The term ‘switch-reference marking’ was introduced by Jacobsen (1967) to describe a system of referential tracking. According to his original definition, switch-reference “consists in the fact that a switch in subject or agent [...] is obligatorily indicated in certain situations by a morpheme, usually suffixed, which may or may not carry other meanings in addition.” (Jacobsen 1967:268) A typical example is given in (1) from the Papuan language Kâte. As shown by the gloss (SS indicating a same-subject relation, DS a different-subject relation), markers on every verb indicate whether its subject is identical to the subject of the immediately following verb.

(1) Kâte (Trans-New-Guinea); Pilhofer (1933) (as cited in Bickel (2011))
ra fisī-pie fahare-râ yâpe?-yopa-pie
go arrive-SEQ.3pDS rise-SEQ.SS chase.away-3pDO-SEQ.3pDS
mafa-yenį? behe-râ wise-pie fiu?
stuff-3pPOSS throw.away-SEQ.SS flee-SEQ.3pDS illicitly
ro=fâre-mbiŋ.
take=all-3pREMOTE.PAST

‘When they_1 (the foreigners) arrived, they_2 (the villagers) got up and chased them away. They_1 threw away their stuff and fled. Then, they_2 stole their stuff.’

The phenomenon of switch-reference is interesting from an empirical as well as a theoretical perspective. Empirically, it is still an understudied topic as the definitions and generalizations are often blurred and not fully understood. Theoretically, the fact that the reference of both subjects has to be taken into account to determine the form of the switch-reference morpheme constitutes a non-local dependency. Since such non-local dependencies are often considered to be undesirable in syntax in general (cf. discussion in Alexiadou et al. (2012)) quite a lot of theoretical
literature on switch-reference circled around the question of how this non-local dependency could be modeled in different syntactic frameworks (for a discussion, see Finer (1984, 1985), Roberts (1988), Broadwell (1997), McKenzie (2011)). This volume contains several papers which try to shed some light on this topic, either from a typological or from a theoretical point of view:

Doreen Georgi shows that the movement theory of control (Boeckx et al. (2010)) can be used to derive same-subjects relations between clauses. The subject of the embedded clause moves to the subject position of the matrix clause. The same-subject marker is a reflex of this movement on the embedded T-head. In different-subject contexts, there is no cross-clausal movement of the embedded subject and hence a different morphological reflex. The non-local dependency is derived via successive-cyclic movement. Anke Assmann takes a look at Quechuan languages and argues that their switch-reference system is best analysed as a tense agreement relation (cf. also Camacho (2010)) between the matrix clause and the subordinate clause. Same-subject marking is the result of a tense agreement relation between both clauses. Such an agreement relation, however, is only possible when both subjects are identical in reference. The different-subject marker is the realization of a failed agreement relation. Here, the non-local dependency is derived via agreement. Stefan Keine argues that clauses that involve switch-reference marking are to be reanalysed as coordination structures. Following his analysis, switch-reference marking is the context-sensitive spell-out of a coordination head. Same-subject marking is the coordination head conjoining two VPs, which do not contain a subject, and different-subject marking is coordination of two vPs, each of which contains its own subject. In his reanalysis, there is no non-local dependency. Katja Barnickel & Andreas Opitz show that even though languages like German do not exhibit switch-reference marking morphologically, the identity or non-identity of subjects between a matrix and a subordinate clause still plays a role in syntax, namely with respect to the order of both clauses. Based on a corpus study, they show that subordinate clauses in German more preferably precede the matrix clause if both clauses have different subjects. It follows the matrix clause if the subjects are identical. Philipp Weisser addresses the very general question in which syntactic contexts we find switch-reference marking. He takes a close look at all the languages which have been claimed to show switch-reference marking in coordinated clauses and argues that what we find in these languages is a similar but still distinct mechanism, namely tight vs. loose coordination, a phenomenon already well-attested in Oceanic languages.

It should be noted that all of the contributions in this volume heavily benefited from the activities and discussions within the DFG-project "Local modeling of non-local dependencies in syntax" and the workshop "The Fine Structure of Grammatical Relations" (held as part of the DFG-Forscherguppe 742 "Grammatik und Verarbeitung verbaler Argumente").
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