Anti-agreement and resumption in Kabyle[*]

Sarah Mihuc
McGill University

Summary

Among languages which have anti-agreement effects, languages differ as to whether long-distance extraction and/or negation affect the application of anti-agreement. This has been an obstacle to developing a cross-linguistic theory of anti-agreement effects, as different languages behave in seemingly contradictory ways which are hard to unify under any single theory.

In this paper I present data from Kabyle Berber which indicate that in constructions where anti-agreement is expected but not found there is no Ā movement for reasons independent of anti-agreement. Using data on resumptive pronouns and on the distribution of complementizers, I show that the apparent long-distance extraction construction in Kabyle contains resumption instead of Ā movement in its embedded clause. This implies that there is a ban on long-distance extraction in Kabyle. I also present data which show that anti-agreement obligatorily applies under negation in Kabyle, unlike in Tarifit. The new data on (apparent) long distance extraction and negation simplifies the distribution of anti-agreement effects in Kabyle: anti-agreement always applies when there is Ā movement.

This study indicates that further work is needed to determine whether cases in other languages of long-distance extraction and negation affecting anti-agreement may be explained by phenomena unrelated to anti-agreement. This would allow for a simpler unified theory of anti-agreement if similar results hold in other relevant languages.

Résumé

Entre les langues qui ont montrent les effets de anti-accord, il y a variation quant à si l'éxtraction longue distance et/ou la négation affectent l'application des effets d'anti-accord. Ceci posait un obstacle à développer une théorie des effets d'anti-accord pour toutes les langues, parce que des langues différents agissent d'une façon qui semble contradictoire, donc c'est difficile d'unifier toutes les langues sous une seule théorie.

Dans cet article je présente des données en kabyle qui indiquent qu'en les constructions où l'anti-accord est prévu mais en fait non trouvé, il n'y a pas d'extraction Ā. En utilisant des données sur les pronoms résumptives et sur la distribution des complémenteurs, je montre que la construction en kabyle qui est apparemment l'une d'extraction longue distance contient de résumption au lieu d'extraction Ā dans la proposition enchâssée. Ce fait implique que l'extraction

longue distance est interdite en kabyle. Aussi je présente des données qui montrent que l'anti-accord s'applique obligatoirement en cas de négation en kabyle, à la différence d'en tarifit. Les données nouveaux sur l'extraction (apparemment) longue distance et sur la négation simpli-fient la distribution des effets d'anti-accord en kabyle: anti-accord s'applique toujours en cas d'extraction Ā.

Cette étude indique que plus d'investigation est nécessaire afin de savior si en autres langues les cas où l'anti-accord affecte l'extraction longue distance ou la négation peuvent s'expliquer par des phénomènes indépendants de l'anti-accord. Si c'est vrai ça permettrait une théorie unifié d'anti-accord plus simple.

1   INTRODUCTION

Anti-agreement refers to a phenomenon in which the verb loses its agreement for ϕ-features of the subject when the subject is Ā extracted. This phenomenon has been studied in a variety of languages, mostly in the Berber and Bantu families, and was first described by Ouhalla (1993). A remaining puzzle in the study of anti-agreement is the fact that there is variation among languages with anti-agreement as to whether anti-agreement applies in long-distance extraction and/or under negation. Thus, under the assumption that these differences are part of the mechanism which produces anti-agreement effects, any unified analysis of anti-agreement must be able to explain how anti-agreement works in languages which do exhibit anti-agreement in long-distance extraction and those which do not; likewise for negation.

I present new data on resumptive pronouns and the long-distance extraction construction in Kabyle Berber, which motivate a new analysis of the relationship between long-distance extraction and anti-agreement in Berber. This account simplifies the puzzle of anti-agreement cross-linguistically. My analysis is that, in languages which display anti-agreement, anti-agreement happens whenever there is Ā movement of the subject and no special explanation is needed for the effect of long-distance extraction or negation on anti-agreement. Previous syntactic analyses have argued that the lack of anti-agreement in some cases is because the subject moves through (or agrees with) T in these constructions, and does not in constructions where anti-agreement applies (e.g. as in Ouhalla 1993). In such analyses movement occurs whether anti-agreement does or not, and the difference is that in anti-agreement movement follows a different path than normal.

