

# Chapter 3. Agreement domains and targets

Oliver Bond & Marina Chumakina

University of Surrey

<b>CHAPTER 3. AGREEMENT DOMAINS AND TARGETS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3.1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.2 AGREEMENT IN THE NOUN PHRASE</b>	<b>3</b>
3.2.1 DEMONSTRATIVES	3
3.2.2 ATTRIBUTIVES	6
3.2.3 GENITIVE NOUNS AND PRONOUNS	10
3.2.4 NUMERALS	12
<b>3.3 AGREEMENT IN THE CLAUSE</b>	<b>15</b>
3.3.1 VERBS	16
3.3.1.1 Finite verb forms	16
3.3.1.2 Non-finite verb forms	18
3.3.2 ATTRIBUTIVES AS PREDICATIVE COMPLEMENTS	20
3.3.3 PRONOUNS	20
3.3.4 ADVERBS	27
3.3.5 THE POSTPOSITION <i>EQ'EN</i>	29
3.3.6 THE EMPHATIC CLITIC <i>=EJT'U.</i>	30
<b>3.4 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>32</b>

## TABLES

TABLE 3.1. ARCHI DEMONSTRATIVES (BASED ON KIBRIK 1977A: 124).....	4
TABLE 3.2 GENDER AND NUMBER AGREEMENT SUFFIXES ON ATTRIBUTIVES .....	7
TABLE 3.3. GENITIVE FORMS OF FIRST- AND SECOND-PERSON PRONOUNS .....	12
TABLE 3.4 THE AGREEING FORMS OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS .....	21

### 3.1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Generative theories of syntax involve abstract levels of representation to account for the relationship between controllers and targets within an agreement domain. For instance, Minimalism conventionally formalizes agreement in terms of the operation *Agree*, a relation between a functional head and a DP that is established in the syntax via the notion of c-command (see Chomsky 2000, Chomsky 2001, as discussed by Polinsky, Chapter 7). In Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG), agreement relations hold at the level of f-structure, and, in the standard approach to morphosyntax, feature governance and feature agreement are not theoretically distinct. Instead, a single mechanism of governance is used whereby morphosyntactic features of words constrain f-structure directly (see Sadler, Chapter 6). For much work in Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), agreement must refer to lists that contain the value of the argument structure feature ARG-ST. In such a view, an ARG-ST list (and hence agreement) is essentially a constraint on words; however, agreement may also be modelled in terms of constituent structure and order domains (the option argued for by Borsley, Chapter 5). Despite apparent differences between the formal mechanisms employed, each approach treats agreement in terms of the features and values involved. The extent to which syntactic structures/relations and syntactic operations are involved varies from theory to theory.

While these theories generally do not presuppose any access to information regarding the structure of a target's morphological paradigm, they do vary according to how much access they assume to lexically specified information of an agreement target. Evidence from Archi suggests that the possibility of agreement may be sensitive to lexical information about a particular target (§4.4), and thus presents a range of challenges to test the adequacy of existing theoretical models of syntax that constrain access to this type of data.

The purpose of this chapter is two-fold. First, it provides a description of Archi agreement phenomena that is detailed enough to contextualize the problems discussed in the three theoretical accounts given in Chapters 5-7. Second, and perhaps more crucially, it flags up the typological interest of the Archi agreement system and highlights potential challenges that the theoretical accounts will need to address. While most of the interest of the Archi agreement system lies in the behaviour of targets, the ensuing discussion is organized around the concept of domains. Describing agreement in terms of domains (rather than just the relationships between controllers and targets) allows us to reach an adequate level of generalization about agreement relations without losing all the important details of how they differ (Corbett 2006: 54).

There are two distinct syntactic domains in Archi, the noun phrase (§3.2) and the clause (§3.3), each characterized by different rules. Within the noun phrase, agreement occurs between the lexical head of the phrase (the controller) and the element modifying it (the target). Thus, some of the patterns of agreement in the Archi noun phrase can be formalized in terms of familiar syntactic relations (§3.2.1). However, there are some important differences in the behaviour of targets. Modifiers within the noun phrase can exhibit the potential for agreement with multiple targets in different domains (§3.2.2),

---

<sup>1</sup> We are particularly grateful for comments on this chapter from Bob Borsley and Masha Polinsky.

and they show differing potential for agreement within a single lexical class of targets (§3.2.3). Controllers can also exhibit dual behaviour, with different values of the same feature being relevant in two different agreement domains (§3.2.4).

Within the clause, agreement seems straightforward at a first glance. All possible targets agree with the absolutive argument of their immediate clause. Less simple is the issue of defining a possible target, which goes way beyond simply defining its role in the clause (whether we define it via constraints on the f-structure, in terms of the structural position in the tree, or in terms of argument structure). To provide an adequate description of the agreement facts in Archi we need to refer to the lexical category of the target, and in some instances to its morphological type as is the case with simple vs. complex verbs of a certain class. Verbal agreement is discussed in sections §3.3.1 and agreement of predicative attributives is examined in §3.3.2. Sometimes we need to describe the agreement facts in terms of individual cells in the morphological paradigm of the target, as is the case with pronouns (§3.3.3), or in terms of the individual lexical items within the class (adverbs, the postposition *eq'en* and the emphatic clitic *=ejt'u*, discussed in §3.3.4, §3.3.5, and §3.3.6 respectively). Section 3.4 concludes the chapter.

## 3.2 Agreement in the noun phrase

Within the domain of the noun phrase, Archi nouns can be modified by demonstratives, attributives, nominal-adjectives, numerals, quantifiers, and other nouns or pronouns in the genitive case. Nearly all nominal modifiers serve as targets for agreement in gender and number with the lexical head of the noun phrase.<sup>2</sup> The controller of agreement in the nominal agreement domain is always the head of the noun phrase, regardless of its case-marking. Thus, nominal controllers may bear any of the grammatical or spatial cases available for a given noun (§2.4). This contrasts with the clausal agreement domain, where the controller of agreement is always an absolutive argument.

Each type of modifier has a different degree of agreement potential. While nominal-adjectives, quantifiers and genitive nouns never agree with the noun they modify, demonstratives (§3.2.1) and attributives (§3.2.2) always participate in agreement within the nominal agreement domain, as do a subset of genitive pronouns (§3.2.3). Like most other modifiers within the noun phrase, numerals agree with the nominal head in gender and number; however at the same time they determine the number feature of the head (§3.2.4).

### 3.2.1 Demonstratives

Demonstratives in Archi may be used as a modifier of a noun or as a third-person pronoun. When used as a modifier, they agree in gender and number with the lexical head of their noun phrase. When used as a pronoun, their gender and number marking is determined by the properties of their antecedent. There are five different demonstrative stems in Archi, with a primary distinction between proximal, medial and

---

<sup>2</sup> We remain neutral as to whether Archi should be analysed as having NPs or DPs within any given syntactic framework. For the purposes of description, we refer to all phrases with a noun as the lexical head as noun phrases.

distal forms; and a secondary two-way distinction between distal forms on a vertical axis. Their agreement forms are shown in Table 3.1. Agreement morphology distinguishes four genders in the singular, while no gender distinction is made in the plural, resulting in twenty different forms for the demonstrative series. Any of the demonstratives can be used pronominally, however, in practice the medial and distal forms are the most common.

**Table 3.1.** Archi demonstratives (based on Kibrik 1977a: 124)

	I SG	II SG	III SG	IV SG	PL
Proximal (close to speaker)	ju-w	ja-r	ja-b	ja-t	j-eb
Medial (close to addressee)	jamu(-w)	jamu-r	jamu-m	jamu-t	jem-im
Distal (far from speaker and addressee)	to-w	to-r	to-b	to-t	t-eb
Low distal (far and lower than speaker)	gud-u	god-or	god-ob	god-ot	gid-ib
High distal (far and higher than speaker)	ɣud-u	ɣod-or	ɣod-ob	ɣod-ot	ɣid-ib

Demonstratives precede the noun they modify. For instance, in (1) the medial demonstrative *jamut* ‘that’ precedes the head noun *č’emna* ‘time’ (which is in the locative case) and agrees with it in gender (IV) and number (SG). Note that if the demonstrative agreed with the absolutive argument of the clause it would have the form *jamur* ‘that’ (just as the verb agrees in gender (II) and number (SG) with the absolutive subject pronoun, which has a female referent):

- (1)   zon       t’i-ši           do-χo-qi   jamu-t   č’emna  
           1SG.ABS   be.small-CVB   II.SG-find-POT   that-IV.SG   time(IV).LOC  
           ‘I guess I was little at that time.’ (Sisters: 59)

When used in combination with other nominal modifiers, such as attributives, the demonstrative must precede them, as in (2a), where the medial demonstrative *jamu* ‘this’ precedes the attributive *ɣa<sup>h</sup>mat:u* ‘rich’ and the modified ergative head noun *bošormu* ‘man’. These modifiers may not be freely reordered, as demonstrated by the ungrammatical example in (2b) where the order of the demonstrative and the attributive has been inverted:

- (2)   a. jamu   ɣa<sup>h</sup>ma-t:u           bošor-mu   arsī                   kɔo-li  
           that[I.SG]   be.rich-ATTR[I.SG]   man(I)-SG.ERG   money(IV)[SG.ABS]   [IV.SG]give.PFV-EVID  
           ‘That rich man gave (him) money.’ (T1: 32)
- b. \*ɣa<sup>h</sup>ma-t:u       jamu   bošor-mu   arsī                   kɔo-li  
           be.rich-ATTR[I.SG]   that[I.SG]   man(I)-SG.ERG   money(IV)[SG.ABS]   [IV.SG]give.PFV-EVID  
           Intended: ‘That rich man gave (him) money.’ (based on T1: 32)

In both (1) and (2a), a non-absolutive head noun controls agreement on the demonstrative. In (1) the head is in the locative case, while in (2a) it is in the ergative case. While the demonstratives agree with the nominal head in gender and number, they do not themselves inflect for case when modifying a noun.

