(1) “Agreement” and “Non-agreement” Languages:
Focus, broadly conceived, is computationally equivalent to agreement.

(2) (i) EPP and Agreement: e.g., Indo-European
(ii) EPP and Focus: e.g., Japanese

(3) Why is there this Agreement – Focus parameter?
They originate on the same head: C

(4) Agreement-prominent (e.g., most of Indo-European)

```
CP
  C'
    TP
      T_EPP
        AGREEMENT
      C_FOCUS

```

(5) Focus-prominent (e.g., Japanese)

```
CP
  C'
    TP
      T_EPP
        FOCUS
      AGREEMENT

```

(6) Simpson and Wu (2001):
Historically, agreement/concordance may sometimes be traced back to a focus structure.

1. Focus and EPP

1.1. A-movement scrambling and A’-movement scrambling

1.1.1. A-movement: suppression of weak crossover

(7) ?/?*Who_i does his_i mother love t_i?

(8) Who_i seems to his_i mother t_i to be a genius?
(9) *[Soitu-no hahaoya]-ga dare-o aisiteiru no?  
[he,-Gen mother]-Nom who,-Acc love Q  
‘His mother loves who? = Who does his mother love?’

(10) ?Dare-o [soitu-no hahaoya]-ga t, aisiteiru no?  
who,-Acc [he,-Gen mother]-Nom t, love Q  
‘Who, his mother loves?’

Long-distance scrambling: cannot suppress WCO: only A’-movement

(11) ?*Dare-o [soitu-no hahaoya]-ga [CP Hanako-ga t, aisiteiru to] itta no?  
who,-Acc [he,-Gen mother]-Nom [CP Hanako-Nom t, love C] said Q  
’Who, his mother said Hanako loves?’

(12) Summary  
Local scrambling: A-scrambling  
LD scrambling: A’-scrambling

1.1.2. Confirmation: anaphor binding

(13) Local scrambling: can create a new binder through A-movement  
Karera-o [otagai,-no sensei]-ga t, hihansita.  
they-Acc [each other,-Gen teacher]-Nom t, criticized  
‘They, each other’s teachers criticized t.’

(14) LD scrambling: cannot create a new binder because it is solely A’-movement  
Karera-o [otagai,-no sensei]-ga [CP Hanako-ga t, hihansita to] itta.  
they-Acc [each other,-Gen teacher]-Nom [CP Hanako-Nom t, criticized C] said  
’They, each other’s teachers said that Hanako criticized t.’

1.1.3. Further confirmation: idiom chunk (Miyagawa 1997)  
Idiom chunks may scramble only by A-movement

(15) Idiom: kosi-o orosu ‘lower hip’  
Kosi-o, Taro-ga t, orosita (isu)  
hip-Acc, Taro-Nom t, lowered (chair)  
‘(the chair that) hip, Taro lowered (Taro sat down)’

(16) ?*Kosi-o Hanako-ga [Taro-ga t, orosita to] itta (isu)  
hip-Acc Hanako-Nom [Taro-Nom t, lower C] said (chair)  
‘(the chair that) hip, Hanako said that Taro lowered (Hanako said that Taro
1.1.3. A’-scrambling: reconstruction

(17) Himself, John likes t_i.

(18) LD scrambling: reconstruction possible

Zibunzisin_i-o [Taroo-ga [Hanako_i-ga t_i hihansita to] itta.

self_i-Acc [Taro-Nom [Hanako_i-Nom t_i criticized C] said

‘Self_i, Taro said that Hanako_i criticized t_i.’

(19) Local scrambling: may also be A’-movement — reconstruction possible

Zibunzisin_i-o Hanako_i-ga t_i hihansita.

self_i-Acc Hanako_i-Nom t_i criticized

‘Self_i, Hanako_i criticized t_i.’

(20) Summary:

Local scrambling: may be A- or A’-movement
LD scrambling: solely A’-movement

1.2. EPP and Scrambling (Miyagawa 2001, 2003; cf. also Collins 1997, Kitahara 2002)


(21) Taroo-ga subete-no-kodomo-o sikara-nakat-ta.

Taro-Nom all-chidren-Acc scold-Neg-Past

‘Taro didn't scold all children.'

not > all (all > not)


all-children-nom vegetable-Acc eat-Neg-Past

‘All the children did not eat vegetables.'

*not > all, all > not

(23) Yasai-o_i Subete-no-kodomo-ga t_i tabe-nakat-ta. (Miyagawa 2001)

green-Acc_i all-children-Nom t_i eat-Neg-Past

‘All the children didn’t choose green.'

not > all, all > not

(24) A quantifier is in the scope of negation iff it is c-commanded by negation

(cf. Klima 1964)

The position of negation is roughly as proposed by Laka (1990), Pollock (1989).
(24) TP
  all
  T'
  T
  vP
  Neg
  t\_i
  v'
  VP
  v
  ...Object...

