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1. Introduction

Recent years have seen a surge in work on Person Hierarchy Effects (Béjar & Rezac 2009; Nevins 2007, 2010; Walkow 2009; Lochbihler 2009; Georgi 2011). In this paper, I make a novel argument for the superiority of (a version of) Nevins’ (2010) “Multiple Agree with Clitics” (MAwC) view of such effects over the influential “Cyclic Agree” (CA) approach of Béjar & Rezac (2009). The evidence comes from a Person Hierarchy Effect which has been widely discussed in theoretical and descriptive work on the Quechua family (van de Kerke 1996; Lakämper & Wunderlich 1998; Muysken 1981; Weber 1976, 1989). Using data from the Cuzco Quechua variety of southern Peru, I show that this effect can be readily assimilated into the typology of Person Hierarchy Effects predicted by the MAwC approach, but poses a number of problems for the CA theory.

The Person Hierarchy Effect in question, termed the [Addressee]-driven Subject Marking Anomaly (A-SMA), can be described as follows (the formulation and the name are both adapted from Weber 1976:16).

(1) [Addressee]-driven Subject Marking Anomaly (A-SMA)
When a verb takes a 3rd person subject and an object with the feature [Addressee], the subject agreement morpheme spells out features of the object, not the subject. When the subject is 1st person and the object has the feature [Addressee], the subject agreement morpheme spells out the features of the object OR spells out as a portmanteau marking features of both the subject and the object.
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The A-SMA manifests itself in many dialects of the Quechua family, spread out amongst almost all of the known sub-branches. This paper will concentrate on Cuzco Quechua, a southern Peruvian variety (for general description of this variety, see especially Cusihuamán 1976/2000; Hoggarth 2004).\footnote{See Myler (submitted) for an extension of the general style of analysis pursued here to agreement systems across the Quechua family, some of which are rather different from the system exhibited by Cuzco Quechua, and for discussion of the allomorphy of the subject agreement morpheme. The latter is left aside here for space reasons.} In (2) we see a schematic representation of affix order in the Quechua verb in which the subject agreement marker is highlighted in bold (this schema is based on a much more detailed discussion by Muysken 1981). The table in (3) displays examples illustrating the A-SMA. In the left-hand column, we have examples showing that [Addressee]-related internal arguments control agreement on the bolded \textbf{SubjAgr} morpheme. If the internal argument is not [Addressee]-related, as in the right-hand column, agreement is with the subject. Note that the object markers, which are underlined in the table in (3), are not included in the schema in (2)- we return to the status of the object markers presently.

(2) Schematic representation of Quechua affix order in the verb 
\textsc{Root-Argument Structure-aspect-tense-SubjAgr-Mood}

(3) Table: Features Spelled out on the \textbf{SubjAgr} morpheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement with object</th>
<th>Agreement with subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{3subj}&gt;2obj = 2</td>
<td>\textit{3subj}&gt;1obj = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maylla-rqa-\textbf{su-nki}</td>
<td>maylla-wa-rqa-\textbf{n}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash-PAST-2O-2S</td>
<td>wash-1O-PAST-3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘S/he washed you.’</td>
<td>‘S/he washed me.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{3subj}&gt;1incl.obj = 1 incl</td>
<td>\textit{1incl.subj}&gt;3obj = 1incl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maylla-\textbf{wa-rqa-nchis}</td>
<td>maylla-\textbf{g-rqa-nchis}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash-1O-PAST-1INCL.S</td>
<td>wash-3O-past-1incl.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘S/he washed us (incl.).’</td>
<td>‘We (incl.) washed him/her.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{1subj}&gt;2obj = 2</td>
<td>\textit{2subj}&gt;1obj = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maylla-rqa-\textbf{g-yki}</td>
<td>maylla-wa-rqa-\textbf{nkki}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash-PAST-2O-2S</td>
<td>wash-1O-PAST-2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I washed you.’</td>
<td>‘You washed me.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{1subj}&gt;3obj = 1</td>
<td>\textit{Isubj}&gt;3obj = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maylla-\textbf{g-rqa-n}</td>
<td>maylla-\textbf{g-rqa-ni}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash-3O-PAST-1S</td>
<td>wash-3O-PAST-1S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I washed him/her.’</td>
<td>‘I washed him/her.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Béjar & Rezac (2009) have proposed an account of Person Hierarchy Effects which crucially involves the agreement properties of \textit{v*}. They propose that the probe associated with \textit{v*} can vary parametrically in the types of person feature bundles it can Match with.
Since the internal argument is merged earlier than the external argument in the course of
the derivation, it will be probed first, and will Value the probe so long as it fulfills the
probe’s Match requirements. In the event that the internal argument does not fully satisfy
the probe’s Match requirements, the external argument will be probed instead. Since the
order in which arguments become available to be probed is determined by the order
dictated by the cyclic expansion of the phrase marker, the proposal is known as the theory
of Cyclic Agree (CA).

