

## AGREEMENT AND SPURIOUS ANTIPASSIVES

Ken Hale (MIT) and Luciana Storto (MIT and Museu Emílio Goeldi)\*

### Introduction

It is common in the languages of the world for an argument—e.g., the subject, the object, or both—to agree in person and number with the verb, or an auxiliary, in the clause in which it appears. In a number of current theories, agreement is held to be a relation between an *argument* and a (lexical or functional) *head* which stands in an appropriate structural position with respect to the argument. Theories generally agree that the agreement relation involves government. Government in and of itself permits an agreement relation to hold between (i) a head and its Spec(ifier), giving so-called Spec-Head agreement, and also between (ii) a head and the Spec of its complement, a type not customarily named but nonetheless within the canonical domain of government (cf., the well-known and amply documented Exceptional Case-Marking relation). In this paper, the relation which will be assumed is the second of these, as described in detail in Bittner (1994) and, in relation to Case and Agreement specifically, in Bittner and Hale (1996a).

The specific concern of this paper is a phenomenon which we will call “eccentric agreement”. Ordinarily, the expectation is that an argument bearing a specific grammatical function will be consistent in its agreement behavior; that is to say, we expect a subject, or object, to agree always with a particular head. So, for example, if the (s-structure) subject agrees with I(nfl) in one construction, it will agree with I(nfl) in all other constructions. In the two languages discussed here, however, we find this not to be the case. In certain constructions, the agreement is the “opposite” of what is expected, in that a functional head which usually agrees with the object suddenly agrees with the subject. This happens in a construction which can appropriately be called the “spurious” or “false” antipassive.

Our aim here will be to show that, given certain reasonable assumptions, these cases of “eccentric” agreement are inevitable. Moreover, taking the data seriously, within a conservative theory of the type employed here, we must conclude that there is no one-to-one agreement relationship between arguments and heads.

---

\* We dedicate this essay to Aryon Rodrigues whose life-time dedication to the study of the indigenous languages of Brazil and whose work in the development of institutional supports for scientific linguistics in that country constitute one of the most impressive contributions to our field in this century. A fellowship from CNPq (grant #200213/92-0) to Luciana Storto has been supporting research on the Karitiana language since 1994.

## The K'ichee' (Mayan) agent focus construction

K'ichee' is an ergative language, as can be seen from the agreement pattern exemplified in the following sentences:

- (1) (a) X-at-uu-kunaj (at) lee achi  
ASP-2SG-3SG-cure (you.SG) the man  
'The man cured you.'
- (b) X-at-chakun (at)  
ASP-2SG-work (you.SG)  
'You worked.'

The language does not employ overt Case morphology for the direct arguments of a clause (subject and object), but its ergativity is reflected in the agreement morphology. The ergative (associated with the subject of a transitive verb) is distinguished from the nominative (sometimes called "absolute", and associated with the subject of an intransitive and the object of a transitive) both in its morphological form and in its position within the verb word. Where ergative and nominative cooccur, ergative is closer to the verb than the nominative, as in (1a), where *-u-* is ergative, and *-at-* is nominative.

Transitive and intransitive verbs are further distinguished by their suffixal inflections, represented here by the endings *-j* and *-n* respectively (with corresponding pausal forms *-Vj* and *-nik*).

Like many other ergative languages, K'ichee' possesses an antipassive construction:

- (2) X-Ø-kuna-n lee achi ch-aaw-ee  
ASP-3SG-cure-AP the man TO-2SG-RN  
'The man cured you.'

Here, the verb carries the antipassive *-n(ik)* (glossed AP). In addition it has lost its ability to assign ergative Case to its subject. This is ultimately a consequence of the antipassive morphology which forces the *object* to appear in an oblique case, rather than in the nominative characteristic of the basic ergative construction (see, e.g., Bittner, 1994). The object, when overtly expressed, must now appear in an oblique Case construction, represented in (2) by the preposition *ch(i)-* 'to' (not always present in usage) and its complement, the "genitive" relational noun *-ee* (sometimes *-eech*, glossed RN), whose complement in turn corresponds to the logical object of the verb (appearing here as the possessive agreement prefix *-aw-* 2SG, identical in form to the ergative).

Crucially, for our purposes, the verbal agreement morphology is regularly altered in the antipassive, in the following manner: (i) the logical object is no longer represented there, being an oblique expression; (ii) the ergative agreement morphology is suppressed; (iii) and the nominative agreement is now construed with the subject. In (2) above, the zero element  $-\emptyset$ - is the normal realization of 3SG nominative agreement (in contrast to  $-u-$  ~  $-r-$  in the ergative).

The K'ichee' antipassive represented by (2) is a true antipassive in every sense of the word. It involves the total "detransitivization" of the transitive clause—the subject is nominative, not ergative; the object is in an oblique form; and the consequences (i-iii) for agreement follow straightforwardly.

There is, however, another K'ichee' construction to which the term "antipassive" has been applied (cf., Mondloch, 1981; Davies and Sam-Colop, 1990; Larsen, 1987, 1988; Pye, 1988; Trechsel, 1993):

- (3) (a) Laa aree lee achi x-at-kuna-n (at)  
 Q FOC the man ASP-2SG-cure-AF (you.SG)  
 'Was it the man who cured you?'  
 (b) Laa at x-at-kuna-n lee achi  
 Q you.SG ASP-2SG-cure-AF the man  
 'Was it you who cured the man?'

It is not surprising that this construction has been called an antipassive. It employs the antipassive morphology (with verbs of this type at least, so-called derived verbs), and it suppresses ergative agreement. But this is where the similarity ends. First, as has been pointed out by a number of scholars (e.g., those cited above) that the two kinds of "antipassive" differ in relation to transitivity. The "true" antipassive of (2) is clearly a derived intransitive. All are in agreement on that score. But the "focus antipassive" of (3) quite evidently does not "demote" the direct object. Moreover, the construction implicates a particular grammatical process—its use is possible only when the agent (transitive subject) is extracted (fronted) in the derivation of one or another of the following constructions: (i) the relative clause; (ii) the content question; (iii) the focus construction (hence the name). It is not properly speaking a "voice", despite its morphology. For these reasons we will refer to it henceforth as the Agent Focus Construction (AFC), the corresponding suffixal morphology will accordingly be glossed AF (despite its prevailing homophony with the antipassive).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The "true" antipassive construction is sometimes called the Absolutive Antipassive (cf., Larsen, 1987), in honor of the fact that its sole direct argument is in the absolutive (i.e., nominative in our terminology).

