Multiple wh-agreement is a parasitic gap dependency

- Wh-agreement (w)- replaces wh-agreement with the relativized participant on the predicate heading the relative clause.

- Relativization of ergative DP (Lander 2009a:619)
  (1a) t’ale-m q′e-t-Ø -Ø -Ø -Ø -Ø Finite clause: boy-ERG glass-ABS 3ABS-3ERG -break-PST 'The boy broke the glass.'
  (1b) t’ale-m q′e-t-Ø -Ø -Ø -Ø -Ø Relative clause: glass-ABS 3ABS-3ERG -break-PST boy-ABS 'the boy that broke the glass'

- West Circassian is syntactically ergative
  - Ergative and IO are assigned inherent case by v and Appf and remain in-situ within vP
  - Absolutive DP is assigned structural case by T and raises to Spec,TP to satisfy [vP

- Multiple wh-agreement is not non-pronominal binding
  - Cappo; Polinsky (2011) multiple wh-agreement + Op and bound possessor pronoun agree in [wT]
  - Absolutive Constraint is evidence for accusativity:
    - Absolutive DP does not c-command possessor of ergative DP
    - Relativization of ABS + binding/Agree with possessor of ERG renders Weak Crossover violation.

- Constraints on multiple wh-agreement and syntactic ergativity
  - Absolutive Constraint on Multiple Wh-agreement
    - Intra-clausal multiple wh-agreement is ungrammatical if the relativized participant is the absolutive DP (Lander 2009a, b, 2012).
    - Extra-clausal multiple wh-agreement is ungrammatical if the relativized participant is in a clause.
    - *Relativization of possessor of absolutive DP with coreferent ergative DP
      - wh-agreement in a clause.
      - ‘the boy that broke the glass’
      - *Relativization of ergative DP + parasitic DP in absolutive DP (2)
        - wh-agreement in a clause.
        - ‘the boy that broke the glass’
        - *Relativization of absolutive DP + parasitic DP in ergative DP (7)
          - ‘the boy that broke the glass’

- Basic assumptions
  - Relativization = movement of null Op to Spec,CP
  - Argument DPs trigger wh-agreement on predicate via Agree (Chomsky 2000).
  - Wh-agreement is wh-agreement with a wh-trace (Chung 1998; Bair 2016).

- Parastic gap licensing
  - Relativization of ergative DP + parasitic gap in absolutive DP (2)
  - Relativization of absolutive DP + parasitic gap in ergative DP (7)

- Unification analysis for wh-agreement
  - Wh-agreement in West Circassian is always agreement with a wh-trace.
  - Multiple wh-agreement is realization of agreement with a parasitic wh-trace.

- BASIC STRUCTURE OF ABSOLUTIVE DP CONSTRUCTION
  - CP
  - X′P
  - Y′P
  - Agree

- ABSOLUTE CONSTRAINT ON MULTIPLE WH-AGREEMENT
  - (5) Intra-clausal multiple wh-agreement is ungrammatical if the relativized participant is the absolutive DP (Lander 2009a, b, 2012).
  - In terms of parasitic gaps:
    - *An absolutive trace cannot license a parasitic gap in a clausal DP.
    - parasitic gap.
    - ‘the boy that broke the glass’
    - parasitic gap.
    - ‘the boy that broke the glass’
    - parasitic gap.
    - ‘the boy that broke the glass’
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- Glosses
  - Absolutive: ADVP-alienable possession; benefactive: comitative; directive: dynamic verb; ergative: to-object indirect object; negation; oblitative; possessor; PST: past tense; question, 5G:singular

- West Circassian is syntactically ergative
  - Ergative DP and IO are assigned inherent case by v and Appf and remain in-situ within vP
  - Absolutive DP is assigned structural case by T and raises to Spec,TP to satisfy [vP

- Multiple wh-agreement is not non-pronominal binding
  - Cappo; Polinsky (2011) multi-
  - Multiple wh-agreement + Op and bound possessor pronoun agree in [wT]
  - Absolutive Constraint is evidence for accusativity:
    - Absolutive DP does not c-command possessor of ergative DP
    - Relativization of ABS + binding/Agree with possessor of ERG renders Weak Crossover violation.

- Counterarguments:
  - Weak Crossover is not ungrammatical with regular pronominal agreement (7).
  - Doesn’t account for optionality of multiple wh-agreement (2).
  - Cannot be extended to Absolutive Constraint with absolutive subject (8).

- Basic assumptions
  - Relativization = movement of null Op to Spec,CP
  - Argument DPs trigger wh-agreement on predicate via Agree (Chomsky 2000).
  - Wh-agreement is wh-agreement with a wh-trace (Chung 1998; Bair 2016).

- Implications & Questions
  - Reflexive binding and control raising (Potsdam & Polinsky 2012) follow an accusative pattern (ERG-ABS):
    - Reflexives are local subject oriented (Alcin 2015).
    - Controlraising clauses are smaller than TP or lack [vP]
      - Expectation: D[ERG] cannot license PG in DP(vP)
        - [OP LW (ERG) 1z[ERG] 1z[IO] [ERG] [V]
          - Not permitted. A-scrambling?
    - Absolutive Constraint absent in cross-clausal contexts (Lander 2009a, 2012).
    - Embedded clauses attach higher than TP?
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