



What are the theoretical consequences of verbal agreement that does not mirror argumental case alignment?

I. Split-S case, NOM-ACC agreement

Case and agreement are often linked: result of the same operation [1], or one feeds the other [2].

Georgian poses a challenge for this view: it has TAM-based split ergativity [3], [4]...

- (1) a. *bavšv-i icinis* child-NOM laugh:PRES.3SG 'The child laughs'
 b. *ḡac-i zis* man-NOM sit:PRES.3SG 'The man sits'

- c. *bavšv-i xedavs ḡac-s* child-NOM see:PRES.3SG door-DAT 'The child sees the man'
 SA SO = NOM-ACC
 A O

- (2) a. *bavšv-ma icina* child-ERG laugh:AOR.3SG 'The child laughed'
 b. *ḡac-i iḡda* man-NOM sit:AOR.3SG 'The man sat'

- c. *bavšv-ma naxa ḡac-i* child-ERG see:AOR.3SG door-NOM 'The child saw the man'
 SA SO = SPLIT-S
 A O

...But consistent NOM-ACC verbal agreement.

- (3) PRES AOR
 a. *v-icini v-icine* 'I laugh/ed'
 c. *v-zivar v-iḡeki* 'I sit/sat'
 b. *v-xedav v-naxe* 'I see/saw him'
 d. *m-xedavs m-naxa* 'He sees/saw me'
 SA SO
 A O

II. The problem

We can't straightforwardly use case to derive prefixal agreement alternations.

- (4) If... $v- \leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPKR} \\ \text{NOM} \end{bmatrix}$ Then... **v-naxa* 'He saw me'
 $m- \leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPKR} \\ \text{ACC} \end{bmatrix}$ **??-naxe* 'I saw him'

And there doesn't seem to be person-based split ergativity [5], suggesting 1st & 2nd persons aren't secretly always NOM-ACC.

- (5) a. *me da ḡac-ma vicinet* 1SG and man-ERG laugh:AOR.1PL 'The man and I laughed.'
 1/2 person + ERG coordination: ok

- b. *me saḡal-ma movxexe iataḡ-i* 1SG wretched-ERG scrub:AOR.1SG floor-NOM 'Poor me scrubbed the floor.'
 ERG pronominal modifier: ok

III. A syntactic solution?

Béjar & Rezac [6] propose a Cyclic Agree-based analysis of Georgian agreement: v^0 has [uPART].

- (6) a. $[_{VP} S_3 v^0 [_{VP} V^0 O_1]]$ b. $[_{VP} S_1 v^0 [_{VP} V^0 O_3]]$
 ① $\leftrightarrow m-$ ② $\leftrightarrow v-$ ① no [PART] ⊗

But there are a few hurdles for this approach.

- (7) a. Unaccusative subjects → first cycle agr?

- $[_{VP} - v^0 [_{VP} V^0 S_1]]$...but *vzivar*, not **mzivar* 'I sit'
 ① $\leftrightarrow m-$

- b. 2>3>3 ditransitives → same as 2>3 trans?

- $[_{VP} S_2 v^0 [_{VP} IO_3 [_{V'} V^0 DO_3]]]$...but *miscem*, not **mi∅cem* 'you will give it to him' (cf. \emptyset naxe 'you saw him')
 ② $\leftrightarrow \emptyset$ ① fails

- c. 'Inverse agr' [4], [7] → same as normal agr?

- $[_{TP} T^0 [_{PERF} [_{VP} S_1 v^0 [_{VP} V^0 O_3]]]]$...but *minaxavs*, not **vinaxavs* 'I have seen him'
 ② $\leftrightarrow m-$ ① fails

What's the alternative?

IV. Proposal: licensing, not case

In Georgian, [PART] requires licensing [8]. Both v^0 and T^0 can do this. Prefixal agreement tracks which probe is the licenser.

- (8) $[_{TP} T^0 [_{VP} DP_{1/2} v^0 [_{VP} V^0 DP_{2/1}]]]$

- (9) a. $v- \leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPKR} \\ \text{T-LIC} \end{bmatrix}$ b. $m- \leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{SPKR} \\ \text{V-LIC} \end{bmatrix}$

Prediction: PCC effects only in ditransitives, not DAT-subject constructions (cf. Basque [9]).

- (10) a. **man mas me gamacno* 3SG.ERG 3SG.DAT 1SG.(NOM) introduce:AOR.3SG>1SG
 Attempted: 'She introduced me to him.'

- $[_{TP} T^0 [_{VP} S_3 v^0 [_{VP} IO_3 [_{V'} V^0 *DO_1]]]]$

- b. *mas me movḡonvar* 3SG.DAT 1SG.(NOM) like:PRES.3SG>1SG 'S/he likes me.'

- $[_{TP} T^0 [_{VP} - v^0 [_{VP} Ex_3 [_{V'} V^0 Th_1]]]]$

References [1] Chomsky, N. 2000. *Minimalist Inquiries*. MIT Press. [2] Bobaljik, J. 2008. Where's Phi? In *Phi Theory*, eds. D. Harbour et al. Oxford. [3] Aronson, H. 1995. *Georgian: A reading grammar*. Slavica. [4] Harris, A. 1981. *Georgian syntax: A study in Relational Grammar*. Cambridge. [5] Legate, J. A. Split ergativity based on nominal type. *Lingua* 148. [6] Béjar, S. & M. Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *LJ* 40. [7] Lomashvili, L. & H. Harley. 2011. Phases and templates in Georgian agreement. *Studia Linguistica* 65. [8] Béjar, S. & M. Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In *Romance linguistics: Theory and acquisition*, eds. A.-T. Pérez-Leroux et al. John Benjamins. [9] Rezac, M. 2008. The syntax of eccentric agreement. *NNLT*: 26. [10] Levin, T. 2010. Licensing without Case. PhD Thesis, MIT.

Conclusion: Georgian provides further evidence for the claim that **argument licensing** should be distinguished from **morphological case** [10].