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Introduction

- **Topic:** A pattern of verbal agreement in Western Armenian (WA), involving ‘Num(eral) Noun’ constructions.

- WA allows ‘Num Noun’ constructions of the form ‘Num N_{sg}’ (Bale et al. 2011, Bale & Khanjian 2014):

  (1) jerek three a Sagerd
  (2) jerek three a Sagerd-ner

‘Num Noun’ constructions like (1) (covert plurals) can trigger either singular, (3), or plural, (4), verbal agreement (Sigler 1997):

(3) jerek three a Sagerd inga-v fall-pst 3sg ‘Three students fell’
(4) jerek three a Sagerd inga-n fall-pst-3pl ‘Three students fell’
Topic: A pattern of verbal agreement in Western Armenian (WA), involving ‘Num(eral) Noun’ constructions.

WA allows ‘Num Noun’ constructions of the form ‘Num N\textsubscript{sg}’ (Bale et al. 2011, Bale & Khanjian 2014):

(1) jerek ašagerd
three student

(2) jerek ašagerd-ner
three student-PL

(3) jerek ašagerd-inga-v
three student-fall-pst

(4) jerek ašagerd-inga-n
three student-fall-pst-3pl
Introduction

**Topic:** A pattern of verbal agreement in Western Armenian (WA), involving ‘Num(eral) Noun’ constructions.

WA allows ‘Num Noun’ constructions of the form ‘Num N\textsubscript{sg}’ (Bale et al. 2011, Bale & Khanjian 2014):

(1) jerek aʃagerd three student

(2) jerek .Configure.ner three student-PL

‘Num Noun’ constructions like (1) (covert plurals) can trigger either singular, (3), or plural, (4), verbal agreement (Sigler 1997):

(3) jerek aʃagerd inga-v three student fall-PST.\textsubscript{3sg} ‘Three students fell’

(4) jerek aʃagerd inga-n three student fall-PST-\textsubscript{3pl} ‘Three students fell’
We will see that this agreement pattern is restricted:
We will see that this agreement pattern is restricted:

- Covert plurals that show plural agreement (full agreement) are outside the VP.
We will see that this agreement pattern is restricted:

- Covert plurals that show plural agreement (full agreement) are outside the VP.
- Covert plurals that show singular agreement (non-agreement) are inside the VP.
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  - A bipartite model of Agree (Arregi and Nevins 2012), where Agree is sensitive to both iFs and uFs in the syntax, but only to uFs at PF.
  - In the **narrow syntax**, Agree can only look *upwards*. At *PF*, it can look in *either direction*
Introduction

- **Interest:** This pattern tells us something about the directionality of Agree, and the division of labour between uFs and iFs in agreement phenomena.

- We argue that the WA pattern is evidence for:
  - A bipartite model of Agree (Arregi and Nevins 2012), where Agree is sensitive to both iFs and uFs in the syntax, but only to uFs at PF.
  - In the narrow syntax, Agree can only look upwards. At PF, it can look in either direction.
  - The fact that iFs are present in the narrow syntax and not at PF will ensure that plural agreement with a covert plural is restricted to cases where the covert plural is outside the VP.
Preview of analysis

(5)  
TP
  \[ T' \]
  \[ T_{pl} \]
  \[ VP \]
  covert plural_{iPL, uSG}

(6)  
TP
  \[ T' \]
  \[ T_{sg/pl} \]
  \[ VP \]
  (covert) plural_{uSG/uPL}
Here is how the rest of the talk will proceed:
Here is how the rest of the talk will proceed:

1. The pattern
2. The Position of covert plurals
   - Argument 1: Scope
   - Argument 2: Adverbs
3. Agree
4. A detour: Pseudo Noun Incorporation in WA
5. Refining the pattern: Non-agreement in transitives and unergatives
6. Conclusion
The pattern: Passives and Unaccusatives

► Previous literature (Sigler 1997): Passives/Unaccusatives can show non-agreement.
The pattern: Passives and Unaccusatives

Previous literature (Sigler 1997): Passives/Unaccusatives can show non-agreement.