(25) TP
  vegetables
  T'
  T
  vP
  Neg
  all
  v'
  VP
  v
  t\_i

(26) Something must move to the Spec of TP (e.g., subject, object): EPP

(27) LD scrambling: does not count as EPP movement to Spec, TP (Miyagawa 2001).
Syukudai-o\_i subete-no-gakusei-ga [sensei-ga t\_i dasu to]
  homework-Acci all-students-Nom [teacher-Nom t\_i assign C]
  omo-wanakat-ta.
  think-Neg-Past
  ‘Homework, all the students did not think that the teacher will assign.’
  *not > all, all > not

(28) A-movement = “EPP” movement to Spec of TP
A’-movement ≠ “EPP” movement; possibly to Spec of CP?

2. A Focus-prominent Language: Japanese

(29) Two Types of Focus (É. Kiss 1998)

(i) Informational focus: what is not presupposed in a topic-focus structure.
(ii) Identificational focus: expresses exhaustive/contrastive identification.

(30) Informational Focus: John bought a BOOK. **Nuclear stress assignment**

(31) Identificational Focus: **JOHN** bought a book.

Identificational focus: exhaustive listing

Szabolcs (1981)

(32) It was a hat and a coat that Mary picked for herself.

Szabolcsi (1981)

(33) #It was a hat that Mary picked for herself.

Identificational Focus and the EPP

**indeterminate pronoun**

(34) Taroo-ga *nani-mo* kawa-nakat-ta.
    Taro-Nom what-MO buy-Neg-Past
    ‘Taro didn’t buy anything.’

As is well known, the wh-phrase portion and *mo* can be separated (Kuroda 1965, Nishigauchi 1990).

(35) Taroo-ga *nani-o* kai-mo sina-kat-ta.
    Taro-Nom what-Acc buy-MO do-Neg-Past
    ‘Taro didn’t buy anything.’
(36) Kishimoto’s (2001): *mo* must m-command the indeterminate pronoun

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V-mo-v} \\
\text{nani-o} \\
\text{tv} \\
\end{array}
\]

(37) Indeterminate pronoun in the subject position is ungrammatical

*Dare-ga pizza-o tabe-mo sina-kat-ta.*

‘Anyone didn’t eat pizza.’

Kishimoto assumes the EPP here, and argues that the subject indeterminate pronoun *dare* ‘who’ raises to the Spec of TP to satisfy the EPP of T, and this takes it outside the scope of *mo*, which is on *v*. According to the analysis I’m pursuing, the relevant portion of the structure of (37) is the following.

(38)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{dare-ga} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{T$_\text{EPP}$} \\
\text{t$_\text{SUB}$} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V-mo-v} \\
\end{array}
\]

The same as subject-verb agreement

(39)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{SUB} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{T$_\text{EPP}$} \\
\text{t$_\text{SUB}$} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

Scrambling the object does not help if the indeterminate pronoun is in the subject
position. It necessarily gets picked out by the EPP because it has (identificational) focus.

(40) *Pizza-ō, dare-ga  tī  tabe-mo  sina-kat-ta. (Kishimoto 2001)
    pizza-Acc  who-Nom  tī  eat-MO  do-Neg-Past
    ‘Pizza, anyone didn’t eat.’

Indeterminate pronoun in the object position: long-distance “agreement.”

(41) Taro-ga  nani-o  kai-mo  sina-kat-ta.
    Taro-Nom  what-Acc  buy-MO  do-Neg-Past
    ‘Taro didn’t buy anything.’

(42) There walks a boy (into the room).

If the “agreed-with” phrase is moved, it must move to Spec of TP due to the EPP.

(43) *Nani-ō, Taro-ga  tī  kai-mo  sina-kat-ta.
    what-Acc  Taro-Nom  tī  buy-MO  do-Neg-Past
    ‘Taro didn’t buy anything.’

Cannot take the A’-movement option, which should in principle be possible.

(44) [TP  A  boy, T, [VP  walks  tī  (into the room)]]

In a focus-prominent language, the EPP can be met with, for example, the subject, in a long-distance agreement environment.

(45) Taro-ga  nani-o  kai-mo  sina-kat-ta.
    Taro-Nom  what-Acc  buy-MO  do-Neg-Past
    ‘Taro didn’t buy anything.’

(46) LD scrambling of indeterminate pronoun: A’-movement
    a. Taro-ga  [CP  Hanako-ga  nani-o  katta  to]  mo  omowanakatta.
       Taro-Nom  [CP  Hanako-Nom  what-Acc  bought  C]  MO  thought.not
       ‘Taro didn’t think that Hanako bought anything.’

    b. Scrambling of object indeterminate pronoun nani is fine:
       Taro-ga  [CP  nani-ōi  Hanako-ga  tī  katta  to]  mo  omowanakatta.
       Taro-Nom  [CP  what-Acc;Hanako-Nom  tī  bought  C]  MO  thought.not

    c. LD scrambling also fine, showing that an indeterminate pronoun can undergo A’-scrambling and reconstruc.
       Nani-ōi  Taro-ga  [CP  Hanako-ga  tī  katta  to]  mo  omowanakatta.
       what-Acc;Taro-Nom  [CP  Hanako-Nom  tī  bought  C]  MO  thought.not
Focus particle and scope

