

3/4 of a monster: On mixed shifty agreement in Telugu*

Troy Messick

Abstract

Within the typology of embedded pronouns, there are languages that allow for non-first person pronouns to apparently control first person agreement morphology when in certain embedded contexts. This type of agreement displays some degree of optionality: it is also possible for the pronoun to control the expected agreement morphology given the pronoun's own overt morphological features. This paper provides new data from the Dravidian language Telugu that shows when the embedded pronoun controls agreement on two separate targets, agreement may be uniform across the two targets or the two targets can mismatch in one direction, but crucially not the other. I show how we may account for this paradigm using the assumptions that the pronouns in question are similar to so-called hybrid nouns and that agreement features are restricted in principled ways.

Keywords: syntax, semantics, agreement, features, Dravidian, Telugu

Languages differ in the behavior of person morphology embedded in speech and attitude reports. Some languages use specialized logophoric pronouns to refer to the attitude holder in such constructions (Adesola 2005; Clements 1975; Koopman & Sportiche 1989; Pearson 2015). Other languages display so-called indexical shift, where first person pronouns can refer to the attitude holder in embedded environments (Anand & Nevins 2004; Anand 2006; Anvari to appear; Deal 2020; Schlenker 2003; Shklovsky & Sudo 2014) . A relatively new discovery in the typology of embedded pronouns is a set of languages that allow for non-first person pronouns to apparently control first person agreement morphology. A representative example is given in (1) from the Dravidian language Telugu. The agreement on the embedded verb is first person singular *-nu*, however, the embedded subject, which is typically the controller of agreement in the language, is a third person simplex anaphor *tanu*.

- (1) Raju [tanu parigett-ææ-nu ani] čəpp-ææ-Du
 Raju 3SG run-PST-1SG COMP say-PST-3MSG
 ‘Raju said that he ran.’ (Messick 2023: 138; ex. 1)

How to account for such a feature mismatch between the apparent agreement controller and the agreement morphology itself is still a matter of debate (see Deal 2020; Ganenkov 2022; Messick 2023; Sundaresan 2018). In the analysis presented in Sundaresan (2018) for Tamil, the agreement controller of monstrous agreement is not the overt subject, but it is rather a null shifted indexical in the left periphery. The other accounts argue that the overt subject is the agreement controller, but the controller has a “hidden” feature. In his analysis of monstrous agreement in Aqusha Dargwa, Ganenkov (2022) calls this feature ATTITUDE HOLDER, and it forces the agreement morphology to be homophonous with first person agreement via the

language’s Vocabulary Insertion (VI) rules. Another line of analysis posits that the controller has a (special kind of) first person feature and this feature is what allows the subject to control first person agreement (Deal 2020; Messick 2016, 2023). For Deal, this feature is called *author-i*; in Messick 2023, I call it $\langle +\text{author}, -\text{C} \rangle$. The idea behind these analyses is that these features allow the agreement to be syncretic with “normal” first person agreement. In this squib, I present a novel paradigm from Telugu that suggests that the “hidden” feature view is on the right track, and moreover, that the hidden feature that allows monstrous agreement in (1) is similar to hidden features found on so-called hybrid nouns cross-linguistically.

The phenomena of monstrous agreement is at least superficially similar to agreement with hybrid nouns where the agreement controlled by a NP does not appear to match that NPs own morphological features (Corbett 1979, 2006, 1983; Hahm 2010; Wechsler & Zlatić 2000, 2003), and instead seem influenced by the NPs semantics in some way (hence the term: ‘semantic agreement’). A common analysis to this type of semantic agreement is to posit that the NP has the features found on the agreement target, but these features are not morphologically expressed on the controller itself. I have suggested in previous work that the hidden first person feature found in monstrous agreement is similar to hidden features found on hybrid nouns found cross-linguistically (see Messick 2016:151-152 and Messick 2023:139). Similar to the example in (1), when a hybrid noun controls agreement morphology, the features of controller can mismatch from the agreement morphology itself. Observe the Russian example in (2). The controller of agreement *vrač* (‘doctor’) is overtly morphologically masculine but controls feminine agreement on the adjective and the verb.¹