(7) hink zinvor əsbann-ve-ts-av/-an
five soldier.sg kill-PASS-PST-3SG/-3PL
‘Five soldiers were killed’

(8) jerek աջարդ inga-v/-n
three student fall-PST.3SG/-3PL
‘Three students fell’
The pattern: Transitives and Unergatives

▶ Previous literature (Sigler 1997): Transitives/Unergatives obligatorily show full agreement:

(9) hink five zinvor soldier ayn that kyu K-@ village-det kante-ts-in/*-∅ destroy-pst -3pl/-3sg 'Five soldiers destroyed that village'

(10) jerek three S un dog hatse-ts-in/*-∅ bark-pst -3pl/-3sg 'Three dogs barked'

▶ We will revise the statement of the pattern later: Transitives/unergatives will be seen to exhibit non-agreement in limited circumstances (agent Pseudo Incorporation).
The pattern: Transitives and Unergatives

▶ Previous literature (Sigler 1997): Transitives/Unergatives obligatorily show full agreement:

(9) hink zinvor ayn kyub-ə kante-ts-in/*-∅
five soldier that village-DET destroy-PST-3PL/*-3SG
‘Five soldiers destroyed that village’

(10) jerek fun hatse-ts-in/*-∅
three dog bark-PST-3PL/*-3SG
‘Three dogs barked’
The pattern: Transitives and Unergatives

► **Previous literature (Sigler 1997):** Transitives/Unergatives obligatorily show full agreement:

(9)  hink zinvor ayn kyuβ-ə kante-ts-in/*-∅
five soldier that village-DET destroy-PST-3PL/*-3SG
‘Five soldiers destroyed that village’

(10)  jerek fun hatse-ts-in/*-∅
three dog bark-PST-3PL/*-3SG
‘Three dogs barked’

► **We will revise the statement of the pattern later:**
Transitives/unergatives will be seen to exhibit non-agreement in limited circumstances (agent Pseudo Incorporation).
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**Argument:** Covert plurals that show non-agreement are low (VP-internal). Covert plurals that show full agreement are high (outside the VP).
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- **Argument:** Covert plurals that show non-agreement are low (VP-internal). Covert plurals that show full agreement are high (outside the VP).

- **Our first test is scope.**

- **Consider example (11):**

(11) jerek afagerd pos-i-n metʃ tf-inga-v
three student hole-gen-def in neg-fall-PST.3sg
‘Three students did not fall in a hole’

Prima facie, this could have either of the following meanings:

- \( \exists x [3\text{-student}(x) \land \neg \text{fall-hole}(x)] \)
- \( \neg \exists x [3\text{-student}(x) \land \text{fall-hole}(x)] \)
Position of covert plurals: Scope

- **Argument:** Covert plurals that show non-agreement are low (VP-internal). Covert plurals that show full agreement are high (outside the VP).

- Our first test is scope.

- Consider example (11):

  (11) ջերեկ ավագերդ պոսին մետս տզինգավ
       three student hole-gen-def in neg-fall-PST.3sg
       ‘Three students did not fall in a hole’

- Prima facie, this could have either of the following meanings:

  (12) լիներ [3-student(\(x\)) \& \neg fall-hole(\(x\))]
Position of covert plurals: Scope

**Argument**: Covert plurals that show non-agreement are low (VP-internal). Covert plurals that show full agreement are high (outside the VP).

**Our first test is scope.**

**Consider example (11):**

(11)  jerek afagerd pos-i-n metʃ tʃ-inga-v
     three student hole-gen-def in neg-fall-PST.3sg
     ‘Three students did not fall in a hole’

**Prima facie, this could have either of the following meanings:**

(12)  ∃x[3-student(x) ∧ ¬fall-hole(x)]
(13)  ¬∃x[3-student(x) ∧ fall-hole(x)]
To test whether ‘three student’ can have low scope (below negation), we need a scenario where (14) is true, but (15) is false.