(47) Dareka-ga daremo-o aisiteiru.
    someone-Nom everyone-Acc love
    ‘Someone loves everyone.’
    some > every, every > some

(48) Daremo-o, dareka-ga ti aisteiru.
    everyone-Acc, someone-Nom t, love
    ‘Everyone, someone loves.’
    every > some, some > every

Focus particle ‘also’ (Lee 2004)

(49) Subete-no-otoko-no-ko-ga Hanako-mo suki da.
    all-Gen-boy-Nom Hanako-also like
    ‘All the boys like Hanako also.’
    (i) For each boy x, there is someone other than Hanako who x likes. (all > also)
    (ii) There is someone other than Hanako who every boy likes. (also > all)

(50) Hanako-mo, subete-no-otoko-no-ko-ga t, suki da.
    Hanako-also, all-boys-Nom t, like
    ‘Hanako also, all the boys like t’
    (i) *For each boy x, there is someone other than Hanako who x likes. (all > also)
    (ii) There is someone other than Hanako who every boy likes. (also > all)

4. Informational Focus and Nuclear Stress

Two types of focus:
Identificational:
Informational: topic-focus

In the absence of identificational focus, “focus” on T picks out an XP and marks it as “topic”. This XP moves to Spec of TP for the EPP. This creates the topic-focus structure.

In the absence of identificational focus, the focus stress rule is nuclear stress.

Nuclear Stress Rule: nuclear stress falls on the phrase located lowest on the syntactic tree (Cinque (1993), cf. Chomsky and Halle (1968) and Halle and Vergnaud (1987))

(51) Mary read a book yesterday.

Identificationa focus: anywhere
John read a book yesterday.

Neeleman and Reinhart (1998) point out that scrambling allows a given phrase to move away from the position of nuclear stress. In the following Dutch example, the phrase that bears the nuclear stress is in bold.

(53) Dat Jan langzaam het boek las that John slowly the book read

(54) Dat Jan het boek langzaam las that John the book slowly read

The following are taken from Ishihara (2000) (Ishihara assumes V-raising to T).


b. Hon-o_i Taroo-ga [VP t_i t_v] katta
   book-Acc_i Taro-Nom [VP t_i t_v] bought

(56) a. Taroo-ga kyoo hon-o katta. Taro-Nom today book-Acc bought

b. Hon-o_i Taroo-ga kyoo t_i katta.
   book-Acc_i Taro-Nom today t_i bought

(57) Focus Rule
The focus of IP is a(ny) constituent containing the main stress of IP, as determined by the stress rule (=nuclear stress rule).


(59) a. What happened? (focus on IP)
   b. What did Taro do? (focus on VP)
   c. What did Taro buy? (focus on object)

(60) Hon-o_i Taroo-ga [VP t_i t_v] katta
    book-Acc_i Taro-Nom [VP t_i t_v] bought

No focus on VP, hence cannot answer “What did Taro do?”
5. Formal Feature Issue: All Formal Features Are Merged at the Phase Heads

5.1. Agreement does not require tense

Modern Greek (Iatridou 1993)

(61) vlepo ton Kosta na tiganizi psaria (ECM, no active tense on embedded S)
    see DET Kostas/ACC fries fish
    ‘I see Kostas fry fish.’

(62) elpizo o Kostas na tiganizi psaria(tensed embedded S)
    hope DET Kostas/NOM fries fish
    ‘I hope Kostas fries fish.’

5.2. Complementizer agreement with subject, Case I (Turkish, Kornfilt 2004)

(63) a. subject as the target of relativization — no agreement on the lower verb;
    agreement blocked by the subject e agreeing with C.
    [[[e₁ geçenyaz ada -da ben-i gör-en] kişi-i-ler,]
    [[[ last summer isalnd-Loc I-Acc see-(y)An] person-Pl]]
    ‘the people who saw me on the island last summer’ (No φ-feature
    morphology; special nominalization form on predicate)

    b. a non-subject as the target of relativization — agreement on the lower verb
    [[[pro geçenyaz ada-da e₁ gör-duğ-üm] kişi-i-ler,]
    [[[ last summer island-Loc see-DIK-1.sg] person-Pl]]
    ‘the people who(m) I saw on the island last summer’ (φ-feature
    morphology; general indicative nominalization form on predicate).

5.3. Complementizer agreement, Case II: agreement on both C and T (West Flemish
    (Carstens 2003, referring to Haegeman 1992)

(64)a. Kpeinzen dan-k (ik) morgen goan.
    I-think that-I (I) tomorrow go
    ‘I think that I’ll go tomorrow.’

    b. Kpeinzen da-j (gie) morgen goan.
    I-think that-you (you) tomorrow go
    ‘I think that you’ll go tomorrow.’

    c. Kvinden dan die boeken te diere zyn.
    I-find that-PL the books too expensive are
    ‘I find those books too expensive.’

(65) The agreement features gets merged on C, and copied on T (Carstens 2003).