- (2) Nov-aja vrač-ъ prišl-a
 new-F.NOM.SG doctor-NOM.SG arrived-F.SG
 ‘A new doctor arrived.’ (Pesetsky 2013:36)

A well-known fact about hybrid nouns is that they display a characteristic 3/4 pattern in such constructions. Using Russian as an exemplar once again, if the hybrid noun controls agreement on the verb and an adjective in the same sentence, only three of the four possible combinations are grammatical: (2) demonstrates that both agreement targets can be feminine, while (3a) shows that is also grammatical if both targets surface as masculine. The example in (3b) shows that it is impossible for the adjective to show masculine agreement and the verb to show feminine. The other mismatch as shown in (3c) is possible.

- a. Nov-yj vrač-ъ prišël-ъ
 new-M.NOM.SG doctor-NOM.SG arrived-M.SG
 ‘A new doctor arrived.’
- b. *Nov-aja vrač-ъ prišël-ъ
 new-F.NOM.SG doctor-NOM.SG arrived-M.SG
 ‘A new doctor arrived.’
- c. Nov-yj vrač-ъ prišl-a
 new-M.NOM.SG doctor-NOM.SG arrived-F.SG
 ‘A new doctor arrived.’ (Pesetsky 2013:36)

While the number of hybrid nouns can vary within a single language (e.g., a single noun in Hebrew to an apparently open class in Russian (see Corbett 2023 for a recent overview of the types of hybrid agreement controllers), this type of 3/4 paradigm is pervasive in hybrid agreement. Examples include Lebanese Arabic (Pesetsky 2013), Hebrew (Landau 2016), British English (Smith 2017), and

Icelandic (Wood & Sigurdsson 2014) to name just a few.² I present a novel paradigm from Telugu that a similar 3/4 pattern emerges when the embedded *tanu* controls agreement on two separate elements. I sketch an analysis of this new paradigm by combining the idea that monstrous agreement involves a “hidden” feature on the agreement goal with recent approaches to capturing the 3/4 pattern that we see in Russian and other languages.

1 Agreement in Telugu and the 3/4 pattern

Telugu is an SOV language and displays verbal agreement morphology with unmarked (nominative) arguments in person and number, as well as gender in the third person. Illustrative examples are given in below.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(3) neenu parigett-ææ-nu
1SG run-PAST-1SG
'I ran.'</p> | <p>(4) nuvvu parigett-ææ-vu
2SG run-PAST-2SG
'You ran.'</p> |
| <p>(5) vaaDu parigett-ææ-Du
3MSG run-PAST-3MSG
'He ran.'</p> | |

In addition to verbal agreement, we find a different set of agreement markers on predicate nouns and adjectives. This type of agreement is only overtly realized for first singular and plural and second person singular. It is null throughout the rest of the paradigm. Relevant examples are given below.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(6) neenu vidyaardhi-ni
1SG student-1SG
'I am a student.'</p> | <p>(7) nuvvu vidyaardhi-wi
2SG student-2SG
'You are a student.'</p> |
|--|---|

- (8) vaaDu vidyaardhi-∅
 3MSG student-3SG
 ‘He is a student.’

Note that agreement markers on predicate nouns and adjectives must be seen as a distinct agreement probe from the probe found on T. This is shown by the fact that in cases of an overt auxiliary, both agreement on the predicate and the auxiliary are required, as shown in (9) (see also Raghotham 2020).³

- (9) neenu adhjaapakudi-*(ni) avu-taa-nu
 1SG teacher-*(1SG) be-FUT-1SG
 ‘I will become a teacher.’

Following Balusu (2014), I place the probe for the Telugu predicate nouns and adjectives on the PRED head. One piece of evidence in favor of this analysis comes from the fact that this agreement morphology is in complementary distribution with the morpheme *-gaa*, which Balusu (2016) independently argues is an eventive PRED head (see also Abramovitz 2021, where it is argued that a similar agreement morpheme found in Koryak non-verbal predication is located on PRED).