I argue that it is not the application of anti-agreement that is affected by long-distance extraction, but instead Ā movement itself. The inconsistency between languages surrounding long-distance extraction and negation is due to a ban or blocking of Ā movement in those environments in some languages but not others. I will present evidence that apparent Ā movement constructions in which anti-agreement does not take place involve resumption rather than movement. In other words, anti-agreement is not found in certain apparent Ā movement constructions because these are not actually

Ā movement constructions and instead the subject is base-generated high, while there is Ā movement in the constructions which do exhibit anti-agreement. I will support this claim with acceptability judgements of overt resumptive pronouns in these constructions and some evidence from the distribution of two complementizers in Kabyle, comparing the long-distance extraction construction to local Ā extraction and to island repair constructions.

I also present new data and discussion on negation and anti-agreement: Kabyle behaves differently with respect to this than other Berber languages such as Tarifit (Ouhalla, 1993). Namely, in Kabyle anti-agreement still applies under negation. The literature on anti-agreement has generally assumed that all Berber languages behave in the same way as Tarifit in terms of the effect of negation on anti-agreement. Further investigation of negation and anti-agreement across Berber (and other families) is needed in the future.

The remaining sections are organized as follows: In section 2, I give background information about anti-agreement effects including their interaction with the effects of long-distance extraction and negation. In section 3, I briefly discuss negation's effects in Kabyle versus Tarifit Berber. In section 4, I give new data on resumption in various constructions (most importantly island repair constructions, local Ā extraction, and the apparent long-distance extraction construction) which illuminate the structure of sentences in which anti-agreement occurs. The fact that the apparent long-distance extraction construction behaves like island repair motivates an analysis that it does not actually involve long-distance movement, which leads to the conclusion that anti-agreement applies whenever there is Ā movement in Kabyle. In section 5, I conclude and discuss directions for future work.

2   BACKGROUND

2.1   ANTI-AGREEMENT

When subjects undergo Ā movement in Berber, the verb form does not agree with the subject's ϕ-features as it normally would. This effect, known as anti-agreement, is shown in (1).

(1)   D   Amina   i   i-wala-n   Yidir.
      COP   Amina   C   AA-see.PST-AA   Yidir
      'It was Amina that saw Yidir.'

Instead of agreement for ϕ-features, there is an invariant verb form regardless of the person, number, or gender of the subject: in Berberist literature, this is called the participle form. The participle form has been described as a default agreement marker (Ouhalla, 1993) or the realization of a lack of agreement (Ouali, 2011). The participle form is only found in anti-agreement contexts, and thus could also be described as special morphology for anti-agreement.

Ouhalla (1993) first described the three types of sentences in Berber which have Ā-extracted subjects, and thus show anti-agreement: wh-questions, relative clauses, and clefts (used for argument focus). Reproduced below are the Kabyle equivalents of Ouhalla's (1993) examples.

(2)   a.   Anita   tameṭṭut   i   i-wala-n   Muḥand?
           which.F   woman.FS   C   AA-see.PST-AA   Mohand

           'Which woman saw Mohand?'

      b.   *Anita   tameṭṭut   i   t-wala   Muḥand?
           which.F   woman.FS   C   3F-see.PST   Mohand

(3)   a.   tameṭṭut   i   i-wala-n   Muḥand
           woman.FS   F   AA-see.PST-AA   Mohand

           'the woman who saw Mohand'

      b.   *tameṭṭut   i   t-wala   Muḥand
           woman.FS   C   3F-see.PST   Mohand

(4)   a.   D   tameṭṭut   i   i-wala-n   Muḥand.
           COP   woman.FS   C   AA-see.PST-AA   Mohand

           'It was this woman who saw Mohand.'

      b.   *D   tameṭṭut   i   t-wala   Muḥand.
           COP   woman.FS   C   3F-see.PST   Mohand

In Berber both long-distance extraction and negation have been described as causing anti-agreement effects to not appear. This means that full agreement happens when the subject is long-distance extracted or extracted across negation, in contrast to the anti-agreement that happens in local, non-negated subject extraction (Ouhalla, 1993). Kabyle long-distance extraction is shown in (5), and Tarifit data on negation in (6). (Negation in Kabyle will be discussed in section 3.)