All of the different demonstrative stems behave in the same way in terms of their capacity for agreement. For instance, in (3), the proximal demonstrative *jat* ‘this’ agrees with the head noun *mač* ‘place’, which is in the IN localization case, while in (4), the low distal demonstrative *godor* ‘that below’ agrees with the head noun *ḥanna-k’i-š* ‘woman’, a gender II singular noun in the sub-relative case.

(3) ja-t        maždaj        buq’                b-a<r>ca-r-a?  
 this-IV.SG    place(IV).IN    corn(III)[SG.ABS]    III.SG-<IPFV>SOW-IPFV-QUEST  
 ‘Does one sow corn in such a place?’ (based on T2: 13)

(4) godo-r            ḥanna-k’i-š                nen<t>u                k’i-nč’ar-t’u-ra  
 that.below-II.SG    woman(II).SG.OBL-SUB-EL    1PL.INCL<1PL>[ABS]    be.afraid-NEG-QUEST  
 ‘Aren’t we afraid of that woman?’ (T13: 16)

Accounting for the agreement of demonstratives with the head of the noun phrase they modify will invoke the mechanisms usually employed in a given syntactic theory to account for (uncontroversial cases of) agreement within a noun phrase domain. This is typically achieved through an inherently directional checking mechanism (as in Minimalism where there is copying of feature values, discussed in §7.5.4) or a bi-directional constraint requiring certain features to have the same value (as in HPSG, discussed in §5.5.2).

In Minimalism, there is an architectural commitment to the domain in which an agreement relation holds. With demonstratives, which do not project an argument structure, the relevant domain for agreement is the DP, and agreement is established through FEATURE-CHECKING between the features of the noun and features of the demonstrative, itself projected as a DP within the functional projections of the NP. This is the position taken by Polinsky for Archi (see Chapter 7).

Within LFG, simple cases of syntactically determined agreement are generally defined in terms of F-STRUCTURE RELATIONS, rather than in terms of constituent structural relations. Agreement is dealt with by (defining or constraining) equations related to either CONCORD features (related to morphological features) or INDEX features (more related to semantic features). When internal to a noun phrase, agreement is typically treated as an instance of concord (rather than index) particularly when there is no ambiguity about the grammatical agreement features involved in the relation (Wechsler & Zlatić 2003, Dalrymple & Hristov 2010), and so is taken by Sadler as the default assumption for head-modifier agreement in Archi, as stated in §6.1.1.

In HPSG, where a distinction between concord features and index features is also made, agreement has generally been assumed to be resolved through SELECTION (e.g. a ‘selector’ selects a ‘selectee’ with a particular form). In such a view, a third person singular verb is one that *selects* a third person singular subject and in a sense it doesn’t

have any agreement features of its own. However, Borsley (§5.2) argues, following Kathol (1999), that agreement targets have their own features. Given that the selection role (as selector or selected) distinguishes different targets in Archi, there are consequently various possible ways of modelling agreement within HPSG. Agreement could be modelled using ARG-ST features that reflect the concord values of the controller or through a constraint on constituent structure (providing there is consistency in syntactic structure across targets) or through a constraint on order domains (see Borsley 2009 on the role of order domains in agreement in Welsh, and §5.4.2 for their relevance in Archi). We return to this issue in §3.2.2 when discussing attributives with more than one agreement controller.

As in many other languages, the Archi demonstratives can be used as third person pronouns as well as nominal modifiers. This is demonstrated in (5), where the cont-allative case marked *juwmirši* ‘him’ is pronominal in function.

- (5) ju-w-mi-r-ši                      bo-li                      un                      daki                      w-e:<sup>5</sup>-t’u  
       that-1.SG-SG.OBL-CONT-ALL    say.PFV-EVID    2SG.ABS    why    1.SG-come.POT.NEG-NEG  
       ‘(They) asked him, why you are not coming?’ (Mammadibir: 43)

When used in lieu of third person pronouns, demonstratives exhibit the same range of agreement forms as they do when used as (agreeing) adnominal modifiers. However, in such cases their form is determined by the gender and/or number of the (anaphoric) referent. An adequate theory of syntax must therefore be able to account for the distribution of the demonstratives within the noun phrase, including their agreement with the head they modify, but also which factors determine their form when used pronominally.

### 3.2.2 Attributives

Attributives in Archi are a ‘mixed category’ that simultaneously exhibits the syntactic and morphosyntactic properties of more than one lexical class (Bond and Chumakina, to appear). They have a unique ‘external’ distribution and agreement pattern that is distinct from that of any other lexical class. When attributives are used as pre-head modifiers within a noun phrase, they agree in number and gender with the nominal head of the phrase. When they appear as a predicative complement, their controller of agreement is the absolute argument of the clause. Here we focus on the properties of attributives when used as nominal modifiers, while their agreement properties in predicative complements (i.e. within the clausal agreement domain) will be discussed in §3.3.2.

The most striking characteristic of Archi attributives is their dual nature. In addition to their distinct external syntax, attributives clearly retain some of the inflectional and ‘internal’ syntactic characteristics of the base category from which they are transposed.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The term ‘transposed’ describes the end state of a morphological process whereby an (inflecting) lexical stem take on inflectional characteristics of another lexical category in addition to those of its base category. This process is category-transposing, rather than category-changing, because mixed categories of this kind are defined by their ability to simultaneously exhibit the properties of more than one syntactic category. Transpositional processes are not lexeme-creating and therefore more closely aligned to inflectional processes than derivational ones. For more on transposition, see Beard (1995), Haspelmath

For instance, attributives transposed from verbs resemble participles, and as such retain their verbal argument structure and can agree with the absolutive argument of their immediate clause in the same way that a regular verb would do (§3.3.1).

Attributives can be transposed from almost any part of speech, including nouns, pronouns, dynamic verbs, stative verbs, adverbs and postpositions. They are formed through the addition of the suffix *-t:u* (with the allomorphs *-du*, *-nnu* and an irregular realization *-u*) to an inflected or uninflected base. The attributivizing suffix is then followed by an agreement suffix from the forms in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2** Gender and number agreement suffixes on attributives

GENDER	ASSIGNMENT	NUMBER	
		SG	PL
I	male human	(-w)	-ib
II	female human	-r	
III	some animates, all insects, some inanimates	-b	
IV	some animates, some inanimates, abstracts	-t	

The five possible agreement forms of the attributive *mu-t:u* ‘beautiful’ transposed from the stative verb *mu* ‘be beautiful’ are exemplified in (6a-e).

- (6)
- a. *mu-t:u*                      *bošor*  
     *be.beautiful-ATTR[I.SG]*    *man(I)[SG.ABS]*  
     ‘handsome man’
  - b. *mu-t:u-r*                    *ł:onnol*  
     *be.beautiful-ATTR-II.SG*   *woman(II)[SG.ABS]*  
     ‘beautiful woman’
  - c. *mu-t:u-b*                    *noš*  
     *be.beautiful-ATTR-III.SG*   *horse(III)[SG.ABS]*  
     ‘beautiful horse’
  - d. *mu-t:u-t*                    *nokł*  
     *be.beautiful-ATTR-IV.SG*   *house(IV)[SG.ABS]*  
     ‘beautiful house’
  - e. *mu-t:-ib*                    *lo-bur*  
     *be.beautiful-ATTR-PL*      *child(IV)-PL.ABS*  
     ‘beautiful children’

As Table 3.2 and the examples in (6) demonstrate, the agreement exponents of attributives are similar to the agreement exponents of demonstratives. However, there are some notable differences. For instance, gender I singular attributives only have an overt *-w* suffix in the final position when followed by =u ‘and’ or a vowel initial word, whereas some gender I singular demonstratives always end in *-w* regardless of their

---

(1996), Spencer (1999, 2013) and Blevins (2001).

phonological environment (recall the gender I proximal demonstrative *juw* ‘this’ and the distal demonstrative *tuw* ‘that’ from Table 3.1). Furthermore, in the attributive agreement paradigm, there is only one plural suffix *-ib*, while the demonstratives have either *-eb*, *-ib* or *-im*. Despite these differences, the structure of the paradigm is the same for both types of agreement; there are four genders distinguished in the singular and just one form for the plural.