- (10) a. neenu president-gaa-(*ni) unnaanu
 1SG president-GAA be.PRES.1SG
 ‘I am (temporarily) president.’
 b. neenu president-(*gaa)-ni
 1SG president-1SG
 ‘I am the president.’ Balusu (2016: ex. 24-25)

In embedded clauses, Telugu displays what is sometimes called monstrous

agreement when pronouns and anaphors that receive a *de se* interpretation control agreement (Messick 2016, 2023). The element *tanu* itself is 3rd person, as shown by the fact it cannot take first or second person elements as antecedents (11).⁴

- (11) *niiku/naaku_i [tanu_i parigett-ææ-Du ani] telusu
 2SG.DAT/1SG.DAT 3SG run-PAST-3MSG COMP know
 Intended: ‘you/I know that you/I ran.’

Although third person, *tanu* can control first person agreement on the verb and predicate nouns/adjectives, as shown in (12). (12a) shows monstrous agreement with embedded verbal agreement morphology. (12b) shows monstrous agreement with a predicate noun.⁵

- (12) a. raju [tanu parigett-ææ-nu/-Du ani] čəpp-ææ-Du
 Raju 3SG run-PST-1SG/-3MSG COMP say-PST-3MSG
 ‘Raju said that he ran.’ (Messick 2023: ex. 1)
- b. akhil [tanu vidyaardhi-ni/-∅ ani] čəpp-ææ-Du
 Akhil 3SG student-1SG/-3SG COMP say-PST-3MSG
 ‘Akhil said that he is a student.’

Note that monstrous agreement is optional in both cases, the same examples with third person agreement are also grammatical.

Similarly, when the second person pronoun *nuvvu* is construed *de se* in an embedded speech or attitude report, it can control first person agreement morphology or second person agreement on verbs (13a) and predicate nouns (13b).

- (13) a. nuvvu rani too [nuvvu parigett-ææ-nu/-vu ani] čəpp-ææ-vu
 2SG Rani with 2SG run-PST-1SG/-2SG COMP say-PST-2SG

‘You told Rani that you ran.’

- b. nuvvu rani too [nuvvu vidyaardhi-ni/-wi ani] čəpp-ææ-vu
2SG Rani with 2SG student-1SG/-2SG COMP say-PST2SG
‘You told Rani that you are a student.’

We have seen individually that the agreement markers on both verbs and predicate nouns and adjectives can optionally shift and surface as first person in Telugu. We have also seen in (9) that both agreement markers can co-occur in the same clause. When we embed a clause that has both agreement morphology on the copular verb and on the predicate noun, we see a 3/4 pattern emerge. It is possible that both the elements shift (14a), or that neither shift (14b). Of the two potential cases where only one agreement markers shifts, only one case is grammatical. It is possible that the agreement marker on the copular verb shifts and surfaces as first person while the agreement marker on the predicate noun does not shift and surfaces as third person (i.e., null). The inverse where the predicate noun agreement marker shifts and surfaces as first person, while the agreement marker on the copula verb does not shift and surfaces as third person is ungrammatical.

- (14) a. raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-ni ava-taa-nu ani] čəpp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG teacher-1SG be-FUT-1SG COMP say-PST-3MSG
‘Raju said that he will become a teacher.’
- b. raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-∅ ava-taa-Du ani] čəpp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG teacher-3SG be-FUT-3MSG COMP say-PST-3MSG
‘Raju said that he will become a teacher.’
- c. raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-∅ ava-taa-nu ani] čəpp-ææ-Du
Raju 3SG teacher-3SG be-FUT-1SG COMP say-PST-3MSG
‘Raju said that he will become a teacher.’

- d. *raju [tanu adhjaapakudi-ni ava-taa-Du ani] čəpp-ææ-Du
 Raju 3SG teacher-1SG be-FUT-3MSG COMP say-PST-3MSG
 ‘Raju said that he will become a teacher.’

We see the exact same pattern when the controller of agreement is second person.

