Reference tracking via agreement: evidence from Washo switch reference		
GLOW 42 Karlos Arregi	Emily Hanink	
University of Oslo The University of Chicago	The University of ManchesterPosterHandoutEmail	
Switch reference as agreement	Washo (Hokan/isolate): highly endangered (\leq 10 speakers) language spoken around Lake Tahoe (USA).	
Switch reference in Washo tracks whether embedded and matrix subject referents are different	Switch reference in Washo is syntactic (Arregi & Hanink 2018)	
Marked as a suffix on embedded verbs:	Appears in a variety of embedded clause types	
(1) $\begin{bmatrix} Emily_i t'íšimáŋaw k'-é?-i & -š & -ge \\ Emily_i singer.good 3-be-IND -DS -NM.ACC \end{bmatrix} 1_j$ -know-really-IND 'I know well that Emily is a good singer.' (Arregi & Hanink 2018)Different subject \\ Different su	(3) $\begin{bmatrix} mé:hu_i géwe ?-i:gi-yi & -š & -ge \\ boy_i & coyote 3/3-see-IND & -DS & -NM.ACC \end{bmatrix} 1.PRO_j-also 1/3-see-IND$ Internally headed RCs	
(2) $\begin{bmatrix} šáwlamhu_i t'é:liwhu Ø-bó:ŋi-yi -Ø -gi \\ girl_i man 3/3-call-IND -SS -NM.NOM \end{bmatrix}$ here 3_i -be-IND 'The girl that called the man is here.'	 'I also saw the coyote that the boy saw.' (Hanink 2016) (4) [Emily_i t'íšɨmáŋaw k'-é?-i -š -ge] l_j-ášašé:s-šemu-yi Factive complements [Emily_i singer.good 3-be-IND -DS -NM.ACC] 1_j-know-really-IND 'I know well that Emily is a good singer.' 	
(Jacobsen 1964, 1967, 1998, McKenzie 2015) Claim: Switch reference is agreement	(5) $[1_i$ -émlu-ya -š $]?_j$ -í:me?-leg-i $[1_i$ -eat-DEP -DS $]3_j$ -drink-REC.PST-IND 'He was drinking while I was eating.' (Washo Archive)	
Embedded C collects indices from the two subjects via Agree. (Arregi & Hanink 2018, Baker & Camargo Souza 2018, Clem 2018)	Syntactic locality: Clause-bounded	
 • Binding (Finer 1985, Watanabe 2000, Broadwell 1997) • Control (Georgi 2012, Baker & Camargo Souza 2018) 	(6) $\begin{bmatrix} súku?_i banáya ?-é?-i & -s & -ge \end{bmatrix} da?mó?mo?_j bó:nj-yi-s-gi \end{bmatrix} \emptyset_i$ -p'á:šug-i $\begin{bmatrix} dog_i & outside 3-be-IND -DS -NM.ACC \end{bmatrix} woman_j = 3/3.call-IND-DS-NM.NOM \end{bmatrix} 3_i$ -enter-IND 'The dog who was outside who the woman called came in ' (Arregi & Hanink 2018)	



Evidence for Agree-based analysis from cases of overlap in reference		
Reference overlap: SS and DS are optional	The Index Probe Parameter and variation in cases of overlap	
 (11) a. [Adele ga-sú:bi?-i -š -ge] lé:-ši gó:be? l-é:me?-i Adele 3.OBJ-bring-IND -DS -NM.ACC] 1.PRO-DU coffee 1-drink-IND 'We (=Adele and I) are drinking the coffee Adele brought.' b. lé:-ši gó:be? l-é:me?-i [Adele ga-sú:bi?-i -Ø -ge] 1.pro-du coffee 1-drink-IND [Adele 3.OBJ-bring-IND -SS -NM.ACC] 'We (=Adele and I) are drinking the coffee Adele brought.' 	 (15) Index Probe Parameter Agree copies all/exactly one index in the value of [ID] in the Goal. This predicts either optional DS/SS (Washo), or obligatory DS: (16) Obligatory DS in languages that copy all indices [DP[ID:i] C[ID:i,i,j]] DP[ID:i,j] DS 	
(12) a.[Emily gé:gel-a -{ \check{s}, \emptyset }] Adele ida Emily wagayáy-iEmbedded \subset Matrix[Emily 3.sit-DEP -{DS, SS}] Adele and Emily 3.talk-IND'Adele and Emily are talking while Emily is sitting.'	Largely correct prediction for languages of North America	
b. [Adele ida Emily wagayáy-a -{ \check{s}, \emptyset }] Emily bašá?-i Matrix \subset Embedded [Adele and emily 3.talk-DEP -{DS, SS}] Emily 3.write-IND 'Emily is writing while Adele and Emily are talking.'	• In North America (McKenzie 2015): Languages exist with (i) optional DS/SS, and (ii) obligatory DS. Obligatory SS languages are unattested, but this may be due to an absence of relevant data.	
(13) a. Value of [ID] in plural DPs has one index for each individual in its referent (Sportiche 1985).	• Obligatory SS languages claimed to exist in Papua-New Guinea (Roberts 2017), but:	

b. In Washo, Agree copies **exactly one index** from the value of [ID]. a. $\left[DP[ID:i] \dots C[ID:i,i] \right] DP[ID:i,j]$ (indices match) (14)SS b. $[DP[ID:i] \dots C[ID:i,j]] DP[ID:i,j]$ (indices don't match) DS

– Incomplete paradigms, or no negative evidence. (e.g. Bruce 1984 on Alamblak, Roberts 1987 on Amele)

– Person and number are often relevant, suggesting an analysis in which the Probe copies features other than [ID], with potentially complex consequences for exponence.

Similar conclusions for Panoan (Valenzuela 2003 on Shipibo).

The challenges for analyses based on binding or control		
Same subject as control	Switch reference as binding (Finer1985, Watanabe 2000, Broadwell 1997)	
SS directly encodes control of the embedded subject by matrix subject (Georgi 2012), or SS is C-	SR is embedded C agreeing with embedded subject; SS is an anaphor, and DS is a pronoun.	
agreement with embedded subject and operator in Spec-CP controlled by matrix subject (Baker & Camargo-Souza 2018).	But under overlap, SS/DS don't have the distribution of anaphors/pronouns (Rooryck 2006):	
\Rightarrow SS in cases of overlap predicted as cases of partial control :	(19) a. I saved us. (20) *We saved me.	
(17) Mary wanted to assemble in the hall. Mary \subset PRO	b. *I saved ourselves. This contrasts with optionality and bidirectionality of SR in Washo.	
Partial control is unidirectional, but SS (and DS) in Washo is bidirectional: (12).		
(18) *Sue and John expected to go on vacation by herself. PRO \subset Sue & John	The conclusion is tentative, as we need to replicate reflexive/pronoun patterns in Washo.	