There is a further distinguishing characteristic of the K'ichee' Agent Focus Construction, and it is this which is of primary interest to us here. In contrast to the single association possible in the true antipassive, where agreement morphology must necessarily be construed with the subject (the only argument left bearing a direct structural case), in the Agent Focus Construction, the nominative agreement can (under appropriate conditions) be construed either with the subject or with the object. This is, in a sense, not altogether surprising, since these two arguments share the property of bearing a direct structural Case (ergative and nominative respectively). In a sense, however, it *is* surprising, since the two arguments are not equidistant from the structural locus of agreement, certainly not at d-structure and arguably not at s-structure. And, given accepted assumptions, the two arguments are associated with different Case categories – while Case is not *overt* in the nominal system of K'ichee', we must assume that, abstractly, the transitive subject is in the ergative, while the object is in the nominative (cf. Bittner and Hale, 1996a,b). Thus, for one of the two arguments, at least, agreement is “eccentric” in the Agent Focus Construction of K'ichee'.

The sentences of (3) are sufficient to show this. In (3a), the extracted agent (i.e., the extracted transitive subject) is the third person expression *lee achi* ‘the man’, and the argument left behind, i.e., the object, is the second person expression *at* ‘you (singular)’. It is the latter which shows overt agreement, being represented in the verb word by *-at-*, the 2SG nominative agreement morphology. *Ceteris paribus*, this is what is expected, since it is normal for an object to be construed with the nominative (also called “absolute”) agreement morphology. But now consider (3b). Again, it is the subject which is extracted (as usual in the AFC). But in this case, the extracted argument is the second person *at*. And it is this latter which agrees, being represented again by the nominative agreement morphology *-at-*. Thus, in (3a), agreement is with the object, while in (3b), it is with the subject.

In general, the second person “wins” over the third person – in showing agreement, that is – regardless of the grammatical function involved. The first person also wins over the third person in this respect:

- (4) (a) Aree lee achi x-in-kuna-n (in)  
 FOC the man ASP-1SG-cure-AF (me)  
 'It was the man who cured me.'
- (b) In x-in-kuna-n lee achi  
 I ASP-1SG-cure-AF the man  
 'It was I who cured the man.'

Of course, to say that the first and second persons “win” over the third, is to say simply that an argument which necessarily shows *overt* nominative agreement wins over an argument that permits *non-overt* nominative agreement (whether this latter involves a zero morpheme or no morpheme at all). This seems to be a correct generalization, making certain predictions.

The formal (or polite) second person (both singular and plural), like the third person singular, shows non-overt (or zero) agreement. Consequently, when formal second person appears in the AFC with a first person subject or object as co-argument, it is the latter which will show overt agreement in the AFC. However, if both the subject and the object require *overt* agreement (e.g., if both are non-third person and non-second formal), then the Agent Focus Construction is not possible, since it suppresses the ergative agreement morphology, leaving one of the arguments unassociated. Thus, with first singular subject and object, while extraction for focus is indeed possible, it must employ the ordinary transitive (active) form, with both nominative (object) and ergative (subject) agreement, as in (5):

- (5) In x-at-in-kunaaj  
 I ASP-2SG-1SG-cure  
 'It is I who cured you.'

But neither of the following forms, using the AFC and hence only one overt agreement, is permitted:


- (6) (a) \*In x-in-kuna-n at  
 (b) \*In x-at-kuna-n at

There is more to be said about these matters, to be sure, but this is sufficient for our purposes. Further relevant details of these aspects of K'ichee' grammar are to be found in the recent, and quite excellent, literature on the language (a portion of which is cited above). We will attempt now to provide a partially formal account of the observations which have been made, using the theory of Case and agreement initiated by Bittner (1994) and extended in Bittner and Hale (1996).

## The representation of Case and agreement in K'ichee'

The pre-verbal string in the surface verb word of K'ichee' is clearly divided into two parts, the division being between the nominative (absolutive) and the ergative agreement. Although the division is not obvious in the forms cited here, apart from the generally quite "visible" morpheme boundary, we know that it is structurally real because non-agreement morphology can intervene there (namely, the historically verbal "incorporated movement" markers, cf. Kaufman, 1990). We will assume that this substring corresponds to the projections of two functional heads, C ("complementizer") and I ("Infl", i.e., "inflection"), the first selecting the second, and that the syntactic projection headed by V (the verb) is selected by the latter, as depicted in (7), the d-structure of a transitive clause:

(7)



To some extent, this underrepresents K'ichee' clause structure. Among other things, the implied linear order of the ergative subject in relation to the nominative object is not the preferred one, though it is both possible and frequent; and the full system of supravocal functional categories is highly abbreviated in (7). Nevertheless, that diagram embodies the elements which are essential to an account of Case and agreement in accordance with the framework assumed.

The upper functional head, *C*, is the locus of nominative agreement (as well as the elements glossed ASP, e.g., the perfective *x-* seen in the examples cited). The identification of this upper head with the category *C* is possibly controversial, especially given the fact that there is an even higher head, the preposition *chi* (not shown in (7)), which sometimes fulfills the traditional "complementizer" function. The issue is essentially terminological, however, and we will follow Bittner (1994), in assigning the label *C* to the higher of the two functional heads at issue here. What is important for our purposes is that it is a genuine part of the extended projection of *V* (in the sense of Grimshaw, 1991) and that it plays a particular role in the grammar of Case and agreement. Its role in the latter, as already mentioned, is to function as the locus of nominative agreement morphology. Its role in Case theory derives from the fact that it belongs to a category which is "Case-like" and therefore capable of

licensing a nominative argument, in the manner to be described below. The Case-like character of complementizers is well known and amply reflected in case-complementizer syncretism in many languages of the world.

The lower functional head, *I(nfl)*, is the site of ergative agreement, reflected in part by the fact, quite general for ergative languages, that subject (ergative) agreement is closer to the verb than is object (nominative) agreement (cf., Bittner and Hale, 1996b). In an ordinary ergative clause, *I(nfl)* is also responsible for “assigning Case” to the subject. The latter is an adjunct to VP, a “distinguished adjunct”, as indicated by coindexation, the notation employed to represent the predication relation holding between the subject and the verb phrase (cf., Williams, 1980; Bittner and Hale, 1996a). Case assignment, in the framework assumed here, is a binding relation, to be defined presently. And it is the Case-Binding relation between *I(nfl)* and the subject that is responsible for the fact that the latter bears ergative Case (non-overt in K’ichee’ nominals, but ergative nonetheless, by hypothesis).

The basic ingredients of the Case theory assumed here are given in (8), and the theory of Agreement is given informally in (9):

- (8) (a) Case Filter: A DP must be governed by a Case-like head.  
(b) Case-Binding: Structural K (Case, and the phrasal projection KP which it heads) must be antecedent governed by an appropriate head.
- (9) Agreement is a relation between an argument *A* and a head which governs *A*.

