Multiple Agreement in Estonian Imperatives

**AGREEMENT IN ESTONIAN CLAUSES**

In typical affirmative clauses in Estonian, there is one exponent of subject-verb agreement:

(1) a. Te hüppa-te. b. Hüpa-ke!
    you.PL jump-2PL jump-IMP.2PL

(You (pl) are jumping.)

(‘Y’all jump!’)

The patterns in negated clauses show a split:

- Negated indicatives (2a) apparently show no agreement.
- Negated imperatives (2b) have double agreement.

(2) a. Te ei hüppa.
    you.PL NEG jump

(‘You (pl) are not jumping.’)

b. Ar-ge hüpa-ke!
    NEG-IMP.2PL jump-IMP.2PL

(‘Don’t jump!’)

One wrinkle: In negative imperatives, agreement on the main verb is optional for first-person plural -me (Erelt et al. 2000).

It is always obligatory on āra.

(3) a. ār-me hüppa!
    NEG-IMP.1PL jump NEG-IMP jump-1PL

(‘Let’s not jump!’)

Our proposal: The syntax of agreement is the same in negative clauses and affirmative clauses.

- In the syntax, $\Sigma^0$ enters Agree with subject DP in Spec, vP.
- In negated indicatives, $\Sigma_{[\text{NEG}]}$ simply does not realize $\phi$-features.
- An Estonian-specific morphological operation of Feature Copying results in agreement doubling.

**FINNCA CLAUSAL ARCHITECTURE**

Our assumptions about basic Estonian clausal structure are represented below (see Holmberg, et al. 1993):

(4) CP
    [IMP] $\Sigma$
    $\phi$
    T $\Sigma$
    TP
    $\Sigma$
    $\phi$
    vP
    VP

- Negation hosts agreement in most Finno-Ugric languages (Mitchell 2006). $\Sigma^0$ has $\phi$.
- Verb still bears tense-marking in negated clauses $\Sigma^0$ is above $T^0$
- Imperativity is higher than negation (Han 2001, a.o.)

**NO AGREEMENT IN NEGATED INDICATIVES**

Syntax: $\Sigma^0$ agrees with subject DP for $\phi$-features.

- $\Sigma^0_{\text{[NEG]}}$ spells out as NEG+AGR.
- $\Sigma^0$ without [NEG] just spells out as AGR.

**INTEGRITY**

Finnmark Saami: (6) Estonian:

(5) a. $\Sigma_{\text{[NEG]}}, 1SG \leftrightarrow \Sigma_{\text{[NEG]}}, 2SG \\ b. $\Sigma_{\text{[NEG]}}, 2SG \leftrightarrow \Sigma_{\text{[NEG]}}, 1SG $

Agreement still occurs, but its effects are not morphologically realized on the probe.

**DOUBLED AGREEMENT IN IMPERATIVES**

Syntax yields (7):

- Negative imperative syntax = negative syntax + imperative syntax
- $\Sigma^0_{\text{[NEG]}}$ agrees with subject DP as normal; we do not address subject positions here, but assume movement to Spec, $\Sigma_P$.
- $C_{\text{[IMP]}}$ attracts $\Sigma^0_{\text{[NEG]}}$

(7) CP
    [IMP] $\Sigma$
    $\phi$
    $\Sigma_P$
    $\phi$
    TP
    $T + v + V$
    vP

Post-syntactic morphological operations yield (8):

- $\Sigma^0_{\text{[NEG]}}$ and $C^0_{\text{[IMP]}}$ undergo Fusion.
- $C^0_{\text{[IMP]}}$, triggers AGR node insertion on $T^0$. We assume this is optional in the context of [1PL].

- Feature Copying: Copy features from $C^0$ to AGR node adjoined to $T^0$ (On Feature Copying, see Kramer 2010).

(8) CP
    [IMP] $\Sigma$
    $\phi$
    $\Sigma_P$
    $\phi$
    T $\Sigma$
    TP
    $\phi$
    vP

**PROSPECTS FOR A SYNTAX ACCOUNT**

What if the negative imperative has special syntax?

- E.g., regular imperative syntax + special auxiliary āra.

View from Laka (1990): imperative is incompatible with normal negation because both realize $\Sigma^0$ (cf. Zanuttini 1997).

- The only way to express a negative imperative is through the use of an extra element āra.

Assume this head also has $\phi$ and can find features on the head of its complement $\Sigma^0$ (à la Henderson 2006; Baker and Willie 2010)

(9) [ āra $\{ \Sigma_{\text{[NEG]}}, V \ldots \{ \Sigma_{\text{[NEG]}}, \ldots \} \} $]

$\phi$

Challenges: 2

- āra’s restriction to impertatives must be stipulated.
- The agreement paradigm is the normal imperative paradigm $\rightarrow$ unexpected if negation and imperativity are truly incompatible in Estonian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing</th>
<th>Plur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 hüppa-n hüppa-me</td>
<td>1 — hüppa-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hüppa-d hüppa-te</td>
<td>(hüppa-kem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hüpfa-b hüpfa-vad</td>
<td>2 hüpfa hüpfa-ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hüpfa-ku hüpfa-ku</td>
<td>3 hüpfa-ku hüpfa-ku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No clear path to explain the fact that agreement on the verb is optional for -me, but *only when āra is present.*

**CONCLUSIONS**

We have proposed that the syntax of agreement (i.e., Agree) is the same in all types of Estonian clauses.

- In other words, we claim that the different patterns of exponence are not evidence of more or fewer Agree relationships.

- The morphological oddities of Estonian are kept in the morphology.

Previous approaches to multiple exponence of subject-verb agreement have focused on examples where multiple exponence is obligatory.

- Estonian imperatives is an interesting case study, because (i) multiple agreement is not found in all clauses, and (ii) it is not always obligatory even where it is possible.

If our conclusions are correct, they suggest that some post-syntactic copying mechanism must be countenanced as a source of (multiple) agreement.
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