- (15) a. nuuvu rani too [nuvvu adhjaapakudi-ni ava-taa-nu/*-vu ani]
 2SG Rani with 2SG teacher-1SG be-FUT-1SG/*-2SG COMP
 čəpp-ææ-vu
 say-PST-2SG
 ‘You told Rani that you will become a teacher.’
- b. nuuvu rani too [nuvvu adhjaapakudi-wi ava-taa-nu/-vu ani]
 2SG Rani with 2SG teacher-2SG be-FUT-1SG/-2SG COMP
 čəpp-ææ-vu
 say-PST-2SG
 ‘You told Rani that you will become a teacher.’

Agreement in Telugu only allows for three out of four possible combinations of monstrous and regular agreement in embedded clauses making it similar to the 3/4 pattern for agreement with hybrid nouns discussed in the introduction. The utterances ruled out in (14d) and (15a) also follow a pattern that we see from hybrid nouns: if the probe that agrees first mismatches from the morphological features of the goal, then the utterance is ungrammatical if the subsequent probe matches the morphological features of the goal. Assuming bottom up structure building, the probe on PRED is merged first and undergoes Agree. If that agreement relation results in a mismatch with the goal’s morphological features (1st person agreement), then when T is merged and undergoes agree, the result of that

agreement relation cannot be a match with the morphological features of the goal (2nd or 3rd person agreement). Compare this to the ungrammatical Russian example from the introduction (2). If the agreement relation between the probe on the DP-internal adjective and the goal results in mismatching agreement (feminine), then the subsequent probe on T cannot result in morphological matching agreement with the goal (masculine).

2 Accounting for 3/4 with monstrous agreement

A common first step in accounting for 3/4 patterns with hybrid nouns is to posit that the goal in such constructions has two distinct feature values: one expressed by the morphology of the goal and one that goes unexpressed by the morphology, but is nonetheless available for syntactic operations such as agreement. Using the Russian example from the introduction, the agreement controller has both a morphologically expressed masculine feature, but also a morphologically unexpressed but syntactically active feminine feature as well. Similarly, the goal that controls monstrous agreement has a kind of first person feature that goes unexpressed by the morphology in addition to a person feature that is morphologically expressed on the pronoun.

Broadly, there are two ways that researchers have treated the features that are not morphologically expressed. On some accounts, it is argued that lexical items come with two sets of features. One set corresponds to the items morphology while the other corresponds to the items semantics (Bruening 2020; Smith 2017; Wechsler & Zlatic 2000, 2003). What makes hybrid nouns special is their morphological and semantic features mismatch from one another. On this *lexical view*, when the agreement morphology appears to mismatch from the goals

morphological feature it is because the probe targeted the semantic features of the goal. The other *structuralist view* posits that the two features are merged into the derivation at different points in the nominal structure (Kučerová 2018; Landau 2016; Pesetsky 2013; Puškar 2018). Both accounts then restrict access to certain features in principled ways that result in the observed 3/4 pattern.⁶ Below, I outline how the Telugu data may be integrated into these two types of theories.

Under a lexical analysis of monstrous agreement, there must be variants of third person *tanu* and second person *nuvvu* that come with a semantic first person feature. Following Bruening (2020), we can assume that both the morphological features and the semantic feature are possible targets for an agreement probe, however, when a probe targets the semantic features, those semantic features must be targeted for subsequent probes (see Bruening 2020:9). This is what Norris (to appear) calls *The Principle of Semantic Preference*. This system correctly predicts the Telugu pattern. Using the example with *tanu*, the pronoun would be merged into the structure with both a grammatical/morphological third person feature ($\phi_M:3sg$), but a semantic first person feature ($\phi_S:1sg$). Assuming bottom up structure building, the probe on PRED would be merged and undergo search. If this probe targets the semantic first person feature (16), then via *The Principle of Semantic Preference*, the later probe on T must also target the semantic feature (17). Hence the ungrammatical mismatch in (14d) is correctly ruled out while the derivation where both probes are valued first person is ruled in (14a).

might assume the first person feature is added to the pronoun *counter-cyclically* after the PRED head has agreed with the pronoun (resulting in third person agreement) but before the probe on T has been merged and initiated search for a goal (cf. Kučerová 2019 for a proposal that “hidden” features can be added counter-cyclically)⁸ When T undergoes search, it encounters the first person feature and agrees with that feature, it can no longer access the third person feature due to minimality. These assumptions have the same effect of the *The Principle of Semantic Preference*.

