Phenomenon
A Global Agreement

Domino Theory

Language Inquiry Volume 5 (December, 1972) / p. 62-63
(5) Maria parla svelta/svelto, anche se ci vogliono due ore ogni volta che si apre la bocca.
‘Mary speaks fast, even if it takes two hours every time she opens her mouth.’

(6) Maria parla così svelta/svelto che è difficile distinguere tutte le sue parole.
‘Mary speaks so fast that it is hard to distinguish all her words.’

For these speakers (5) and (6) are acceptable with and without gender/number agreement on svelto. These data may be contrasted with the case of speakers who have two svelto’s, one an adjective and one an adverb, and who require gender/number agreement on svelto in both (5) and (5), since they make a semantic distinction between their adjective svelto and their adverb svelto. Another contrast between these two sets of speakers is that the speakers who have an adjective svelto do not accept (4a); they do accept (4b), but with the reading given in (4a) (and not with the reading given in (4b)). The reason the two groups of speakers differ in accepting (1) and (4) is that (1) contains a simple verb form and (4) a compound verb construction. Any successful analysis of this agreement phenomenon will have to account for this strange behavior.

In section 3.1.1 I will propose a rule of agreement for adjectives that will account for these facts. The agreement pattern given in section 3 below offers many contrasts between the speakers who have an adjective and perhaps an adverb svelto and those who have an adjective and an adverb svelto.

In conclusion, for the adjective svelto, there is no semantic difference between (1a) and (1b).

3. The Rules

In this section we shall see that one rule can account for all cases in which gender/number agreement may optionally occur and all cases in which gender/number agreement must not occur. This rule is shown to be postcyclic and global. A separate principle operating in Italian agreement rules accounts for all cases of obligatory agreement. This principle is needed independently of any considerations of svelto.

3.1. A Gender/Number Agreement Rule for svelto (G/N svelto)

3.1.1. Naive Cyclic. There is ample evidence that a rule of gender/number agreement operating cyclically is not empirically adequate. (I will call this rule G/N svelto.)

In sentences where svelto’s subject has been removed by subject to subject Raising or by Equi NP Deletion between subjects, no gender/number agreement may occur on svelto:

(a) Maria sembra parlare *svelta/svelto.
   f.s. f.s. unmk.
   ‘Mary seems to speak fast.’

(b) Maria vuole parlare *svelta/svelto.
   ‘Mary wants to speak fast.’

Consider the derivation of these sentences:

(8) s*[Maria parla svelta/svelto, sembra]*

(9) s*[Maria vuole s*[Maria parla svelta/svelto]*]

If gender/number agreement of svelto is cyclic, on S, both (8) and (9) will optional agreement as in (1). Yet in surface structure no agreement appears in (7). Thus the rule producing optional agreement on svelto cannot be cyclic.

3.1.2. Not a Simple Postcycic Rule. There is also evidence that a postcyclic form of G/N svelto that does not have access to information present earlier in the de cannot work.

(10) Comandiamo a Maria di parlare svelta/svelto.
    m.p. f.s. f.s. unmk. m.p.
    ‘We command Mary to speak fast.’

(11) Promettiamo a Maria di parlare svelta/svelto.
    m.p. f.s. f.s. unmk. m.p.
    ‘We promise Mary to speak fast.’

(10) and (11) are structurally identical sentences in the postcycle, yet agreement occurs in (10) but not in (11). A postcyclic rule could not distinguish between (10) and (11), and thus G/N svelto should operate the same way in both sentence types, a postcyclic rule. However, it does not. Therefore, G/N svelto cannot be a postcyclic rule.

3.1.3. Postcyclic and Global. The possibility of gender/number agreement or depends upon where its “controller” appears at the point when agreement a svelto’s controller is usually its cyclic subject. However, in an S where svelto’s

7 By the cyclic subject of svelta, I mean the NP that is the subject of svelta at the end of the cycle applying to svelto. This notion is the same as that of Andrews (1971). Andrews has shown that in an italic case agreement between NPs and predicated modifiers takes into account the subject of the predicate to the end of the first cycle applying to that predicate. Andrews needs to refer to the subject at the end of cycle because transformations such as Passive and Raising into subject position can give the predicate a derived cyclic subject, and it is with that derived cyclic subject that the predicate modifier agrees.

Since in Italian svelto and other adjectives are never subject to the underlying subject of (Napoli 1974), svelto’s cyclic subject is the subject at the end of the first cycle applying to svelta. Thus, by using Andrews’s notion of cyclic subject, one principle can be applied to both the Greek and Italian cases. Therefore, Andrews’s notion of cyclic subject is a distinct and less powerful one.

However, note that if it were possible to define cyclic subject as the subject of the beginning of cycle, then a global rule referring to the cyclic subject of some other element would be appealing to infer structure in the deep structure. Since deep structure is argued to be a significant level of structure for various linguistic phenomena (such as semantic interpretation), this situation would be preferable to a global r
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A MODEL OF NEURAL FUNCTIONING

Upon a view that suggests potential neural relationships, we may consider the following hypotheses:

1. Neurons are interconnected through synaptic connections.
2. These connections can change over time, leading to neural plasticity.
3. Neural activity is influenced by external stimuli.

These hypotheses suggest that neural functioning is dynamic and adaptable, allowing for a wide range of behaviors and responses. Understanding these relationships is crucial for advancing knowledge in neuroscience and related fields.