VSO and Left-Conjunct Agreement

Biblical Hebrew vs. Modern Hebrew
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VSO word order may on principle be the reflection of very different clause structures. This chapter argues that for many languages where VSO order is attested (Semitic, Celtic, Romance, Greek), it reflects a particular clause structure, which I will call a “VSO clause,” where the subject does not raise out of the c-command domain of the tense head of the clause:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
T_{\text{max}} \\
T \\
\vdash \\
...S...O...
\end{array} \]

A VSO clause is derived only if T has the following property:

(i) T does not have the EPP feature.

VSO clauses exhibit the pattern of “left-conjunct agreement” observed in Irish by McCloskey (1986), and in Arabic by Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche (1994), where the verb agrees with the leftmost conjunct of a postverbal conjoined subject, rather than with the full conjoined subject. Example (1) shows left-conjunct agreement in Biblical Hebrew:

(1) way-yiqqən șem wa-yeqənt ṣ̄aḥṣimla:
and-took 3MS Shem and-Japheth ACC-the.garment
‘And Shem and Japheth took a garment.’ (Genesis 9:23)

This chapter shows that left-conjunct agreement follows from (i) above, and more precisely from the weaker (ii):

(ii) T does not attract DP.

I assume (following Borer 1986 and Chomsky 1998) that what triggers the attraction of DP to T is the Agree relation between T and DP. Therefore, if T attracts DP, then they must be related by Agree. But if T has property (ii)—i.e., it does not attract DP—then T need not be related by Agree to DP. Rather, I propose that the Agree relation be defined to hold between T and the minimal D constituent closest to T which allows the derivation to converge. In a derivation which requires D to move, the minimal D that does not lead to a violation of the constraints on movement (such as the Coordinate Structure Condition) is the full subject DP. But in a derivation where D is not required to move, the minimal D constituent is a D head. In section 3, I show that in clauses with a conjoined subject, it is the head of the left conjunct that is the D head closest to T.

VSO clauses share property (ii) with another very different type of clause, those with an expletive subject. In this type of clause, T has the EPP feature—i.e., it does not have property (i). The EPP feature of T is satisfied by merging an expletive rather than by attracting the subject; that is, clauses with expletive
subjects have property (ii). Yet both VSO clauses (which also have property (i)) and clauses with expletive subjects (which do not have property (i)) exhibit left-conjunct agreement, which shows that this kind of agreement follows from a property weaker than (i). It will be shown in section 3 that left conjunct agreement follows from property (ii)—i.e., from the lack of DP-raising to T—either because T does not have the EPP feature (property (i)), or because the EPP feature is satisfied by merging an expletive.

Left-conjunct agreement is illustrated below for English, in a clause with an expletive subject, and for Modern Hebrew, in a clause with a null expletive:

(2) a. In the school there was a library and a terminal room.
    b. ??In the school there were a library and a terminal room.

(3) Modern Hebrew

a. hayta li sipriya ve-fidadar mafišebim
   was.3FS DAT.me library.F and-room.M (of)computers
   ‘I had a library and a terminal room.’

b. ??hayu li sipriya ve-fidadar mafišebim
   were.3P DAT.me library.F and-room.M (of)computers
   ‘I had a library and a terminal room.’

In general, VSO clauses are not expletive constructions, since they do not show the definiteness effect found in (2) and (3). (1) above, for example, is a VSO clause which is clearly not an expletive construction, since its subject is definite. In addition, not every VSO sequence is a VSO clause. VSO word order is found in Modern Hebrew, but not VSO clauses. First, VSO word order occurs in Modern Hebrew in a null expletive structure such as (3) above. In addition, Modern Hebrew has VSO sequences following any preverbal constituent. But there is no VSO sequence in Modern Hebrew which by itself constitutes a clause. Example (4) below shows that clause initial VSO is ungrammatical in non-expletive constructions, irrespective of the agreement features of the verb. (5) shows that VSO is possible only when some other constituent precedes the verb.

The contrast between (5a) and (5b) indicates that left-conjunct agreement is disallowed. These constructions are therefore different in some crucial way from the expletive construction in (3), which allows left-conjunct agreement:

(4) Modern Hebrew

a. *yiqaš īm ve-yepet ?et-hasimla
   will-take.3MS Shem and-Japheth ACC-the.garment
   ‘Shem and Japheth will take the garment.’

b. *yiqfiu īm ve-yepet ?et-hasimla
   will-take.3P Shem and-Japheth ACC-the.garment
   ‘Shem and Japheth will take the garment.’

(5) a. *mafar yiqaš īm ve-yepet ?et-hasimla
   tomorrow will-take.3MS Shem and-Japheth ACC-the.garment
   ‘Shem and Japheth will take the garment tomorrow.’
b. mafiar yiqfiu šem ve-yepet ?et-hasimla tomorrow will-take.3p Shem and-Japheth ACC-the.garment
‘Shem and Japheth will take the garment tomorrow.’