While deciding between lexical and structural approaches lies beyond the scope of the squib, it should be noted that most structural approaches were first created to account for the 3/4 where either one or both of the agreement probes occur inside the DP. This differs from the data discussed here where both the probe on T and PRED occur outside the DP. Hence, these analyses do not account for these facts as straightforwardly as lexical approaches that were created to account for 3/4 patterns with two DP external agreement probes (see Smith 2021: Section 4.4.1 for discussion).

2.1 Licensing shifty agreement

Monstrous agreement does differ from other semantic agreement phenomena in that it has a more limited distribution. In Telugu, monstrous agreement is only possible in embedded clauses, and is not possible in matrix clauses. *Nuvvu* and *tanu* cannot control first person agreement in matrix clauses.

- | | | |
|------|---|---|
| (18) | a. *nuvvu parigett-ææ-nu
2SG run-PST-1SG
Intended: ‘You ran.’ | b. *tanu parigett-ææ-nu
3SG run-PST-1SG
Intended: ‘He ran.’ |
|------|---|---|

In order to account for this fact, we must restrict access to the ‘hidden’ first person feature in some way. A number of works have reached the conclusion that first and second person features require special additional licensing when compared to other ϕ -features (see Béjar & Rezac 2003; Baker 2008; Portner et al. 2019 among others). Following these works, I previously argued that the hidden first person feature also requires special licensing. In this vein, I put forth the following condition on the hidden first person feature in Messick 2023. The condition is given in (19) (cf. Deal 2020: Section 5.4 on the distribution/requirements of the *author-i* feature in her theory).⁹

- (19) * $[(+author, -C)]$ if occurs on a pronoun X such that X is not locally bound by Op_{ani} . (Messick 2023: 166; ex. 83)

The element Op_{ani} can occur in clauses introduced by the complementizer-like element *ani* which can occur under nearly all attitude verbs.¹⁰ Note that the attitude verb itself is not a necessary component, as shifted agreement is possible in purpose clauses introduced by *ani*, as shown in (20).

- (20) Rao [tanu paDDaa-nu ani] raa-leedu
 Rao 3SG fell-1SG COMP come-NEG.3SG
 ‘Rao did not come because/as he fell.’ (Balusu 2020: ex. 48)

This suggests that the hidden feature that underlies shifted agreement has a more restrictive distribution because it has more stringent licensing requirements than other hidden features previously studied. Due to space, I do not delve deeper into the details of the licensing condition here, and point the interested reader to Messick 2023.

3 Discussion and Conclusion

Before concluding, let’s consider whether previous approaches to monstrous agreement could potentially account for the 3/4 pattern. A prominent approach is given in Sundaresan (2018) for the Dravidian language Tamil. Under this analysis, the goal of the embedded agreement probe is ultimately a null pronoun in the left periphery that represents the perspective holder of the clause and has undergone indexical shift.¹¹ This is schematized in (21).

$$(21) \quad [{}_{PerP} \textit{pro}_{\phi:1st} \overbrace{[{}_{Per'} [{}_{TP} \textit{taan}/\textit{nii} [{}_{T'} [{}_{vP}\dots] T_{\phi:_}]]}] \textit{Per}]$$

Under this analysis, the embedded subject *taan* (for third person) and *nii* (for second person) cannot control agreement due to the Anaphor Agreement Effect, hence the only accessible potential goal for a ϕ -probe is the *pro*. Whether or not a clause exhibits indexical shift, is thought to be due to the presence of a shift operator in the left periphery of the embedded clause. Since the operator can either be present in the structure or not, we can account for cases of agreement where either agreement is entirely 1st person (shifted) or entirely 3rd person (non-shifted), but it is unclear how to generate mixed agreement example since it requires both 1st person features and 2nd/3rd person features to be accessible to the ϕ -probes.