Like the demonstratives discussed in §3.2.1, attributives agree with the noun they modify regardless of that noun’s grammatical role or case marking, and all attributives within the noun phrase agree at least with the head that is modified, regardless of the base category of the attributive. For instance, there are two attributives in (7), *terst:ur* ‘stubborn’ and *š:ut:at:ut* ‘tomorrow’s’, and they each agree with the nominal head of their NP. The first, transposed from a stative verb, agrees with a gender II absolutive noun *ḥ:onnol* ‘woman’, the second, transposed from a noun agrees with a gender IV noun *oqlit* ‘wedding’ which is in the super locationalization case

- (7)    *ters-t:u-r*                      *ḥ:onnol*                      *š:ut:a-t:u-t*                      *oq-li-t*  
          be.stubborn-ATTR-II.SG    woman(II)[SG.ABS]    tomorrow-ATTR-IV.SG    wedding(IV)-SG.OBL-SUP  
          *d-e:ˀ-t’u*  
          II.SG-go.POT-NEG  
          ‘A stubborn woman is not going to the wedding tomorrow.’

Examples like this point to a theoretical analysis of attributives in which the noun-phrase internal agreement patterns could be accounted for in a similar way to agreement between modifying demonstratives and their lexical head. These might include reference to the theoretical notion of *Agree* in Minimalism (although this is rejected in the Minimalist analysis presented in §7.5.3 because attributive expressions are treated as left-adjoined to their head). In LFG they might involve equations defining or constraining f-structures or AGR features in HPSG. The challenge Archi attributives present for syntactic theory is evident when they exhibit multiple agreement patterns with distinct controllers in distinct domains. For instance, attributives transposed from verbs retain characteristics of their base category including aspectual characteristics, argument structure and agreement (of the verb) with its absolutive argument (see Bond & Chumakina, to appear, for a detailed analysis). At the same time, they will also agree with the noun they modify. For instance in (8), the attributive formed from the transitive verb ‘buy’ agrees with its gender III singular absolutive object, *č’an* ‘sheep’, but also agrees with the gender IV singular head that the attributive phrase modifies, namely ‘time’.

- (8)    *ḥali-mu*                      *č’an*                      *be-šde-t:u-t*                      *safat*  
          Ali(I)-SG.ERG    sheep(III)[SG.ABS]    III.SG-buy.PFV-ATTR-IV.SG    time(IV)[SG.ABS]  
          ‘the time when Ali bought a sheep’

Attributives produced from verbs are therefore of particular interest from the perspective of syntactic theory because they may act as the target for agreement for multiple controllers in different syntactic domains. Consider the differences between the transitive clause in (9) and the attributivized verb in (10). In (9), the verb *barcar*

'milk' agrees in gender (III) and number (SG) with the absolutive argument of the clause,  $\chi^{\text{on}}$  'cow'.

- (9) laha                     $\chi^{\text{on}}$                     b-a<r>ca-r  
 child(II).SG.ERG    cow(III)[SG.ABS]    III.SG-<IPFV>milk-IPFV  
 'The girl milks the cow.'

An attributive produced from an agreeing dynamic verb such as *barcar* 'milk' will have two controllers: the absolutive argument of the source verb's own verb phrase and the nominal head modified by the attributive. When the absolutive argument of a transitive verb is not co-referential with the head of the modified noun, the attributive form has two different controllers for its two agreement realizations. In (10), the attributive *barcart:ur* transposed from the inflected base form *barcar* 'milk' preserves prefixal agreement with its gender III absolutive argument  $\chi^{\text{on}}$  'cow' yet also agrees with the nominal head of the relative clause *lo* 'girl' through the realization of the gender II singular suffix *-r*.<sup>4</sup>

- (10)  $\chi^{\text{on}}$                     b-a<r>ca-r-t:u-r                    lo  
 cow(III)[SG.ABS]    III.SG-<IPFV>milk-IPFV-ATTR-II.SG    child(II)[SG.ABS]  
 'the girl who is milking the cow'

Attributives transposed from verbs are equivalent to participles in other Daghestanian languages in which it is typical to have a wide range of participles formed from various verbal stems. They can function as noun phrase modifiers, complements of the copula and heads of relative clauses. Despite their similarity to participles, we describe these forms as attributives because the suffix *-t:u* produces attributive forms from a wide variety of morphological bases – not just verb forms. Consequently, the theoretical analysis of such forms must take into account both the inflectional and distributional properties of the base form as well as inflectional and distributional properties of the transposed attributive itself.

Just as dynamic verbs, stative verbs and nouns may serve as a base for transposition; attributives can also be transposed from postpositions. In (11), the attributive suffix *-t:u* attaches to the postposition  $\chi ir$  'behind' which heads the postpositional phrase *iškollis  $\chi ir$*  'behind the school'. This postposition also governs the dative case on its object, and in doing so the attributive retains the government and argument structure of its base. However, the attributivized postposition also exhibits properties associated with all members of the class of attributives in that it agrees with the gender IV noun *nokʔ* 'house'.

- (11) iškol-li-s                     $\chi ir$ -t:u-t                    nokʔ                    ak:u-ra?  
 school(IV)-SG.OBL-DAT    behind-ATTR-IV.SG    house(IV)[SG.ABS]    [IV.SG]see.PFV-QUEST  
 'Do (you) see the house (that is) behind the school?'

A further complication to the analysis of attributives within a given syntactic framework

<sup>4</sup> Coincidentally, *-r* appears twice within the attributive – once marking imperfective aspect, and then again as an exponent of agreement.

is their ability to be used as a modifier without an overt head to modify. In such instances, a noun may be marked with a non-core case, attributivized, and then marked by the full range of cases (see §2.4.1 for an overview of case in Archi). For instance, the attributive in (12) is derived from the inter-relative case form of the noun *ha<sup>ʔ</sup>təra* ‘river’, and is used without a nominal head. The attributive agrees in gender IV singular with a covert referent, a little child, which in Archi is denoted by the gender IV noun *lo* ‘child’. The verb *da:<sup>ʔ</sup>zɛχ:as* ‘fall on (by destiny)’ takes absolutive and dative arguments: in (12) the headless attributive functions as the absolutive argument but given that absolutive is the morphologically unmarked case, this is not apparent in the form of the attributive itself in (12). Consider, instead, (13), where a case-marked noun is attributivized and then case marked again as the dative object of the postposition *χarak* ‘behind’.

- (12) *ha<sup>ʔ</sup>tər-če-q<sup>ʔ</sup>-aš-du-t*                      *duχ:<sup>ʔ</sup>a-n*                      *hal-mu-s*  
river(IV)-SG.OBL-INTER-EL-ATTR-IV.SG[ABS]    mill(IV).SG.OBL-GEN    master(I)-SG.OBL-DAT  
*da:<sup>ʔ</sup>zɛχ:u-li*  
[IV.SG]fall.on.PFV-EVID  
‘The one from the river fell on the miller.’ (Kibrik et al. 1977b: 56)

- (13) *doš-mi-s-du-m-mi-s*                      *χarak*    *is*                      *i*  
sister(II)-SG.OBL-DAT-ATTR-IV.SG-SG.OBL-DAT    behind    [IV.SG]1SG.GEN    [IV.SG]be.PRS  
‘Mine [my chest for dowry] is behind the one that is for my sister.’

Structures of this kind are challenging for the resources of a syntactic theory in terms of domains, but also the way in which morphological exponence is constrained. In theories that acknowledge a distinct morphological component of grammar, this will partly be achieved in syntax and partly in morphology. In theories of syntax that handle morphological structure using similar principles as syntax, the problems posed here will be treated purely syntactic in nature.

### 3.2.3 Genitive nouns and pronouns

Nouns in Archi can be modified by another noun or pronoun, providing the modifier occurs in the genitive case. Genitive nouns or pronouns occurring as nominal modifiers precede the head of the phrase, and typically indicate either a possessor or the substance from which an entity is formed. For instance, in (14), the genitive marked kinship term *buwan* ‘mother’ is the possessor of the modified noun *χ<sup>ʔ</sup>on* ‘cow’. In (15), the genitive noun *nibqin* ‘tear’ modifies the absolutive head *go<sup>ʔ</sup>ro<sup>ʔ</sup>tu* ‘balls’ and indicates the substance of the modified noun.

- (14) *buwa-n*                      *χ<sup>ʔ</sup>on*  
mother(II)[SG]-GEN    cow(III)[SG.ABS]  
‘mother’s cow’



**Table 3.3.** Genitive forms of first- and second-person pronouns

GENDER	1 <sup>ST</sup> PERSON						2 <sup>ND</sup> PERSON	
	SG		PL				SG	PL
			INCL		EXCL			
	<i>SG</i>	<i>PL</i>	<i>SG</i>	<i>PL</i>	<i>SG</i>	<i>PL</i>		
<i>I</i>	w-is	b-is	la<w>u	la<b>u	ulu	b-olo	wit	wiš
<i>II</i>	d-is		la<r>u		d-olo			
<i>III</i>	b-is	is	la<b>u	la<t'>u	b-olo	olo		
<i>IV</i>	is		la<t'>u		olo			

The pronominal base realizes inherent features, i.e. person and number of the referent of the pronoun. The gender and number features realized through affixation on the pronoun show contextual features, i.e. the features determined by the controller of the agreeing pronoun. Italics are used for the labels of contextual feature values in Table 3.3.