(14) $\neg\exists x[3\text{-student}(x) \land \text{fall-hole}(x)]$

(15) $\exists x[3\text{-student}(x) \land \neg\text{fall-hole}(x)]$

(16) **Scenario 1:** There’s a class with 3 students and they fell. We are trying to determine what happened. 2 students fell in a hole. 1 student fell off a hill.
Position of covert plurals: Scope

To test whether ‘three student’ can have low scope (below negation), we need a scenario where (14) is true, but (15) is false.

(14) $\forall x [3\text{-student}(x) \land \text{fall-hole}(x)]$
(15) $\exists x [3\text{-student}(x) \land \neg \text{fall-hole}(x)]$

(16) **Scenario 1:** There’s a class with 3 students and they fell. We are trying to determine what happened. 2 students fell in a hole. 1 student fell off a hill.

In this scenario, (17) turns out to be true.

(17) jerek afagerd pos-i-n metʃ tf-inga-v
three student hole-gen-def in neg-fall-PST.3SG
‘Three students did not fall in a hole’
To show that non-agreeing cannot have high scope (above negation), we need the reverse of Scenario 1.

(18) $\forall \exists x[3\text{-student}(x) \land \text{fall-hole}(x)]$

(19) $\exists \forall x[3\text{-student}(x) \land \neg\text{fall-hole}(x)]$

(20) **Scenario 2**: There’s a class with 6 students and they fell. We are trying to determine what happened. 3 students fell in a hole. 3 students fell off a hill.
To show that non-agreeing cannot have high scope (above negation), we need the reverse of Scenario 1.

(18) $\forall x [\exists \text{student}(x) \land \exists \text{fall-hole}(x)]$

(19) $\forall x [\exists \text{student}(x) \land \neg \exists \text{fall-hole}(x)]$

(20) **Scenario 2**: There’s a class with 6 students and they fell. We are trying to determine what happened. 3 students fell in a hole. 3 students fell off a hill.

In this scenario, (21) turns out to be false.

(21) jerek afagerd pos-i-n met$\exists$ tf-inga-v
three student hole-gen-def in neg-fall-PST.3SG
‘Three students did not fall in a hole’
Observation 1:

Non-agreeing covert plurals only scope below negation. ($\exists \neg > \exists$, $\forall \exists > \neg$)
Observation 1:

Non-agreeing covert plurals only scope below negation. ($\forall \neg > \exists$, $\forall \exists > \neg$)

► **Conclusion:** Non-agreeing covert plurals do not move out of the VP (taking negation to mark the left edge of the VP).
Agreeing covert plurals show the exact opposite pattern:

(22)  jerek asagerd tf-inga-n
three student neg-fall-PST.3PL

‘Three students did not fall’ (\(\neg \exists > \exists, \checkmark \exists > \neg\))
Agreeing covert plurals show the exact opposite pattern:

(22)  jerek afagerd tʃ-inga-n
      three student neg-fall-PST.3PL
      ‘Three students did not fall’ (x¬ > ∃, √∃ > ¬)

Observation 2:

Agreeing covert plurals only scope above negation.

Conclusion: Agreeing covert plurals move out of the VP.
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

▶ **Further Evidence:** Adverbial facts.

- Consider the following example where the adverb 'arakoren' ('quickly') crucially appears above the covert plural:

  (23) jereg yesterday gajan-i-n train.station-da t -def mech in arakoren quickly jergu two a S agerd student jega-v/-n arrive-pst -3sg/-3pl 3pl.

  ‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’

- ‘arakoren’ can be TP-adjoined, with a meaning like ‘the arrival event happened quickly after another event had happened’.

- It can also be VP-adjoined, meaning that the arriving itself was quick.
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

▶ **Further Evidence:** Adverbial facts.

▶ Consider the following example where the adverb ‘arakoren’ (‘quickly’) crucially appears **above** the covert plural:

```
jereg yesterday
gajan-i-n train.station-
def them
mech in
arakoren quickly
jergu two
a S
agerd student
jega-v/-n arrive-pst 3sg/-pst 3pl
```

‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’

▶ ‘arakoren’ can be TP-adjoined, with a meaning like ‘the arrival event happened quickly after another event had happened’.