Ganenkov (2022) analyzes monstrous agreement in the Nakh-Daghestanian language Aqusha Dargwa. Under this approach, the embedded pronoun has a special “hidden” ATTITUDE HOLDER feature that allows it to control first person agreement morphology. Both Messick 2023 and Deal 2020 also allow for a “hidden” feature on the controller and treat monstrous agreement as syncretic with normal first person agreement (Deal does not hash out the morphological details). Both Ganenkov (2022) and I give morphological analyses to shifted agreement such that

the ATTITUDE HOLDER feature or ⟨+author, -C⟩ feature must be morphologically exponed on every agreement target (though the two analyses ensure this in different ways). What this paper showed is that (at least for Telugu), the “hidden” feature can be selectively accessed so that one probe can target it, while another does not, resulting in mixed shifty agreement, hence the previous morphological accounts do not straightforwardly account for the novel paradigm. Since the mixed agreement behavior is restricted in ways found with hybrid nouns cross-linguistically, this suggests that the “hidden” feature found on monstrous agreement controllers can be analyzed in a similar fashion to “hidden” features found on hybrid nouns.

References

- Abramovitz, Rafael. 2021. Person and predication in Koryak. In Rachel Soo, Una Y. Chow & Sander Nederveen (eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 38*, 1–10. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Adesola, Oluseye. 2005. *Pronouns and null operators: A-bar dependencies and relations in Yuroba*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University dissertation.
- Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De De Se*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Anand, Pranav & Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing context. In Robert B Young (ed.), *Semantics and Linguistic Theory 14*, 20–37.
- Anvari, Amir. to appear. The ban against illeism and indexical shift in Farsi. *Journal of Semantics* .
- Baker, Mark C. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mark C. 2011. When agreement is for number and gender but not person.

Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 29. 875–915.

- Baker, Mark C. & Shiori Ikawa. 2022. Control theory and the relationship between logophoric pronouns and logophoric uses of anaphors. Ms., Rutgers University & Fuji Women's University.
- Balusu, Rahul. 2014. Person agreement in adjectival predication in Telugu. Talk delivered at the Bhatt Workshop at LISSIM 8.
- Balusu, Rahul. 2016. The eventive predicator *-gaa* in Telugu. *Linguistic Analysis* 40(3-4). 199–236.
- Balusu, Rahul. 2020. The quotative complementizer says “I’m too baroque for *that*”. In Bhamati Dash & Gurmeet Kaur (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to South Asian Languages*, vol. 8, 1–12.
- Béjar, Susana & Milan Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In Ana Teresa Pérez-Leroux & Yves Roberge (eds.), *Romance linguistics: Theory and acquisition*, 49–62. John Benjamins.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David & Susi Wurmbrand. 2012. Word order and scope: Transparent interfaces and the 3/4 signature. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3). 371–421.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2020. The head of the nominal is N, not D: N-to-D movement, hybrid agreement, and conventionalized expressions. *Glossa* 5.
- Clements, G. N. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 2. 141–177.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1975. Polite plurals and predicate agreement. *Language* 51(2). 406–418.
- Corbett, G. G. 1979. The agreement hierarchy. *Journal of Linguistics* 15. 203–395.
- Corbett, G. G. 1983. *Hierarchies, targets and controller: Agreement patterns in Slavic*. London: Croom Helm.
- Corbett, G. G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Corbett, G. G. 2023. The agreement hierarchy and (generalized) semantic agreement. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 8(1). 1–39.
- Culy, Christopher. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32(6). 1055–1094.
- Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 2002. Three types of verbal logophoricity in African languages. *Studies in African Linguistics* 31(1/2).
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2020. *A theory of indexical shift: meaning grammar and crosslinguistic variation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2001. ‘Plurilinguals’, pronouns and quirky agreement. *The Linguistic Review* 18. 19–41.
- Forker, Diana. 2019. Reported speech constructions in Sanzhi Dargwa and their extension to other areas of grammar. *Spachwissenschaft* 44. 171–199.
- Frampton, John & Sam Gutmann. 2000. Agreement is feature sharing. Ms., Northeastern University, Boston, MA.
- Ganenkov, Dmitry. 2022. Agreement shift in embedded reports. *Linguistic Inquiry* .
- Hahm, Hyun-Jong. 2010. *A cross-linguistic study of syntactic and semantic agreement: Polite plural pronouns and other issues*. Austin, TX: University of Texas dissertation.
- Heath, Jeffery. 2014. A grammar of Donno So. Ms., University of Michigan.
- Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1989. Pronouns, logical variables, and logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 555–589.
- Kučerová, Ivona. 2018. ϕ -features at the syntax-semantics interface: Evidence from nominal inflection. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(4). 813–845.
- Kučerová, Ivona. 2019. On the role of person in the mapping of syntactic features onto their interpretable counterparts. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 64(4). 649–672.

