

<u>Workshop ID :</u>	11
<u>Workshop Duration :</u>	Workshop - 1 Day
<u>Workshop Title :</u>	The Syntax of agreement in African languages
<u>Workshop Leader :</u>	Ken Safir, Rutgers University

While not every language has agreement of one form or another, most have exponents of agreement, even if it is only antecedent agreement. Some syntactic theories, such as Chomsky's minimalism, regard agreement as a fundamental primitive relation underlying the structure of all languages, even those where agreement exponents are scarce. Agreement relations are fundamentally syntactic since there are very few linear effects, that is, proximity between exponent and associate depends on syntactic relations, often relations at a distance. Minimalist theorists propose that the same syntactic configurations that license overt agreement in some languages, also license other syntactic relations, such as displacement and constituent chunking, and do so even in languages with scarce agreement exponents. This panel focuses on agreement relations in African languages where agreement morphology is rich and/or atypical as a window into the syntactic relations that must be possible given attested morphology, setting boundary conditions on what any theory of agreement must be able to account for.

While not all African languages are rich in agreement relations, a great many are, particularly in the Bantu subfamily and certain other Niger-Congo, Nilo-Saharan, and Afro-Asiatic languages. Much recent research has been devoted to agreement in these languages. Subject-verb agreement must always identify the syntactic subject, not just the closest noun, even in cases of first or second conjunct agreement, and especially when the thematic subject is in a non-canonical position and still agrees. Non-adjacent agreement effects are widespread, such as agreement between complement clause complementizers and matrix subjects e.g., Kawasha (2007, for several Bantu languages), logophoric agreement with operators and anaphors (e.g., Adesola, 2005, on Yoruba), and forms of extraction leave agreement residues in the clauses they pass through, as in Dinka Bor (e.g., van Urk and Richards, 2015) or in Zulu raising out of finite clauses (Halpert, 2012) or hyper-agreement (e.g. Carstens, 2011), where main verbs and auxiliaries both agree with the subject. Additional agreement relations include verb-object agreement (e.g., Baker and Kramer, 2016, for Amharic and Marten and Kula, 2008, amongst many others, on Bantu), wh-question-operator-C agreement and anti-agreement (e.g., Schneider-Zioga, 2007, for Kinande), C and lower subject, adjectives internal to nominals, and adverbs agreeing with arguments (e.g., Carstens and Diercks, 2013 on Lubukusu) and contexts of default agreement. The features of agreement are most commonly for noun class, number and person, but agreement for animacy, humanness, tense, reciprocity (e.g., Safir and Selvanathan, 2016). Sometimes differences in what is agreed for distinguish one form of agreement from another (e.g., Baker, 2008 on noun class and number vs. person). Papers on any other exponent-associate relation where syntactic relations require matching or corresponding morphology are welcome.

Successful abstracts will be those that contribute to our understanding of the syntax of agreement, either by presenting empirical patterns, language internally or across African languages, that specifically bear on the boundary conditions that any successful general theory of agreement must address, or by presenting theoretical approaches that enhance our understanding of agreement patterns in African languages.