In CA theory, whether or not a given language displays Person Hierarchy Effects
(and if it does, what form they take) is determined by the Match requirements of the
probe on $v^*$. Person features are related to each other via an implicational hierarchy. All
person features contain the feature $[\pi]$, and 3rd person consists only of that feature. 1st
and 2nd person contain $[\pi]$ and the feature [Participant], so that 1st and 2nd person are
more specified than 3rd person (each being a superset of 3rd person). Languages vary as
to whether 1st or 2nd person counts as more specified, and hence which counts as higher
on the person hierarchy. In languages in which $1 > 2 > 3$ is the hierarchy, 2nd person is
represented as $[\pi]$—[Participant], and 1st person is represented as having the extra feature
[Speaker]: $[\pi]$—[Participant]—[Speaker]. Such an inventory is depicted in (4). In
languages with the hierarchy $2 > 1 > 3$, 1st person is represented as $[\pi]$—[Participant], and
2nd person is further specified with the feature [Addressee]: $[\pi]$—[Participant]—
[Addressee]. This system is shown in (5).

(4) Representation of Person in a Language with a 1 > 2 > 3 Hierarchy
1st person: $[\pi]$—[Participant]—[Speaker]
2nd person: $[\pi]$—[Participant]
3rd person: $[\pi]$—

(5) Representation of Person in a Language with a 2 > 1 > 3 Hierarchy
1st person: $[\pi]$—[Participant]
2nd person: $[\pi]$—[Participant]—[Addressee]
3rd person: $[\pi]$—

If the probe on $v^*$ is specified to Match only the feature $[\pi]$, then all person feature
bundles will be able to satisfy it, and it is guaranteed that the probe will agree with the
internal argument. Such a language will not display any Person Hierarchy effects at all.
If the probe is instead specified to Match bundles of the form $[\pi]$—[Participant], then 3rd
person internal arguments will Match only a subset of the features of the probe (i.e., the
$[\pi]$ feature), leaving the [Participant] feature unmatched and able to probe the external
argument when it is introduced. On the other hand, if the internal argument is 1st or 2nd
person, it will Match both features on the $[\pi]$—[Participant] probe, leaving no unmatched
features when the external argument is introduced. This is a language in which
agreement is with the internal argument if it is 1st or 2nd person, and with the external
argument otherwise (i.e., there is a hierarchy of the form 1,2 > 3)- Béjar and Rezac
(2009:51) give Georgian and Karok as examples of languages like this. Finally,
languages in which agreement is determined by a hierarchy of the form 1 > 2 > 3 (e.g.,
Mohawk- Béjar & Rezac 2009:56) or 2 > 1 > 3 (e.g. Nishnaabemwin- Béjar & Rezac
are held to involve a probe on $v^*$ specified to Match bundles of the form $[\pi]$—[Participant]—[Speaker] and $[\pi]$—[Participant]—[Addressee] respectively.  