- Landau, Idan. 2016. DP-internal semantic agreement: A configurational analysis. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34. 975–1020.
- Messick, Troy. 2016. Pronoun agreement mismatches in Telugu. In Rahul Balusu & Sandhya Sundaresan (eds.), *Proceedings of formal approaches to south asian languages*, vol. 5, 143–161.
- Messick, Troy. 2023. On apparent pronominal feature contradictions: Shifty agreement in Telugu. *Syntax* 26(2). 137–182.
- Messick, Troy & Irina Monich. 2016. Agreement in Nuer speech reports. Paper presented at ACAL 47.
- Norris, Mark. to appear. Estonian and Finnish show that hybrid agreement is structural. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 39*, .
- Pearson, Hazel. 2015. The interpretation of the logophoric pronoun in Ewe. *Natural Language Semantics* 23. 77–118.
- Pesetsky, David. 2013. *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and interpretability. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian & W.K. Wilkins (eds.), *Phrasal and clausal architecture*, 262–294. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Portner, Paul, Miok Pak & Raffaella Zanuttini. 2019. The speaker-addressee relation at the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 95(1). 1–36.
- Puškar, Zorica. 2018. Interactions of gender and number agreement: Evidence from Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. *Syntax* 21. 275–318.
- Raghotham, Sreekar. 2020. Identity crisis. Talk presented at FASAL 10.
- Sauerland, Uli & Paul Elbourne. 2002. Total reconstruction, PF movement, and derivational order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33. 283–319.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26.

29–120.

- Shklovsky, Kirill & Yasutada Sudo. 2014. The syntax of monsters. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(3). 381–402.
- Smith, Peter. 2017. The syntax of semantic agreement in English. *Journal of Linguistics* 53(4). 823–863.
- Smith, Peter W. 2021. *Morphology-semantics mismatches and the nature of grammatical features*, vol. 35 Interface Explorations. Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 2018. Somber prospects for Late Merger. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50(2). 416–424.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya. 2018. Perspective is syntactic: evidence from anaphora. *Glossa* 3(1). 1–40.
- Vinokurova, Nadezhda. 2005. *Lexical categories and argument structure: A study with with reference to Sakha*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: University of Utrecht dissertation.
- Wechsler, Stephen & Larisa Zlatić. 2000. A theory of agreement and its application to Serbo-Croatian. *Language* 76. 799–832.
- Wechsler, Stephen & Larisa Zlatić. 2003. *The many faces of agreement*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Wood, Jim & Einar Freyr Sigurdsson. 2014. Icelandic verbal agreement and pronoun-antecedent relations. In Chris Collins (ed.), *Cross-linguistic studies of imposters and pronominal agreement*, 196–237. Oxford University Press.

Rutgers University

troy.messick@rutgers.edu

3/4 patterns (if possible) as a matter for future research.

³This distinguishes it from the superficially similar pattern found in Sakha as described in Baker (2011). In Sakha, predicate nouns and adjectives appear to host person agreement affixes just like in Telugu. This is shown in (23a). Unlike Telugu, when there is an overt auxiliary, as in (23b), agreement only appears on the auxiliary and not the predicate. Baker analyzes the agreement morphemes in examples like (23a) as instances of T agreement. The agreement only appears on the adjective as a result of a morphological merger like operation.