Third person pronouns built from genitive case-marked demonstratives do not agree with the head they modify. In a sense, they exhibit different behaviour from the demonstratives discussed in §3.2.1. Like the second-person pronouns, third-person genitive pronouns only realize inherent properties of their referent, but distinguish between referents with different genders.

- (18) a. jamu-m-mi-n      ušdu  
           that-I.SG-SG.OBL-GEN brother(I)[SG.ABS]  
           ‘his brother’
- b. jamu-r-mi-n      ušdu  
           that-II.SG-SG.OBL-GEN brother(I)[SG.ABS]  
           ‘her brother’
- c. jamu-m-mi-n      ušdu  
           that-III.SG-SG.OBL-GEN brother(I)[SG.ABS]  
           ‘its brother’
- d. jamu-t-mi-n      ušdu  
           that-IV.SG-SG.OBL-GEN brother(I)[SG.ABS]  
           ‘its brother’
- e. jemim-me-n      ušdu  
           that.IV.PL-PL.OBL-GEN brother(I)[SG.ABS]  
           ‘their brother’

As with the problem of multiple controllers discussed in 3.2.2, an adequate theory of syntax must be able to differentiate between the ‘referential’ number of the pronoun and the ‘concordial’ agreement in number and gender controlled by the nominal head of the phrase.

### 3.2.4 Numerals

Numerals modifying nouns present an especially interesting agreement relation in Archi due to the interaction of two syntactic constraints. Firstly, a generalizable principle of Archi morpho-syntax, namely that agreement is controlled by the lexical head within the noun phrase agreement domain, ensures that numerals agree in gender and number with the noun they modify. Secondly, a government-like requirement



The grammatical ‘singularity’ of the noun phrase is also apparent in the clausal agreement domain, where the noun modified by a numeral normally controls singular agreement on the verb. This pattern of verb agreement was exemplified in (20). However, alternative patterns are attested in which agreement is semantic, rather than syntactic in nature (see §4.2 for discussion of this distinction, and §8.2.1 for its importance in diagnosing the maximal agreement domain). For instance, in (22), which is the standard opening line for an Archi story, there are two forms of the verb ‘to be’, an affirmative form and a negative form. Agreement on both of these targets is controlled by the same absolutive noun phrase *ɬibaw kulu lo* ‘three orphan lads’. Since there is a numeral modifying the head noun, *lo* ‘lad’ is necessarily in its singular form. Its singular feature specification is also responsible for the singular agreement on the numeral *ɬibaw* ‘three’ and singular agreement on the two forms of the verb ‘be’.

- (22) *os i<w>di-li i<w>di-t'u ɬiba-w kulu lo*  
 one <I.SG>be.PST-EVID <I.SG>be.PST-NEG three-I.SG orphan child(I)[SG.ABS]  
 ‘Once upon a time there were three orphan boys.’ (lit. ‘There was or there was not...’, the standard beginning of a tale) (T2: 1)

However, when the noun referent is human, the verb can alternatively agree in accordance with the plural semantics of the noun phrase, such that a semantically plural noun phrase will control plural agreement on the verb, as in (23).<sup>5</sup> Thus, while (22) is an example of grammatical agreement, (23) is an example of semantic agreement.

- (23) *os e<b>di-li e<b>di-t'u ɬiba-w kulu lo*  
 one <I/II.PL>be.PST-EVID <I/II.PL>be.PST-NEG three-I.SG orphan child(I)[SG.ABS]  
 ‘Once upon a time there were three orphan boys.’

Semantic plural agreement is only allowed on the verb, that is, in the clausal agreement domain. Noun modifiers must agree with the noun in the singular. For instance, in (24) the verbal complex *abč'uli obsdili* ‘have hid’ shows semantic agreement in the plural with the numeral phrase *juw os:u q'w<sup>f</sup>ewu c'ohor* ‘these two other thieves’. The noun *c'ohor* ‘thief’ occurs in its singular form (as required by the numeral) and controls the agreement in gender (I) and number (SG) of its two modifiers *juw* ‘this’ and *os:u* ‘other’.

- (24) *ju-w os:u q'w<sup>f</sup>e<w>u c'ohor a<b>č'u-li o<b>s-di-li*  
 this-I.SG other.I.SG two<I.SG> thief(I)[SG.ABS] <I/II.PL>hide.PFV-CVB <I/II.PL>stand-PFV-EVID  
 ‘These two other thieves have hidden (themselves).’ (T26: 10)

This is the only agreement possibility for the modifiers and no semantic agreement is allowed in the noun phrase. Such a situation is not surprising from a typological perspective since semantic agreement within the NP domain is less expected than with

<sup>5</sup> The singular verb form in (22) represents the text as it was transcribed for the collection of Archi texts published in 1977 (Kibrik et al, 1977b). However, when readings of these texts were recorded in 2005, a variant presented in (23) was obtained: the speaker was reading the text and spontaneously changed the verb form into plural. Chumakina then discussed the example in (23) with 12 other speakers, and all confirmed its grammaticality.

the predicate (Corbett 2006: 225). However, from a theoretical perspective, semantic agreement poses a potential problem in that it is necessary for a syntactic framework to account for the limitations on this phenomenon, including the fact that the domains of agreement exhibit different behaviour in this regard.

### 3.3 Agreement in the clause

The rule underlying agreement in the clausal domain is straightforward: targets must agree with the absolutive argument of a clause. Absolutive case forms in Archi encode the only argument of an intransitive verb (S) and the patient-like argument of a transitive verb (P). The agent-like argument of a transitive verb (A) occurs in the ergative case in transitive constructions. There is also a group of verbs denoting emotion and perception, which take a dative subject and an absolutive object; these are known as affective constructions (see §2.4.1). A clause can typically have only one absolutive argument. There are two exceptions to this generalization, namely (i) the special biabsolutive construction, discussed in detail in §4.3, §5.4.2 (in HPSG), §6.4 (in LFG) and §7.3.2.2 (in Minimalism), and (ii) clauses containing nominal predicates, where the predicate comprises a noun in the absolutive case and a copula. In the latter case, agreement may be with the subject absolutive, or the complement absolutive, as in (25). While in (25a) the copula agrees in gender and number with the gender II singular subject *tor* ‘her’, in (25b) it agrees with the gender III singular complement *halhaʁdub č’an* ‘real sheep’. See §4.3.4 for more on the differences between biabsolutives and nominal predicates.

- (25) a. to-r            ħajwan            d-i  
           that-II.SG[ABS]    animal(III)[SG.ABS]    II.SG-be.PRS  
           ‘She’s an animal.’ (pejorative)
- b. to-r            halhaʁ-du-b    č’an            b-i  
           that-II.SG[ABS]    real-ATTR-III.SG    sheep(III)[SG.ABS]    III.SG-be.PRS  
           ‘She is very stupid.’ (lit. ‘She is a real sheep.’)

The agreement rules of Archi pattern with case, not according to the subject and object distinction, and therefore we must dissociate case from these syntactic functions. This is familiar from analyses of other morphologically ergative languages and different syntactic approaches have worked out various mechanism for this situation (see, among others, Legate 2008 and Bobaljik 2008 for generative approaches to ergativity, Manning & Sag 1998 for an HPSG analysis, and Butt 2008 for an introduction to LFG approaches to case).

In analyses of this kind, the Minimalist approach treats the absolutive case as the only structural case in the grammatical system (as opposed to lexical and inherent cases). Structural cases are assigned by functional heads T or v, whereas inherent cases such as ergative and dative are assigned by local heads and are invisible to verbal agreement. Polinsky proposes that for Archi, structural cases are assigned by v (see §7.3.2.2).

In HPSG the constraints on agreement are also formulated without the reference to the grammatical function of an argument; the agreement controller is whatever element is

marked with absolutive case. Discussing clausal agreement in Archi, Borsley assumes that the gender-number form of the verb is not directly determined by the absolutive, but that verbs that have an absolutive sister have an ARG-C (i.e. AGR-CLAUSAL) feature whose value is the same as the index of the absolutive argument and that this feature determines the form of the verb (see §5.4.2).

The LFG approach described by Sadler (Chapter 6) differs from the previous two in that the agreement must be defined in terms of f-structure relations. Therefore the agreement rules for intransitive and transitive verbs are different: the former agree with their subjects, the latter with their objects.

While an important issue to be resolved in any theoretical account, the agreement relation between a verb and the absolutive is not the only interesting agreement pattern in Archi. What makes Archi particularly noteworthy is the diversity of targets that have the potential for agreement. In the clause, it is not just verbs that agree, but also pronouns, adverbs, a single postposition and an emphatic clitic. These targets are now discussed in turn.

### 3.3.1 Verbs

Finiteness is a complex notion involving a set of criteria which usually, but not always, form bundles of characteristics associated with verb forms (Nikolaeva 2012). The ability to head independent clauses and the presence of agreement are often listed among the definitive properties of finite forms. However, in Nakh-Daghestanian languages verbal forms which fulfil the functions associated with non-finite forms in many other languages (participial, adverbial and verbal noun functions) and which cannot head independent clauses, normally agree with an absolutive controller. For Archi, we take the ability to head an independent clause to be the main property of the finite forms and discuss the agreement in main clauses first. Then in §3.3.1.2, we turn to agreement in non-finite forms, i.e. forms which cannot function as independent predicates but nevertheless agree.

