

Agreement Beyond Phi. By SHIGERU MIYAGAWA. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph Seventy-Five. 2017. Pp. 223.

Reviewed by ELENA ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, *University of Crete*

In this monograph, SHIGERU MIYAGAWA expands, sharpens and further substantiates the theory of clausal operations argued for in his 2010 Monograph *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-Based and Discourse-Configurational Languages* (MIT Press), exploring its consequences in many new domains of syntax and the syntax-discourse interface. Based on Chomsky's (2001) Uniformity Principle, Miyagawa (2010) argued that movement operations across languages are governed by Strong Uniformity which dictates that the same set of grammatical features occurs and is overtly manifested in all languages. The current monograph defends a version of Strong Uniformity, according to which phi-features (φ -features) and discourse configurational features (δ -features) all start out on the phase head C and may or may not be inherited by T as a parametric option (cf. Chomsky 2005, 2007). The different combinatorial possibilities lead to four basic types of languages, depending on where the different sets of grammatical features are hosted: (I) φ -feature on C, δ -feature on T (Japanese); (II) δ -feature on C, φ -feature on T (English); (III) both φ -feature and δ -feature on T (Spanish); (IV) both φ -feature and δ -feature on T (Dinka). In this simple and elegant typology, the variation we find across languages depends on how φ -features and δ -features interact with each other and with items in their local domain, the C-domain and the T-domain.

The book investigates a wealth of empirical phenomena in many typologically unrelated languages and arrives at a set of surprising new generalizations which are accounted for in terms of the Strong Uniformity Hypothesis, thus shedding light on the interaction between the agreement-systems and the discourse configurational properties of languages. It is argued that politeness markers in Japanese, allocutive agreement in Basque, sloppy interpretations of null subjects in Japanese, Chinese, Malayalam and Spanish, *why* and *how come* in Japanese, Chinese, English and Spanish, and focus in *ga/no* conversion in Japanese can be understood only if the locus of φ -features and δ -features in the clause is taken into account. The book thus initiates an exciting new research program in the study of formal syntax.

Chapter 1 introduces the basic theory argued for in the book: Strong Uniformity, the predicted typology of four language-categories, and some preliminary empirical evidence for the unconventional claims that δ -features reside in T in Japanese and Spanish, while φ -features reside in C in Dinka (Nilo-Saharan; van Urk 2015). Chapters 2-5 are case studies illustrating how the typology developed in chapter 1 can be fruitfully exploited to account for a range of that do not seem to be connected to one another. Chapter 6 concludes by summarizing the main findings of the monograph.

Chapter 2 argues that, contrary to what is assumed in the literature, Japanese is not a language lacking agreement; rather, it is a language where φ -feature agreement resides in C, being manifested as the politeness marker *-mas-*. Unlike e.g. French politeness agreement which is sensitive to the clausal subject and can occur in all kinds of embedded clauses, the distribution of politeness marking in Japanese is sensitive to properties of the addressee and is limited to environments matching the notion of the Root (Emonds 1969). M argues that the differences between the two language types can be accounted for if φ -features are hosted in C in Japanese and in T in French, as predicted by the Strong Uniformity typology. He furthermore analyzes

Japanese politeness marking as an analogue to allocutive agreement in Basque dialects. Basque allocutive agreement displays sensitivity to properties of the addressee (e.g. gender, status) and is limited to Root environments, just like Japanese politeness markers. M analyses them as agreement in C, adopting Speas & Tenny's (2003) Speech Act Projection (saP). SaP can only be present when C is unselected, thus providing a straightforward explanation for the fact that this type of agreement is limited to Root environments.