▶ It can also be VP-adjoined, meaning that the arriving itself was quick.
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

► **Further Evidence:** Adverbial facts.

► Consider the following example where the adverb ‘arakoren’ (‘quickly’) crucially appears *above* the covert plural:

(23)  jereg  gajan-i-n  mech arakoren jergu afagerd
      yesterday train.station-DAT-DEF in  quickly two student
      jega-v/-n
      arrive-PST.3SG/-PST.3PL

‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

► **Further Evidence:** Adverbial facts.

► Consider the following example where the adverb ‘arakoren’ (‘quickly’) crucially appears **above** the covert plural:

(23) jereg gajan-i-n mech arakoren jergu aʃagerd 
yesterday train.station-DAT-DEF in quickly two student 
jega-v/-n 
arrive-PST.3SG/-PST.3PL

‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’

► ‘arakoren’ can be TP-adjoined, with a meaning like ‘the arrival event happened quickly after another event had happened’.
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

► **Further Evidence:** Adverbial facts.

► Consider the following example where the adverb ‘arakoren’ (‘quickly’) crucially appears **above** the covert plural:

(23)  
\begin{align*}
  \text{jereg} & \quad \text{gajan-i-n} & \quad \text{mech arakoren jergu aṣagerd} \\
  \text{yesterday} & \quad \text{train.station-DAT-DEF in} & \quad \text{quickly two student} \\
  \text{jega-v/-n} & \\
  \text{arrive-PST.3SG/-PST.3PL} & \\
\end{align*}

‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’

► ‘arakoren’ can be TP-adjoined, with a meaning like ‘the arrival event happened quickly after another event had happened’.

► It can also be VP-adjoined, meaning that the arriving itself was quick.
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

Prediction:

(i) If non-agreeing covert plurals are VP-internal, then we expect them to allow both the VP- and the TP-modifying interpretation of the adverb in (23).
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

Prediction:

(i) If non-agreeing covert plurals are VP-internal, then we expect them to allow both the VP- and the TP-modifying interpretation of the adverb in (23).

(ii) If agreeing covert plurals are outside the VP, then we expect them to only allow the TP-modifying interpretation in (23) (since the adverb is forced to be above the covert plural)
This prediction is borne out.
Position of covert plurals: Adverbs

- This prediction is borne out.

✔ VP-modifying, ✔ TP-modifying:

(24)  jereg  gajan-i-n  mech arakoren jergu aʃagerd
      yesterday  train.station-DAT-DEF  in  quickly  two  student
      jega-v
      arrive-PST.3SG

‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’
This prediction is borne out.

✓ VP-modifying, ✓ TP-modifying:

(24) jereg gajan-i-n mech arakoren jergu ajagerd
yesterday train.station-DAT-DEF in quickly two student
jega-v
arrive-PST.3SG
‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’

✗ VP-modifying, ✓ TP-modifying:

(25) jereg gajan-i-n mech arakoren jergu ajagerd
yesterday train.station-DAT-DEF in quickly two student
jega-n
arrive-PST.3PL
‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly after’
Given the results of the scope and adverbs tests, we conclude the following:

Position of Covert Plurals:

- Non-agreeing covert plurals are VP-internal.
Given the results of the scope and adverbs tests, we conclude the following:

**Position of Covert Plurals:**

- Non-agreeing covert plurals are VP-internal.
- Agreeing covert plurals move outside the VP. We assume they move to [Spec, TP].
Covert plurals are formally singular [uSG]. No [uPL] feature.
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Verbal agreement is agreement with a probe on T.
Covert plurals are formally singular \([uSG]\). No \([uPL]\) feature.

But they do express a plurality of objects \(\rightarrow [iPL]\) feature (essentially contributed by the numeral) (see also Wechsler & Zlatić 2003 on index/concord).

Verbal agreement is agreement with a probe on \(T\).

We will model agreeing covert plurals as an instance of semantic agreement.
Covert plurals are formally singular [uSG]. No [uPL] feature.

