

## Anaphor agreement effect and agreement switch in Kutchi Gujarati

The anaphor agreement effect (AAE) was originally formulated by Rizzi (1990) which simply refers to the phenomenon that anaphors cannot trigger regular verbal agreement. Kutchi Gujarati (henceforth, KG), an Indo-Aryan language spoken in the western parts of India, displays AAE by undergoing an agreement switch. As discussed in Patel (2014), in the perfective aspect, it is usually the object that triggers the agreement (as in (1)) but whenever the object is an anaphor, then it is the subject that triggers the agreement (as in (2)). We would refer to the fact that agreement is switched from the object to subject as ‘Agreement switch’ and would account for this pattern in terms very similar to those of Deal’s (2010) analysis of Nez Perce but differing in certain crucial aspects.

- |                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>(1) a. Mary John-ne ad-y-o<br/>         Mary John-ACC touch-PFV-M.SG<br/>         ‘Mary touched John.’</p>             | <p>b. John Mary-ne ad-y-i<br/>         John Mary-ACC touch-PFV-F.SG<br/>         ‘John touched Mary.’</p>                         |
| <p>(2) a. John e-na potha-ne jo-y-o<br/>         John 3.SG-GEN self-ACC see-PFV-M.SG<br/>         ‘John saw himself.’</p> | <p>b. Mary e-na potha-ne jo-i<br/>         Mary 3.SG-GEN self-ACC see-PFV-F.SG<br/>         ‘Mary saw herself.’ (Patel 2014 )</p> |

Further evidence for the agreement switch pattern comes from the fact that in perfective aspect, when the object is an anaphor and the subject is a dative marked NP (which cannot control the agreement), the agreement morphology on the verb is a default marker as shown in (3). This clearly shows that it is the subject that controls the agreement rather than the anaphors in (2).

- (3) Raj-ne e-na potha-ne jo-vu/\*vo par-y-u/\*o  
 Raj-DAT 3.SG-GEN self-ACC see-INF.DEFAULT/M.SG had-PFV- DEFAULT/\*M.SG  
 ‘Raj had to see himself.’ (Patel 2014 )

Patel (2014), who discusses these facts in (1)-(3), also introduces further interesting facts showing first conjunct agreement (as in (4)), where the verb is in perfective aspect, the object is an anaphor and the subject is a conjoined DP. Since object is an anaphor, the agreement is switched to the subject and this case, where the subject is a conjoined DP, the subject agreement is with the first conjunct rather than the full subject DP.

- |                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>(4) a. [John ane Mary] pot-potha-ne jo-y-o<br/>         John and Mary themselves-ACC see-PFV-M.SG<br/>         ‘John and Mary saw themselves.’</p> | <p>b. [Mary ane John] pot-potha-ne jo-y-i<br/>         Mary and John themselves-ACC see-PFV-F.SG<br/>         ‘Mary and John saw themselves.’ (Patel 2014)</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

So Kutchi displays very clear manifestations of AAE. How are these facts to be accounted for? In Patel’s (2014) analysis, the derivation in syntax would proceed as follows: Once *v*P is built, the probe from *v* would search in its domain for agreement but the anaphor in the argument position cannot act as a suitable goal. In the next step in the derivation, the &P would merge. Both & and *v* would mark their complement for spell out but they would not actually get spelled out until the C head merges in the structure. Now once the C head merges in the structure, the complement of & and *v* would be spelled out. After the spell out of the complement, what remains in the derivation is the *v* head and the first conjunct. The agree relation between the two results in first conjunct agreement. For the simple DP subject, the derivation would work in the same way, where the *v* would agree with the subject. Though this analysis accounts for the agreement switch pattern, it is not without problems. There are at least two problems to begin with. The first problem has to do with the timing of the agree relation, where the probe from *v* has a potential goal to agree with in but it would not enter into agree relation until C gets merged in the structure. The second problem has to do with the subject agreement happening with *v* rather than T.

