2. Non-Reference-Tracking Accounts of Switch-Reference

- Some recent theories of SR have sought to derive SS and DS marking via a mechanism that does not rely on tracking referential indices in the syntax.
- These theories capitalize on the fact that SS clauses often appear to be structurally smaller than DS clauses, as evidenced by verbal morphology and agreement.
- Keine (2013) argues that SS clauses involve VP coordination and contain a single shared subject introduced by a higher v° (4), while DS clauses involve v° coordination with two subject DPs (5).

3. The Distribution of Overt DPs in Same Subject Constructions

- In Amahuaca SS constructions, an overt DP can appear in the marked clause, reference clause, or both. (8)
- When a DP appears in both clauses, each instance bears the case appropriate for its own clause, (9), demonstrating that the two DPs are not part of the same movement chain.

4. An Agree-Based Solution

- Direct reference-tracking theories, such as Finer (1985) and Watanabe (2000), have no trouble accounting for the presence of multiple overt subjects in Amahuaca, but they fail to capture the size asymmetry between SS and DS clauses, (11), as well as grammatical function tracking, (3).
- Georgi (2012) argues that SS clauses involve control via DP movement out of an embedded TP into the matrix, (6), while DS clauses are standard embedded CPs, (7).
- Keine (2013) argues that SS clauses involve VP coordination and contain a single shared subject introduced by a higher v° (4), while DS clauses involve v° coordination with two subject DPs (5).

3. Distribution of Overt DPs in Same Subject Constructions

- In Amahuaca SS constructions, an overt DP can appear in the marked clause, reference clause, or both. (8)
- When a DP appears in both clauses, each instance bears the case appropriate for its own clause, (9), demonstrating that the two DPs are not part of the same movement chain.
- While both SS and DS clauses can host full DPs, only DS clauses can host person clitics, (11), suggesting that DS clauses are, indeed, structurally larger than SS clauses.

Conclusions

- The possibility of multiple overt DP subjects in Amahuaca SS constructions is problematic for non-reference-tracking theories of SR.
- An Agree-based reference-tracking theory allows for multiple overt subjects, while capturing a size asymmetry between SS and DS clauses as well as some of the more unique features of Amahuaca’s SR system.
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