

## Agreeing with conjuncts

Rajesh Bhatt and Martin Walkow  
University of Massachusetts/Amherst

Hindi-Urdu displays an asymmetry with respect to the availability of Closest Conjunct Agreement. It is available only to objects and not to subjects. Agreement with subjects is always agreement with the full conjunct. We argue that this asymmetry in Conjunct Agreement is related to another asymmetry between subject and object agreement in Indo-Aryan languages: object agreement never involves person. We derive these properties of object agreement from the fact that object agreement is an instance of dissociated agreement, agreement that takes place independent of case-licensing. As a result when the probe (T) accesses the direct object goal, the person features of the goal have already been deactivated by the case-licenser ( $v$ ) and T must look inside the DP at the PhiP, where only gender and number features are available. This yields the absence of person features in object agreement. With subjects, T is both the case-licenser and Phi-agreement trigger. Hence the person features of the subject are visible to T. By a similar logic, the features of conjoined objects are not visible to the probe and a subpart must be identified whose features are visible. The identification of the subpart is subject to linearity considerations and we present a mechanism that allows for this.

The resulting proposal sheds light on the distribution of features within the DP and within coordinations (&P). It is also a first step towards an integration of linearization and structural considerations in the treatment of agreement. This work continues proposals like Marusic et al (2007) for Slovenian and Boskovic (2009) for Serbo-Croatian in attributing CCA to a featural deficiency on &P. It differs in what brings about that deficiency, failure to project certain features to &P or their absence due to prior checking. It differs in how the grammar recovers from this deficiency, and which part of the grammar is responsible for that recovery. We will address whether LCA/RCA-alternations are a unified phenomenon cross linguistically and how the differences in the proposals relate to empirical differences between the different languages.