Case (overt or tacit) is a functional head, *K*, projecting the phrasal type KP in the usual manner. The “structural *K*” of (8b) corresponds in part to the traditional notion “structural Case”, as opposed to “inherent” and “semantic” Case. The argument represented as *ERG*, in (7) is in reality a KP realized at s-structure by the ergative Case. As a structural Case, i.e., structural *K(P)*, it must be Case-bound by an appropriate head – in this case, *I(nfl)*.<sup>2</sup>

KP is the maximal extended projection of a nominal expression, just as CP is the extended projection of a verb. A DP appearing within KP is, of course, governed by *K* and therefore satisfies the Case Filter (8a) trivially. By contrast, *NOM* in (7), like nominatives in general, is a bare DP, not a KP. It is therefore not

---

<sup>2</sup>Strictly speaking (b) is an instance of the Empty Category Principle (ECP), which structural Case must satisfy, being “empty” at d-structure (see Bittner, 1994, and Bittner and Hale, 1996a,b for details).

Case-bound and must be licensed in another way – namely, through government from C, a Case-like head. This is how a nominative satisfies the Case Filter.

We can make use of (1a) and its structural description (7) to illustrate more precisely the manner in which these arguments are Case-licensed. The Case-binding relation must first be defined. Case-binding holds between a head  $H$  (the binder) and an argument  $A$  (the bindee) only if the following conditions are met:

- (10) (a)  $H$  either projects or governs a “small-clause” containing  $A$ .
- (b)  $H$  locally c-commands  $A$ .
- (c)  $H$  governs a Case Competitor of  $A$ .

Looking at (7), we ask whether there are any heads which either project or govern a small clause. A small clause is a phrase to which a distinguished adjunct is attached – thus, VP is a small clause in (7). There are two heads which stand in the relevant relation to this small clause, namely, V (which projects the small clause) and I(nfl) which governs it. This takes care of (10a). Now let us consider (10b). Does V locally c-command an argument  $A$ ? The answer is yes; clearly V c-commands its object (NOM), and the relation is *local*, inasmuch as no other argument or head  $X$  “intervenes” (structurally) between V and NOM in such a way that  $X$  c-commands NOM but not V (see Bittner and Hale, 1996a, for a more precise characterization of local c-command). So V satisfies both (10a) and (10b). What about I(nfl)? Here again, local c-command evidently holds, in this instance between I(nfl) and ERG <sub>$\bar{r}$</sub> . The higher head, C, fails in this regard, because I(nfl) intervenes between C and ERG <sub>$\bar{r}$</sub> .



In summary, we have two candidates for the office of Case-binder. But we know that in (1a), only one of the two arguments is Case-bound. This follows from the third requirement, that there be an appropriately situated Case Competitor. A Case Competitor is first of all a Case-less nominal element—i.e., a NP, a N, a DP, or a D, bereft of K. The nominative fits perfectly within this characterization, of course, given the “bare DP” hypothesis of that Case category. But there are two additional requirements, the Case Competitor must be distinct from *A*, the Case-bindee, and it must be governed (m-commanded) by the Case-binder (*H* of (10)).

It cannot be, therefore, that both *V* and *I*(nfl) function as Case-binders. The verb, to be sure, stands in the proper structural relation to the object, but it cannot Case-bind that argument because it does not also govern a Case Competitor—the subject is the closest argument, but as an adjunct of *VP*, it is beyond the reach of the *V*, which is of course included in *VP*, being its head.

This leaves *I*(nfl) as the remaining candidate for Case-binder. And that head does in fact Case-bind an argument—namely, the subject, identified by the label *ERG* in (7), in recognition of the general fact that the Case realized on *I*(nfl)-bound subjects is that which has been termed “ergative” in the traditional terminology of Case nomenclature.<sup>3</sup> We have not shown yet how the Case-binding relation comes about, however.

### Morphological ergativity, transparency and *V-to-I-to-C* movement

The linguistic literature on ergativity recognizes two major classes within the ergative type, traditionally termed the syntactic and the morphological. Our account of this distinction (cf., Bittner, 1994; Bittner and Hale, 1996b) maintains that syntactically ergative languages involve raising of the nominative argument, the object, to *Spec* of *IP*. This syntactic process accounts, of course, for the renowned property of “syntactic ergativity” that the nominative is “high” in the syntactic structure and therefore has the characteristic of subject-like prominence in the clause. For our purposes, raising the nominative achieves two aims: (i) it situates the nominative (a bare DP) in the governing domain of *C*, thereby satisfying the Case Filter; and (ii) it also places the nominative in the governing domain of *I*(nfl), since, its raised position, the latter m-commands the nominative. This second circumstance supplies the needed Case Competitor, permitting, in fact requiring, that *I*(nfl) Case-bind the subject.

But this is not the only way in which the subject can be Case-bound by *I*(nfl). The relation is achieved in another way in so-called morphologically

---

<sup>3</sup>This Case is also called “relative”, particularly in the rich tradition of Eskimo-Ateut linguistics.

ergative languages. In these, the nominative is licensed *in situ*, through “transparency”, i.e., elimination of the barrier status of intervening phrasal categories. This can be achieved in at least two ways (see Bittner and Hale, 1996b). One of these is rather well-known in the linguistic literature. If V raises to I(nfl) in the syntax, then the VP dominating V and its object ceases to be a barrier to government. Under transparency effected by V-to-I movement, the object is, in the relevant sense, “visible” to I(nfl). And if, as is true in canonically ergative languages, the object is a nominative (i.e., bare DP), it will function as a Case Competitor permitting I(nfl) to Case-bind the subject.


Is K’ichee’ syntactically ergative or morphologically ergative? As a V-initial language, it is clearly transparent to an extent, assuming its verb raising is a syntactic (as opposed to phonological) process—and it gives all appearances of being syntactic. At least, it is transparent with respect to VP. But a fully transparent language must also remove the barrierhood of IP, permitting the bare DP object to satisfy the Case Filter (through government from C, a Case-like head).

Although I(nfl), with raised V attached, combines with C to form a single word, it is in this instance not so obvious that I(nfl) actually raises to C in syntax. As noted, grammaticalized auxiliaries of motion (Kaufman’s “incorporated movement markers”) can appear between those two heads. While this does not preclude syntactic raising or raising of I to C, more evidence one way or another would be desirable.

There is a slight preference for the linear order VOS, in K’ichee’, and this is the order normally attributed to the language and to the proto-language. However, England (1989) points out that VSO is preferred in K’ichee’ when both the subject and object are definite. While the relevance of surface word order is not altogether clear, it is worth considering the implications of the VOS theory of K’ichee’, and of its ancestor.