Left-conjunct agreement in non-expletive constructions seems to be attested in languages which, like Biblical Hebrew, have VSO clauses:

(6) a. **Standard Arabic**
lašibat maryam wa- zayd fi l-bayt played.3FS Mariam.F and-Zayd.M in.the.house
‘Mariam and Zayd played in the house.’ (Rana Fahoum, p.c.)

c. **Modern Irish**
dá mbeinn -se agus tusa ann if be.COND.IS EMPH and you there
‘if you and I were there’ (McCloskey and Hale 1984: 31a)

c. **Spanish**
Estaba abierta la tienda y el mercado
was.3S open.FS the.shop.F and the.market.M
‘The shop and the market were open.’ (Rodrigo Gutierrez, p.c.)

d. **Greek**
Irthe o Pavlos kai o Giannis sto parti came.3S the.Paul and the.John to-the.party
‘Paul and John came to the party.’ (Anastasia Giannakidou, p.c.)

1. Word Order in Biblical Hebrew and Modern Hebrew

The prevalent word order in Biblical Hebrew is verb initial, as shown again in (7) below. In Modern Hebrew, on the other hand, the prevalent word order is SVO, as shown in (8a), whereas verb initial sentences are in general ungrammatical, as shown again in (8b):

(7) **Biblical Hebrew**
V S O
‘The Lord hath showed me that thou shalt be king over Syria.’
(2 Kings 8:13)

(8) **Modern Hebrew**
S V O
a. haseret her?a-li ?et-dani menaceafi ba-tafiarut
the.movie showed-me ACC-Dani winning in-the.race
‘The movie showed me Dani winning the race.’

V S O
b. *her?a-li haseret ?et-dani menaceafi ba-tafiarut
showed-me the.movie ACC-Dani winning in-the.race
‘The movie showed me Dani winning the race.’
SVO is also often attested in Biblical Hebrew. Example (9), exactly as is, is a perfect grammatical sentence of both Modern and Biblical Hebrew:

(9) **Biblical Hebrew**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & V & O \\
\text{u-mo:še}: & \text{ha:ya}: & \text{ro:še}: & \text{?e-šo:n yitro: & fi:tno:} \\
\text{and-Moses was.3MS keeping.MS ACC-sheep (of)Jethro father-in-law.his} \\
\text{‘Now Moses kept the flock of Jethro his father-in-law.’ (Exodus 3:1)}
\end{array}
\]

In Biblical Hebrew, the only sentences not introduced by an overt complementizer are direct quotations, such as (7) above. Other main clauses are always introduced by the complementizer \( w- \) ‘and’, also realized phonologically as \( u- \), as in (9) above, or as \( \text{way}- \) in (10).\(^4\)

(10) **V S O**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{way-yiqqa:} & \text{mo:še}: & \text{?e-maṭṭe ha:ʔlo:hi:m b° - ya:do:} \\
\text{and-took.3MS Moses ACC-rod (of)the.God in-hand.his} \\
\text{‘And Moses took the rod of God in his hand.’ (Exodus 4:20)}
\end{array}
\]

In verb initial sentences such as (10), the complementizer ‘and’ cliticizes to the verb, yet it does not follow that the verb raises to C in Biblical Hebrew. Rather, the complementizer in both (9) and (10) lowers to cliticize to the left edge of the clause, similar to what is argued by Shlonsky (1988) for the Modern Hebrew complementizer \( še \) ‘that’ and by McCloskey (1996b) for Irish. Indeed, when sentences like (9) and (10) are preceded by adverbial clauses (themselves introduced by complementizers), then the main-clause complementizer **follows** the adverbial clause, as shown in (11a-b). Notice that it should not be inferred from the syntax of the corresponding King James translations that the clause following the adverbial clause is an embedded clause. In Biblical Hebrew, unlike English, a clause with an overt complementizer is possible as a main clause. In fact, the complementizer ‘and’ never introduces an embedded clause (cf. footnote 4):

(11)a. **wa-yhi: l- šiḥyaṭ hayya:m\( i \) u- me hammabu:l and-was to-seven the.days and-waters (of)the.flood ha:yu: ʔa1 ha:ʔa:reš were upon the.earth ‘And it came to pass after seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth.’ (Genesis 7:10)

b. **wa-yhi: miq-qeṣ ya:m\( i \) way-ya:be qayin mip-pri: and-was in-end (of-)days and-brought Cain from-fruit ha:ʔa-da:ma: (of)the.ground ‘And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground.’ (Genesis 4:3)
2. Conjoined Subjects in Biblical Hebrew

As noted in the standard grammars of Biblical Hebrew (e.g., Gesenius 1910, Joion 1923), the verb agrees fully with a conjoined subject in SV clauses, as in (12), but it agrees with the left conjunct in VS clauses, e.g., (13). I list here more examples of left-conjunct agreement simply because it is more exotic:

(12) u-mo:$e\lt\text{?ah$a$ro$n}\ w-fi:u\ r\ ?a$1u: ro:$ haggib$ya:
and-Moses Aaron and-Hur climbed.3MP head (of)the.hill
‘And Moses, Aaron and Hur went up to the top of the hill.’
(Exodus 17:10)