The A-SMA as stated and illustrated in (1)-(3) poses two immediate difficulties for the CA theory. First, the CA theory relies crucially on the probe involved being associated with $v^*$ and thus sandwiched in between the internal argument and the external argument—this is what allows cyclic expansion of the phrase marker to determine the time at which the two arguments become available to be probed. However, Quechua affix ordering facts make it impossible to maintain that the affected subject agreement marker is in fact a manifestation of a $\phi$-bundle on $v^*$. As shown in the affix order schema in (2), the relevant marker surfaces outside of tense and aspect morphology, indicating that it is located in the IP domain. A second difficulty is the fact that no anomaly is triggered in the case of a 3rd person subject and a 1st exclusive object: such cases give rise to regular 3rd person subject agreement. Since 1st person is always a superset of 3rd person in the CA feature system, the $[\pi]$ feature should be matched by the 1st person object in such a derivation, and agreement with the 3rd person subject should be neither necessary nor possible, contrary to fact.

The rest of this paper is devoted to a demonstration that, while the A-SMA poses problems for the CA theory, it admits of a satisfying solution under the “Multiple Agree with Clitics” (MAwC) approach to Person Hierarchy Effects espoused by Nevins (2010). In outline, MAwC holds that Person Hierarchy Effects obtain when internal arguments raise as clitics out of the vP phase, allowing them to be probed along with the subject in a Multiple Agree relation (Hiraiwa 2001, 2004). Multiple Agree relations are subject to certain constraints which account for Person Hierarchy effects of various sorts. My MAwC-inspired approach to the A-SMA will involve the following components: (i) the object markers in Quechua are clitics rather than agreement morphemes; and (ii) [Addressee]-related clitics raise higher in the clause than 1st person exclusive clitics do—while both move out of the vP phase, only [Addressee] clitics raise so high as to c-command the subject. The general conclusion is that, because it differs from CA in deriving Person Hierarchy Effects as a case of cliticization “feeding” agreement, MAwC implicitly predicts that Person Hierarchy Effects might apply selectively if there is differentiation in how high different types of clitic raise in a language. The Quechua A-SMA confirms this prediction, and poses problems for the CA approach. Thus we have an argument for MAwC over CA.

The argument is laid out as follows. Section 2 shows that the object markers of Quechua are pronominal clitics rather than agreement affixes, and motivates the idea that [Addressee]-related clitics raise higher than non-Addressee-related ones. Section 3 shows how this yields an account of the A-SMA on MAwC assumptions. Section 4 is a brief conclusion.

---

2 In derivations in which the internal argument Matches all of the features specified on the probe, the external argument remains unmatched. This has the potential to lead to a violation of the Person-Licensing Condition, Béjar & Rezac’s (2009:46) updating of the Case Filter.

(i) Person-Licensing Condition (PLC)
   
   A $\pi$-feature $[F]$ must be licensed by Agree of some segment in a feature structure of which $[F]$ is a subset.

Potential PLC violations are avoided via the merger of an extra probe, which, depending on the language, might be spelled out as an extra agreement morpheme, an “inverse” marker of some kind, or special case morphology.
2. **Cuzco Quechua Object Markers are Clitics**

There are a number of arguments that point to these object markers being clitics rather than object agreement affixes. The first argument is that the object markers may climb onto a matrix clause verb in restructuring contexts:

\[
\begin{align*}
(6) & \quad \text{Maqa-wa-y-ta}^3 \quad \text{muna-Ø-n} \quad \text{(Cuzco Quechua)} \\
& \quad \text{Beat-1O-INF-ACC} \quad \text{want-PRES-3S} \\
& \quad \text{‘S/he wants to beat me.’} \\
& \quad \text{Maqa-y-ta} \quad \text{muna-wa-Ø-n} \\
& \quad \text{Beat-INF-ACC} \quad \text{want-1O-PRES-3S} \\
& \quad \text{‘as (a.)’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Adapted from Lefebvre & Muysken 1988:246; their (134))

This is an argument for the clitic status of these markers not merely because it suggests an analogy between them and the clitics of Romance languages (which undergo climbing in similar contexts), but because Baker (2008) has established the robust generalization that agreement for person only occurs in strictly local configurations, and never long-distance as in (6). Since the object markers are capable of climbing, they cannot be agreement affixes if Baker (2008) is correct (see also Nevins 2010:22 for the use of climbing as a diagnostic for clitichood).

