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1. Two Approaches to Antiagreement

- **Definition:** Antiagreement
  - "In some languages, (local) extraction of the subject requires a special form of the verb whose main characteristic is that its ... inflection does not agree with that of the extracted subject." Ouhalla 1993
  - **Central Question:** does antiagreement implicate syntactic subject positions?

1. The Syntactic Approach: **Extraction Skips Subject Position** Brandi & Cordin 1989
   - **Observation:** antiagreement typically arises with subject agreement. Ouhalla 1993
   - **Connection:** cross-linguistic constraints on subject extraction. Chomsky 1981, Rizzi 2006
   - **Proposal:** antiagreement arises when extracting arguments *skip* canonical subject position.
     - Movement constraints block direct extraction from the projection linked to subject agreement.
   - **Claim:** antiagreement references subject position; arises only with subjects.

2. The Morphological Approach: **Subject Position Irrelevant** Baier 2018
   - Antiagreement *not* linked to constraints on subject extraction; purely morphological.
     - **Issue:** Probes copy both ϕ- and wh, foc, rel-features; cannot spell out both.
   - **Key evidence:** object antiagreement in Selayarese (South Sulawesi, Austronesian)
     - Baier (2018): this *does not* involve extraction through a subject position.
     - **Result:** antiagreement formally delinked from constraints on subject extraction.

3. **Today’s Claim:** Antiagreement *does* make reference to subject position (elsewhere) in South Sulawesi.

- **Mandar** (South Sulawesi, Austronesian): identical agreement and antiagreement effect.
- **High Abs language:** absolutive objects move into a subject position above the ergative agent.
- **Antiagreement arises because extracting arguments skip the subject position.**

(1) **Antiagreement is Syntactic: Skipping**

(2) **Vs: Morphological Approach: no Skipping**
2 Mandar Agreement: Linked to Subject Position

• Mandar: South Sulawesi, Indonesia; 400,000 speakers; closely related to Selayarese. Grimes & Grimes 1987

• Verb-initial; no morphological case; erg-abs agreement; wh-words & foci in the left periphery.

• Agreement: ABS agreement cannot index A’-moved elements. (3c)

(3) Mandar: Agreement and Antiagreement

a. Maq-ellong=i pro diong. b. Mu-ita=i iting a? c. Innai mu-ita(="i")?
INTR-sing=3.ABS there 2.ERG-see=3.ABS that Q who 2.ERG-see=3.ABS
‘He’s singing there.’ ‘You saw that guy, huh?’ ‘Who did you see?’

2.1 Absolutive Enclitics = Agreement

Table 1: Mandar ABS is Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>AGR</th>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indexes all features on goal?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>Preminger 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets only referential goals?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Kramer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows tense-variant forms?</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Nevins 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can surface in second-position?</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Bošković 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Agreement on T

1. Distribution: finite clauses only.

2. Position: follows first element in TP: neg > asp > modal > motion > v; no climbing to C.

(4) ABS second-position in TP; finite clauses only

a. Mau tulu indang=o u-ita,  b. Na-tumae-mu/o, sumangiq=o?
Although always neg=2.abs 1.ERG-see 3.ERG-propose-2.gen/2.abs cry=2.abs
‘Although I always don’t see you.’ ‘When he proposed to you, you cried?’

2.3 Absolutives in Subject Position

• The ABS argument = the structural subject Schachter 1996

1. A’-extraction: abs only; ‘highest-only restriction’ Keenan 1972; Aldridge 2004

(5) Only Absolutives Extract

a. Na-ita=aq kamaq pro. b. Innai na-ita kamaq? c. *Innai na-ita=aq?
3.ERG-see=1.ABS dad who 3.ERG-see dad who 3.ERG-see=1.ABS
‘Dad saw me.’ ‘Who did dad see?’ int: ‘Who saw me?’

1Mandar data presented here have been collected over 2 years of fieldwork and ten months in Indonesia. All judgments checked with two long-term (2018-) consultants. Abbreviations: ABS: absolutive, ERG: ergative, GEN: genitive, NEG: negation, INTR: intransitive, PFV: perfective.
2. Binding: \textit{ABS} > \textit{ERG}.

- Condition-a anaphors can be \textit{erg}; bound by \textit{abs} \hfill Cole & Hermon 2008
- Quantified \textit{abs} object can bind possessor of \textit{erg}; no \textit{wco} even with extraction
- \textit{cf}: Tagalog (Richards 2000), Malagasy (Pearson 2001), Atayal (Huang & Lin 2012), Malay (Kaufman 2018),
- Analysis: o shifts above a, then moves to subject position \hfill Rackowski 2002

(6) \textit{Absolutive O} binds into Agent; no \textit{WCO}

(a) *Maq-ellong=i \textbf{alawe-na}. b. Na-ita=i \textbf{alawe-na} i=Adi. c. \textbf{Innai}, na-salili kindo’-\textbf{na},?