(13) a. wat-ta$as\ d$bo:ra u-$ba:ra?q b$en ?$bi:no:$am
and-sang.3FS Deborah and-Barak son (of)Abinoam
‘Then sang Deborah and Barak the son of Abinoam.’ (Judges 5:1)

and-died.3MS Nadab and-Abihu before father.their
‘But Nadab and Abihu died before their father.’ (1 Chronicles 24:2)

c. u-$ba:ta$: ?atta: w-ziqne yi$ra:$?el ?$el me$lek
and-will.come.2MS you and-elders (of)Israel to king
mi$rayim wa-$mart$m ?$el:a:w
(of)Egypt and-will.say.2MP to.him
‘And thou shall come, thou and the elders of Israel, unto the king of
Egypt, and ye shall say unto him...’ (Exodus 3:18)

d. way-yiq$afi $a$bra:m w$na:fi:or la:hg$m na:$i:m
and-took.3MS Abram and-Nahor DAT.themselves wives
‘And Abram and Nahor took them wives.’ (Genesis 11:29)

e. wat-taq$as$ r$ibqa: w$-$na:$ro$gy$ha wat-tirka$bu: ?a$1
and-rode.3FS Rebecca and-maids.her and-rode.3FP on
hagg$?all$ji:m the.camels
‘And Rebeka arose, and her damsels, and they rode upon the camels.’
(Genesis 24:6 1)

f. wat-t$a:n$ ra$fi:el w$-le$?a: wat-to:mama: lo:
and-answered.3FS Rachel and-Leah and-said.3FP to.him
Q-yet to.us portion and-inheritance in-house (of)father.our
‘And Rachel and Leah answered and said unto him, Is there yet any
portion or inheritance for us in our father’s house?’ (Genesis 31:14)

g. way-yi$s$a: da$wi:d w$-$ha:$a:m ?$?$?e$\l$itto:
and-lifted.3MS David and-the.people that with.him
?$t$-qo:la:m way-yib$ku:
ACC.voice.their and-wept.3MP
‘Then David and the people that were with him lifted up their voice and
wept.’ (1 Samuel 30:4)
In the examples in (13), the form of the verb is singular, yet the subject is clearly plural. It is implausible to analyze these examples as containing a singular subject combined with a comitative phrase, though this is the interpretation often offered by traditional interpreters of the Bible, such as Rashi (Rabbi Shlomo Yitzhaki, 1040—1105), and traditional translations such as the King James Bible (see in particular the translation of 13c and 13e).\(^5\) For example, contains a plural reflexive dative bound by the subject. (13g) contains the idiom ‘X lifted up X’s voice’ which is obligatorily reflexive: There is no lifting up anybody’s voice but one’s own. But this entails, since X is marked as plural in the second part of the idiom, that the subject is plural as well. The examples in (13) are, therefore, examples with plural subjects.

The contrast between full agreement of the preverbal subject and partial agreement of the postverbal subject is also found in the other languages with left-conjunct agreement. Postverbal left-conjunct agreement, as in the (a) sentences below, alternates with full preverbal agreement, in the (b) sentences:

(14) **Standard Arabic**

a. lašībat māryam wa-zayd fi l-bayt
   played.\(3Fs\) Mariam.\(F\) and-Zayd.\(M\) in the.house
   ‘Mariam and Zayd played in the house.’

b. māryam wa-zayd lašība:/# lašība/#lašībat fi l-bayt
   Mariam and Zayd played.\(3MDual/#3MS/#3FS\) in the.house
   ‘Mariam and Zayd played in the house.’

(15) **Spanish**

a. Estaba abierta la tienda y el mercado
   was.\(3S\) open.\(FS\) the shop.\(F\) and the market.\(M\)
   ‘The shop and the market were open.’

b. La tienda y el mercado estaban abiertos/#estaba abierto/abierta
   the shop and the market were.\(3P\) open.\(MP/#was.3S\) open.\(FM/#FS\)
   ‘The shop and the market were open.’

(16) **Greek**

a. Irthe o Pavlos kai o Giannis sto parti
   came.\(3S\) the Paul and the John to-the party
   ‘Paul and John came to the party.’

b. O Pavlos kai o Giannis irthan/#irthe sto parti
   the Paul and the John came.\(3MP/#came.3S\) to-the party
   ‘Paul and John came to the party.’

3. V-Raising and Left-Conjunct Agreement in VSO Clauses

First, we must establish that VSO word order in Hebrew is indeed a case of V-raising, similar to Irish (Chung and McCloskey 1987, McCloskey 1991, 1996a,

It has already been argued extensively that the verb in Modern Hebrew raises out of the VP.\(^6\) First, there is evidence (Shlonsky 1987) that the verb can precede sentential adverbs, like *bevaday* ‘certainly’:

(17) **Modern Hebrew**

a. hamore bevaday yasbir \(?et-hašfur\)
the.teacher certainly will.explain ACC-the.lesson
‘The teacher will certainly explain the lesson.’

b. hamore yasbir bevaday \(?et-hašfur\)
the.teacher will.explain certainly ACC-the.lesson
‘The teacher will certainly explain the lesson.’

