Shigeru Miyagawa: *Agreement beyond Phi*

Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2017. xvii + 223pp.

Satoko Osawa

1. Introduction

Since the principle and parameter approach to a fundamental linguistic issue, how the universality and diversity of natural languages arises, was questioned in the minimalist program, an alternative approach has been sought. As a potential solution, Miyagawa proposed Strong Uniformity (SU) in his earlier work (Miyagawa 2010).

(1) Strong Uniformity
Every language shares the same set of grammatical features, and every language overtly manifests these features.(Miyagawa 2010: 2)

Under SU in (1), it is hypothesized that every language is equipped with agreement features (ϕ -features) and topic/focus features (δ -features) as a uniform set of grammatical features. Miyagawa's approach reflects Chomsky's Uniformity Principle, which proposes that a linguistic theory "assume languages to be uniform, with variety restricted to easily detectable properties of utterance" (Chomsky 2001: 2), since under SU, languages are uniform in that they share the same grammatical features. In this approach, languages can be diverse due to the different properties of the highly limited set of features that are detectable. *Agreement beyond Phi* is a further exploration of SU, focusing on the language typology predicted by SU. With the assumption that the grammatical features are

borne in C and then can be inherited by T, SU predicts four language patterns in (2).

(2) Category I: C_{ϕ}, T_{δ} — Japanese, Korean
Category II: C_{δ}, T_{ϕ} — English, Chinese
Category III: C, $T_{\phi/\delta}$ — Spanish
Category IV: $C_{\phi/\delta}$, T- — Dinka

Chapter 1 of this book introduces the background of SU and the predicted language typology. An immediate question that arises under SU is how apparent agreementless languages such as Japanese and Chinese are categorized. These two languages are discussed in depth in Chapters 2 and 3. In addition to the predicted typology, Chapters 2–4 discuss how SU accounts for language variation such as politeness marking, sloppy interpretation, and the externally-merged option of 'why.' Chapter 5, adopted from Miyagawa (2013), provides evidence that a grammatical feature triggers movement.

In this brief review, section 2 will summarize the evidence for agreement in Japanese, followed by the language variation based on SU in section 3. Concluding remarks are given in section 4.

2. Agreement in Japanese

One of the tasks imposed on SU is to show that even languages with no agreement morphology, such as Japanese (Category I), have ϕ-features. Miyagawa claims that in Japanese, the politeness marking *-mas-* is the ϕ-feature agreement in C.

(3) Watasi-wa piza-o tabe-**mas**-u./tabe -u.
I-TOP pizza-ACC eat-MAS-PRS/eat- PRS
'I eat pizza (formal)/(colloquial).'

As shown in (3), *-mas-* appears as part of the verbal morphology to add politeness and targets a hearer who is superior to the speaker. Miyagawa argues that *-mas-* is analogous to the allocutive agreement found in certain

dialects of Basque, which agrees with a hearer, namely 2nd person. Consider the example taken from Oyharçabal (1993).

(4) Pettek lan egin di**k**.
Peter. ERG work.ABS do.PRF AUX—3SG.ABS- 2SG.COLLOQ.M -3SG.ERG
allocutive agr. subj.agr.

In (4), while the verbal ending agrees with the 3rd person subject, the allocutive agreement is manifested as 2nd person, targeting the hearer. Since the Japanese politeness marker is also directed at a hearer, it is claimed that *-mas-* is the manifestation of the 2nd person ϕ-feature, as with the Basque allocutive agreement. In addition, the distribution of *-mas-* and allocutive agreement in Basque is parallel. Miyagawa discusses that *-mas-* can occur only in the root environments in the sense of Emonds (1969), which are "either the highest S in a tree, an S immediately dominated by the highest S, or the reported S in direct discourse" (Emonds 1969: 6). The occurrence of allocutive agreement in Basque is also limited to the main clause. Furthermore, it is not allowed when C is occupied by a question morpheme, which indicates a close association between allocutive agreement and C. With the parallel behaviors, it is concluded that-*mas-* is the ϕ-feature agreement in C; thus, Japanese has ϕ-feature agreement.

3. SU and Language Variation

Let us see how SU can account for language variation: sloppy interpretation and externally-merged 'why,' discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, respectively.

In the Japanese examples below, the null argument allows both a strict interpretation, i.e., a pronominal interpretation, and a sloppy interpretation, i.e., an indefinite interpretation.

(5) a. Mariko-wa [zibun-no kodomo-ga furansugo-o benkyoosuru to] omotteiru.
Mariko-TOP self-GEN child-NOM French-ACC study that think
b. Haruna-wa [*e* surobeniago-o benkyoosuru to] omotteiru.
Haruna-TOP Slovenian-ACC study that think

The null argument *e* in (5b) can be Mariko's child (strict reading) or Haruna's child (sloppy reading). It has been pointed out in the literature, however, that sloppy interpretation is difficult in Chinese and Romance languages without proper contexts if not impossible. Miyagawa claims that the language variation in sloppy interpretation can be explained in terms of SU. Contrary to prevailing analyses that the null argument in a sloppy interpretation results from some sort of ellipsis, he accepts Oikonomou's claim that the null argument is a *pro* and its sloppy interpretation is due to an E-type pronoun (Oikonomou 2017). Consider the example in (6).

(6) The man who gave his paycheck to his wife was wiser than the man who gave **it** to his child.