Chapter 3 investigates pro-drop and agreement. The empirical question addressed concerns the nature and availability of sloppy readings of zero subjects in three different types of languages, namely (i) Japanese, (ii) Chinese/Malayalam and (iii) Spanish. In the literature, there is a debate concerning the proper analysis of empty subjects in Japanese, whether these involve pro-drop, as originally proposed by Kuroda (1965), or they result from argument ellipsis, as argued for by Oku (1998). Oku's argument crucially rests on a Generalization according to which Romance pro-drop languages with rich agreement do not allow for sloppy interpretations of null subjects, unlike Japanese which freely permits sloppy readings and lacks agreement. Oku accounts for this on the basis of the hypothesis that sloppy interpretations are only possible under argument ellipsis and proposes that rich agreement blocks argument ellipsis in Romance-type languages. As a first step, M extends Oku's generalization to capture languages like Chinese and Malayalam that lack overt subject agreement, like Japanese, but do not permit sloppy interpretations of null subjects, like Spanish. Drawing on evidence from long distance binding, he argues that these languages conform with Oku's Generalization despite appearances to the contrary. He points out, however, that Oku's Generalization is contradicted by languages like Spanish and Greek where sloppy readings for subjects are, in fact, possible under certain conditions. He also presents a large-scale survey of Japanese and Chinese speakers which shows that sloppy interpretations are systematically available in Japanese without context, unlike Chinese where context is required to encourage sloppy interpretations.

These combined results lead to a restatement of Oku's Generalization. The right question to ask, according to M, is why do pro-drop languages like Japanese freely permit sloppy readings, while this is only possible under the right contextual conditions in Chinese and Spanish/Greek. M proposes that the key towards an answer to this question is provided by Oikonomou's (2017) proposal that sloppy readings are the result of an E-type interpretation of pro, which gives rise to indefinite readings. The Topic systems of languages in connection to properties of pro determine the conditions under which E-type interpretations may arise. In rich agreement languages, agreement leads to topicalization of pro (interpreted as movement of pro to T hosting δ -features; rich agreement languages are $T\phi/\delta$) which is incompatible with E-type interpretations. Furthermore, due to its referential/ ϕ -deficiency, Chinese pro can pick a referent outside the sentence only when it is topicalized to C hosting δ -features (Chinese is $T\phi-C\delta$), once again rendering E-type interpretations and the concomitant sloppy readings difficult. On the other hand, pro is allowed to remain vP internal in Japanese (a $T\delta-C\phi$ agreement-less language), and therefore E-type/sloppy readings are freely available.

Chapter 4 is an investigation of 'why' from the perspective of the debate between movement and external-merge (EM) analyses of *why*-questions. While many languages provide robust evidence that wh-adjuncts like *why* may be externally merged in the Spec,CP position and wh-adjuncts like *how come* must be externally merged in that position, Japanese has nothing comparable to wh-adjuncts like *how come* in English which are obligatorily externally merged in the Spec,CP position. The question that arises is what explains this gap in the paradigm of Japanese, as opposed to English, Chinese and Spanish. M (2017) proposes that this difference

between Japanese vs. Chinese/English-type languages relates to the fact that the EM option requires focus in C. Being a discourse feature, focus never resides in C in Category I C ϕ -T δ languages like Japanese, while it is hosted in C in Category II C δ -I ϕ languages like Chinese and English, explaining the absence of *how come*-type questions in the former type of languages and their presence in the latter. Based on a comparative investigation of wh-adjunct questions with respect to *anti-superiority* (Saito 1985), *anti-intervention effects* (Beck 1996a) and *anti-pied piping* (Nishigauchi 1990), Miyagawa argues that Japanese *naze* displays all the signature properties of movement while Chinese *zenme* all those of base-generation. In turn, this entails that the movement vs. base-generation behavior of why/how come-adjuncts cannot be attributed to the *wh-in-situ* parameter and depends on the position of focus features in the clause. Combining the syntactic analysis of Shlonsky & Soare (2011) with the semantic analysis of Beck (1996b) M offers a syntax for *why/naze* in terms of a *because of what* clause (ReasonP), attached above TP. *Why* phonologically spells out an operator that binds a variable in ReasonP, and undergoes movement from ReasonP to CP for scope reasons. In languages like Japanese and Korean which have a δ -feature in T there is an option to merge ‘why’ lower than TP and move it across the subject to the Spec,ReasonP position, prior to ‘why’ moving to Spec,CP. In contrast, there is no topic T δ position that can host the movement step from a TP-internal position to ReasonP of Chinese *weishenme* (‘why’).