Second, there is evidence (Shlonsky 1991) that quantifiers are floated from a postverbal position:

(18) hayeladim hebinu kulam \(?et-hašfur\)
the.children understood all.3MP ACC-the.lesson
‘The children have all understood the lesson.’

Third, VP-ellipsis strands the verb (Doron 1990, 1999), which shows that the verb has raised out of the VP. The second reading available for (19) shows that VP-ellipsis has applied, stranding the verb in T:

(19) \(?im mišehu yedaber \(\text{al abodato}, \text{gam dani yedaber}\)
if someone will.speak about work.his, also Dani will.speak
a. ‘If someone will speak about his work, Dani will speak too.’

b. ‘If someone will speak about his work, Dani will too.’

In Biblical Hebrew, it is possible to show that the verb may be found to the left of sentential adverbs, which indicates that it raises out of VP:

(20) **Biblical Hebrew**

we-lo: yiqqa:re: \(\text{So:d} \ ?et-šimka: \ ?abra:m\)
and-NEG will.be.called any more ACC-name.yours Abram
‘Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram.’ (Genesis 17:5)

In addition, at least for the absolute form (ABS), the verb can be shown to raise out of VP, since ABS precedes not only T (i.e., the tensed form of the verb), but negation (NEG) as well, as mentioned by Levin (1971)\(^7\):

(21a) ra:?o: ra:?i:ti \(\text{?eg - ŋni: ŋammi: \(\text{?šer b}-\text{mišra} :\text{yim}\)
see.ABS saw.İS ACC-affliction (of)people.my that in-Egypt
‘I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt.’

(Exodus 3:7)
b. ba:ko: lo tibkg:
cry.ABS NEG will.cry.2MS
‘Thou shalt weep no more.’ (Isaiah 30:19)

The original position of ABS is within VP, as can be seen in untensed clauses. The order ABS-T observed in (21) is not found in imperative clauses, which are untensed. Rather, the order found in imperative clauses is T-ABS, as in (22):

(22) sim'ū: šamo:ša w-ʔal ta:bi:nu:
hear.IMP.MP hear.ABS and-NEG will.understand.2MP
u-rʔu: raʔo: w-ʔal teğa:šu:
and see.IMP.MP see.ABS and-NEG will.know.2MP
‘Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not.’
(Isaiah 6:9)

I will therefore assume that V raises in tensed clauses in Biblical Hebrew, and I will attempt to answer the question posed as a consequence: How far does V raise in a VSO clause? The answer that Aoun, Benmamoun and Sportiche (1994) have given for Arabic is that V raises to functional head F beyond T. F is lower than C, since VSO order is possible in embedded clauses introduced by an overt C. The motivation for Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche’s answer is theory internal: Subject-verb agreement, according to them, is a relation which holds between T, the head of the clause, and its specifier, as shown in (23) and, exemplified in (24). Therefore, the subject must be in the specifier of TP even when the verb precedes it. Accordingly, the verb must have raised to a functional head F higher than T in a VSO clause:

(23)

```
  FP
     \     / 
   V+T+F  TP
        /     \ 
  SUBJ   TP
        /     \  
  tV+T  VP
        /     \ 
  tSUBJ  VP
        /     \ 
  tV    OBJ
```
Yet if agreement is a relation which invariably holds between T and its specifier, then there is no structural difference between examples with left-conjunct agreement, such as (14a), and examples with full agreement, such as (14b). Indeed, Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche deny the existence of left-conjunct agreement, and argue that such examples involve sentence conjunction where ellipsis of the verb and Right Node Raising have also taken place:

In (25), the second occurrence of the verb ‘play’ is ellided, whereas the PP ‘in the house’ is Right Node Raised (RNR). Yet this account is problematic even for Arabic. It predicts that the RNR constituent should show singular agreement, since this constituent supposedly originates from two singular clauses. This prediction cannot be tested with an RNR constituent such as ‘in the house’ in (25), which does not exhibit agreement. Yet in examples where the RNR constituent is a predicate with overt agreement, this prediction is systematically falsified. In (26), for example, the RNR constituent "yal'aba:nī fi l-bayt ‘play.3MD in the"
house’ is obligatorily marked as dual (D), but if it were raised from two singular clauses, it should be marked as singular:

(26) **Standard Arabic**

ka:nat maryam wa-zayd ya:li:aba:ni fi l-bayt was.3FS Mariam and-Zayd play.3MD in the.house

‘Mariam and Zayd used to play in the house.’ (Rana Fahoum, p.c.)

Aoun and Benmamoun (1999) deny the existence of this problem by showing that it is not attested in either Lebanese or Moroccan Arabic. Yet this problem arises for Standard Arabic, as (26) shows, and moreover, it is also found in Irish and Biblical Hebrew. The relevant example from Irish is shown in (27), where the constituent which is Right Node Raised from two singular clauses (according to Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche), ‘nár suí, is nevertheless plural:

(27) **Irish**

Bhínn féin agus an seandúine ‘nár suí. was.IS EMPH and the old-fellow 1p sitVN

‘The old fellow and I used to be sitting.’ (McCloskey 1986:ex. 37)

In Biblical Hebrew as well, the putatively RNR constituents contain plural anaphors—e.g., *lahem* ‘for themselves’ in (13d), and *qolam* ‘their voices’ in (13g), which is an anaphoric part of the expression ‘raise their voices’. The plurality of these anaphors would be completely unexpected if they originated from singular clauses.