A second argument for the clitic status of these object markers is that full 1\textsuperscript{st} person and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronouns have an emphatic interpretation when they are pronounced in conjunction with the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person object markers. Moreover, as shown in (7), the object markers are not necessarily obligatory in the presence of a strong pronoun.

\[
\begin{align*}
(7) & \quad \text{Qhawa-ri-y} \quad \text{noqa-ta} \\
& \quad \text{Look-POLITE-IMP} \quad \text{I-ACC} \\
& \quad \text{‘Look at me.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Hoggarth 2004:50)

The non-obligatoriness of object marking makes an analysis in terms of object agreement highly unlikely, since we would expect an agreement relation of this sort to be obligatory (see Preminger 2009). However, the situation is compatible with a clitic analysis, since the interpretive effects of doubling are similar to those of clitic left dislocation (see i.a. Cinque 1990). Hence, we have our second argument for the clitic status of Quechua object markers.

Thirdly, Nevins (2010) points out that clitics cross-linguistically never seem to vary allomorphically for tense, whereas agreement affixes frequently do so. He suggests this as a diagnostic for the clitic/affix distinction.\(^4\) By this diagnostic, also, the Quechua

---

\(^3\) Quechua infinitives, like most Quechua subordinate clauses, are nominal in nature. They therefore take the accusative case marker when they appear in object positions. See Lefebvre & Muysken (1988) for extensive discussion.

\(^4\) A disadvantage of this diagnostic is that it is obviously inapplicable to the clitic/affix distinction in non-verbal domains, but this does not affect the matter at hand.
object markers are clitics rather than affixes— they never vary allomorphically for tense, although they frequently occur adjacent to tense markers in the linear string (several examples can be seen in the table in (3) above). By contrast, subject person markers in Quechua must be affixes rather than clitics given this diagnostic, since these do show allomorphy for tense. For instance, the 1st person subject agreement marker is –ni in most tenses in finite clauses, but a special portmanteau form –saq is used in the future tense.

(8) Puñu-ni  (Cuzco Quechua)  
Sleep-1S  
‘I sleep.’

(9) Puñu-saq  
Sleep-1.FUT  
‘I will sleep.’

This is another strong argument that the object markers, as opposed to the subject markers, are clitic pronouns rather than agreement affixes.

In contrast, arguments against a clitic analysis which might be mustered seem comparatively weak. One such argument is the fact that Quechua lacks an overt 3rd person object marker, whereas Romance clitic inventories usually contain a 3rd person clitic. However, it turns out that colloquial Brazilian Portuguese retains only its 1st and 2nd person clitic (Nevins 2010:20), so that clitic inventories of this sort are not unheard of.

A second argument that one might put forward against the clitic analysis is that combinations of 1st person –wa and 2nd person –su are systematically impossible in all Quechua dialects. Therefore, no Romance-style clitic clusters occur.

(10) a. *Qo-wa-su-y-ta  muna-Ø-n  (Cuzco Quechua)  
Give-1O-2O-INF-ACC want-PRES-3S  
‘S/he wants to give me to you/you to me.’

b. *Qo-su-wa-y-ta  muna-Ø-n  
Give-2O-1O-INF-ACC want-PRES-3S  
‘as (a).’

Baker (2011) uses the absence of clusters as an argument against analyzing object markers in Amharic as clitics. Nonetheless, a transposition of this argument to Quechua fails to be convincing for the following reason. Recall that there is no 3rd person object marker. This means that the only logically possible clitic clusters in Quechua would be ones containing 1st and 2nd person clitics. The fact that these are ruled out could simply

5 However, clusters involving –wa/-ma or –su plus the reflexive clitic –ku, which is person-neutral, are apparently allowed in at least one variety of Bolivian Quechua (I have no data for other dialects).