Chapter 5 investigates the phenomenon of *ga/no* conversion from the perspective of Strong Uniformity. In Japanese, the subject of a relative clause or a noun-complement may either be marked with the nominative *-ga* or with the genitive *-no*. In the first part of the chapter, M argues that *ga/no* conversion provides strong evidence for the central thesis of Strong Uniformity that all formal features start out in C and are inherited by T. Building on previous work, M argues that the nominative marking occurs in a full CP, while the genitive marking is associated with a TP not selected by C. On the Strong Uniformity hypothesis, this means that in constructions with a nominative subject, T is fully active; it can license nominative and focus on the subject and can trigger EPP-related operations like subject movement to T and object scrambling. On the other hand, since T is devoid of features and syntactically inactive in the absence of C, constructions in which the subject bears genitive case show several restrictions. T cannot license nominative case on the subject which is therefore assigned genitive case by D. Moreover, T cannot EPP-attract the subject, resulting in an adjacency requirement between the vP-internal subject and the verb, and cannot EPP-attract the object, resulting in unavailability of scrambling. Most importantly, as shown in (1), a focus element on the subject precludes genitive from occurring on the subject:

- (1) Taroo-*dake-ga*/*-no nonda kusuri
 Taro-only-NOM/*-GEN took medicine
 ‘medicine that only Taro took’

This is so because focus requires C, and C is associated with an active T which assigns nominative to the subject. In the second part of the chapter, M argues that focus features on arguments are activated by Case, similarly to ϕ -features.

The book makes an important contribution to our understanding of theoretical syntax and parameter theory through an in-depth investigation of the interaction between ϕ -features and δ -features across languages and phenomena. Based on highly complex and intriguing data from several areas of syntax, Miyagawa makes a convincing case that there is much to be gained if variation is approached from the perspective of Strong Uniformity. The book offers a systematic typology of C-related and T-related phenomena depending on where ϕ -features and δ -features

are hosted. It highlights the similarities between the agreement/Case systems and the topic/focus systems in natural language and offers a restrictive and conceptually sound theory of the interaction between ϕ -features and δ -features. It also provides novel tools for comparing related structures in typologically diverse languages, such as the presence, properties and distribution of politeness agreement; the conditions governing the availability of sloppy readings on null subjects; the syntactic behavior of *why*, *how come* and *what for why* adjuncts; and the (un)-availability of special case and focus marking on subjects in full vs. reduced clausal environments. The book will be a valuable guide to researchers studying these phenomena in all languages and initiates a new research agenda in the investigation of clause structure, agreement, Case, discourse configurability and their typology.

REFERENCES

- BECK, SIGRID. 1996a. Quantifier structures as barriers for LF Movement. *Natural Language Semantics* 4. 1-56.
- BECK, SIGRID. 1996b. Wh-constructions and transparent logical form. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tübingen.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2005. Three factors in language design. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36. 1-23.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2007. Approaching UG from below. *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?*, ed. by Uli Sauerland and Hans Martin Gärtner, 1-29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- EMONDS, JOSEPH. 1969. Root and structure-preserving transformations. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge MA.
- KURODA, S.-Y. 1965. Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge MA.
- MIYAGAWA, SHIGERU. 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-Based and Discourse-Configurational Languages*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- NISHIGAUCHI, TAISUKE. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- OIKONOMOU, DESPINA. 2017. Sloppy pro in Greek: An E-type analysis. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.
- OKU, SATOSHI. 1998. A theory of selection and reconstruction in the minimalist perspective. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- SAITO, MAMORU. 1985. Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implications. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge MA.
- SHLONSKY, UR and GABRIELA SOARE. 2011. Where's 'why'? *Linguistic Inquiry* 42. 651-669.
- SPEAS, MARGARET and CAROL TENNY. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. *Asymmetry in Grammar*, ed. by M. Di Sciullo, 315-344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- VAN URK, COPPE. 2015. The syntax of displacement. A Dinka case study. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge MA.

Department of Philology, Linguistics section
University of Crete, University Campus Gallos, 74100 Rethymno, Greece
[anagnostopoulou@uoc.gr, elena.anagnostopoulou01@gmail.com]