\textbf{INTR} sing=3.\textsc{abs} self-3.\textsc{gen} 3-see=3 self-3 \textsc{name} \hfill who \hfill 3-miss mom-3

\textbf{INT}: 'Himself is singing.' \textbf{INT}: 'Himself, saw Adi,' \textbf{INT}: 'Who, does his, mom miss?'

2.4 Antiagreement Implicates the Subject Position

- \textit{abs} objects occupy a subject position above \textit{erg}: extraction, binding, quantifier float.
- \textbf{claim}: \textit{Mandar absolutive agreement tied to subject position: spec,\textsc{tp}}
- \textbf{result}: Antiagreement makes reference to subject position \hfill pace Baier 2018 on Selayarese

3 Antiagreement via Skipping

3.1 Quantifier Float

- Mandar quantifiers: \textsc{dp}-internal or preverbal.

(7) \textit{Mandar Quantifiers: DP-Internal or Preverbal}

a. Mambaca=i \textbf{inggana-na} sola-u. \hfill b. \textbf{Inggana-na} pole=i sola-u.

\textsc{read}=3.\textsc{abs} all-3.\textsc{gen} friend-1.\textsc{gen} \hfill all-3.\textsc{gen} \textsc{come}=3.\textsc{abs} friend-1.\textsc{gen}

'All my friends are reading.' \hfill 'All my friends came.'

- \textbf{Preverbal quantifiers occupy subject position}.
  - \textbf{LINEAR POSITION}: identical to \textit{abs} agreement: follows c, precedes \textsc{neg}, \textsc{asp}, \textsc{modals}, \textsc{v}
  - \textbf{ASSOCIATION}: Strictly associates with the \textit{abs} argument; cannot associate with \textit{erg}.

(8) \textit{Preverbal Quantifiers at the left edge of the middle field}

a. Sangnnging \textbf{indang}=i mecawa tomeqoro. b. \textbf{Mau} \textbf{tulu} sangnging mecawa=i, all NEG=3 laugh attendant although always all laugh=3

'All of the people attending didn’t laugh.' \hfill 'Although they all always laugh,'

- \textbf{Proposal}: preverbal quantifiers reach their surface position via stranding.
  - \textbf{The subject moves to spec,\textsc{tp}; triggers \textit{abs} agreement; q pied-piped into this position}.
  - The subject and quantifier get spelled out discontiguously. \hfill Fanselow and Ćavar 2001; Doliana 2020
    \hfill \textbf{cf}: subjects undergo postsyntactic postposing in Austronesian. \hfill Chung 1990, Sabbagh 2014
(9) **Two Quantifier Positions**

a. **Sangning** pole=m=i sola-u.
   all-3.gen come=pfv=3 friend-1.gen
   ‘My friends all came.’

b. **Para** maqalli=m=i bau sola-u
   each buy=pfv=3 fish friend-1.gen
   ‘My friends each bought a fish.’

c. **Siccoq** u-alli barras
   some 1-buy=3 raw.rice
   ‘I bought some raw rice.’

d. **Duam-bua** na-ande tomessang.
   two-clf 3-eat mango
   ‘He ate two mangos’

(10) **Quantifier Float via Scattered Deletion**

(11) **3.2 Quantifier Float and Extraction**

- A'-extracted arguments cannot float quantifiers to this position.
  - Parallel: arguments which don’t trigger ABS (ERG agent, ANTIP o) cannot float Q.
- **Claim**: A'-extracted arguments never pass through the subject position.

(12) **A'-Moved Subjects cannot float Q**

a. *Innai **sangning** maqalli bau?*
   who all buy fish
   INT: ‘Who all bought fish?’

b. *Sola-u **sangning** mecawa.*
   friend-1.gen all laugh
   INT: ‘My friends all laughed.’

c. *Ia iting tauq **sangning** mongeq.*
   those.are person all sick
   INT: ‘Those are the ones who are all sick.’

d. **Sola-u** *para/*/tatallu/*… pole.
   friend-my each/three/… come
   INT: ‘Each/three/… of my friends came.’

4 **Conclusions**

1. Mandar anti-agreement makes strict reference to subject position (pace Baier 2018).
   - Antiagreement arises only with absolutive arguments which move to SPEC,TP.
   - The objects which trigger this pattern occupy subject position; they are NOT in-situ.
   - **Result**: no evidence for a non-syntactic approach to antiagreement from this pattern.

2. A'-extraction show independent evidence of Skipping.
   - ABS arguments float quantifiers to the preverbal position linked to subjecthood.
   - A'-extracted arguments generally cannot float quantifiers to this position.
   - **Claim**: both antiagreement and the ban on quantifier float arise from a skipping derivation.
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