(5)   tameṭṭut=nni   i   y-enna   t-wala   ɛumar
      woman.FS=DEM   C   3M-say.PST   3F-see.PST   Omar

      'the woman that he said saw Omar'

(6)   a.   tamghart   nni   ur   t-ssn   Mohand
           woman   C   NEG   3F-know   Mohand

           'the woman that does not know Mohand'

      b.   tamghart   nni   ur   y-ssn-n   Mohand
           woman   C   NEG   AA-know-AA   Mohand

           'the woman that does not know Mohand'   (Ouhalla, 1993, p. 499)

However, it is important to note that both anti-agreement and full agreement are possible under negation in Tarifit (Ouhalla, 1993). Indeed, Ouhalla (1993) even states that the form without anti-agreement is 'much less preferred'. This indicates that the relationship between negation and anti-agreement in Berber may be more tenuous than assumed in the past.

This behavior in long-distance extraction and negation is not uniform across languages which exhibit anti-agreement: long-distance extraction in Berber, Celtic and Turkish results in full agreement, but in anti-agreement in Fiorentino and Trentino; negation results in full agreement in Celtic,

but anti-agreement in Turkish (Ouhalla, 1993).

2.2 PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS OF ANTI-AGREEMENT

All previous accounts for anti-agreement effects, except Baier (2016), explain it in terms of agreement with the subject being blocked when there is Ā extraction because of some relationship between C and T. Either movement or agreement from T to C is 'too close' when the subject is extracted in these languages, and thus is repaired by the subject skipping T (and agreement) on its way to C (e.g. Ouhalla 1993, Schneider-Zioga 2007), or there is some relationship between C and T, usually involving conflicting features on them, which blocks agreement with T (e.g. Ouali 2011, Kinjo 2017). Under these analyses, anti-agreement is found either when the subject does not move through T on its way to C, or when T does not agree because of features on C.

Previous accounts also focus on explaining either the interaction of long-distance extraction or of negation (or both) with anti-agreement. They often attempt to find an analysis of anti-agreement which can predict the variety of effects that negation and long-distance extraction have on anti-agreement in different languages. I will present evidence that long-distance extraction does not actually have any effect on anti-agreement in Kabyle. Instead, Kabyle disallows long-distance extraction altogether, and thus apparent long-distance extraction constructions do not have the Ā movement required to produce anti-agreement. In Kabyle, negation is also not an issue for any analysis of anti-agreement, because in Kabyle anti-agreement still applies under negation.

Baier (2016) does not view anti-agreement as agreement being blocked, and instead argues that it is morphological and due to a [Wh] feature on T. The analysis presented below lends support to his morphological analysis of anti-agreement. This is because syntactic analyses are designed to not allow anti-agreement to apply in at least one of long-distance extraction or negation. I argue that anti-agreement does apply in all constructions where Ā movement happens, and that constructions without anti-agreement are not actually instances of Ā movement. This is in keeping with Baier's analysis, which predicts that anti-agreement happens in all Ā movement constructions (and in cases when there is a [Wh] feature on the Agr head without movement applying). His analysis is also the only one which works for 'partial anti-agreement' (loss of agreement for only a subset of ϕ-features), which is found in Tachelhit Berber and some other languages.