There are at least two possibilities. If the basic structure of the K’ichee’ clause is the relatively standard one given in (7), then some displacement is involved in defining the surface ordering of elements. We have already suggested that the verb moves to I(nfl), and the surface position of V indicates that. One possibility is that the object also moves—leftward, to some position preceding the subject. And this might be expected if IP is “opaque”—object movement to Spec of IP would place it within the government domain of C, assuming, as is usually done, that a head governs Spec of XP if it governs XP itself. This first possibility is represented diagrammatically in (11), abstracting away from V-movement (V-to-I):

(11)



The second possibility takes seriously the idea that VOS is the *d-structure* order, or an alternative d-structure order. Departing minimally from (7), this would position the subject (ERG<sub>*j*</sub>) after rather than before the VP (conforming, essentially, with Aissen’s ordering principle for Tzotzil; see Aissen, 1996).<sup>4</sup> This is an attractive possibility, as it would permit an account of the variation noted by England (1989) as a somewhat trivial linearization alternative, positioning the subject (ERG) before VP, as in (7), or after, as in (12), with V-raising indicated as well:

(12)



This effects VOS ordering through V-raising alone, without object raising. The structure depicted in (12), and that in (7) as well, is possible only if IP, like

---

<sup>4</sup>Aissen’s principle (Aissen, 1996:451) has to do with the position of Spec (to the left if Spec of a functional category, to the right of a lexical category). If this can be understood to include the distinguished adjunct (subject) of a small clause, as well as specifiers, then Aissen’s principle applies rather well to K’ichee’, and possibly other VOS languages of the family. This implies, however, that the subject follows the VP in its entirety, not just the object but all VP-internal constituents. This is a matter which has not been thoroughly investigated, so far as I know, though the literature includes examples of the implied ordering in transitive clauses, as in (i), for example (from Nik’té’ and Saqijix, 1993:131):

- (i) X-u-jux            ri tzimaa    chi u-wach    ri ab’aj ri achi.  
 ASP-3SG-scrape the gourd    to 3SG-surface the stone the man  
 ‘The man scraped the gourd bowl against the stone.’


VP, is transparent, permitting C to govern NOM, a bare DP which must satisfy the Case Filter (i.e., be governed by a Case-like head).

Although I-to-C movement is suggested by the morphophonological inclusion of C in the verb word, we have as yet no direct evidence that this fusion takes place in syntax, i.e., that it is not an entire superficial matter of phonological form. The surface facts do, however, cast some doubt on the object raising hypothesis. If the object raises in order to satisfy the Case Filter, the IP must be opaque. And the expectation would be, then, that the object would appear between I(nfl) and C. Instead, it appears beneath (to the right of) the C-I-V complex, suggesting that *both* head raising operations have taken place in syntax (assuming adjacency to be necessary for the *phonological* merger of heads). If I-to-C indeed takes place in syntax, then object raising is not motivated by the need to satisfy the Case Filter, and, within the framework we are assuming, it is not otherwise motivated either. While this favors the I-to-C raising alternative, further evidence for IP-transparency would strengthen the case. We think that eccentric agreement of the Agent Focus Construction (AFC), as in (3b), provides further evidence.

#### An account of “spurious” antipassives

We believe that the AFC is the result of grammaticalization of the “true antipassive,” which, we assume, can be understood (following Baker, 1988; cf. also Bittner, 1994) as involving the presence of a nominal element (N) incorporated in the verb. The presence of this element has consequences for Case-binding and Agreement. The d-structure of the antipassive, under these assumptions, is approximately as follows:

(13)



The incorporated N is realized as the antipassive morphology  $-(V)n$ . Theoretically, however, it is an incorporated noun. Being a “bare nominal”, it can qualify as a case competitor, under appropriate conditions. And it is this that determines the Case-binding properties of the structure. XP and YP are nominal projections – their status as KP or DP depends on Case-binding, of course. Since V projects a small clause, locally c-commands YP, and governs a Case Competitor (i.e., the incorporated N), it necessarily Case-binds YP, which is therefore a KP. The principles of Case Realization determine quite generally (across languages) that an argument Case-bound by a head of the form  $[_V V^{\wedge} N]$ , i.e. with lexical as opposed to functional-level adjunct, surface in an “oblique” Case, as in (2) above.

Since the object is in an oblique Case, it cannot itself serve as a Case Competitor in relation to I(nfl). The subject, XP, must therefore be a bare DP, since it has no Case-binder. It is nominative and is construed with nominative agreement. In the antipassive, I(nfl) is not “active” in relation to Case-binding; it also fails to function as a governor for agreement, losing its (ergative) agreement morphology.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the antipassive is an intransitive construction, as has been noted generally.

The true antipassive of K’ichee’ is heavily restricted in its occurrence, many transitive verbs cannot appear in the antipassive, and for those that can, it is quite generally limited to clauses with a “volitional” agentive subject (cf. discussion in Mondloch, 1981). By contrast, the Agent Focus Construction involves no such constraint. It is associated with a productive syntactic process (extraction) and is, accordingly, not itself sensitive to semantic types. Constraints on the AFC are purely morphosyntactic; any transitive verb at all may appear in

---

<sup>5</sup>There may be a problem here for the way in which we think of agreement, i.e., as primarily a relation between an argument and a head which governs it. While “detransitivization” quite generally eliminates one set of agreement (subject or object), why is it generally the lower agreement (i.e., that closest to the verb, object in nominative-accusative languages, subject in ergative-nominative languages)? There is a clear connection with Case-binding. If a head “loses” its ability to Case-bind an argument in a particular construction, it also fails to agree with an argument. The problem makes some sense if Case is *linked* with agreement, as has often been suggested, but as we shall see in eccentric agreement, the issue is not straightforward.

the AFC. While it involves a certain morphology in the verb word, it is used only in association with the syntactic process of extraction, in particular, extraction of the subject of a transitive clause (to Spec of CP, an A-bar position). There are, thus, two components, extraction and the morphology. Let us refer to the morphological component as AFC-formation; for our purposes, the use of the latter can be formulated informally as follows:

(14) The Agent Focus Construction:

If the subject (ergative) argument of a transitive clause is moved to an A-bar position (Spec of CP, we assume here), then AFC-formation applies (optionally).<sup>6</sup>

The morphology implicated by the AFC, in the examples cited, is cognate with that of the antipassive, inviting the suspicion that the two are the same in origin. There is some reason to question this, however, because the two large verb classes of K'ichee' do not agree entirely in the distribution of this morphology. The class termed "derived transitive" show  $-(V)n$  for both uses, while the class called "root transitive" show this ending for the antipassive and another, i.e.,  $-(V)w$ , for the AFC (see, e.g., Larsen, 1987, fn. 8, as well as Mondloch, 1981, and many other sources). This observation reinforces the notion that the two constructions are to be distinguished, of course, but while the morphology is synchronically distinct, we need more information to rule out the possibility that the historical source of the two is utterly distinct, particularly given the fact that there is both partial overlap in form and partial overlap in the morphosyntactic effect of suppressing ergative agreement. We will assume here that there is some *historical* connection between the morphologies of the two constructions and that the AFC results, in part, at least, from reanalysis of the morphology.

