To account for the agreement mismatch in (1): morphologically singular DP subject — plural verbal agreement.

\[(1) \ [DP [D [El] (n1 hornero) \ y \ n2 hornera]] \text{cobraban en panes}. \ [CREA] \]
the\textsubscript{HS}\, bakers\textsubscript{HS} and \ bakers\textsubscript{FS} were\textsubscript{\textit{es}} paid in bread loaves

Closest Conjunct Agreement of D is obligatory

\[(2) \ {*La/*los/*las} \text{n1 hornero} \ y \ \text{n2 hornera} \text{cobraban en panes}. \]
the\textsubscript{FS/PS}\, baker\textsubscript{FS/PS} and \ baker\textsubscript{FS} were\textsubscript{\textit{es}} paid in bread loaves

Plural semantics of DP: collective reading possible

\[(3) \ \text{Su marido e hijo se encontraron ayer.} \]
her\textsubscript{FS}\, husband\textsubscript{FS} and son\textsubscript{FS} \text{SE met\textsubscript{\textit{on}}} yesterday

A typology of \(\phi\)-features

- The notion of \(\phi\)-features is insufficient to explain 'mixed agreement' facts.
  (D’Alessandro 2004, Costa & Pereira 2005; same claim in OT, LFG, HPSG)
- Two different sets of \(\phi\)-features (cf. V & Z 2003)
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\phi)-index</th>
<th>(\phi)-concord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>decensional properties (valued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N{}, G{}, C{}]</td>
<td>[N{}, G{}, F{}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>decensional properties (unvalued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N{}, G{}, C{}]</td>
<td>[N{}, G{}, F{}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co(P)</td>
<td>Co operates on index features of its conjuncts (Number:joint; Gender/Person: resolution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N{}, G{}, F{}]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree and feature sharing

- Agree is a Probe Goal relation triggered by unvalued features on a Probe (Chomsky 2001).
- Feature sharing (Frampton & Gutmann 2000): agreement is realized as the sharing of a single feature between two syntactic nodes. Agree specifies that two elements share a single feature, regardless of whether it is valued or not.
- Agree is constrained by the Maximization principle: “Maximize matching effects” (Chomsky 2001).
- Index and concord \(\phi\)-features behave as bundles.
- T has at least person and number features. They are unvalued concord \(\phi\)-features (inflectional properties).

Why not ellipsis? (Camacho 2003)

\[(4) \ \text{La fascinante flora y fauna} \ [DP D A N] \ y \ [DP \ O D \ O A N] \text{the fascinating flora and fauna}

Questions...

- Why ellipsis of A depends on D ellipsis?
- Why must N\textsubscript{2} be a remnant?
- Why must N\textsubscript{2} be a remnant?
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(5) La fascinante flora y la fauna \(\rightarrow\) la fascinante fauna
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(6) La alta mujer de Raúl y de Juan \(\rightarrow\) la alta mujer de Juan

the tall wife of R. and of J.  the tall wife of J.

Conclusions

- The typology of \(\phi\)-features must be enriched: \(i\)-/\(c\)-features.
- Agree: a single computational process operating both DP-internally and in S-V agreement.
- Prospects: (1) other cases of agreement mismatches
  (2) the parametric question

References