The ultimate goal of work on anti-agreement is to find an analysis of anti-agreement effects which works cross-linguistically, or else to show that they are not a unified phenomenon. The main obstacle to this is the variation across languages in how long-distance extraction and negation affect the application of anti-agreement. Thus, if this variation can be explained independently from the mechanism of anti-agreement, it becomes much easier for a unifying analysis of anti-agreement cross-linguistically to be proposed. I argue that the unexpected behavior of long-distance extraction with respect to anti-agreement in Kabyle is due to factors independent of anti-agreement. What prevents anti-agreement from applying as expected is a property of the apparent long-distance extraction construction in Kabyle, not of anti-agreement itself.

3 ANTI-AGREEMENT AND NEGATION IN BERBER

Even within the Berber family, there is variation in the effect that negation has on anti-agreement. In Kabyle, negated sentences require anti-agreement when the subject is extracted. This is different from what has been described for the rest of the Berber family, particularly Tarifit.

(7) a. tameṭṭut=nni   ur   i-wala-n   ara   Yidir
      woman.FS=DEM   NEG   AA-see.PST-AA   NEG   Yidir
      'the woman that did not see Yidir'

     b. *tameṭṭut=nni   ur   t-wala   ara   Yidir
      woman.FS=DEM   NEG   3F-see.PST   NEG   Yidir
      'the woman that did not see Yidir'

The counterparts of both (7a) and (7b) are grammatical in Tarifit Berber (Ouhalla, 1993). In Kabyle, a special 'negative participle' verb form is optionally used under negation in the anti-agreement context, instead of the normal anti-agreement form:

(8) tameṭṭut=nni   ur   n-wala   ara   Yidir
    woman.FS=DEM   NEG   AA.NEG-see.PST   NEG   Yidir
    'the woman that did not see Yidir'

This suggests that negation does have some effect on the application of anti-agreement in Kabyle similar to that found in Tarifit: something becomes optional and/or different under negation.[1] But, negation certainly does not make anti-agreement impossible in Kabyle. In Kabyle, the verb can be in its normal anti-agreement form or in a negative anti-agreement form, but must have anti-agreement; in Tarifit, the verb can be in an anti-agreement form or have full agreement with the subject.[2]

Previously Berber has been the main example of a language family where anti-agreement does not apply under negation. However, Kabyle does not fit with that generalization, and even in Tarifit this effect is optional. This means that any analysis of anti-agreement, even just within Berber, must be able to account for languages where negation does not affect anti-agreement at all in addition to ones where it at least optionally does affect anti-agreement.

4 RESUMPTION, ISLANDS, & LONG-DISTANCE EXTRACTION

Recall that in Kabyle, as in other Berber languages, full agreement is found in cases of apparent long-distance extraction, as shown in (9).

---

[1] There is some preliminary evidence that other Berber languages behave the same way as Kabyle in this respect, including the negative participle form (Baier, 2018).

[2] In addition, the Kabyle negative participle appears to contain the same *n* as the regular participle form, but in a different location with respect to the verb. This may indicate something about the underlying syntax, but it is left to future work.

(9) tameṭṭut=nni   i   y-enna   t-wala   ɛumar
     woman.FS=DEM   C   3M-say.PST   3F-see.PST   Omar
     'the woman that he said saw Omar'

    In this section, I will argue that what appears to be long-distance extraction in Berber is not actually extraction from an embedded clause, but instead resumption in the embedded clause.[3] The evidence for this analysis is that the apparent long-distance extraction construction behaves like an island rather than like extraction with respect to both resumptive pronouns and complementizers.

    My analysis is given in the following generalization:

(10)   Anti-agreement in Kabyle happens when (and only when) the subject is Ā-extracted.

    As for the mechanism which causes this to be the case, any of the existing analyses cited in section 2.2 can account for (10). Most of them focus on finding an analysis which can explain the effects of long-distance extraction and/or negation, so if those data turn out to be happening for independent reasons from the mechanism which causes anti-agreement, almost all previous analyses produce equivalent predictions.

4.1 OVERT RESUMPTIVE PRONOUNS

I will now walk through the evidence for the claim in (10). This provides a view of the structure of constructions that do and do not trigger anti-agreement. As a diagnostic for whether Ā movement has occurred, I present data on overt resumptive pronouns.[4] Resumptive pronouns shed further light on the role of movement in the various constructions possible in Kabyle and form the basis for my analysis of long-distance extraction. I argue that apparent long-distance extraction actually involves a resumptive pronoun in the lowest clause, not successive cyclic movement.