#### 3.3.1.1 Finite verb forms

In intransitive main clauses, agreement is controlled by the single argument of the clause, which occurs in the absolutive case. In such instances, the form of an agreeing target is determined by the gender and number of the subject, as in (26), where the gender II singular noun *buwa* ‘mother’ controls prefixal agreement on the verb *daq<sup>ʃ</sup>a* ‘come’.

- (26) *buwa*                      *ari-li-t:i-š*                      *da-q<sup>ʃ</sup>a*  
 mother(II)[SG.ABS]    work(IV)-SG.OBL-SUP-EL    II.SG-come.PFV  
 ‘Mother came (home) from work.’

When the verb in an intransitive clause has a pronominal subject, agreement is controlled by the gender and number of the personal pronoun. Gender agreement is determined by the gender of the pronoun’s referent. Thus, the first-person singular

pronoun *zon* can refer to a woman, as in (27a), or to a man, as in (27b), and agreement on the verb form reflects this difference.

- (27) a. *zon iškol-l-a d-irχ<sup>w</sup>in*  
 1SG.ABS school(III)-SG.OBL-IN II.SG-work.IPFV  
 ‘I work at the school.’ (female speaking)
- b. *zon iškol-l-a w-irχ<sup>w</sup>in*  
 1SG.ABS school(III)-SG.OBL-IN I.SG-work.IPFV  
 ‘I work at the school.’ (male speaking)

The head of the absolutive argument controls agreement, independently of the semantics of the argument. Some agentive arguments controlling agreement were provided in (27); experiencer subjects have the same possibilities of agreement control as agentive ones, as illustrated in (28).

- (28) *došdur χ<sup>e</sup> e<r>t:i-li*  
 sister(II)[SG.ABS] cold <II.SG>become.PFV-EVID  
 ‘Sister got cold.’

Most transitive verbs take ergative and absolutive arguments, as in (29). In each case, the absolutive argument of the verb controls agreement:

- (29) *zari nošš darc'-li-r-ši e<b>t'ni*  
 1SG.ERG horse(III)[SG.ABS] post-SG.OBL-CONT-ALL <III.SG>tie.PFV  
 ‘I tied the horse to the post.’

The absolutive argument of a verb does not have to be overtly expressed to control agreement. The verb *t'alaru-li* ‘send’ used in the example (30) has two arguments, an agentive sender in the subject function, and a theme-like entity functioning as an object. In (30), the subject, *nokʔat:ib dijat:aj* ‘elders’ is expressed in the ergative case, and although the object is omitted it nevertheless controls the agreement on the verb and can be easily retrieved from context.

- (30) *nokʔ-a-t:ib dija-t:aj t'ala<r>u-li*  
 house(IV)[SG]-IN-ATTR-PL father(I)-PL.ERG <II.SG> send.PFV-EVID  
 ‘Elders (lit. house fathers) sent (her).’

Verbs of perception, cognition and emotion differ from regular transitive verbs in that their subject is an experiencer in the dative case, while their object is a stimulus in the absolutive case. In (31) the experiencer subject is *towmis* ‘he’ while the stimulus object is an absolutive argument *Aisha* (a girl’s name). The absolutive object, not the dative subject, controls prefixal agreement in gender and number on the verb *dak:u* ‘saw’.

- (31) to-w-mi-s            Ajša            d-ak:u  
 that-I.SG-SG.OBL-DAT    Aisha(II)[SG.ABS]    II.SG-see.PFV  
 ‘He has seen Aisha.’

The stimulus object can also be covert, as in (32), where the omitted argument controls agreement on the two verbs in a mini-dialog.

- (32) d-oχo-ra?            d-oχo-t’u  
 II.SG-find.PFV-QUEST    II.SG-find.PFV-NEG  
 ‘Did you find (her)? – No, I did not.’

Finally, the typically intransitive verb ‘be’ can be used as a verb of possession. In such constructions, the possessor occurs in the genitive case and verbal agreement is controlled by the absolutive argument (the possessed entity), as in (33).<sup>6</sup>

- (33) buwa-n            duχriq<sup>s</sup>            χ<sup>s</sup>on            b-i  
 mother(II)[SG]-GEN    village(IV)[SG].IN    cow(III)[SG.ABS]    III.SG-be.PRS  
 ‘Mother has a cow in the village.’

These data demonstrate that regardless of the specific facts of the construction, it is always the absolutive argument (S/P) which controls agreement on finite verb targets.

### 3.3.1.2 Non-finite verb forms

Non-finite verbal forms in Archi include finalis forms (i.e. agreeing infinitives), converbs, masdars and attributives (which can be formed from various parts of speech, including verbs, see §3.2.2). None of these forms can function as independent predicates and all of them agree with their absolutive arguments, providing that the verbal lexeme has the potential to agree. Basic morphological properties of non-finite verbs are set out in §2.5.2; here we examine their behaviour in relation to agreement within their syntactic context.

The contexts requiring the usage of the finalis are very similar to those in which infinitives are used in European languages. Thus, matrix verbs such as *kʔan* ‘want’, *bijeʔas* ‘begin’ take a phrase headed by a finalis form as their complement. As is the case with many European infinitives, the finalis can also be used to express purpose. The finalis form *abčas* ‘to kill’ heads the dependent purposive clause in (34) and agrees with the absolutive argument of that clause, *jeb* ‘them’.

- (34) k<sup>w</sup>i            χuw:t:i            j-eb            a<b>ča-s  
 who.ABS            [I.SG]go.POT    this-PL[ABS]    <I/II.PL>kill-FIN  
 ‘Who will go to kill them?’

<sup>6</sup> See §3.3.3 for discussion of the syntactic status of the genitive form in possessive constructions.

Converbs head dependent clauses with various temporal-aspectual meanings, as well as conditional, concessive and causal ones (see §2.5.2). Most Archi converbs can have their own arguments that are not co-referential with the arguments of the main verb, though in actual use, there is normally some sharing of the arguments between main and dependent clauses. Converbs are also used as the complement of the copula to form periphrastic tenses. In both of these functions, the converb agrees with its absolutive argument. Thus in (35), the converb *arχuli* ‘having lain down’ heads the temporal dependent clause *jamum pormalit a<r>χuli* ‘(after) having lain down in this way’. Its absolutive argument is covert and in this particular sentence, co-referential with the absolutive argument of the main clause, *zon* ‘I’. The converb agrees with its covert absolutive argument in gender (II) and number (SG) by the infix <r>, indicating that the referent of the pronominal is female.

- (35)    jamu-m    porma-li-t            a<r>χu-li            e<r>χ:u            zon  
           this-III.SG    form(III)-SG.OBL-SUP    <II.SG>lie.down.PFV-CVB    <II.SG>remain.PFV    1SG.ABS  
           ‘Having lain down in this way, I stayed (there).’

Example (36) shows a converb *uwšaw* which heads the concessive clause *han uwšaw* ‘no matter what I did’ and agrees in gender and number with the absolutive *han* ‘what’. Here, the ergative subject of the clause is covert.

- (36)    han                    uw-šaw                    č’olla-ši    a<r>ti-t’u  
           what(IV)[SG.ABS]    [IV.SG]do.PFV-CONC    outside-ALL    <II.SG>let.go.PFV-NEG  
           ‘No matter what (I) did, (they) did not let me out.’ (Sisters: 20)

Masdars head non-finite clauses selected by certain matrix verbs such as *sini* ‘know’. Like other heads of dependent clauses, these non-finite forms also agree with their absolutive argument. In (37) the verbal noun *dak<sup>w</sup>mul* ‘seeing’ agrees with the gender II absolutive argument ‘Aisha’.

- (37)    was            Ajša                    d-ak<sup>w</sup>-mul            tu-w-mi-s            sini  
           2SG.DAT    Aisha(II)[SG.ABS]    II.SG-see-MSD(IV)    that-I.SG-SG.OBL-DAT    know  
           ‘He knows that you saw Aisha.’

The verbal noun itself, as with all verbal nouns, belongs to gender IV and the whole clause headed by it functions as the complement of the main verb. We do not, however, see agreement with the masdar on the matrix verb *sini* ‘know’ because this is a non-agreeing verb that is invariant in form.

The verbal forms functioning as nominal modifiers and heading relative clauses belong to the wider class of attributives (already discussed in detail in §3.2.2 and §3.3.2). In the nominal domain attributives agree with the head they modify through suffixation. Verbal attributives, i.e. those formed from a verbal base, retain their argument structure and agree with their absolutive argument, which is realized by a prefix or an infix. If the absolutive of the verb is not co-referential with the head of the attributive, the attributive will have two different controllers. Thus in (38) the attributive *kunnet’ut:ur* is based on the verb *kummus* ‘eat’. The prefixal realization of agreement is controlled by

the absolutive object of the base verb, the gender IV singular noun *kummul* ‘food’. The suffixal exponent agrees with the (covert) head, the woman described in this text.<sup>7</sup>

- (38)    *lagi*                      *a:c'a-l-kan*              *kummul=u*              *kunne-t'u-t:u-r*  
           stomach(IV)[SG.ABS]    [IV.SG]fill-FIN-TEMP    food(IV)[SG.ABS]=and    [IV.SG]eat.PFV-NEG-ATTR-II.SG  
           ‘(who) never ate to the full’ (= ‘didn’t eat food until (her) stomach fills up.’)