Since the only argument in Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche for raising V beyond T is to afford a unified account of agreement, and since this attempt is not successful, we are left with no reason to assume that V raises beyond T in VSO structures. Indeed, in McCloskey (1986, 1996a, 1996b), it is argued with respect to Irish that the verb does not raise beyond T. Rather, the verb is in T, while the subject is in a specifier of a head lower than T. For simplicity’s sake, I assume that this lower head is V, though it is argued in Bobaljik and Carnie (1996) and McCloskey (1996b) that this head is actually a functional head below T and above temporal adverbs which follow the verb. Agreement in Irish holds between T and the lower subject, as shown in (28):

(28)

```
      TP
        /\         /
       V+T   VP
         /\        /
        SUBJ   VP
               /
              tV    OBJ
```

Something needs to be said about how the structure in (28) satisfies the EPP. According to Chomsky (1995), the EPP is satisfied by covert raising of the features of the subject to T. Chomsky (1998) argues against covert feature movement, and moreover proposes to view the EPP as a feature not just of T but of functional heads in general. This feature is not necessarily a lexical property of functional heads, but can be added independently into the derivation. I propose
that in a strictly VSO language such as Irish, T is not compatible with the EPP feature, neither as part of its lexical specification nor as an addition by the derivation. In Biblical Hebrew, Arabic, Romance, and Greek, on the other hand, an EPP feature may be added to T in some derivations, though it is not part of the lexical specification of T. Accordingly, in these languages, a VSO structure such as (28) is derived with a numeration which does not include the EPP feature. An SVO structure such as (29) is the outcome of a different derivation, one which includes an EPP feature but no expletive:

(29)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
TP \\
\text{SUBJ} & TP \\
V+T & VP \\
\text{agreement} \\
\text{t}_{\text{SUBJ}} & VP \\
\text{t}_{v} & \text{OBJ}
\end{array}
\]

The two derivations in (28) and (29) have different agreement patterns, based on the same operation Agree:

*The operation Agree* (adapted from Chomsky 1998)^9^  
(a) The relation Agree holds between the \(\phi\)-features of T and the \(\phi\)-features of D which is closest to T (in terms of c-command) in T’s domain (all the nodes dominated by its sister).

(b) The values of \(\phi\)-features are copied to T from the D related to it by Agree.

(c) If T has an EPP feature, D is raised to T.

In (30), if T has an EPP feature not satisfied by the pure merging of an expletive, it enters into the Agree relation with the highlighted DP, since this is the DP closest to T, and since this is the minimal constituent within the closest DP that may move without violating the constraints on movement:

(30)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
TP \\
V+T & VP \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP} & \text{DP} \\
\text{D} & \text{NP} & \text{CONJ} & \text{DP} \\
\text{t}_{v} & \text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

Yet, if T in (30) does not have an EPP feature (or if the EPP feature can be satisfied by a pure merging of an expletive), no movement is forced, and the Agree relation holds with the closest D head, which is the boldfaced D in (30). Crucially, I assume the asymmetric structure of coordinate structures argued for by Larson (1990), where conjunctions head coordinate structures. I also assume
that conjunctions lack any formal features, from which it follows that the category they project is that of the conjuncts themselves. Moreover, the number specification of a conjoined DP is not a morphosyntactic feature of the conjunction head, as argued by Farkas and Zec (1995).

4. Subject-Verb Agreement in OVS Clauses
In section 3, I showed that left-conjunct agreement to postverbal subjects is a motivation for assuming VSO clause structure—i.e., a structure where the subject does not raise beyond T. The question now is whether such a structure is also motivated in clauses where V is not clause initial, e.g., OVS order. At first sight, it seems reasonable to continue assuming that in OVS clauses as well, the subject does not raise beyond T. OVS clauses are simply VSO clauses with subsequent fronting of the object. By this reasoning, the structure of (31 a) should be (31b), which is derived from a structure like (28) by raising OBJ to T:

(31) Biblical Hebrew
a. O V S
   we-?et-Šōma:šā: šā: m ?ābša:tem tafiṭṭ yōʔa:š
   and-ACC-Amasa appointed Absalom instead (of)Joab
   ŋal haṣṣa:ha:
on the.army
   ‘And Absalom made Amasa captain of the host instead of Joab.’
   (2 Samuel 17:25)

b. TP
   OBJ TP
   V+T VP
   SUBJ VP
   tV tOBJ

OVS sentences like (31 a) are also attested in Modern Hebrew. As mentioned in the introduction, Modern Hebrew allows postverbal subjects on condition that some other constituent—e.g., the object—precedes the verb. Indeed, (31b) is proposed by Borer (1995) as the structure of Modern Hebrew OVS sentences. Yet if this is the right structure for OVS sentences in Modern Hebrew, and if left-conjunct agreement is accounted for structurally, then the prediction is that (31b) should exhibit left-conjunct agreement in Modern Hebrew as well. But this is not the case, as already mentioned. In Modern Hebrew, only full agreement is attested:

(32) Modern Hebrew
a. *?et-haseper sama dvora ve baraq al hamadap
   ACC-the.book put3FS Deborah and Barak on the.shelf
   ‘Deborah and Barak put the book on the shelf.’
The lack of left-conjunct agreement in Modern Hebrew is puzzling in view of the fact that it exists in Biblical Hebrew. This leads us to suspect that the structure in (31b) cannot be the right structure for OVS sentences in Modern Hebrew. I claim that neither is it the right structure for Biblical Hebrew.