    In contrast with traces, resumptive pronouns are used when movement cannot or has not occurred. Because Kabyle is a subject *pro*-drop language, resumption of the subject is normally accomplished using the null resumptive pronoun, represented as *pro*. It is not immediately clear from the surface realization whether a sentence involves resumptive *pro* or a trace, as both are empty categories. However, it is expected that an overt resumptive pronoun may also be used in contexts where *pro* is present, and may not be used when *pro* is not present (i.e. when there is a trace instead). Thus, data on the acceptability of overt pronouns in different constructions can shed light on which ones are using *pro* and which are using movement. Only the places which contain resumptive pronouns instead of traces should allow overt pronouns to be optionally used.

    In the remainder of this section I will present a few examples to show that this generalization holds in cases that are either clearly resumption or are clearly Ā extraction. This provides a baseline for the behavior of overt pronoun acceptability in Kabyle. The first of these is island repair constructions.

---

[3] This is due to a ban on long-distance Ā extraction in Kabyle. There is also such a ban attested in Tsez (Polinsky and Potsdam, 2001).

[4] Note that this type of evidence is only useful in a *pro*-drop language, where *t* and *pro* are indistinguishable on the surface except that *pro* may be replaced with an overt resumptive pronoun.

It is well known that arguments cannot be extracted across islands. In Berber the repair for an island violation involves base-generation of the would-be extracted argument, which is co-indexed with a resumptive *pro* inside the island. Because the resumptive *pro* is phonetically null, this construction appears exactly the same as a movement construction. Shlonsky (2014) gives some examples of 'movement' across islands in Tarifit Berber. The same structure is found in Kabyle.

(11) Man   tafruxt ay t-ttu-t   mani   t-zdegh?
       which girl   C   2P-forgot-2P   where 3F-lives

'Which girl have you(pl) forgotten where she lives?'   (Shlonsky, 2014, p. 25)

(12) Man   tafruxt ay t-ttu-t   amkhan mani   t-zdegh?
       which girl   C   2P-forgot-2P   place   where 3F-lives

'Which girl have you(pl) forgotten the place where she lives?'   (Shlonsky, 2014, p. 25)

Notice that there is no anti-agreement in such contexts. This is to be expected, because there cannot be movement out of an island and thus there is no Ā-extraction to trigger anti-agreement. This preliminary data suggests that apparent long-distance extraction, which also lacks anti-agreement in Berber, may really be a construction in which there is not movement. (Thus, the element that appears to have moved is co-indexed with a null resumptive *pro*, similarly to these island repair constructions.).

To ensure that replacing *pro* with an overt resumptive pronoun is a good test for the presence of *pro* versus a trace, I present data for constructions where it is clear which of these is present. As just discussed above, island repair constructions in Kabyle involve a null resumptive *pro* in the embedded clause. In contrast, (local) Ā-extraction constructions contain a trace in the embedded clause.

Indeed, overt resumptive pronouns for the subject are grammatical in island repair constructions, and not in local Ā-extraction. This indicates that they are only grammatical where there is a *pro* and not a trace. This is further supported by the availability of overt resumptive pronouns in topicalization (SVO word order without clefting) and in the basic VSO word order.

The following examples illustrate the acceptability of overt resumptive pronouns in island repair constructions. In (13), the subject is apparently extracted across an island, and in (14) the object is. (13) and (14) are wh-islands, and (15) is a complex NP island.[5]

(13) Anita   taqcict i   t-ettu-ḍ   (nettat) anida   t-ettidir (nettat)?
       which.F   girl.FS C   2-forget.PST-2   (she)   where   3F-live   (she)

'Which girl have you forgotten where she lives?'

(14) Aniwa i   t-esteqsa-ḍ   (netta) dacu i   i-wala   (netta)?
       who   C   2-ask.PST-2   (he)   what C   3M-see.PST   (he)

'Who did you ask what he saw?'