But they do express a plurality of objects → [iPL] feature (essentially contributed by the numeral) (see also Wechsler & Zlatić 2003 on index/concord).

Verbal agreement is agreement with a probe on T.

We will model agreeing covert plurals as an instance of semantic agreement.

Asymmetry: Agreeing covert plurals are always high, non-agreeing covert plurals are low. Thus, our Agree must have at least the following characteristics:
Covert plurals are formally singular [uSG]. No [uPL] feature.

But they do express a plurality of objects → [iPL] feature (essentially contributed by the numeral) (see also Wechsler & Zlatić 2003 on index/concord).

Verbal agreement is agreement with a probe on T.

We will model agreeing covert plurals as an instance of semantic agreement.

Asymmetry: Agreeing covert plurals are always high, non-agreeing covert plurals are low. Thus, our Agree must have at least the following characteristics:

- It can be sensitive to iFs
Agree: Assumptions and Desiderata

- Covert plurals are formally singular [uSG]. No [uPL] feature.
- But they do express a plurality of objects → [iPL] feature (essentially contributed by the numeral) (see also Wechsler & Zlatić 2003 on index/concord).
- Verbal agreement is agreement with a probe on T.
- We will model agreeing covert plurals as an instance of semantic agreement.

**Asymmetry:** Agreeing covert plurals are always high, non-agreeing covert plurals are low. Thus, our Agree must have at least the following characteristics:

- It can be sensitive to iFs
- It’s sensitivity to iFs emerges only when the iFs are above the probe (i.e above T)
We adopt a model of bipartite Agree (Arregi and Nevins 2012), that is also sensitive to iFs (Smith 2017).
Agree: Mechanism

► We adopt a model of bipartite Agree (Arregi and Nevins 2012), that is also sensitive to iFs (Smith 2017).
► Agree is split into two parts: One part operates in the narrow syntax, the other at PF.
We adopt a model of bipartite Agree (Arregi and Nevins 2012), that is also sensitive to iFs (Smith 2017).

Agree is split into two parts: One part operates in the narrow syntax, the other at PF.

The narrow syntax Agree can only look upwards (bounded by maximal projections, i.e. restricted to Spec-Head configurations). The PF Agree can look either upwards or downwards.
We adopt a model of bipartite Agree (Arregi and Nevins 2012), that is also sensitive to iFs (Smith 2017).

Agree is split into two parts: One part operates in the narrow syntax, the other at PF.

The narrow syntax Agree can only look upwards (bounded by maximal projections, i.e. restricted to Spec-Head configurations). The PF Agree can look either upwards or downwards.

iFs are only available in the narrow syntax, and Agree in the narrow syntax is defined on Spec-Head configurations, T will only find the [iPL] feature of a covert plural when that feature is in [Spec, TP].
Agree: Mechanism

(26)

\[
\text{TP} \\
\text{covert plural }_{i\text{PL}}, \quad {uSG} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{T}_{pl} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{t}_i \quad \ldots
\]
When the covert plural stays low, then T probes in its specifier in the syntax and finds nothing. At PF, it can probe downwards and in that case it finds the covert plural. But only the uFs are available, since iFs delete at PF.

(27)  
\[
TP \\
| \quad T' \\
| \quad T_{sg} \\
| \quad \text{covert plural}_{uSG} \quad \ldots
\]
Desideratum: When the covert plural is in [Spec, TP], Agree will find the [iPL] feature first and agree with it.
**Desideratum:** When the covert plural is in [Spec, TP], Agree will find the [iPL] feature first and agree with it.

**Solution:** A structure that ensures that [iPL] will be high while [uSG] will be low:

(28)

```
#P
  /
Numeral[iPL] /’/
  /
# NP[uSG]
```
Evidence for our structure: A classifier can optionally appear between the numeral and the NP (Sigler 1997, Khanjian 2013).
Evidence for our structure: A classifier can optionally appear between the numeral and the NP (Sigler 1997, Khanjian 2013).