Despite the grammar-book generalization concerning Biblical Hebrew left conjunct agreement, there are conjoined postverbal subjects in Biblical Hebrew where full agreement is attested:

(33) **Biblical Hebrew**

\[
\text{w}^\text{3}-\text{hanno:}\text{g}eny \text{ mimmenn}: \text{yo:klu:} \\
\text{and-the.remainder from.it will.eat.}\text{MP}
\]

\[
\text{?ah}^\text{3}:\text{on u-ba:na:w} \\
\text{Aaron and- sons.his}
\]

‘And the remainder thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat.’

(Leviticus 6:9/16)

(34) **way-yhi: ?afiar hadd?bari:m ha:?elle: ha:?u:u**

\[
\text{and-was after things these offended.}\text{MP}
\]

\[
\text{ma}^\text{3}:\text{ge melek misra:yim w}^\text{3}-\text{ha:}?o:pe: la-?\text{do:nehem} \\
\text{butler (of)king (of)Egypt and-the.baker to.lord.their}
\]

\[
\text{l-melek misra:yim} \\
\text{to-king (of)Egypt}
\]

‘And it came to pass after these things, that the butler of the king of Egypt and his baker had offended their lord the king of Egypt.’ (Genesis 40:1)

(35) **w}^\text{3}-\text{ta:psu: bo: ?a:bi:w w}^\text{3}-\text{immo:}**

\[
\text{and-will.hold.}\text{MP at.him father.his and-mother.his}
\]

‘Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him.’

(Deuteronomy 21:19)

Full agreement is specially puzzling in examples such as (36a), since in the same chapter, three verses earlier, the same postverbal subject does trigger left-conjunct agreement, as shown in (36b):

(36a) **way-yerd}\text{u: ?ela:w melek yi}^\text{3}:\text{ra:?el w-i:ho:sa:pa:t}**

\[
\text{and-descended.}\text{MP to.him king (of)Israel and-Jehoshaphat}
\]

\[
\text{u-melek ?do:}\text{m} \\
\text{and-king (of)Edom}
\]

‘So the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom went down to him.’ (2 Kings 3:12)

(36b) **way-yel}\text{ek melek yi}^\text{3}:\text{ra:?el u-melek y}^\text{3}:\text{hu:da: u-melek ?do:}\text{m}**

\[
\text{and-went.}\text{MS king (of)Israel and-king (of)Judah and-king (of)Edom}
\]

\[
\text{way-ya:so:bbu: derek sihi}^\text{3}:\text{at ya:mi:m} \\
\text{and-circled.}\text{MP road seven days}
\]

‘So the king of Israel went, and the king of Judah, and the king of Edom;
and they fetched a compass of seven days’ journey.’ (2 Kings 3:9)

We must ask whether there is a structural difference between sentences with full agreement and sentences with left-conjunct agreement. The answer is provided by Moreshet (1967). In a comprehensive study of the complete prose of the Bible (excluding poetry), Moreshet found 235 sentences with a conjoined postverbal subject. In 210 of these sentences, agreement is with the left conjunct, whereas in 25 examples the verb fully agrees with the conjoined postverbal subject. Moreshet was able to discover a descriptive generalization which captures the distribution of full versus left-conjunct agreement. His generalization constitutes a necessary condition for full agreement:

THE Moreshet Generalization (adapted from Moreshet 1967)
The verb in Biblical Hebrew agrees with the leftmost conjunct of a postverbal conjoined subject, unless either (I) or (II) hold:
(1) The verb is preceded in the clause by some constituent.
(II) A clitic is attached to the verb.

Examples (33) and (34) above fall under clause (I) of this generalization, whereas (35) and (36a) fall under clause (II). The problem is that the two clauses of the Moreshet Generalization do not seem to constitute a natural class of syntactic environments.

Fortunately, the analysis proposed for clitics in Semitic by Doron (1996) and Doron and Heycock (1999) makes it possible to subsume condition (II) of the Moreshet Generalization under condition (I). According to this analysis, clitics may be viewed as anaphors bound by preverbal constituents, as in (37):

(37) kol habben hayyilo:d hay?o:r-a: tašli:ku:-hu: every son born the.river-ALLAT you.will.throw-him

‘Every son that is born ye shall cast into the river.’ (Exodus 1:22)

(37) is not an example of left-dislocation, as the constituent binding the clitic is the quantifier kol habben hayyilo:d ‘every son that is born’. Quantifiers with ‘every’ do not undergo left-dislocation.