- (23) a. Bihigi bytaam-myt
1PL.NOM slow-1PLS
'We are slow.' (Baker 2011: ex. 10)
- b. Bihigi bytaam-(*myt) buol-a-byt
1PL.NOM slow-(*1PLS) be-AOR-1PLS
'We are slow.' *Sakha* (Vinokurova 2005: 205)

⁴Outside of Dravidian, this type of monstrous agreement is found in Nakh-Dagestanian (Forker 2019; Ganenkov 2022), Dogon (Culy 1994; Heath 2014) and Nilo-Saharan (Curnow 2002; Messick & Monich 2016) languages .

⁵Though very similar, monstrous agreement is a distinct phenomena from so-called indexical shift (see Deal 2020 for a recent overview of indexical shift). With monstrous agreement, it is possible for agreement morphology to shift and surface as first person. In languages with indexical shift, indexical pronouns themselves shift. In Telugu, pronouns never shift. This is shown in (24). The pronoun *neenu* must refer to the current speaker and cannot refer to the attitude holder Raju. Note that

the embedded clause in (24) contains a negative polarity item *ee* (‘any’) licensed by matrix negation. This is done to rule out the possibility that the embedded clause is a quotation (cf. Anand & Nevins 2004:22-23).

- (24) raju [neenu ee aratipanD-lu tinn-aa-nu ani] čepa-leedu
 Raju 1SG any banana-PL eat-PST-1SG COMP say-NEG.3SG
 ‘Raju did not say that I ate any bananas.’

⁶A reviewer wonders whether such analyses can account for the observation in Sauerland & Elbourne (2002) that semantic agreement is only possible with wide scope in raising constructions. Smith (2017, 2021) attempts to account for this fact (along with several other pieces of data) with his “LF-visibility” condition on semantic agreement in British English, which restricts access to semantic features in a principled way, hence approaches that argue for dual features are compatible with these facts as well.

⁷An anonymous reviewer wonders about the exact structural locus of the two person features on the structural account. At the moment, it is unclear what the locus would be save for the fact that the first person feature must be higher than the third person feature. One may view this as recursive embeddings of a ϕ P.

⁸Of course counter-cycle merge is a controversial mechanism (see Sportiche 2018).

⁹As an anonymous reviewer notes, the licensing condition in Messick 2023 is more syntactically oriented than is commonly assumed in the literature on embedded pronouns/indexical shift. It should be noted that the licensing condition can be implemented with the person features being inherent to the pronoun (Anand 2006:102,

Baker 2008) or by treating pronouns as minimal (or featureless) and gaining the features through agreement with their binders (as in e.g., Portner et al. 2019). This relates to a second issue raised by a reviewer, which concerns timing of valuation or licensing. Given that the operator that licenses the feature is not introduced until the left periphery of the embedded clause after T and PRED had undergone agree, it appears to be the case that features can enter into agreement relations before they are licensed. One way to implement this in a valuation framework, is to treat agreement as feature-sharing (Frampton & Gutmann 2000; Pesetsky & Torrego 2007). Under this view, the pronoun has an unlicensed or unvalued feature. When T or PRED agrees with it, the pronoun shares that unlicensed/unvalued feature with the probe. Once the null the operator is introduced and licenses/values the feature on the pronoun, it licenses/values all occurrences of the feature.

¹⁰As an anonymous reviewer notes, in order to ensure coreference between the pronoun and the matrix subject, we must assume there is some relation between the matrix subject and the null *Op_{ani}*. This is similar to the issue found with operator theories of logophoric pronouns (Koopman & Sportiche 1989). One recent approach to this issue is to treat the relationship between the null operator and the matrix subject as a form of control (Baker & Ikawa 2022). Such an analysis seems amenable to Telugu since monstrous agreement is sensitive to syntactic locality and c-command (see Messick 2023: Section 3.3.3).

¹¹While null pronouns have also been used to account for agreement with hybrid nouns (e.g., den Dikken 2001), further research is required to deduce whether such approaches can account for the 3/4 pattern generally (Smith 2017: 852).