Attributives in particular raise a number of issues surrounding the ways in which theories must deal with mixed categories that exhibit properties of more than one part of speech simultaneously, including the contextual inflection of two different syntactic categories.

### 3.3.2 Attributives as predicative complements

When used as predicative complements, attributives combine with the copula *i* ‘be’ agreeing with the absolutive of the clause, as (39) shows.

- (39)    *aχbəzan*                      *naʕg-du-b*                      *e<b>di*  
           apricot(III)[SG.ABS]    be.unripe-ATTR-III.SG    <III.SG>be.PST  
           ‘The apricot was unripe.’

Often, the attributive precedes the copula but other orders are also possible as demonstrated by (40) and (41). In (40) the attributive *mut:ur* ‘beautiful’ occurs at the end of the clause and is separated from the copula *erdi* ‘was’ by a modifier.

- (40)    *os lo*                      *e<r>di*                      *ʁanak lap mu-t:u-r*  
           one child(II)[SG.ABS]    <II.SG>be.PST    up.there very be.beautiful-ATTR-II.SG  
           ‘There was one girl in the upper part of Archi village, a very beautiful (girl).’  
           (T1: 6)

In (41) the attributive *t'it:ur* ‘little’ is at the beginning of the clause and is again separated from the copula *erdi* ‘was’, this time by the subject pronoun.

- (41)    *t'i-t:u-r*                      *zon*                      *e<r>di*  
           be.little-ATTR-II.SG    1SG.ABS    <II.SG>be.PST  
           ‘I was little then.’

Thus, the behaviour of the attributive functioning as a predicative complement is like that of a finite verb in intransitive predicates. Like a finite lexical verb, the predicative attributive agrees with the absolutive subject of the clause. It also demonstrates a similar degree of freedom in terms of word order as a finite verb has, and can be reordered independently of the copula.

### 3.3.3 Pronouns

We have already seen in §3.2.3 that within a noun phrase, first person pronouns in the

<sup>7</sup> This example is taken from a mourning song about a woman called Patimat.

genitive case have the potential to agree with the gender and number of the possessed noun. Here we show that agreement on pronouns is also found in the clausal domain.

There are two different types of pronouns that have the potential to agree in number and gender with the absolutive argument in the clausal domain: (i) a subset of first person genitive, dative and ergative personal pronouns and (ii) the reflexive pronouns, themselves built from a set of logophoric pronouns.

Here, we exclude from discussion third person pronouns which are based on the demonstratives and realize the gender of their antecedent (§3.2.1); instead we are interested in a strictly morphosyntactic operation controlled by an absolutive argument within the same clause as the target.

Typologically, Archi presents a highly unusual picture with respect to agreeing personal pronouns; in addition to genitives, dative case forms of the first person pronoun and the ergative case form of the first person plural inclusive pronoun serve as targets for agreement.

**Table 3.4** The agreeing forms of personal pronouns

		1 <sup>ST</sup> PERSON						2 <sup>ND</sup> PERSON	
		SG		PL				SG	PL
				INCL		EXCL			
ABSOLUTIVE		zon		nent'u				un	ž <sup>w</sup> en
ERGATIVE	GENDER	zari		SG	PL	nen			
	I			nena-w	nena<b>u				
	II			nena<r>u	nen<t'>u				
	III			nena<b>u					
IV	nen<t'>u								
GENITIVE	GENDER	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL	wit	wiš
	I	w-is	b-is	ulu	b-olo	la<w>u	la<b>u		
	II	d-is		d-olo		la<r>u			
	III	b-is	is	b-olo	olo	la<b>u	la<t'>u		
	IV	is		olo		la<t'>u			
DATIVE	GENDER	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL	was	wež
	I	w-ez	b-ez	w-el	b-el	w-ela-w	b-ela<b>u		
	II	d-ez		d-el		d-ela<r>u			
	III	b-ez	ez	b-el	el	b-ela<b>u	el<t'>u		
IV	ez	el		el<t'>u					
COMITATIVE		za-ł:u		la-ł:u				wa-ł:u	ž <sup>w</sup> a-ł:u
SIMILATIVE		za-q <sup>ɬ</sup> di		la-q <sup>ɬ</sup> di				wa-q <sup>ɬ</sup> di	ž <sup>w</sup> a-q <sup>ɬ</sup> di

Throughout the literature on agreement, arguments have been presented that datives can function as agreement *controllers* in languages such as Basque, Itelmen and

Georgian (see among others Rezac 2008) but not as agreement *targets*. Likewise, the ergative case form serving as an agreement target seems typologically very odd. Archi, however, presents clear evidence for this unusual agreement relation. Table 3.4. provides a partial paradigm of the Archi personal pronouns (it covers only some oblique cases), but it includes all the case forms which show agreement. Feature value labels in italics indicate contextual feature values determined through agreement. See §5.4.3 (HPSG), §6.2.4 and §6.3.1 (LFG) and Polinsky, Radkevich & Chumakina (to appear) for accounts of the issues that arise through pronominal agreement with the absolutive argument.

Shaded areas show the cells of the personal pronoun paradigm which contain the agreeing forms; all these agree with the absolutive argument of the clause. The first person pronoun has agreeing forms the six different cells: genitive and dative singular, genitive and dative plural inclusive and genitive and dative plural exclusive. In addition, the first person plural inclusive has agreeing forms in the ergative. The absolutive form of this pronoun has only one form *nent'u* (this form is determined by the person feature, see Corbett 2012: 239-251 for more details). The forms of second person pronoun, and the forms of the absolutive, comitative and simulative cases do not agree and are given for comparison.

We start our discussion from the top of Table 3.4. The first agreeing case-form is the ergative of the first person plural inclusive pronoun. In (42) the gender III noun *pəlow* 'pilaw', the object of the verb 'eat', controls the agreement in the modifier *jab* 'this', in the verb *bukne:t'u* 'will not eat', and in the subject of the clause, the ergative *nenabu* 'we'.

(42) ja-b      pəlow                  nena<b>u                  bu-kne:-t'u  
           this-III.SG pilaw(III)[SG.ABS] 1PL.INCL.ERG<III.SG> III.SG-eat.POT.NEG-NEG  
           'We will not eat this pilaw.' (based on T9: 17)

In (43) the gender III singular noun *ʃummar* 'life' controls the agreement on the verb *barčar* 'carry out, spend', and in the pronominal *nenabu* 'we'.

(43) nena<b>u                  hanžugur      ʃummar                  b-a<r>ča-r?  
           1PL.INCL.ERG<III.SG> how                  life(III)[SG.ABS] III.SG-<IPFV>carry.out-IPFV  
           '...how (should) we spend our life?' (T3: 4)

Agreeing ergative pronouns are challenging given two related facts: on the one hand, the phrase headed by an ergative case form has some properties of a subject (see §2.4.3), and therefore can be conceived as having syntactic dominance over the absolutive. Yet the absolutive controls the agreement of the ergative target, suggesting that dominance relations alone cannot account for this morphosyntactic pattern.

The data presented here demonstrate that agreement in Archi cannot be described solely in terms of syntactic role, case or lexical class. A situation where only a certain lexical class shows agreement in a specific syntactic position is familiar from Welsh (Borsley 2009) where only subjects expressed by pronouns agree. In explaining Archi pronominal agreement, however we cannot say that it is the (transitive) subject expressed by a pronoun that agrees, nor that the ergative of a personal pronoun agrees,

but rather that the target is the ergative form within a plural inclusive sub-paradigm of a specific pronoun. In other words, the agreement targets a specific cell in a morphological paradigm of the first person pronoun.

Next, we turn to pronouns that occur in the genitive case. We have already seen that when a genitive pronoun is used as a modifier, it agrees with the noun it modifies. But genitive nouns and pronouns also appear within a possessive construction formed with the verb *i* ‘be’ and a possessed entity. In combination with a genitive noun phrase, this verb means ‘have’. The genitive noun phrase is used to indicate the possessor, while the possessed noun occurs in the absolutive case. The genitive head then agrees with the absolutive argument, as in (44) and (45).

(44) b-is            duχriq<sup>ς</sup>            χ<sup>ς</sup>on            b-i  
 III.SG-1SG.GEN   village(IV)[SG].IN   cow(III)[SG.ABS]   III.SG-be.PRS  
 ‘I have a cow in the village.’

(45) cimint            hinc    baran    e<b>di-t’u            b-olo  
 cement(III)[SG.ABS]   now    like            <III.SG>be.PST-NEG   III.SG-1PL.EXCL.GEN  
 naq<sup>w</sup>            edi            teni-k  
 earth(IV)[SG.ABS]   [IV.SG]be.PST   there-LAT  
 ‘We didn’t have cement as (we do) now, it was (just) earth there.’ (Sisters: 16)

The word order in the examples above indicates that the genitive pronoun and the absolutive argument do not constitute a noun phrase. Thus, *cimint* ‘cement’ in (45) is separated from the genitive pronoun *bolo* by an adverbial *hinc baran* ‘like now’ and the verb *ebdit’u* ‘there was not’. The situation is therefore different from that of noun phrase agreement, since the genitive occurs in a clause peripheral position and agrees with the absolutive of the clause.

