Prefix Concord in Saaroa: Restructuring and Multiple Agree

Introduction. Lexical prefixes (LPs) are attested in some Oceanic languages and in some Formosan languages such as Bunun, Siraya, and Saaroa (e.g. Nojima 1996, Radetzky 2006, Tsuchida 2000). These prefixes are often attached onto functional verbs and semantically and formally identical with following lexical verbs in multiple verb constructions, which called as Prefix Concord Constructions (PCCs), as shown in (1). This paper addresses the following questions: (i) What constraints the prefix concord distribution? (ii) What causes the concord effect in Saaroa? Why multiple spell-out?

Saaroa Data. First, we argue that the Prefix Concord Domain (PCD) in Saaroa is limited within vP. Lexical prefixes can co-occur with Manner verbs and Quantity verbs, as in (2a), but they cannot appear with Frequency verbs, Modal verbs or Mood verbs, as in (2b). Second, PCCs exhibit the morphosyntactic properties of restructuring: they show obligatory clitic climbing (3a), allow long NP movement (3b), select a tenseless complement (3c), obey AV-only inflection on embedded verbs (3d), and forbid an intervening complementizer (3d). Third, Prefix Concord Effect is subject to Relativized Minimality: PCCs obey the locality condition and disallow defective intervening; cf. (4a).

Previous Analyses. First, Nojima (1996:3) argues for PCCs in Bunun as verb classifier constructions and that the Concord Effect is semantics-determined rather than agreement-based. However, her theory cannot explain the domain and minimality constraints in Saaroa PCCs. Second, Tsuchida (2000:120) and Adelaar (2004:340) both view PCCs in Siraya as a type of Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs). Third, Adelaar (2004:345) observes that some concord prefix [his anticipating sequences] in Siraya does not completely match their correspondent lexical verbs in forms and suggests that the concord effect be a syntactic ‘concord/agreement’, as a result of grammaticalization process. Their analyses suffer some problems: Under the SVC account, it is mysterious why common SVCs forbid Prefix Concord Effect and long NP movement in Saaroa. Moreover, the diachronic perspective sheds a light on the formal mismatch between LPs and correspondent lexical verbs; however, it does not offer any explanation for the domain condition and various structural restrictions on PCCs.

Our Analysis. Under the current minimalist framework, we propose that Prefix Concord in Saaroa is treated as a case of Multiple Agree (cf. Chomsky 2004, Hiraiwa 2005). We argue that the matrix functional verb, e.g. muamuare ‘slowly’ in (4a), has an uninterpretable and unvalued verbal class [CLV] feature and thus probes into a goal (i.e. umu ‘eat’) with a matching feature/value, as in (4b). It is this displaced feature that triggers the Prefix Concord effect. Second, assuming that the Agree operation enlarges the Θ-domain of embedded lexical verbs into the higher functional verbs, the embedded Logical Object will cyclically move to the Spec of the functional verbs and then to the Spec of matrix Non-Actor Voice in order to check the uninterpretable [NAV] feature. Next, the embedded object is attracted to [Spec, TP] to check the [EPP] and [NOM] case. Since the defective embedded T₀ cannot check the [NOM] case, the Logical Object NP must undergo long-distance movement to check the case feature (TAM-less Restriction on V₂); cf. (3c). Third, embedding the Prefix Concord Effect within a larger context of agreement, which include Long-distance Agreement in Hindi (Boeckx 2004) and TMA/Participle Copying in Swedish (Wiklund 2007), we argue that various restrictions on PCCs are reducible into attested universal conditions. We argue that only Non-Actor Voice constructions are true transitive vP because only the NomP and GenP can control PRO. Given CP and transitive vP as strong phases, the Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 2000) ensures the embedded clauses must be CP-less (cf. 3e) and the embedded verb must be AV-only inflected (cf. 3d).
(1) a. \( pahlu_i\)-muamuare\(=aku \)
    \( AV.LP\text{-}(\text{sing})\text{-}\text{IMPFV-slowly=}1\text{SG.NOM} AV.LP\text{-}(\text{sing})\text{-}\text{song} \)
    ‘I am singing songs slowly.’

b. \( ku\text{-ngahlangahla=}ku \text{ um-}\text{u} \text{ papa’a-lemehle.} \)
    \( AV.LP\text{-}(\text{eat})\text{-}\text{again=}1\text{SG.NOM} AV\text{-}eat \text{ meat-wild.boar} \)
    ‘I ate wild-boar meat again.’