Grammaticalization, in the original sense of Meillet (1912), is the process according to which a lexical element loses its lexical character and assumes that of a grammatical element—an auxiliary, article, tense marker, case marker, i.e., a functional category. And assuming that the antipassive and the AFC are indeed historically related, the evolution of the latter must have involved at least the grammaticalization of the incorporated N, say to D (an undifferentiated pronominal, appropriate since it is an element from the class of functional categories associated with the nominal extended projection). This is not enough, however, since grammaticalization to this point alone results, by hypothesis and demonstrably, in a nominative-accusative language (as in the case of the


---

<sup>6</sup>If the process *can* apply, it generally *does* apply, giving the impression that the rule is obligatory, not optional. Our notes have a number of instances of non-application in root clauses and somewhat more instances of non-application in association with extraction from embedded clauses (cf., Mondloch, 1981, for discussion of this matter).

Wellesley Island languages of North Queensland; cf., McConvell, 1981). This follows, since grammaticalization resulting in  $[_V V^{\wedge} D]$  does not affect the *Case-binding* capability of V, only the *realization* of the Case it “assigns” – this is accusative (a direct Case) in this instance, the V-adjoined D being the defining property of nominative-accusative languages (in the framework assumed here).

Something additional must have happened in the history of K’ichee’. We suspect that the primary change was structural. The surface form of the verb in K’ichee’ leaves utterly ambiguous the basic structural association of the morphology Agent Focus morphology. It could be in the verb, as it must be in the antipassive, by hypothesis. Or it could be in I(nfl); and this is what we propose – the original antipassive morphology, no longer lexical, is located in I(nfl) at d-structure, not in V as before.<sup>7</sup> And, moreover, the Agent Focus morphology *replaces* the agreement morphology, so that while I(nfl) continues to be a Case-binder, it is not a locus of agreement. The syntactic structure of an AF construction is as follows (abstracting away from head-movement, which does not change the basic configuration, only the barrierhood of IP, and VP):

(15)



Since focus extraction is A-bar movement, it has no effect on Case. That is to say, the Case-binding relations in (15) are the same as in (7), the canonical transitive clause. As in (7), the verb cannot Case-bind its object (YP), because it fails to govern a Case Competitor. I(nfl) does Case-bind the trace of  $XP_i$ , however. The chain headed by  $XP_i$  is therefore assigned ergative Case, by the standard Case realization principles. The object, YP, must be a bare DP, i.e., nominative. Assuming that K’ichee’ is transparent (i.e., that IP and VP are not barriers, as a result of V-to-I-to-C movement, not shown in (15)), the object is Case-licensed *in situ*, through government from C.

<sup>7</sup>Another outcome would be that in which the antipassive morphology stays in place, giving an AFC in which focus extraction is simply identical to the antipassive in terms of agreement and Case. This seems to be true of the focus construction exemplified in Nik’te’ and Saqijix (1993:136-138), in which the object is regularly in the oblique Case.

The essential grammar of the Agent Focus Construction is identical to that of an ordinary transitive, in so far as Case and government relations are concerned. However, only one Agreement-bearing functional head is present, namely C. A transitive clause has two direct arguments, and some arguments *must* agree—as mentioned earlier, these are the arguments whose corresponding agreement is phonologically overt (i.e., first person, second person informal, and third person plural).<sup>8</sup> Consequently, the actual use of the Agent Focus structure portrayed in (15) is limited, for essentially morphological reasons of no relevance to basic grammatical processes.<sup>9</sup>

If  $XP_i$  is first person singular, and YP is, say, second person plural informal, the “option” of using the AFC is unavailable. This is because both arguments must agree—i.e., must be construed with overt agreement morphology. Subject-extraction can occur, but the AFC cannot, because only one overt agreement morpheme is available, that associated with the highest functional head, C, the other being replaced by AF morphology. But if one or the other (or both) of the two direct arguments is, say, third person singular, and therefore capable of occurring in the absence of overt agreement, then the AFC is not only possible but preferred, to an extent which has led many to say it is obligatory.

Consider first the situation in which  $XP_i$  of (15) is third person singular and YP is first person singular, as in (4a). In this situation, YP<sub>i</sub> must agree and evidently does agree with C, in the normal manner. Of course, we do not know definitively that YP is *in situ* or raised. That is what we are attempting to determine. If YP is raised, then it is “close” to C and governed in that way; if YP is not raised, then the structure must be transparent.

Now consider the situation in which the person categories are reversed, as in (4b), so that the extracted subject,  $XP_i$  is first singular and the object, YP<sub>i</sub> is

---

<sup>8</sup>The details of third person plural agreement require some adjustment of the simple statement just given (cf., Davies and Sam-Colop, 1990; Trechsel, 1993; Mondloch, 1981). Third plural agreement may be suppressed in combination with first or second, a hierarchical arrangement which may be related to well-known person hierarchies elsewhere. Alternatively, this apparent hierarchy may simply reflect the fact that third person plural nominative agreement is sometimes optional in transitives, depending on the nature of the object.

<sup>9</sup>In addition to its effect of preempting ergative agreement, there is an additional “property” associated with the AF morphology which is probably also traceable to its putative antipassive ancestry. AF shares with the “impersonal *se*” of Spanish, for example, the property that it cannot function as the antecedent of a pronominal. Pascal de Campo and Philippe Schlenker (p.c.) point out that its behavior is comparable to that of the resumptive *ce* of French, which can antecede *ce* but not *il*, as in *les taureaux, c’est fort quand c’est grand* (\**quand il est grand*). The relevant K’ichee’ facts are discussed in Larsen (1987) and Pye (1988), and analyses are offered there in two distinct approaches within the Principles and Parameters framework.



third singular. In this case, the subject must agree, which it does – this is “eccentric” agreement, inasmuch as the subject is construed with agreement morphology which is normally associated with the object in a fully transitive clause, which the AFC construction surely is. And since agreement is in C, IP must be transparent. The subject must “skip” the closer head, I(nfl), since it lacks agreement morphology and is therefore irrelevant. It cannot skip that head in the ordinary transitive, of course, since that would violate (relativized) minimality (cf., Rizzi, 1990), I(nfl) being the closest relevant head in relation to the subject.