There is a question as to whether the genitive in these sentences can be considered to be the subject. The genitive possessor does not have the same binding properties as the ergative and has less freedom of order: it can only appear in the very beginning or the very end of the clause, but not between the absolutive and the verb (whereas the ergative can take this position). Such word order is typical for an adjunct phrase. Even though the genitive pronoun does not have the properties of a core argument of the verb, the problem with lexical specification of the agreeing items in this position remains. The genitive agrees with the absolutive of the clause only when it codes the possessor, yet neither the genitive of nouns nor the genitive of other personal pronouns agree in the same syntactic context.

Finally, as seen with genitive pronouns, the first person singular and plural dative pronouns also agree with the absolutive argument of the clause. The dative case can mark various syntactic roles and the agreement happens independently of the specific role of the argument. Thus, the dative can be the subject of a verb of emotion or perception, as in (46).

- (46) b-is           χ<sup>ʕ</sup>ele           b-ez           e<b>χni  
 I/II.PL-1SG.GEN guest(I)[PL.ABS] I/II.PL-1SG.DAT <I/II.PL>forget.PFV  
 'I forgot my guests.'

The position of the dative (immediately before the verb) also indicates that it codes the subject argument. However, the dative in (46) *bez* 'I' agrees with the absolutive χ<sup>ʕ</sup>*ele* 'guests'. Other verbs with this alignment pattern are *ak:us* 'see', *kos* 'hear', *χos* 'find', *kʰ'an* 'love', *sini* 'know', making a semantically coherent group of emotion, perception and cognition verbs. Note that (46) also includes the genitive *b-is* 'of me'; in this sentence it is an attributive modifier of the absolutive head noun.

Other dative arguments, when expressed by a first person pronoun also show agreement. Thus, in (47) the dative codes an (almost) obligatory benefactive argument of the verb *kumak abas* 'help' and agrees with the absolutive *kumak* 'help', part of the complex verb *kumak abas* (literally 'help do'):

- (47) b-el                   kumak           b-a-r-ši           e<b>di  
 III.SG-1PL.EXCL.DAT help(III)[SG.ABS] III.SG-do-IPFV-CVB <III.SG>be.PST  
 '(He) was helping us.' (T31: 4)

Even when first person dative pronoun codes a non-obligatory argument, it nevertheless agrees with the absolutive argument of the clausal head. Thus, in (48) and (49) the dative codes adjuncts (note the word order in (49), where the adjunct is in the right periphery). These arguments can be easily omitted. They also agree with the absolutive of the clause, χ<sup>ʕ</sup>*ošon* 'dress' in (48) and *q'onq'* 'book' in (49):

- (48) to-r-mi           b-ez           χ<sup>ʕ</sup>ošon           a<b>u  
 that-II.SG-SG.ERG III.SG-1SG.DAT dress(III)[SG.ABS] <III.SG>make.PFV  
 'She made me a dress.'

- (49) tu-w-mi           q'onq'           o<r>kʰin-ši           i           ez  
 that-I.SG-SG.ERG book(IV)[SG.ABS] [IV.SG]<IPFV>read-CVB [IV.SG]be.PRS [IV.SG]1SG.DAT  
 'He is reading me a book.'

The dative can also be governed by a postposition such as *χir* 'behind':<sup>8</sup>

- (50) d-ez           χir           d-e<r>q<sup>ʕ</sup>a-r-ši           d-i  
 II.SG-1SG.DAT behind II.SG-<IPFV>go-IPFV-CVB II.SG-be.PRS  
 'She follows me.' (male speaking)

In (50) the dative pronoun *dez* is the complement in the postpositional phrase *dez χir* 'behind me' but shows the gender II singular agreement as determined by the (omitted)

<sup>8</sup> In many Nakh-Daghestanian languages, postpositions are also used as adverbs, in which case they have a different syntactic distribution. See Chumakina & Brown (to appear) for discussion this issue in relation to Archi.

absolute argument of the clause. This is a particularly interesting pattern from a theoretical perspective, given that the agreeing dative is not an argument of the verb, but a complement within a postpositional adjunct that must look outside its own phrase for an agreement controller. Thus, besides the issue of the lexical specification of the agreeing items, the agreeing dative pronouns present the problem of the versatility of the semantic roles (experiencer, benefactive, locative) and grammatical functions the dative case codes.

These data demonstrate that agreeing pronouns in Archi can either code the obligatory arguments of the verb or its adjuncts (distinguished by the word order and the recoverability if omitted). This shows that the domain for agreement encompasses targets at various levels of syntactic and semantic remoteness. For instance, the datives in (48) and (49) have a peripheral role, and, if omitted, would not be recovered unequivocally, yet still agree. Most interesting is the situation presented in example (50) where the dative has a direct syntactic dependency on the postposition it is governed by, but agrees with the absolute of the clause, with which it is not connected either syntactically or semantically.

The second agreement possibility for pronouns is found with reflexive pronouns, themselves derived from set of logophoric pronouns. A logophor is a special pronoun used in dependent clauses when an argument of the dependent clause is coreferential with the subject argument of the main clause. Logophors are typically found in the complements of speech/psych predicates.

The absolute case form of the Archi logophor is *inž* in the singular and *žab* in the plural. The absolute form does not express the gender of the referent like the demonstratives and neither does it have a possibility to agree with the absolute of the clause like some genitives and dative of the first person pronoun. Its singular oblique stem however, has two forms: *žu* and *že* where the former is used to refer to the gender I singular and the latter covers the rest of the genders and the plural reflecting the gender of the referent. The following table shows the direct and the oblique stems of the logophor (recall that the oblique stem has the same form as the ergative case):

**Table 3.5** Logophoric pronouns

	SG				PL		
	I	II	III	IV	I/II	III/IV	
ABS	inž				žab		
ERG	žu	že					

An example of where logophors are used is given in (51). Here, the logophor *žu* is the ergative subject of the dependent clause. The logophor is coreferential with the gender I singular referent of the subject of the matrix clause.

- (51) tu-w-mi bo [žu Ajša daŋe<r>t:i-qi]  
 that-I.SG-SG.ERG say.PFV LOG.I.SG.ERG Aisha(II)[SG] <II.SG>beat.up.PFV-POT  
 ‘He<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> will beat Aisha.’

Archi reflexive pronouns are transparently derived from the logophoric pronouns by the addition of a suffix *-(a)u*, and the infixation of gender and number agreement markers familiar from the dative paradigm in Table 3.4. Agreement is with the absolutive of the clause. The reflexive pronoun therefore agrees with two controllers: the stem agrees in gender and number of the referent of the pronoun and the infix agrees with the absolutive argument of the clause. Partial paradigms for the reflexive pronouns are provided in Tables 3.6 and 3.7. In these tables, the columns show different agreement forms depending on the gender and number of the absolutive argument of the clause. Rows show direct vs. oblique stems. In Table 3.6 the forms also express the gender and number of the referent.

**Table 3.6** Singular reflexive pronouns

	GENDER	SG				PL	
		I	II	III	IV	I/II	III/IV
ABS		inža-w	inža<r>u	inža<b>u	inža<t'>u		
ERG	I	žu-w	že<r>u	žu<b>u	žu<t'>u	žu<b>u	žu<t'>u
	II/III/IV	že<w>u	že<r>u	že<b>u	že<t'>u	že<b>u	že<t'>u
DAT	I	žus:a<w>u	žus:a<r>u	žus:a<b>u	žus:a<t'>u	žus:a<b>u	žus:a<t'>u
	II/III/IV	žes:a<w>u	žes:a<r>u	žes:a<b>u	žes:a<t'>u	žes:a<b>u	žes:a<t'>u

**Table 3.7** Plural reflexive pronouns

	SG				PL	
	I	II	III	IV	I/II	III/IV
ABS					žap:u	žap<t'>u
ERG	žej<w>u	žej<r>u	žej<b>u	žej<t'>u	žej<b>u	žej<t'>u
DAT	že-s:-a<w>u	že-s:-a<r>u	že-s:-a<b>u	že-s:-a<t'>u	že-s:-a<b>u	že-s:-a<t'>u

Note that although the segmentation of the gender I singular agreement forms in Table 3.7 is different to the other forms; this merely reflects a combination of infixation with a phonologically motivated deletion processes.

The reflexive construction in (52) illustrates the use of a reflexive pronoun based on the logophoric pronoun *inž*.<sup>9</sup>

- (52)   Zalik-li-s       inža-w       w-ak:u       daχon-n-a-š  
           Zalik-SG.OBL-DAT   REFL.ABS-1.SG   1.SG-see.PFV   mirror(IV)-SG.OBL-IN-EL  
           ‘Zalik saw himself in the mirror.’

The first and second person reflexive pronouns are formed by the addition of a suffix *-(a)u* to the absolutive personal pronouns in in Table 3.4. This is accompanied by the infixation of gender and number agreement markers, as in (53).

<sup>9</sup> Note that for the sake of consistency across the analyses in this volume, we do not distinguish the internal complexity of the reflexive stem in interlinear glosses.