(2) a. \( ku\text{-muamuare}/\text{ngahlangahla=}aku \text{ um-}\text{u} \text{ vutukuhlu.} \)
    \( AV.LP\text{-}(\text{eat})\text{-}\text{slowly/again=}1\text{SG.NOM} AV\text{-}eat \text{ fish} \)
    ‘I eat fish slowly/again.’

b. \( \text{(*)} ku\text{-karekehle=}aku\text{(*)-mailalalahlu=}aku \text{ um-}\text{u} \text{ papa’a.} \)
    \( AV.LP\text{-}(\text{eat})\text{-}\text{often/again}=1\text{SG.NOM}/AV.LP\text{-}(\text{eat})\text{-}\text{intentionally=}1\text{SG.NOM} AV\text{-}eat \text{ meat} \)
    ‘I often/intentionally eat meat.’

(3) a. \( hli\text{-}\text{um-ari-muamuari=}cu\text{=}aku \text{ um-}\text{u} \text{ suhlatej}. \)
    \( PFV\text{-}\text{AV-LP(read)-IMPFV-slowly=}1\text{SG.NOM} AV\text{-}read \text{ book} \)
    ‘I read books slowly.’

b. \( hli\text{-}\text{ari-muamuari=}ku \text{ um-}\text{u} \text{ suhlatej}. \)
    \( PFV.PV\text{-}LPP(read)-slowly=1SG.GEN AV\text{-}read NOM\text{-}book \)
    ‘I would read aloud the book slowly.’

c. \( \text{*um-ari-muamuari=}cu\text{=}aku \text{ hli-}\text{um-iape} \text{ suhlate}. \)
    \( AV\text{-LP(read)-slowly=}1\text{SG.NOM} \text{PFV}\text{-AV-read book} \)
    ‘I would read aloud the book slowly.’

d. \( \text{*hli-ari-muamuari=}cu\text{=}aku \text{ iap-a} \text{ suhlate}. \)
    \( PFV\text{-AV-LP(read)-slowly=}1\text{SG.NOM} \text{read-PV book} \)
    ‘I would read aloud the book slowly.’

e. \( \text{*hli-pahlu-muamuare=}cu\text{=}aku \text{ pahlu-sahli}. \)
    \( PFV\text{-LP(sing)-IMPFV-slowly=}1\text{SG.NOM} LP(sing)-/LP(utter)-twice LP(sing)-\text{song} \)
    ‘I slowly sang songs twice.’

b. The derivation of (4a) under the Multiple Agree

\[
V^{\text{FUN}}\text{[uCL]}[\ldots]V^{\text{FUN}}\text{[uCL]}[\ldots]V^{\text{LEX}}\text{[uCL]}[4] \quad \rightarrow \quad V^{\text{FUN}}\text{[aCL]}[4]\ldots V^{\text{FUN}}\text{[aCL]}[4]\ldots V^{\text{LEX}}\text{[aCL]}[4] \]
\]

(4) a. hli-pahlu-muamuare\(=cu=aku \text{ pahlu-sahli}. \)
    \( PFV\text{-LP(sing)-slowly=}1\text{SG.NOM} LP(sing)-/LP(utter)-twice LP(sing)-\text{song} \)
    ‘I slowly sang songs twice.’

b. The derivation of (4a) under the Multiple Agree

(5) a. \( \text{pai-}\text{alive-ate=}\text{a=}ku \text{ (m-(p)ai-veterau} \text{ t}\text{t_j} \text{ a saliya}. \)
    \( LP\text{(do.by.hand)-awhile-PV=}1\text{SG.GEN} AV-LP\text{(do.by.hand)-sweep} \text{ NOM house} \)
    ‘I cleaned the house in a short while.’

b. \( \text{[TP DP, r-T'0[VOICE\text{DP, Voice}^0\text{NAV...}[VP\text{DP, [V-V'0\text{FUN...[V-V'0\text{LEX DP, P'0]]]]}]}}} \)
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