Crucially, the constituent binding the clitic is possibly empty, if previously mentioned in the discourse. This is clearly the case in (36a), for example, where the object clitic refers to the prophet Elisha, mentioned earlier in the text. The same is true for (35), where there is previous mention of a rebellious son, to which the clitic is anaphoric. These clitics may therefore be analyzed as bound by a preverbal constituent, just as in (37). The only difference is that the preverbal constituent is overt in (37), but it is null in (35) and (36a). Condition (II) therefore does not characterize any examples that do not already fall under (I). The two necessary conditions can be collapsed to a single one, which coincides with condition (I):

THE Moreshet Generalization (revised)
The verb in Biblical Hebrew agrees with the leftmost conjunct of a postverbal conjoined subject, unless the verb is preceded in the clause by some constituent.
The reformulation of the Moreshet Generalization is an improvement over the original formulation for yet another reason. It now accounts as well for cases where the anaphoric element which licenses full agreement is not a clitic attached to the verb, but some other anaphor. An example is shown in (38), where the anaphor is part of the conjoined subject itself (additional examples are Exodus 29:15, Leviticus 8:19,22, Numbers 20:10):

(38) way-yo:\ku: way-yi\stu: hu: w-ha:\na: ši:m ū\scr: ūimmo:
and-ate.3MP and-drank.3MP he and-the.men that with.him
‘And they did eat and drink, he and the men that were with him.’
(Genesis 24:54)

The Moreshet Generalization in conjunction with our previous discussion provides a necessary condition for the raising of the verb beyond T. According to the conclusions of section 4, full agreement is the result of the subject raising to specifier of TP. Accordingly, if in a full-agreement structure the subject is found following the verb, then it must be that the verb has raised beyond T. The Moreshet Generalization states a condition on such a movement very similar to the condition on V-raising beyond T known from the discussion of Germanic languages (den Besten 1983, Platzak 1986a, and many others). This condition can be formulated as a V2 condition on V-raising beyond T:

**THE V2 CONDITION**

The verb in Biblical Hebrew does not raise beyond T unless preceded by some constituent.

In other words, the raising of V to a functional projection F beyond T is possible only if some constituent—e.g., the object—occupies the specifier position of TP.\(^{11}\)

\[(39)\]

\begin{center}
\[\text{FP}
  \text{OBJ} \quad \text{FP}
  \text{V+T+F} \quad \text{TP}
  \text{SUBJ} \quad \text{TP}
  \quad \text{t}_{V+T} \quad \text{VP}
  \quad \text{t}_{\text{SUBJ}} \quad \text{VP}
  \quad \text{t}_{V} \quad \text{t}_{\text{OBJ}}\]
\end{center}

Descriptively, as we have seen, Modern Hebrew differs from Biblical Hebrew in two relevant respects:

(i) The verb is always preceded by some constituent, not necessarily the subject.
There is no left-conjunct agreement when the subject follows the verb, other than in expletive constructions.

The difference may be reduced to a single factor if we simply assume that in Modern Hebrew, T has the EPP feature as a lexical property. This is why in Modern Hebrew, unlike Biblical Hebrew, there is always some constituent preceding the verb, and there is no left-conjunct agreement. Even where the object precedes the verb, the subject is in the specifier of TP and therefore triggers full agreement. Indeed, (39) is the structure proposed by Shlonsky and Doron (1992) for Modern Hebrew OVS sentences. In that chapter, independent evidence was presented in favor of (39) over (31b) as the structure for OVS sentences in Modern Hebrew. The distribution of left-conjunct agreement in Biblical Hebrew coupled with the lack of left-conjunct agreement in Modern Hebrew, is an additional argument to the same effect. The structure of Modern Hebrew SVO sentences, on the other hand, is argued by Shlonsky and Doron (1992) to be as in (29), the structure proposed here for Biblical Hebrew SVO sentences as well. A similar asymmetry between the position of a preverbal subject and a preverbal object is argued for in Germanic by Zwart (1993a).

Adopting the framework of Chomsky (1998) has made it possible to account for the different distribution of the EPP feature in the different languages. T in Modern Hebrew is assigned the EPP feature lexically (as in English). In Biblical Hebrew, it is not, but T may be enriched with an EPP feature as part of some derivations but not of others (the same is true of Arabic, Greek, and Romance). In Irish, in contrast, T is incompatible with the EPP feature, which cannot be added to it either lexically or by the derivation.

Notes

1. All the Biblical Hebrew translations are from the King James Bible (1611), which is generally more literal than the other translations.

2. I am very grateful to Shraga Assif for the phonetic transcription of the Biblical Hebrew data.

3. The preverbal constituent may be null even when it is not expletive, as is generally assumed for “narrative inversion” and for “all-focus sentences,” e.g.:

   (i) Modern Hebrew
   hitqašer ʾaba šelka
called father yours
‘Your father called.’