We conclude that K’ichee’ is a language in which Case and agreement relations are satisfied through transparency. It is not a “raising ergative language” in the typology of Case systems (cf., Bittner and Hale, 1996b) and it belongs therefore to the observationally predominant morphologically ergative type. Its “eccentric” agreement follows straightforwardly from general principles and just two “local” (i.e., K’ichee’-specific) assumptions, (i) that AF morphology replaces agreement in I(nfl) and (ii) an argument associated with overt agreement cannot occur without actually being construed with overt morphology.

#### The “false antipassive” in Karitiana (Arikém family, Tupi stock)

Karitiana is a verb raising language which displays verb-final word order in embedded clauses and verb-initial or verb-second word order in main clauses. Evidence for verb raising, apart from the order of constituents itself, can be found in the ergative pattern of agreement. Whenever the verb raises, which occurs obligatorily in main clauses, nominative (object and intransitive subject) agreement appears on the verb, while in embedded clauses the verb stays *in situ* and no agreement is present (see Storto, in this volume, for more evidence of verb raising):

- (16) (a) Taso            i-oky-t            boroja  
           man            3AGR-kill-NFUT   snake  
           ‘The man killed the snake’ (irrealis)
- (b) Yn                i-oky-t            boroja  
           I                 3AGR-kill-NFUT   snake  
           ‘I killed the snake’ (irrealis)
- (c) [Boroja        taso    oky]    y-taka-kārā-t        yn  
           snake man    kill    1-REALIS-think-NFUT    I  
           ‘I thought the man had killed the snake’

The irrealis sentences (16a-b) show agreement with the object through the use of the prefix *i-*, and indeed all transitive verbs show object agreement in main

clauses. In the embedded sentence in (16c), however, no agreement occurs on the transitive verb *oky*. The realis main sentence (17a) shows nominative agreement with the intransitive subject, realized on the verb, while in the embedded clause of (17b) no agreement is present.

- (17) (a) Y-ta-opisot yn  
 1AGR-realis-listen I  
 'I listened'
- (b) [Yn opisot] a-taka-kārā-t an  
 I listen 2AGR-realis-think-NFUT you  
 'You thought that I listened'

We can explain the facts above by hypothesizing that Karitiana is a verb second language in which the verb is generated in final position (SOV) and raises obligatorily in main clauses to the second highest structural position. Storto (1996) argued that this second position is not C(omp), because in questions and topicalization a still higher phrase is projected.

Ergative subjects in Karitiana often occupy the Spec position of the projection to which the verb raises, yielding the unmarked SVO order. We know that the subject and verb are in Spec and head position of the same maximal projection in SVO sentences because adverbs, which adjoin to maximal projections in Karitiana, are never allowed to occur between a subject and a verb, while they may occur before the subject, between the verb and the object and after the object:

- (18) (a) Mynda taso na-m-potpora-j ese  
 Slowly man REALIS-CAUS-boil-FUT water  
 'The man boiled the water slowly'
- (b) \*Taso mynda nampotporaj ese  
 (c) Taso nampotporaj mynda ese  
 (d) Taso nampotporaj ese mynda

Subjects in Karitiana SVO sentences do not seem to be in their underlying position given the fact that intransitive sentences occur in VS word order and VOS is a very common order whenever the subject is a discourse topic (old information).


Storto (1996) has accounted for the post-verbal word order of intransitive subjects and objects by positing a Case-driven movement for nominative arguments to Spec of IP. Under this account, ergative subjects would be *in situ* in VOS sentences, and intransitive subjects and objects would always move to the

Spec position immediately below the landing site of the verb in main clauses. The head position to which the verb moves, cannot be argued to be C(omp) if we assume that wh-movement of constituents and adjuncts is movement to Spec of CP, because it is possible for an ergative subject to intervene between a wh-phrase and the verb:

- (19) Morasong João i-amang tyj̃a gok?  
 wh-for João 3AGR-plant PROGR manioc  
 'Why is João planting manioc?'

We will refer to the C(omp) position and its projection as C<sub>2</sub> and CP<sub>2</sub>, while the projection to which the verb moves in main clauses will be referred to as CP<sub>1</sub>. The structure hypothesized for Karitiana based on the facts discussed above is given in (20):

(20)



The structure depicted in (20) is that of a VOS sentence, the most common word-order in narratives where the subject is old information. Verb raising to the head position of CP<sub>1</sub> (possibly a focus phrase) first involves verb raising to I(nfl), because whenever the verb raises it takes aspect, tense and evidential morphology with it. We assume the subject is generated as an adjunct to VP and is licensed *in situ*. Storto (1996) hypothesized that objects and intransitive subjects raise to Spec of IP to check nominative Case in I(nfl), and that subjects optionally raise to Spec of CP<sub>1</sub> whenever there is the need to escape a topic interpretation. Those hypotheses, however, are very tentative at the present stage in the description of Karitiana, and more evidence needs to be discovered before a convincing argument can be made in their support. Storto (1996) assumes that wh-phrases occupy the Spec of CP<sub>2</sub> position. Karitiana does not have overt

complementizers. However, there is a morpheme which occurs cliticized to the wh-word *morã* whenever a nominative wh-phrase occupies Spec of CP<sub>2</sub>:

- (21) Mora-mon a-ti-amang tyka?  
wh-NOM 2AGR-OT-plant PROGR  
'What are you planting?'
- (22) Mora-mon i-hyryp tyka?  
wh-NOM 3AGR-cry PROGR  
'Who is crying?'
- (23) Morã i-oky tyãa y-opok ako?  
wh 3AGR-kill PROGR my-chicken  
'Who is killing my chicken?'
- (24) Morã-ty aj-pytagng tyãa?  
wh-OBL 2AGR-steal PROGR  
'What are you stealing?'

Examples (21) to (24) show wh-movement of arguments. In (21) and (22) the nominative argument is moved to Spec of CP<sub>2</sub>, and the agreement morpheme *-mon* suffixes (or cliticizes to) the wh-word *morã*. In (23), the ergative argument is moved, and the wh-word *morã* occurs by itself in Spec of CP<sub>2</sub>. (24) is an example of an intransitive verb whose oblique argument undergoes wh-movement; in such cases, the oblique suffix *-ty* moves along with the wh-word. Since *-mon* distinguishes nominative wh-phrases from all other wh-phrases, it seems reasonable to describe that morpheme as nominative wh-agreement generated in C<sub>2</sub>.