(29) jergu had afjagerd
    two   CLF student

# head as the locus of the optional realisation of the classifier
Covert plurals are in [Spec, TP]:

(30)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{NP}_{[uSG]} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

As T probes into its specifier, the first feature it will find is [iPL].

Economy considerations suggest that T will agree with the first feature that matches its specification. Thus, we expect plural agreement to manifest.
Covert plurals are in [Spec, TP]:

As T probes into its specifier, the first feature it will find is [iPL]. Economy considerations suggest that T will agree with the first feature that matches its specification. Thus, we expect plural agreement to manifest.
A sanity check

**Prediction:** An overtly plural ‘Num Noun$_{pl}$’ construction will always exhibit plural agreement, as the [uPL] feature will be always be found, either in the narrow syntax or at PF.
A sanity check

► **Prediction:** An overtly plural ‘Num Noun_{pl}’ construction will always exhibit plural agreement, as the [uPL] feature will be always be found, either in the narrow syntax or at PF.

► This is borne out:

(31) jerek aʃagerd-ner inga-n/*-v
    three student-PL fall-PST.3PL/*-PST.3SG
    ‘Three students fell’
A sanity check

A morphologically plural ‘Num N_{pl}’ allows both VP- and TP-adjoined interpretations of adverbs like ‘quickly’:

✓VP-modifying, ✓TP-modifying:

(32) jereg gajan-i-n mech arakoren jergu
yesterday train.station-DAT-DEF in quickly two
afagerd-ner jega-n
student-PL arrive-PST-3PL

‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’
A sanity check

A morphologically plural ‘Num N$_{pl}$’ allows both VP- and TP-adjoined interpretations of adverbs like ‘quickly’:

✔VP-modifying, ✔TP-modifying:

(32) jereg gajan-i-n mech arakoren jergu
    yesterday train.station-DAT-DEF in quickly two
    asjagerd-ner jega-n
    student-PL arrive-PST-3PL

‘Yesterday in the train station, two students arrived quickly (after)’

Here ‘students’ is VP-internal. Hence, the PF part of Agree looks downwards and finds this feature at PF.
The pattern: Non-agreeing covert plurals are always low, whereas agreeing covert plurals are always high.
**Interim Summary**

- **The pattern:** Non-agreeing covert plurals are always low, whereas agreeing covert plurals are always high.

- **Our proposal:** A mechanism of Agree where iFs can be found only if they are in the specifier of a probe.
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Our proposal: A mechanism of Agree where iFs can be found only if they are in the specifier of a probe.

Prediction: Parallel behavior for subjects of transitives and unergatives: if they stay in the VP, they should trigger singular agreement.

Claim (Sigler 1997): Covert plurals always trigger plural agreement with transitives and unergatives.
The pattern: Non-agreeing covert plurals are always low, whereas agreeing covert plurals are always high.

Our proposal: A mechanism of Agree where iFs can be found only if they are in the specifier of a probe.

Prediction: Parallel behavior for subjects of transitives and unergatives: if they stay in the VP, they should trigger singular agreement.

Claim (Sigler 1997): Covert plurals always trigger plural agreement with transitives and unergatives.
The pattern: Non-agreeing covert plurals are always low, whereas agreeing covert plurals are always high.

Our proposal: A mechanism of Agree where iFs can be found only if they are in the specifier of a probe.

Prediction: Parallel behavior for subjects of transitives and unergatives: if they stay in the VP, they should trigger singular agreement.

Claim (Sigler 1997): Covert plurals always trigger plural agreement with transitives and unergatives.

(33) híh kín vər ayn kuy̤-ə kante-ts-in/*-∅
five soldier that village-DET destroy-PST-3PL/*-3SG
‘Five soldiers destroyed that village’
Argument: Non-agreement is in fact possible for transitive/unergatives.

To see this, we first need to take a detour through Pseudo Noun Incorporation (PNI) in WA.
Bare nominals in WA can undergo Pseudo Noun Incorporation, which we take to mean that they can be left low (following Massam 2001).
Bare nominals in WA can undergo Pseudo Noun Incorporation, which we take to mean that they can be left low (following Massam 2001).

