunction does not create an island. It is different from A-bar movement through [SPEC CP] which creates an island by blocking up the escape hatches. This indicates that the empty position in [SPEC vP] is not an A-bar trace and contains no variable and hence no weak crossover configuration is created.

- (18) (ð) [ymas n kur arba]_j i g [_{vP} i-texsše-n t_j memi-s_j]
 COP mother-his of every boy CM X PART-love.IMPERF-PART son-his/her
 ‘It is the mother of every boy who loves her son.’ (AAE)

Therefore, the (WH)-subject is possibly base generated outside the CP, as adjoined to CP, e.g. in a topic /focus phrase and presumably this is why the copy trace of the (WH)-subject in AAE contexts shows no sensitivity to weak crossover effect.

3.2.4. Reconstruction

A final piece of evidence which corroborate the independent findings introduced in the preceding three arguments comes from reconstruction. Consider the constructions in (19.a-d) where I am after the detection of reconstruction effects in AAE contexts. I assume that reconstruction can be dependent on movement. As such, I read any failure in reconstruction possibilities in AAE contexts as an indication for the absence of movement in such constructions.

- (19) a. y-siwrr Muhand_j ag Omar_i x ixefiness_{i/j}
 3S.M-talk.PERF Muhand with Omar about himself
 ‘Muhand talked with Omar about himself.’ (NA)
- b. ð ixefiness_{i/j} ixef y-siwrr Muhand_j ag Omar_i
 COP himself about 3S.M-talk.PERF Muhand with Omar
 ‘It is himself that Muhand talked with Omar about.’ (NA)
- c. ð Muhand_j i g y-siwrr-n ag Omar_i x ixefiness_{i/*j}
 COP Muhand CM X PART-talk.PERF-PART with Omar about himself
 ‘It is Muhand who talked with Omar about himself.’ (AAE)
- d. ð Omar_i i kð y-siwrr Muhand_j x ixefiness_{i/*j}
 COP Omar CM with 3S.M-talk.PERF Muhand about himself
 ‘It is with Omar that Muhand talked about himself.’ (NA)

What emerges from the data paradigm in (19.a-d) is that there is a failure of reconstruction in AAE context ((WH)-subject extraction/Cf. 19.c) and which presumably follows from the fact that there is a copy features mismatch among copies of (presumably) the same lexical item. That is, the copy of its features in the gap, which mark the extraction site do not match those of the A-bar antecedent. That this might be the case is further reinforced by the possibility of reconstruction in normal agreement contexts (NA contexts) as attested by the (WH)-object extraction/ in (19.d). This is because the copy features in the A-bar trace match those of the antecedent. Therefore, the coreference possibility of the reflexive is established in object clefting but not subject clefting. This indicates that reconstruction presumably operates in NA but not in AAE. AAE seems to be a context of connectivity failure (anti-connectivity) where the coreference possibilities superset those in simple sentences.

4. Conclusions

Three main empirical conclusions follow from the battery of arguments introduced above so as to characterize the movement properties of AAE in Tarifyt Berber.

- (i) There is an asymmetry between (WH)-subject and (WH)-object constructions with respect to movement constraints in Berber.
- (ii) The kind of referential dependency chain and configuration established in AAE, presumably, does not follow from syntactic movement.
- (iii) AAE contexts attest to the absence of movement induced connectivity between a (WH)-subject gap and its antecedent. As such it is, presumably, a case of superset connectivity failure *à la* Ross (2004).

These conclusions all converge on the absence of movement in AAE contexts. This might be taken to hint indirectly to the possibility of analyzing the <filler>-<gap> connection in the context of (WH)-subject extraction in Berber along the lines of a base generation approach, implemented by the deployment of AGREE technology to distantly value the features on the antecedent and the gap. I equally give up on a base generation view as I do on a movement approach. I abandon a movement approach because the battery of empirical evidence introduced above militates against it. The reason I do not pin too much faith on an AGREE approach is due to the fact that AGREE functions by relying on the identity (matching) of the features of the goal and the probe, a prerequisite which is not a priori available in AAE contexts. Thus, the approach advanced above establishes a WH-asymmetry in terms of the extractability of the (WH)-subject and the (WH)-object in Berber. This constitutes an important fundamental conclusion which adds to the previously established observations about AAE in Berber (Cf. Ouhalla 1993, 2004) and which can pave the way for further decoding of other puzzles of AAE.

References

- Akmajian, A. (1979). *Aspects of the grammar of focus in English*. New York: Garland.
- Boeckx, C. (2003). *Islands and Chains: Resumption as Stranding*. John Benjamins Publication
- Belletti, Adriana. (1991). *Generalized verb movement: Aspects of verb syntax*, Rosenberg & Sellier, Torino
- Chomsky, Noam. (1993). A Minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds), 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In *Step by Step: Essays in honor of Howard Lasnik*. R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds), 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chung, Sandra. (1982). Unbounded dependencies in Chamorro grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 13: 39-77.
- Chung, Sandra. (1998). *The Design of Agreement: Evidence from Chamorro*. The University of Chicago Press
- Dechaine, R-M. and Wiltschko, M. (2004). Dissolving Condition A. GLOW handout.
- Elouazizi, Noureddine. (2005.d). *The referential dependencies and linear properties of object clitics in Berber*. Ms., ULCL, Leiden University.
- Galand, L. (1977). "Continuité et renouvellement d'un system verbal: le cas du berbère", *Bulletin de la société de Linguistique de Paris* 72-1, 275-303.
- Higgins, F.R. (1979). *The pseudo-cleft construction in English*. New York: Garland.
- Heycock, C. & A. Kroch. (1999). Pseudocleft connectedness: Implications for the LF interface level. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 365-97
- Kayne, Richard. (2002). Pronouns and their antecedents. In *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*. S. Epstein & D. Seely (eds). Oxford: Blackwell
- Ouhalla, Jamal. (1993). Subject Extraction, Negation and the Anti-agreement Effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11, 477-518.
- Ouhalla, Jamal. (2004/to appear). Agreement, Anti-agreement and the EPP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Phillips, C. (1998). Disagreement between Adults and Children. In Amaya Mendikoetxea and Miriam Uribe Etxebarria (eds.), *Theoretical issues in the morphology-syntax interface*, 173-212. ASJU, San Sebastian.
- Pesetsky David. (1998). Some optimality principles of sentence pronunciation. In *Is the best good enough?* P. Barbosa, D. Fox, P. Hagstrom, M. McGinnis and D. Pesetsky (eds), 337-83. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989), 'Verb movement, universal grammar and the structure of IP', *LI* 20: 365-424.
- Ross, John Robert. (2000). 'The Frozenness of Pseudoclefts—Towards an Inequality-based Syntax', in John P. Boyle and Arika Okrent (eds.), *CLS* 36, Chicago, pp. 385–426.
- Ross, John Robert. (2004). The architecture of emphasis, unpublished ms., University of North Texas.
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. (2000). Anti-agreement and the fine structure of the left edge. University of California Irvine Working Papers in Linguistics 6.

Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by John Alderete,
Chung-hye Han, and Alexei Kochetov

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2005

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2005 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 1-57473-407-5 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Elouazizi, Nouredine. 2005. Anti-agreement Effects as (Anti)-connectivity. In *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. John Alderete et al., 120-128. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Elouazizi, Nouredine. 2005. Anti-agreement Effects as (Anti)-connectivity. In *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. John Alderete et al., 120-128. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1214.