One may object to our analysis of the wh-agreement morpheme *-mon* by pointing out that object wh-movement triggers the appearance of the morpheme *ti-* (glossed as OT=OBJECT TOPICALIZER) on the verb, which, if described as an intransitivizer, would obliterate the difference between examples (21) and (22) above. If *ti-* were a marker of the antipassive, we would expect the object to be in an oblique Case. However, we have evidence that that the verb in “*ti-* constructions” remains fully transitive: in such constructions not only is the object unmarked by the oblique suffix *-ty*, but it is ungrammatical to drop the object, as exemplified in (26):

- (25) Boet i-ti-m'-a-t ãonso  
necklace 3AGR-OT-CAUS-do-NF woman  
'It was the necklace that the woman made'
- (26) \*Itim'at ãonso

The function of the “*ti*-construction” seems to be similar to that of the K’ichee’ AFC construction. In the case of K’ichee’, the AFC was described as an optional construction that may occur when an ergative subject is raised to Spec of CP<sub>2</sub>. In Karitiana, the “*ti*-construction” is obligatory whenever an object is moved to Spec of CP<sub>2</sub> - that includes to icalization (see (27)), wh-movement (as in (28)), and relativization (as in (29)):

(27) Sepa                    y-ti-m-'a                    tyj̃a  
basket 1AGR-OT-CAUS-do                    PROGR  
'It is a basket I am weaving'

(28) Mora-mon    y-'it                    ti-oky-t  
wh-NOM    my-father    OT-kill-NF  
'What did my father kill?'

(29) Yn    na-sombak                    [ōwā [taso    ti-mi]]  
I        REALIS-see                    [child [man    OT-hit]]  
'I saw [the child who the man hurt/the child be hurt by the man]'

In K’ichee’ the AFC has the function of marking the ergative subject as focus. In Karitiana, however, the “*ti*-construction” does not involve focus. Since the answer to an object wh-question must not be given in the “*ti*-construction”, we assume that it is not focus (that is, new information) that defines the semantics of that construction. Focus of arguments is attained in Karitiana by movement of an argument to Spec of IP. As we have mentioned, an ergative subject moves to Spec of IP when it needs to escape being interpreted as old information. Furthermore, the optimal answer to an object wh-question is given in the passive construction (30b):

(30) (a) Mora-mon    taso    ti-'y-t  
wh-NOM    man    OT-eat-NF  
'What did the man eat?'

(b) Ohy                    a-taka-'y-t                    (taso)  
potato PASS-REALIS-eat-NF man  
'The potato was eaten by the man'

(c) ??Ohy i-ti-'y-t                    taso  
potato 3AGR-OT-eat-NF    man  
'It was the potato that the man ate'

Based on the analysis given above, we will refer to the “*ti*-construction” as the Object Topicalization Construction (OTC):


- (31) **The Object Topicalization Construction:**  
If the object argument of a transitive clause is moved to Spec of CP<sub>2</sub>,  
then OTC-formation applies (obligatory).

## Karitiana under The Case-Binding Theory (Bittner, 1994)

In this paper we would like to propose an alternative account of Case assignment in Karitiana, assuming the theory proposed by Bittner (1994) and developed further in Bittner and Hale (1996a). Since verb raising to V2 position is obligatory in declarative clauses, both IP and VP are transparent to government from the higher head  $C_1$  in Karitiana, which means that objects and intransitive subjects do not have to raise to Spec of IP in order to be Case licensed. Under this view, Karitiana is a transparent ergative language. Ergative case is assigned to transitive subjects because VP is transparent, allowing I(nfl) to "see" the object as a case competitor, and thus Case-bind the ergative subject. Nominative arguments are never Case-bound: subjects of intransitive clauses do not have Case competitors because in an intransitive clause the subject is the only argument of the verb, and in transitive clauses neither V nor  $C_1$  can Case-bind the object because  $C_1$  does not locally c-command the object and V does not govern a Case-competitor.

The word order patterns of Karitiana may be explained in the Case-Binding theory by positing that subjects are right-adjoined to VP at d-structure. This base position of the subject has to be described as a discourse topic position, which accounts straightforwardly for the fact that subjects occur post-verbally whenever they are old information. Subjects which occur pre-verbally at s-structure, have moved to the Spec of  $CP_1$  position to avoid being interpreted as topics. Under this view, objects never move out of their base position for Case-licensing reasons, since by virtue of transparency all arguments are licensed in-situ. The structure posited for a Karitiana VOS sentence in the Case-Binding theory is exemplified in (32):

(32)



We have seen that syntactic movement of the verb to I(nfl) and C<sub>1</sub> can be offered as evidence that Karitiana is a transparent ergative language. Within the Case-Binding Theory, independent evidence for this analysis can be given by the occurrence of "eccentric" agreement in the OTC. In such constructions, the nominative prefix occurring on the verb exceptionally agrees with the agent of the transitive clause, which is unexpected in a language in which agreement is nominative:

- (33) Sojxa            yj-ti-m-pi'orot            yjxa  
       pig            1pAGR-OT-CAUS-run        we  
       'We caused the pig to run'

The puzzle we have to solve has to do with a mismatch between Case and agreement in the OTC. Although Case relationships are the same in declarative sentences and the OTC, the former display nominative agreement (that is, agreement with the intransitive subject or the object) on the verb, while in the latter the verb agrees with the ergative subject. One immediate explanation can be offered for this fact in the Case Theory assumed here. If the morpheme *ti-* is an old antipassive morpheme which was reinterpreted by the present speakers of Karitiana as a head located in I(nfl) which assimilates the agreement features of that position, then it is possible to explain "eccentric" agreement in such constructions. Agreement is a s-structure binding relation between the functional head which hosts agreement features and an argument chain. In transitive declarative clauses nominative agreement occurs on the verb because the head position to which the verb raises (C<sub>1</sub>) hosts nominative agreement features and it binds the object by virtue of being the head of a transparency chain. Declarative clauses do not display ergative agreement because I(nfl), the functional head which locally binds the ergative argument, does not have overt agreement morphology to display. However, when the OTC morpheme *ti-* replaces the agreement features of I(nfl), the ergative argument is no longer in an agreement relationship with I(nfl), and the nominative agreement features of the higher head C<sub>1</sub> are able to pick up the ergative argument chain.

If *ti-* were described as a head with nominal features, the theory of Case we are using would predict that the object would be assigned an oblique case in Karitiana, because a V-adjoined N or D serves as a Case competitor for the object, allowing the verb to Case-bind the latter and assign it structural Case. In this case, the OTC would be an antipassive if the head adjoined to the verb were N and an accusative structure in case that head were D. However, the object in the OTC is clearly nominative, as the presence of the *-mon* morpheme in Comp attests in object wh-questions. Thus, the theory correctly predicts that the OTC is not an antipassive or a nominative-accusative construction, but an ergative-nominative construction in which "eccentric" agreement occurs by virtue of the presence of the verbal head *ti-*.