4. The main clause complementizer ‘and’ has an important role for text cohesion (for recent discussion see de Caen 1995 and Hatav 1997). It is in complementary distribution with other complementizers—e.g., *ki*:
'for/that', *pen* ‘lest’, h‘Q’ (a yes-no interrogative complementizer) — which only introduce embedded clauses:

(i) ʔal ti:r:ʔi: ki:ša:ma:ʔi ʔolo:hiːm ʔəl qoːl hanaːfar
NEG fear.2FS for heard.3MS God to voice (of)the.lad
‘fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad.’ (Genesis 21:17)

(ii) ki:ʔaːmrū plištːiːm pen yaːʔšuː haːʔibliːm
for said.3MP Philistines lest will.make.3MP the.Hebrews
fiːregh ʔaː fəniːʕ
sword or spear
‘For the Philistines said, lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears.’
(1 Samuel 13:19)

(iii) way-yoːmər hətaːfət ʔoloːhiːm ʔaːnoːki:
and.said.3MS q.instead God I
‘and he said, Am I in God’s stead.’ (Genesis 30:2)

5. Genuine comitative phrases in Biblical Hebrew seem to be small clause adjuncts of the form [*_sC and DP with him*], e.g.:

(i) way-yaːboː noːəfıː [*_sC u-baːnaːw w-ʔiːʃtoː u-n̥e_]
and.came.3MS Noah and.sons.of.his and.wife.of.his and-wives
baːnaːw ʔtiːttoː] ʔeːl hattebaː mippne me hammabbuːl
(of)sons.of.his with.him to.the.ark because waters (of)the.flood
‘And Noah went in, and his sons and his wife and his sons’ wives
with him into the ark, because of the waters of the flood.’
(Genesis 7:7)

6. Borer (1995) presents arguments that V does not always raise in Modern Hebrew, but the validity of these arguments is disputed in Doron (2000).

7. ABS is the absolute (i.e. non-construct) form of the verbal gerund used to reduplicate the verb for the purpose of strengthening the affirmative force of the utterance. It is usually translated as ‘surely’ or ‘indeed’.

8. One approach to the question of how the structure in (28) satisfies the EPP is that of Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998). According to them, in *pro*-drop languages, V-raising to T itself satisfies the EPP, since V in these languages carries a clitic which has the feature [+D]. I will not discuss this proposal in the text, since it makes several wrong predictions. First, it predicts that every *pro*-drop language has VSO clauses, a prediction clearly falsified by Modern Hebrew. Second, by this approach, the subject cannot raise to the specifier of TP in *pro*-drop languages. Rather, any preverbal subject is purely merged to the specifier of TP, an A’ position, and binds the thematic subject *pro* situated in the specifier of VP (or some other projection lower than T). Yet it can be shown that the subject does raise to the specifier of T in *pro*-drop languages. Raised subjects differ in many of their syntactic and semantic properties from purely merged constituents, as amply shown for Standard Arabic, Modern Hebrew and
Japanese by Doron and Heycock (1999). For a very different view of the EPP in VSO languages, see Massam (2000).

9. Chomsky’s definition also includes an additional clause regarding the erasure of the non-interpretable φ-features of an agreeing T.

10. There exist a couple of apparent counterexamples to this generalization, yet it seems that even those can be explained away:

(i)  wa-ykah’nu: ʾeḫa:za:r ṃ?-ʾi:tɑ:ma:r
    and-served.3MP Eleazar and-Ithamar
    ‘Eleazar and Ithamar executed the priest’s office.’
    (1 Chronicles 24:2)

    The verb in (i) shows full agreement to the postverbal subject, yet neither does it contain an object clitic, nor is it preceded by any constituent. But notice that (i) appears in the context of a detailed list of all the temple officials in King David’s administration, at the point where the divisions of high priests, the descendents of Aaron, are listed:

(ii) ṃ?-li-bne ʾahrō:n mafīlqo:ta:m bne ʾahrō:n na:da:b
    and-to-sons (of)Aaron divisions.their sons (of)Aaron Nadab
    and-Abihu Eleazar and-Ithamar
    and-died.3MS Nadab and-Abihu before father.their and-sons
    NEG were to.them and-served.3MP Eleazar and-Ithamar
    ‘Now these are the divisions of the sons of Aaron. The sons of Aaron; Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar. But Nadab and Abihu died before their father, and had no children: therefore Eleazar and Ithamar executed the priest’s office.’
    (1 Chronicles 24: 1-2)

    The passage in (ii) is an explanation for why there are only two divisions of high priests listed, not four, in spite of the fact that Aaron, the forefather of all high priests, had had four sons (about two centuries prior to David’s time). The clause in (i), which is the last clause in (ii), is therefore probably not conjoined to the preceding clause, but rather contains it as an adverbal clause: ‘Because Nadab and Abihu had died leaving no children while Aaron was still in office, only Eleazar and Ithamar succeeded him as high priests.’ If this is so, then (i) does after all fall under the Moreshet Generalization.
11. In Arabic, Spanish, and Greek, left-conjunct agreement is optional, which
may indicate that in those languages, T-raising to F is independent of the
fronting of a constituent to the specifier of FP.
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