

Head-mediated antecedent agreement

Ken Safir, Rutgers University

In Safir (2014) is proposed that the difference between local and non-local anaphora is not based on different mechanisms that achieve coconstrual relations, but on what sort of morphological relations are possible. When the antecedent-dependent identity relation (henceforth, informally, ‘binding’) is phase-internal, the morphology of the dependent form often has a special shape and may have morphology, or even exponents of agreement that are not seen on non-locally bound formatives, such as pronouns. However, there is also sometimes a difference in the ‘flavor’ of local binding relations that is also represented in morphology. Morphological differences such as these are part of what motivates my main thesis.

- 1) Heads introduced below the external argument mediate morphological agreement and concord and flavor the interpretation of the binding relation between antecedents and locallybound dependents.

That local binding can be mediated by heads is not a novel claim in itself, but the form of the proposal here is new (eliminating Agree triggered from T as the mediator, for example, and positing a different source flavored readings). Others have also argued, as I will, that Voice plays a mediating role (Bruening, 2006 for reciprocals, Ahn, 2012 for reflexives, though the approach here differs along the lines proposed by Baker, Safir and Sikuku, 2013, and in particular, Safir and Selvanathan, 2017). Moreover, unlike other Agree-based approaches to binding, the argument for the mediation is largely orthogonal to whether or not the mediating head is in an Agree relation to either the anaphor or the antecedent, as long as its visible agreeing features respect conditions general to local and non-local binding. The local/non-local contrasts in morphological concord, agreement and interpretation are consequences of phase-internal head-mediated antecedent relation. Moreover, the apparent violation of intervention effects will be attributed to the role of the mediating head.

It has been suggested that agreement does not just accompany the binding relation, but rather that agreement, and more specifically Agree (as in Chomsky, 2000, 2001), actually *forms* the binding relation (e.g., Reuland, 2005, 2011, Heinat, 2006, Hicks, 2009, Kratzer, 2009, Rooryck and van den Wyngaerd, 2011, and Diercks, van Koppen, and Putnam, 2017). For arguments against deriving binding from Agree, see Safir (2013) and Charnavel and Sportiche(2016), but in most local anaphora, a head mediates binding relations, sometimes with distinct morphological and/or semantic effects.

It has been suggested that agreement does not just accompany the binding relation, but rather that agreement, and more specifically Agree (as in Chomsky, 2000, 2001), actually *forms* the binding relation (e.g., Reuland, 2005, 2011, Heinat, 2006, Hicks, 2009, Kratzer, 2009, Rooryck and van den Wyngaerd, 2011, and Diercks, van Koppen, and Putnam, 2017). For arguments against deriving binding from Agree, see Safir (2013) and Charnavel and Sportiche(2016) and there is some further argumentation against binding by Agree here. The mediation by heads advocated for here is also not an Agree relation.

There are several empirical claims that will be established in this presentation based on a re-evaluation of the relation between agreement and antecedent-dependent relations:

- A) There is no role for T-agreement in antecedent-agreement.
- B) At least part of antecedent agreement (and binding) cannot be standard Agree (where an unvalued head probes a DP).
- C) Voice and/or other heads on the VP spine are mediating head for local antecedent agreement and shape concord.