First, bare singulars are number neutral, (34). They also take narrow scope with respect to operators like negation, (35) (Bale & Khanjian 2014).

(34) Dǝgha vaze-ts.
    boy-SG run-PST
    ‘One or more boys ran’

(35) Dǝgha tʃi vaze-ts.
    boy-SG not run-PST
    ‘No boys ran’ (¬ > ∃, *∃ > ¬)
Another test for Pseudo Incorporation is case\(^1\). If we think of case as a property of full arguments, we expect that Pseudo Incorporated nominals will not be able to bear case.

\(^1\)For similar, although not exactly the same, facts in Hindi, see Dayal 2011.
Another test for Pseudo Incorporation is case\(^1\). If we think of case as a property of full arguments, we expect that Pseudo Incorporated nominals will not be able to bear case.

In WA, the dative marks animate nominals that are full arguments (DPs) in object position:

\begin{align*}
(36) & \quad \text{John-ә manug-i-n gә-sire} \\
& \quad \text{John-DEF child-DAT-DEF IND-love.3SG} \\
& \quad \text{John loves the child}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(37) & \quad \text{John-ә manug-ә gә-sire} \\
& \quad \text{John-DEF child-DEF IND-love.3SG} \\
& \quad \text{John loves the child}
\end{align*}

\(^1\)For similar, although not exactly the same, facts in Hindi, see Dayal 2011
This contrasts with bare animate nouns, which cannot be marked dative:

(38) ?*John-ə manug-i գա-sire
    John-DEF child-DAT IND-love.3SG
    John loves a child

(39) John-ə manug գա-sire
    John-DEF child   IND-love.3SG
    John loves children
Bare nominals in WA fulfill some of the classic diagnostics for Pseudo Incorporation.
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► Covert plurals pattern with bare nominals as far as their scope taking possibilities are concerned.
Bare nominals in WA fulfill some of the classic diagnostics for Pseudo Incorporation.

Covert plurals pattern with bare nominals as far as their scope taking possibilities are concerned.

They also pattern in the same way in terms of case. They cannot be marked Dative:

\[(40) \quad \text{John-} \odot \text{ harujr had zinvor mert-uts} \]
\[\text{John-DEF 100 CLF soldier killed.PST} \]
\[\text{John killed 100 soldiers} \]

\[(41) \quad *\text{John-} \odot \text{ harujr had zinvor-i mert-uts} \]
\[\text{John-DEF 100 CLF soldier-DAT killed.PST} \]
\[\text{John killed 100 soldiers} \]
Bare nominals in WA fulfill some of the classic diagnostics for Pseudo Incorporation.

Covert plurals pattern with bare nominals as far as their scope taking possibilities are concerned.

They also pattern in the same way in terms of case. They cannot be marked Dative:

(40)  John-ә  harujr  had  zinvor  mert-uts  
      John-DEF 100  CLF soldier  killed.PST  
      John killed 100 soldiers

(41)  * John-ә  harujr  had  zinvor-i  mert-uts  
      John-DEF 100  CLF soldier-DAT killed.PST  
      John killed 100 soldiers

Based on this evidence, we claim that non-agreeing covert plural in WA undergo Pseudo Incorporation.
- Interestingly, WA allows agent Pseudo Incorporation, (42) (notice how the agent is below the object, like Turkish, (43) (Öztürk 2007):
Interestingly, WA allows agent Pseudo Incorporation, (42) (notice how the agent is below the object, like Turkish, (43) (Öztürk 2007):

(42) mariam-i-n kəsan meyu xajte-ts
    mariam-DAT-DEF twenty bee sting-PST.3SG
    ‘Twenty bees stung Mary’

(43) Ali-yi  ari soktu
    Ali-ACC bee stung
    ‘Ali got bee stung’
Interestingly, WA allows agent Pseudo Incorporation, (42) (notice how the agent is below the object, like Turkish, (43) (Öztürk 2007):

(42) mariam-i-n kəsan meyu xajte-ts
mariam-DAT-DEF twenty bee sting-PST.3SG
‘Twenty bees stung Mary’