An E-type pronoun is an unbound anaphoric pronoun replaced by a full NP whose semantic content is retrieved from the discourse context, and the pronoun *it* in (6) can be interpreted indirectly from the context as the second man's paycheck. Given that sloppy interpretation is an instance of an E-type pronoun, the question here is why an E-type pronoun interpretation is readily available in Japanese but difficult in Chinese and Romance languages. Miyagawa further claims that when the subject is a topic, it makes sloppy reading difficult because a topic has a specific reading with a direct antecedent, which conflicts with an E-type pronoun reading.

In Chinese, the subject *pro* is a topic due to its characterization of being a weak pronoun that lacks both ϕ-features and a referential index (Liu 2014). To compensate for the deficiency, Miyagawa proposes that Chinese *pro* must get either ϕ-features or δ-features, assuming that these features are computationally equivalent under SU. Since Chinese belongs to

Category II, the *pro* must get the ϕ-feature from T or the δ-feature from C. In the relevant construction, however, Miyagawa claims that the *pro* cannot get the ϕ-feature from the local T and hence it must move to Spec CP to get the δ-feature from C, where the *pro* is interpreted as a topic. In Romance languages, Category III with ϕ-features and δ-features on T, the subject *pro* also has a topic nature. Under the assumption that agreement induces movement (Miyagawa 2010), the subject *pro* moves to Spec TP due to the ϕ-features inherited by T. At the same time, the *pro* becomes a topic since T inherits the δ-feature as well. On the other hand, Japanese has no subject agreement and the subject *pro* stays in Spec *v*P. Notice that the ϕ-feature of Japanese does not induce subject movement since it agrees with the hearer but not the subject. Staying in Spec *v*P, the *pro* can be interpreted as an indefinite pronoun, which makes an E-type pronoun reading readily available.

Another discussion on language variation concerns the externally-merged (EM) option of 'why,' such as *how come* in English. Consider (7).

(7) a. How come you left? / * How come did you leave?
b. How come John said Mary left?

Unlike *why*, *how come* does not induce Aux inversion as in (7a); in addition, it takes scope unambiguously at the CP where it occurs in (7b). These facts indicate that no movement is involved and that *how come* is externally merged into Spec CP.

Although the EM option of 'why' is available in some languages, Miyagawa argues that this option is allowed only for Category II languages, in which the δ-feature of focus (but not topic) remains in C. With an examination of the 'why'-question in European Portuguese in (8), he shows that focus on C is involved with the EM option.

(8) a. Porque veio o João? b. Porquê o João veio?
Why came João Why João came

As indicated by the presence/absence of verb inversion, 'why' in (8a) undergoes movement while 'why' in (8b) is externally merged into Spec

CP. Since only the latter is accompanied by focus, Miyagawa claims that the EM option is associated with the δ-feature of focus on C. This analysis further predicts that the EM option is unavailable for Japanese because the δ-feature is inherited by T in this language. While previous studies claim that 'why' in Japanese, *naze*, is externally merged into Spec CP, Miyagawa provides evidence from idioms such as *mune-o itamete-iru* (to be worried) to suggest that *naze* occurs within *v*P.

(9) a. Tanaka-wa mune-o yoku itamete-iru.
Tanaka-TOP chest-ACC frequently hurt
b. *Mune-o Tanaka-wa itamete-iru.
Chest- ACC Tanaka-TOP hurt
c. Tanaka-wa mune-o naze itamete-iru no?
Tanaka-TOP chest-ACC why hurt Q

As the examples in (9a-b) show, the object of the idiom can undergo short-scrambling within *v*P across the adverb but it cannot scramble to the TP region across the topic. Therefore, in (9c) the object undergoes short-scrambling across *naze* within *v*P. Miyagawa concludes that *naze* occurs within *v*P before undergoing covert movement to CP for scope taking, and thus Japanese has no EM potion of 'why' as predicted by SU.

4. Concluding Remarks

As we have seen, Miyagawa pursues the SU approach for language universality and diversity. He argues for the presence of ϕ-features in agreementless languages to claim that ϕ-features are shared by every language as assumed by SU. He also demonstrates how language variation results from the typological difference based on SU. Importantly, Miyagawa's arguments suggest that SU and the predicted typology can be a theoretical tool to account for language diversity. However, the validity of the SU-based account crucially depends on the success of his analyses, and there are some issues that are open to question. Let us consider

subject movement, for instance. Miyagawa claims that the subject moves to Spec TP in Romance languages while it stays in Spec *v*P in Japanese due to the presence/absence of agreement. Despite association between agreement and movement, it is still controversial if agreement triggers movement and, moreover, there is evidence in the literature to show that the Japanese subject moves to Spec TP. Another consideration concerns the δ -feature that covers both topic and focus. Since topic and focus can appear in different positions with distinct effects, dealing with them as the same feature can be misleading. Furthermore, if they are distinct features, more complex language patterns should be examined. Setting aside these issues, it is obvious that the SU approach proposed in *Agreement beyond Phi* contributes to the current linguistic theory as an attempt to implement Uniformity Principle.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Emonds, Joseph. 1969. *Root and structure-preserving transformation*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Liu, Chi-Ming. 2014. *A modular theory of radical pro drop*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why agree? Why move? Unifying agreement-based and discourse configurational languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2013. Strong uniformity and *ga/no* conversion. *English Linguistics* 30: 1–24.

Oikonomou, Despina. 2017. Sloppy *pro* in Greek: An E-type analysis. In *Proceedings of the fifty-second annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Jessica Kantarovich, Tran Tuong and Orest Xherija. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Oyharçabal, Beñat. 1993. Verb agreement with non agreements: On allocutive agreement. In *Generative studies in Basque linguistics*, ed. by José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina, 89–114. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.