---

[5] The reason *netta* is not grammatical before *adlis* in (15) is because this is a relative clause: even lexical DPs cannot appear in this position.

(15)   Anita   taqcict i t-wala-ḍ   adlis   i   t-uγ   (netta)?
       which.F   girl.FS C 2-see.PST-2 book.FS   C   3F-buy.PST (he)
       'Which girl did you see the book that she bought?'

This contrasts with the case of Ā-extraction. In these sentences, an argument has truly been extracted and thus an overt resumptive pronoun co-indexed with it cannot appear in the embedded clause.

(16)   Aniwa i   (*netta) i-wala-n   (*netta) izimer?
       who   C   (he)   AA-see.PST-AA (he)   sheep.FS
       'Who saw the sheep?'

Similarly, in VSO order there is no resumption or movement, so extra pronouns are ungrammatical anywhere in the sentence.

(17)   T-wala   (*nettat) Amina (*nettat) izimer   (*nettat).
       3F-see.PST (she)   Amina (she)   sheep.FS (she)
       'Amina saw the sheep.'

In SVO order without clefting (i.e. topicalization), overt resumptive pronouns are also grammatical. This is supporting evidence that arguments in the topic position in Kabyle are base-generated and co-indexed with a resumptive pronoun. This is in line with Shlonsky (1987) (also Aissen (1992) for Mayan); they both argue that (external) topics are base-generated high.

(18)   Amina (nettat) t-wala   (nettat) izimer.
       Amina (she)   3F-see.PST (she)   sheep.FS
       'Amina saw the sheep.'

These examples show that overt resumptive pronouns may be optionally used in Kabyle only when there is already a resumptive *pro* in that position, and that they cannot be used to spell out traces. Based on this evidence, there must be a resumptive *pro*, and not a trace, wherever overt pronouns are optionally possible.

4.2 APPARENT LONG-DISTANCE EXTRACTION

Where resumptive pronouns produce something unexpected is in what appears at first glance to be long-distance extraction. Because these constructions are said to be extraction, resumptive pronouns co-referent with the subject should be ungrammatical anywhere in the sentence, as there would be a trace instead of a resumptive pronoun. However, resumptive pronouns can appear before or after the verb of the most embedded clause (but not any higher) in an apparent long-distance extraction construction in Kabyle, as in (19). This is the same distribution as in island repair constructions.

(19) | tameṭṭut=nni | (i) | (*nettat) | ye-nna | (nettat) | t-wala | (nettat) | εumar |
      |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
      | woman.FS=DIR | (C) | (she) | 3M-said | (she) | 3F-saw | (she) | Omar |

'the woman that he said (she) saw Omar'

This suggests that so-called long-distance extraction in Kabyle is not actually extraction from the most embedded clause at all.

Evidence from complementizers further supports this hypothesis. Similar to Irish (McCloskey, 2002), Kabyle has multiple complementizers which have different functions: *i* is used when there is Ā extraction, as in clefts, questions, and relative clauses, and *belli* is used when there is no extraction, for example in complement clauses. Ouali (2005) notes that *belli* is borrowed from Arabic.

The complementizer for Ā extraction, *i*, is ungrammatical in apparent long-distance extraction at the beginning of the most embedded clause, as in (20). Instead, *belli* may appear. In the upper embedded clause, the opposite is true. This supports the claim that there is no Ā extraction out of the most embedded clause, and also shows that there is Ā extraction out of the upper embedded clause. A similar phenomenon with non-Ā-extraction complementizers in apparent long-distance extraction was also noted by Shlonsky (1987) in Middle Atlas Berber.

(20) | tameṭṭut=nni | (i/*belli) | ye-nna | (belli/*i) | t-wala | εumar |
      |---|---|---|---|---|---|
      | woman.FS=DEM | (C) | 3M-said | (C) | 3F-saw | Omar |

'the woman that he said (she) saw Omar'

There appears to be a similar contrast between two complementizers in Tarifit in the examples given in Ouhalla (1993), although more investigation is needed to confirm this.