(43) Ali-yi  ari soktu
Ali-ACC bee stung
‘Ali got bee stung’

Notice that the agreement in (42) is singular. Thus, we have a case of a transitive verb where the covert plural agent is left low (due to Pseudo Incorporation), which exhibits singular agreement. This confirms our predictions.
The correct statement of the pattern

Thus, we have shown that transitives/unergatives can exhibit non-agreement.
The correct statement of the pattern

- Thus, we have shown that transitives/unergatives can exhibit non-agreement.
- But because this is only visible in an agent Pseudo Incorporation configuration (which, although productive, is rare), it does not usually surface.
Thus, we have shown that *transitives/unergatives* can exhibit non-agreement.

But because this is only visible in an agent Pseudo Incorporation configuration (which, although productive, is rare), it does not usually surface.

**The pattern (revised):**

- Covert plurals show non-agreement, when they are VP-internal.
The data in (44) make the pattern particularly recalcitrant from the perspective of a narrowly syntactic downwards Agree.

(44) mariam-i-n kəsan meyuy xajte-ts
    mariam-DAT-DEF twenty bee sting-PST.3SG
    ‘Twenty bees stung Mary’

The probe on T will look downwards and will always find the iPL feature on ‘20 bee’ (the agent).
Even if we say that the VP is a phase and hence Agree cannot look into it, the agent is at the edge and hence should be accessible.

We take this as further evidence that the correct approach to the WA requires Agree to look upwards in the narrow syntax.
Conclusion

- Covert plurals in WA show non-agreement, when they are VP-internal.

We argued for a bipartite Agree mechanism, where Agree in the narrow syntax can only look upwards (although bounded by the maximal projection) and is sensitive to iFs.
Conclusion

- Covert plurals in WA show non-agreement, when they are VP-internal.
- Covert plurals in WA show full agreement, when they are in [Spec, TP].
Conclusion

- Covert plurals in WA show non-agreement, when they are VP-internal.
- Covert plurals in WA show full agreement, when they are in [Spec, TP].
- We argued for a bipartite Agree mechanism, where Agree in the narrow syntax can only look \textit{upwards} (although bounded by the maximal projection) and is sensitive to iFs.
The iPL features in covert plurals are structurally higher than the uSG features of the NP and hence visible to (upwards) Agree when the covert plural is in [Spec, TP] (i.e. outside the VP).
The iPL features in covert plurals are structurally higher than the uSG features of the NP and hence visible to (upwards) Agree when the covert plural is in [Spec, TP] (i.e. outside the VP).

Finally, evidence from Pseudo Incorporated agents in transitives and unergatives offers support for our analysis, as these covert plural agents do not agree.
Thank you!
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Scenario 1: There are 5 soldiers in total. 3 destroyed that village, while the other 2 stayed in the camp and did nothing.

(46) \( \neg \exists x [5\text{-soldier}(x) \land \text{destroy}(x)] \)

(47) \( \forall x [5\text{-soldier}(x) \land \neg \text{destroy}(x)] \)

(48) hink zinvor ayn kyuʁ-ə tʃə-kante-ts-in/*-∅

five soldier that village-DET NEG-destroy-PST-3PL/-*3SG

‘Five soldiers did not destroyed that village’

(48) is false in Scenario 1
Appendix: Scope in Transitives

► **Scenario 2:** There are 10 soldiers in total. 5 destroyed that village, while the other 5 stayed in camp and did nothing.

(49) $\forall x \neg \exists x [5\text{-soldier}(x) \land \text{destroy}(x)]$

(50) $\exists x [5\text{-soldier}(x) \land \neg \text{destroy}(x)]$

(51) հինկ զինվոր այն կյուրեղ-ը տեսա-կանտե-ԲԻԾ-
five soldier that village-DET NEG-destroy-PST-3PL/-*3SG
‘Five soldiers did not destroy that village’

► (51) is **true** in **Scenario 2**

► Hence agreeing transitives take **only high scope** with respect to negation.
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