Another possibility which must be discarded is the analysis of *ti-* as a head located originally in  $C_1$ . Since V raises to I and  $C_1$  in all main clauses, it is plausible to hypothesize that the OTC morphology attached to V is actually inserted in  $C_1$ . This hypothesis, however, can be refuted on empirical grounds: Embedded clauses may appear in the OTC construction (as in (29), repeated here as (34)), and when they do, no agreement is present on the embedded verb:

- (34) Yn     na-sombak           [ōwā [taso ti-mi]]  
       1s     REALIS-see(tr)    [child [man OT-hit]]  
       'I saw [the child who the man hurt/the child be hurt by the man]'

The presence of the OTC morpheme *ti-* combined with the lack of agreement indicates that V has raised to I, but not to  $C_1$  in embedded clauses.

Let us discuss two possible analyses of "eccentric" agreement in the Karitiana OTC. The first one, to which we will refer as the "agreement replacement" view, is parallel to the account that has already been proposed to explain the AFC in K'ichee'. We have hypothesized that the presence of the morpheme *ti-* in I(nfl) has taken the place of agreement features, destroying the covert agreement relationship between the ergative subject and that functional head. The ergative argument is thus free from its usual agreement relationship with I(nfl). For that reason, the functional head  $C_1$ , which contains nominative agreement features and usually agrees with the nominative argument, is able to agree with the ergative argument instead in the OTC. This "switch" in agreement patterns is possible in this view because the ergative argument is the most local argument chain governed by  $C_1$  in the OTC configuration.

Alternatively, one might suggest that "eccentric" agreement occurs in the OTC as a result of the fact that movement of the object in those constructions renders the head of the nominative argument chain inaccessible to the agreeing head  $C_1$ . We will refer to this hypothesis as the "movement" analysis of agreement. Indeed, we have seen that whenever the object raises to Spec of  $CP_2$ , the OTC is obligatory, which indicates that movement of the object (rather than the presence of OT morphology in I(nfl)) may be the actual trigger of "eccentric" agreement. The theory of Case-Binding, at first inspection, seems to allow this hypothesis, since it defines agreement as a surface structure relationship between a head and a specific position (head or foot, depending on the parameter set by the language in question) which it governs in an argument chain. If we assume that the nominative agreement pattern occurring in Karitiana is the relationship between  $C_1$  and the head of an argument chain, then it is possible to say that when the object raises to Spec of  $CP_2$  in the OTC construction, the usual agreement relationship between  $C_1$  and the nominative argument is broken, since  $C_1$  no longer binds the head of the nominative

argument chain. Since, within Case-Binding theory, Case and agreement are independent from each other, the nominative agreement features of  $C_1$  are able to enter into a relationship with the head of the ergative argument chain, leading to what we have been calling "eccentric" agreement.

There are two main reasons why we must reject the "movement" view of "eccentric" agreement. The first reason is theory-internal, and has to do with the definition of argument chain. Although the s-structure object of an OTC construction is not governed by the functional head  $C_1$ , it is clear that the chain linking the base object position to Spec of  $CP_2$  is not an argument chain, but an A-bar chain. This fact indicates that the head of the object A-chain at s-structure is not in Spec of  $CP_2$ , but in base position. This account makes the empirically correct prediction that no A-bar chains should ever alter agreement relationships<sup>10</sup>. The second reason for rejecting the "movement" view of "eccentric" agreement is empirical in nature, and has to do with how to better capture the agreement patterns of the AFC in K'ichee'. Unlike Karitiana, K'ichee' usually has two positions for agreement, one of which is blocked by the AFC construction. That single position may agree with the subject or object, as seen in (4a) and (4b), although in both cases the subject has moved to Spec of  $CP_2$ . That is, the factor determining which argument is construed with agreement in K'ichee' is the person hierarchy, and A-bar movement of the subject plays no role in this process. We conclude that the "movement" account of agreement is unsustainable, while the "agreement replacement" hypothesis is able to explain "eccentric" agreement in both K'ichee' and Karitiana.

In summary, the Case-Binding theory predicts an independence between Case and agreement which is able to capture the agreement patterns of the OTC. The OTC can be described in this theory as the Karitiana counterpart of the Agent Focus construction in K'ichee'. Case relationships are the same in declarative transitive sentences and in the OTC, but agreement is crucially changed by the presence of the inflectional head *ti-* in I(nfl), which replaces ergative agreement features.

---

<sup>10</sup> Note that in raising ergative languages the object raises to Spec of IP for Case licensing reasons. Although the Case-Binding theory describes Spec of IP as an A-bar position, the fact that it sometimes licenses arguments forces us to conclude that that position also has properties of an A-position. We are forced to conclude that a chain which involves movement of an argument to Spec of IP for Case licensing reasons is a mixed chain (it has both A and A-bar properties).

## References

- Aissen, Judith (1996) Pied-piping, abstract agreement, and functional projections in Tzotzil. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. 14:447-491.
- Bittner, Maria (1994) *Case, Scope, and Binding*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bittner, Maria, and Ken Hale. (1996a) The structural determination of case and agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27:1-68.
- Bittner, Maria, and Ken Hale. (1996b) Ergativity: toward a theory of a heterogeneous class. To appear in *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.
- Davies, William D., and Luis Enrique Sam-Colop (1990) K'iche' and the structure of antipassive. *Language* 66:522-549.
- England, Nora (1989) Changes in basic word order in Mayan languages. Ms. La Antigua Guatemala: Centro de Investigaciones Regionales de Mesoamerica.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1990) Extended projection. Ms. Brandeis University. Waltham, Mass.
- Kaufman, Terrence (1990) Algunos rasgos estructurales de los idiomas mayances con referencia especial al k'iche'. In Nora England and Stephen Elliott (eds.), *Lecturas Sobre la Lingüística Maya*, La Antigua Guatemala: Centro de Investigaciones Regionales de Mesoamerica. Pp. 59-114.
- Larsen, Thomas W. (1987) The syntactic status of ergativity in Quiché. *Lingua* 71:33-59.
- McConvell, Patrick (1981) How Lardil became accusative. *Lingua* 55:141-179.
- Meillet, Antoine (1912) *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale*. Paris: Champion.
- Mondloch, James L. (1981) *Voice in Quiché-Maya*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY-Albany Doctoral Dissertation.
- Nik'te' and Saqijix (1993) *Gramática Pedagógica K'ichee'*. Guatemala: Oxlajuuj Keej Maya' Ajtz'iib'. Programa para el Desarrollo Integral de la Población Maya, Universidad Rafael Landívar

Pye, Clifton (1988) The Focus Antipassive in K'iche' Maya. University of Kansas Manuscript.

Rizzi, Luigi (1990) *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Storto, Luciana (1996) Verb Raising and Word Order Variation in Karitiana. General's paper. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Ms.

Trechsel, Frank R. (1993) Quiché focus constructions. *Lingua* 33-78.

Williams, Edwin (1980) Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:203-238.