(i) kaserita  khuchi aycha-ta  ranti-ku-wa-y  (Bolivian Quechua)  
Client  pig  meat-ACC  buy-REFL-1O-INF  
‘Dear client! Buy yourself a piece of pork from me!’

(Van de Kerke 1996:164, his (69))
follow from the strong version of the Person Case Constraint (which is also operative in French, Italian, and Modern Greek amongst other languages), and the data in (10) thus cannot form the basis of an argument against the clitic analysis.

Lastly, one might argue that the object markers must be affixes since they appear inside inflectional affixes (such as the subject markers and tense/aspect markers) in the verb. The premise that clitics are not expected to occur in this position is refuted empirically by the existence of so-called ‘mesoclisis’ in European Portuguese (and in imperatives in many varieties of Spanish as discussed by Harris & Halle 2005; Kayne 2008).

(11) comprá-lo-ei (European Portuguese)
    Buy-it-FUT.1S
    ‘I will buy it.’

This would moreover be an extremely theory-bound argument: in a lexicalist theory in which affixes are objects of the lexicon and clitics are objects of the syntax, the expectation is that clitics should appear outside of affixes (since the lexicon feeds the syntax and not vice versa). A syntactic approach to morphology in which affixes and clitics are both manipulated by syntax generates no such expectation, and it is such an approach that I adopt here (following Halle & Marantz 1993; many others).

I conclude that there are several good reasons to analyze the object markers of Quechua as clitics, and no compelling arguments against this position. I will therefore proceed on the assumption that the object markers are indeed clitics. Furthermore, affix ordering facts give us reason to believe that, despite the fact they are in complementary distribution, the 1st and 2nd person object clitics of Quechua are not associated with the same syntactic position. Instead, the 2nd person object clitic raises systematically higher. This can be seen by examining where these markers fall with respect to the other affixes in the schematic representation of affix order in the Quechua verb, repeated from (2) here:

(12) Schematic representation of Quechua affix order in the verb
    ROOT-ARGUMENT STRUCTURE-ASPECT-TENSE-SUBJAGR-MOOD

As can be seen, Quechua inflectional affixes are exclusively suffixal, with affixes corresponding to lower functional heads coming closer to the root and affixes corresponding to higher functional heads being further away, in accordance with the Mirror Principle of Baker (1985) (hence, thematic-domain-related affixes are closest to the root, followed by Aspect, and so on and so forth). If we take this correlation seriously, and then apply it to the relative positioning of –wa/-ma and –su across the Quechua family, the following striking generalization emerges.

(13) In many dialects, the 2nd person clitic occurs higher or at least as high as the 1st person clitic. In no dialect is the 1st person clitic potentially or obligatorily higher than the 2nd person clitic. Also, in no dialect does the 1st person clitic occur to the right of tense, whereas the 2nd person clitic does in some dialects.

This is particularly striking in our dialect of interest, Cuzco Quechua, where the 2nd person clitic –su obligatorily surfaces to the right of the past tense morpheme, whereas
the 1st person clitic –wa must surface to the left of that morpheme (Van de Kerke 1996:126; his (13)).

6 It has often been suggested that Cuzco Quechua and related dialects have no independent 2nd person object marker –su at all, but rather a fused subject agreement marker –sunki which marks a 3rd person subject acting on a 2nd person object (Lakämper & Wunderlich 1998:134; van de Kerke 1996). It seems to me that this position is untenable, since –su and –nki both appear independently of each other: –nki appears as the 2nd person subject marker in many forms in (3), and –su occurs as a 2nd person object marker separated from other affixes by the adverbial clause marker –qti in examples like the following (from Hoggarth 2004:76):

(i) waqya-su-qti-yki uyarimu-nki (Cuzco Quechua)
call-2O-SUB-2S listen-2S
‘When s/he calls you, you will listen.’

(Note that such subordinate clauses are also subject to A-SMA, explaining the 2nd person subject marking on the verb waqya- ‘call’.)