(21) | man | tamghart | ay | nna-n | qa | t-zra | Mohand? |
      |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
      | which | woman.FS | textscc | said-3PL | C | 3F-saw | Mohand |

'Which woman did they say saw Mohand?'   (Ouhalla, 1993, p. 480)

Instead of successive cyclic movement, these apparent long-distance extraction constructions involve resumption followed by one application of movement (from the higher embedded clause to Spec, CP). This data indicates that there is a ban on true long-distance extraction in Kabyle: extraction across another clause must be accomplished through resumption. The cause of this ban is still unclear, and left to future investigation.

This explains why anti-agreement does not appear in these constructions: there is no movement of the subject out of the most embedded clause, which would trigger anti-agreement on its verb. Instead the subject is a resumptive *pro* co-indexed with the argument, which is base-generated higher. In the upper embedded clause, there is extraction but the extracted argument is not the subject so there is no anti-agreement.

Indeed, this analysis is further supported by the following example, in which the same argument is the subject of both embedded clauses. In this sentence, 'the woman' is co-indexed with a resumptive *pro* in the most embedded clause, and then Ā extracted one time to form a relative clause. Resumptive pronouns may only be used in the more embedded clause, out of which movement has

not taken place. In the higher clause, the argument 'the woman' has been Ā-extracted so a resumptive pronoun is ungrammatical, and anti-agreement appears.

(22) tameṭṭut=nni   (i) (*nettat) ye-nna-n   (nettat) t-wala   (nettat) ɛumar
      woman.FS=DEM   (C) (she)   AA-said-AA   (she)   3F-saw   (she)   Omar
      'the woman$_i$ that said she$_i$ saw Omar'

Once again there is also a difference in which complementizers may be used.

(23) tameṭṭut=nni   (i/*belli) ye-nna-n   (belli/*i) t-wala   ɛumar
      woman.FS=DEM   C   AA-said-AA   C   3F-saw   Omar
      'the woman$_i$ that said she$_i$ saw Omar'

Based on the evidence presented in this section, anti-agreement only occurs in the sentences where two conditions are satisfied: subject extraction appears to have occurred, and resumptive pronouns are ungrammatical (indicating that extraction truly *has* occurred). It turns out that only local Ā extraction satisfies both these criteria, and it is the only environment in which anti-agreement appears in Kabyle.

Building off of this observation, we arrive at the conclusion that anti-agreement applies whenever the subject is Ā-extracted, as outlined above in (10), and reproduced below.

(24)   Anti-agreement in Kabyle happens when (and only when) the subject is Ā-extracted.

The cases which in the past have cast doubt on that generalization are exceptions for independent reasons. In particular, apparent long-distance extraction in Kabyle is not actually realized through successive cyclic extraction.

Based on this generalization, other languages which have no anti-agreement in (apparent) long-distance extraction, such as Celtic and Turkish, should behave like Kabyle: they should have a ban on long-distance extraction and allow resumptive pronouns in a similar pattern. Languages in which there is still anti-agreement in long-distance extraction, such as Fiorentino and Trentino, can be said to allow long-distance extraction and should not allow resumptive pronouns in such sentences. Also, this analysis predicts that in languages where negation causes anti-agreement not to apply, resumptive pronouns may be more acceptable under negation, or some other mechanism may be preventing Ā movement.

5   DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Evidence from resumptive pronouns in a variety of constructions established the importance of movement in the appearance of anti-agreement effects: anti-agreement does not happen when movement has not applied to the subject. Furthermore, evidence from resumptive pronouns and complementizers showed that apparent long-distance extraction constructions in Kabyle are not what they seem: the subject is not extracted out of the most embedded clause, but is instead co-indexed with

a resumptive *pro* there. This explains why there is no anti-agreement in apparent long-distance extraction in Kabyle. In addition, negation does not affect anti-agreement in Kabyle, contrary to what is typically described for Berber. Overall, this evidence points toward an analysis of anti-agreement like the one in Baier (2016). This is because most existing analyses are designed to rule out anti-agreement under long-distance extraction and/or negation, while I am arguing that it is expected to apply in those contexts. Baier (2016) and Baier (2018) are built with the assumption that anti-agreement should always apply under Ā movement conditions.