Accordingly, -su must follow the durative aspectual marker -sha too. The 1st person clitic –wa, on the other hand, may precede or follow this marker.

(14) a. maylla-rqa-su-nki-chis (Cuzco Quechua)
Wash-PAST-2O-2S-PL
‘S/he washed you (pl.).’

b. maylla-wa-rqa-nki-ku
Wash-1O-PAST-2S-PL
‘You washed us.’

In section 3, I show that the conclusions of the present section feed nicely into a MAwC analysis of Person Hierarchy Effects.

3. Clitics Feed Agreement (but only if they raise high enough)

I will follow Bianchi (2006), Cattaneo (2009), and Săvescu-Ciucivara (2009) in taking it that there are projections dedicated to hosting object clitics in the clause structure. As diagnosed by the affix order, it seems that there is one such position above T that attracts [Addressee] clitics, and one such position below T which attracts non-[Addressee] clitics. Assuming that the subject raises to spec-TP in Quechua, this will mean that a raised
[Addressee] clitic will c-command the subject, but a raised non-[Addressee] clitic will not. This accounts for the A-SMA directly: the subject agreement probe, represented by AgrS in the trees below, simply undergoes Agree with whatever is closest to it. If an [Addressee] clitic is in the structure, agreement will be with that clitic. If there is no such clitic in the structure, agreement will be with the subject. (I abstract away from the position of Aspect marking for the sake of a clearer diagram. Given the facts in (15), a fuller clause structure would include an AspectP above vP, and an additional optional clitic position capable of attracting non-[Addressee] clitics above AspectP.)

(16)  Juan maylla-rqa-su-nki    (Cuzco Quechua)  
Juan wash-PAST-2O-2S  
‘Juan washed you.’
A question arises concerning forms in which the subject is 3rd person and the object is 1st person inclusive, as in (18) (adapted from the table in (3)).

The object clitic here is identical in form to that used in first person exclusive contexts like (17), and it surfaces to left of the past tense morpheme. Nevertheless, the subject agreement morpheme marks the features of the 1st person inclusive object, not those of the 3rd person subject. Hence, in this form we have an apparent mismatch between the height to which the clitic raises and the triggering of A-SMA. The problem is only
apparent, however. Recall that I have postulated a high clitic position associated with [Addressee] clitics and a low position associated with non-[Addressee] ones. Since the 1st person inclusive is the conjunction of 1st and 2nd person, it seems reasonable to assume that a 1st person inclusive clitic is eligible to raise to both of these positions. Suppose, then, that 1st person inclusive –wa (as opposed to 1st person exclusive –wa) raises in the syntax first into the lower clitic position and then into the higher clitic position. Then, the affix order in (18) can be derived if it is the lower of the two copies of –wa that is spelled out. The higher, silent copy of –wa will nevertheless still c-command the subject as a result of such a derivation, and so the subject agreement morpheme will agree with the object, explaining the agreement pattern in (18).7

4. Conclusion

This paper has shown that the [Addressee]-driven Subject Marking Anomaly in Cuzco Quechua, a Person Hierarchy Effect triggered by arguments with the feature [Addressee], poses problems for a Cyclic Agree (Béjar & Rezac 2009) approach to such effects. This is because the affected subject agreement morpheme appears outside of tense and aspect morphemes, meaning that they cannot possibly be hosted by v*, as required on this approach. Furthermore, the fact that no anomaly is triggered by 1st person exclusive objects cannot be accounted for under this theory. On the other hand, an approach in which cliticization potentially feeds agreement, such as the Multiple Agree with Clitics theory (Nevins 2007, 2010), can readily account for the Quechua pattern. The key advantage of this latter approach is that it implicitly predicts that Person Hierarchy Effects might apply selectively when there is variation in the height to which different clitics move in a language. The A-SMA in Quechua confirms this prediction: only [Addressee] arguments trigger the effect, and this correlates with the relevant type of clitics raising higher than the other types.
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