One direction for future work would be to collect a wider variety of data to test the hypothesis that there is a ban on long-distance extraction in Berber. Also, the motivation for such a ban in Kabyle is unknown.

Another direction for future work is to test whether the predictions made by my analysis are true of other Berber languages, and of other languages which have anti-agreement that is not applied in some expected context. In particular, constructions in other languages (e.g. Celtic and Turkish) which behave similarly to apparent long-distance extraction in Kabyle are expected to allow resumptive pronouns. It would also be interesting to see whether this analysis holds up in a language that isn't *pro*-drop.

My analysis predicts that in languages where negation causes anti-agreement not to apply, it may in reality block extraction from occurring. This is the opposite of what is typically proposed in anti-locality or otherwise syntactic accounts of anti-agreement such as Ouhalla (1993), which rest on the assumption that anti-agreement happens when movement from Spec TP to Spec CP is blocked and that negation is what *allows* movement to happen normally. The relationship between negation, movement, and resumption in the languages which motivated previous treatments of negation and anti-agreement (e.g. Tarifit and Celtic languages) should be investigated in the future. In addition, a more extensive description of the interaction of anti-agreement effects and negation across Berber would be useful in light of the differences between Kabyle and other Berber languages in these constructions.

The effects of adverbs and NPIs (Ouali, 2005) on anti-agreement also bear more investigation in the future. Preliminarily, adverbs also cause anti-agreement not to apply in Kabyle, but only if they appear between the complementizer and the verb. For example:

(25)   D   Amezyan   i   tikwal   y-erza   tiẓurin.
      COP   Amezyan.FS   C   sometimes   3M-sell.PST   grape.PL.FS
      'It is Amezyan that sometimes sold grapes'

This is may not be true of Tarifit based on the data in Baier (2017), although he does not give data for this kind of construction, only one where the adverb follows the verb. Sentences with the same word order as Baier's examples also have anti-agreement in Kabyle. It is possible that an explanation for this adverb phenomenon similar to that of Henderson and Coon (2016) also holds in Kabyle, although the resumptive pronoun and complementizer data are not what Henderson and Coon would predict.

REFERENCES

Aissen, J. (1992). Topic and focus in Mayan. *Language*, 68(1):43–80.

Baier, N. (2016). Unifying anti-agreement and wh-agreement.

Baier, N. (2017). Antilocality and antiagreement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 48(2). (lingbuzz/003275).

Baier, N. (2018). *Anti-Agreement*. PhD thesis, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.

Henderson, R. and Coon, J. (2016). Adverbs and variability in Kaqchikel Agent Focus: A reply to Erlewine (2015). Ms. University of Arizona and McGill University (lingbuzz/002921).

Kinjo, K. (2017). An intervention approach to antiagreement. In *Proceedings of the 34th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*.

McCloskey, J. (2002). Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In Epstein, S. D. and Seeley, T. D., editors, *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*, pages 184–226. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Ouali, H. (2005). Negation and negative polarity items in Berber. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pages 330–340.

Ouali, H. (2011). *Agreement, Pronominal Clitics, and Negation in Tamazight Berber: A Unified Analysis*. Bloomsbury, London.

Ouhalla, J. (1993). Subject-extraction, negation, and the anti-agreement effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 11:477–518.

Polinsky, M. and Potsdam, E. (2001). Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 19(3):583–646.

Schneider-Zioga, P. (2007). Anti-agreement, anti-locality and minimality. the syntax of dislocated subjects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 25(2):403–446.

Shlonsky, U. (1987). Focus constructions in Berber. *Studies in Berber Syntax*.

Shlonsky, U. (2014). Subject positions, subject extraction, EPP, and the Subject Criterion. *Locality*, pages 58–86.