- (53) d-ez        zona<r>u        d-ak:u-r-ši        d-i        daχon-n-a-š  
 II.SG-1SG.DAT 1SG.REFL.ABS<II.SG> II.SG-see-IPFV-CVB II.SG-be.PRS mirror(IV)-SG.OBL-IN-EL  
 ‘I am seeing myself in the mirror.’

The reflexive pronoun agrees with the absolutive of the clause. In (53) the pronominal controller of agreement has a gender II singular referent, the female speaker who is seeing herself in the mirror. Compare this to (54) where the reflexive pronoun is in the dative case and agrees with the gender III singular absolutive argument of the clause, *tilivizor* ‘TV set’.

- (54) ʃali-mu    žus:a<b>u        tilivizor        be-šde.  
 Ali(I)-SG.ERG REFL.SG.DAT<III.SG> TV.set(III)[SG.ABS] III.SG-buy.PFV  
 ‘Ali bought a TV set for himself.’

HPSG and Minimalism base their syntactic accounts for pronominal agreement in Archi on the fact that all the agreeing constituents are part of a VP (see Chapters 5 and 7). It is less clear, however, how to account for the fact that agreement happens only in certain cells of the pronominal paradigm. LFG addresses this issue by providing lexical specification for the agreeing items (see Chapter 6). For LFG it is the versatility of the semantic roles that makes the account less elegant, as every possible semantic role has to be listed at some point and no syntactic generalizations can be made.

### 3.3.4 Adverbs

Only a minority of adverbs (13 out of 392 adverbs in the Archi dictionary) have the morphological possibility to agree (see §4.4.2 for a full list). Like other clause-level elements, adverbs agree with the head of the absolutive argument of the clause. For adverbs which modify verb phrases, as in (55) and (56), such agreement does not seem too exotic, since the adverb has a scope narrower than the whole clause.

- (55) o<b>q<sup>h</sup>a-t:u-b        balah        dit:a<b>u    b-erχin  
 <III.SG>leave.PFV-ATTR-III.SG trouble(III)[SG.ABS] soon<III.SG> III.SG-forget.IPFV  
 ‘Past trouble gets forgotten quickly.’ (Kibrik et al. 1977a: 186)

- (56) tu-w-mi    is        mišin        allij<t’>u    mua-r-ši    i  
 that-I.SG-SG.ERG [IV.SG]1SG.GEN car(IV)[SG.ABS] for.free<IV.SG> [IV.SG]repair-IPFV-CVB [IV.SG]be.PRS  
 ‘He is repairing my car for free.’

In (55) and (56), the verbal adjuncts presented are adverbs of manner. They modify the verb rather than the whole clause, and a structural dependency can be postulated between the adverb and the verb. The word order also points towards this analysis since the adverb is adjacent to the verb, between the verb and the absolutive argument.

Perhaps a more surprising situation from a theoretical perspective is the one where sentence adverbs (also called “high” adverbs in the Chomskyan tradition, see Cinque 1999) agree with the absolutive of the clause. According to the classification suggested by Cinque (1999: 106), the “highest” adverbs are categorized as speech act (‘frankly’),

evaluative ('fortunately'), evidential (allegedly), epistemic ('probably') and temporal ('once'). In Archi, most of these meanings are expressed by special verb forms, or with an extra clause (such as 'to tell you the truth' for 'frankly'). The only 'high' adverbs which agree are temporal in nature, such as *no:su<t>u* 'a long time ago' and *horo:keij<t>u*, 'a very long time ago'. All these agree in number and gender with the head of the absolutive argument of the clause. Thus, in (57) the adverb *horo:keij<t>u* 'a very long time ago' agrees with the absolutive argument *č'at* 'word', a gender IV noun.

- (57) *godo-r laha-n ummi ez horo:keij<t>u*  
 that-II.SG child(II).SG.OBL-GEN father(I).SG.ERG [IV.SG]1SG.DAT long.time.ago<IV.SG>  
*č'at k̄o-li edi*  
 word(IV)[SG.ABS] [IV.SG]give.PFV-CVB [IV.SG]be.PST  
 'The father of that girl gave me (his) word a very long time ago.' (i.e. he promised me his daughter's hand in marriage)

In (58) we see the same adverb in the form *horo:keij<r>u* since it agrees with gender II singular noun *Aisha* (a girl's name).

- (58) *tu-w-mi-s Ajša horo:keij<r>u k̄'an-ši e<r>di*  
 that-I.SG-SG.OBL-DAT Aisha(II)[SG.ABS] long.time.ago<II.SG> love.IPFV-CVB <II.SG>be.PST  
 'He fell in love with Aisha a very long time ago.'

In (59) the same adverb has yet another form, *horo:keij<b>u* as it agrees with the absolutive argument *maħla* 'house' which belongs to gender III.

- (59) *godo-b maħla gudu-m-mi horo:keij<b>u a<b>u-li*  
 that-III.SG house(III)[SG.ABS] that-I.SG-SG.ERG long.time.ago<III.SG> <III.SG>make.PFV-CVB  
*e<b>di*  
 <III.SG>be.PST  
 'He built that house a very long time ago.'

Examples (57)-(59) demonstrate that the adverb *horo:keij<t>u* 'a very long time ago', which modifies the whole clause rather than any of its elements, agrees with the absolutive argument of the clause. These examples were all elicited, and the placement of the adverb does not necessarily indicate that it is a sentence adverb. However, the only instance where this adverb is used in texts points towards such interpretation. In (60) the adverb *horo:keij<w>u* 'a very long time ago' is placed at the right periphery and modifies the whole clause 'his son died a very long time ago':

- (60) *tu-w-mi-n lo-wu k<sup>w</sup>a bo-li horo:keij<w>u*  
 that-I.SG-SG.OBL-GEN child(I)[SG.ABS] I.SG.die.PFV say.PFV long.time.ago<I.SG>  
 'His son died a very long time ago, they said.' (T22: 46)

Data of this kind demonstrate that Archi adverbs present two specific challenges for syntactic theory. First, only a subset of this word class agree, and the agreeing set does not show any homogeneity either in terms of semantics or in terms of syntactic

behaviour (such as position in the clause). The second issue concerns the structural position of adverbs: since the list of agreeing adverbs includes both speaker-oriented and temporal-aspectual adverbs a theoretical account of it must allow for the agreement of all types of (agreeing) adverb to be controlled by the absolutive of the clause.<sup>10</sup>

### 3.3.5 The postposition *eq'en*

The postposition *eq'en* presents a particularly challenging problem for a model of morphosyntax, since it occurs within an easily defined syntactic domain (i.e. a postpositional phrase), yet the agreement is controlled by an element outside that domain. Before looking at the agreeing postposition *eq'en* in more detail, a very brief characterization of postpositions in Archi in general is in order. Each postposition governs a complement in a particular case; nothing can be inserted between the postposition and the noun governed by it. The neutral word order for a postpositional phrase in the clause is either at the absolute beginning, as in (61), or in clause final position, after the verb, illustrated in (62).

(61) jamu laha-s χir tu-w bošo:r=u q<sup>w</sup>a-li  
 this[I.SG] child(I).SG.OBL-DAT behind that-I.SG man(I)[SG.ABS]=and I.SG.come.PFV-EVID  
 'That man was walking behind this boy.' (T2: 10)

(62) jo-w oq'ert:u=wu łunne-li jemim-me-s χir  
 this-I.SG beggar(I)[SG.ABS]=and I.SG.flee.PFV-EVID that.PL-PL.OBL-DAT behind  
 '(Then) this beggar ran after them.' (T8: 62)

Examples (61) and (62) show the most frequent Archi postposition *χir* 'behind'. It governs the dative case and does not agree. There is only one postposition in Archi which does agree, the postposition *eq'en* 'up to'. The fact that *eq'en* is the only Archi postposition which agrees can be explained diachronically, as *eq'en* is derived from an irregular converb of the verb *eq'is* 'reach'. For details of the different usages (converbial vs. postpositional) see Chumakina and Brown (to appear).

While agreeing adpositions are attested in other languages, in such cases the adposition agrees with an element within the constituent that it heads, i.e. the postposition agrees with the noun it governs. However, in Archi the postposition agrees with the absolutive argument of the clause, i.e. it has a controller outside its own syntactic domain. For example, consider (63) in which the postpositional phrase is *ha<sup>ʃ</sup>tərčeq<sup>ʃ</sup>ak ebq'en* 'up to the river'. Rather than agree with the noun *ha<sup>ʃ</sup>təra* 'river', which belongs to gender IV, the postposition *ebq'en* has an infixal marker of gender III and agrees with the absolutive of the clause *goroχči* 'rolling stone'. In (65) the postpositional phrase is *jab maq'allirak eq'en* 'up to this chapter' where the noun *maq'al* 'chapter' belongs to gender III. Here the postposition agrees with the absolutive of the clause, *q'onq* 'book', a noun of gender IV.

<sup>10</sup> As we will see in §7.4, Polinsky argues that agreeing adverbs are VP-level items and that adverbs at the TP level do not participate in agreement.

- (63) goroxči                      ba-q<sup>ʕ</sup>a                      ha<sup>ʕ</sup>tər-čə-q<sup>ʕ</sup>a-k                      e<b>q<sup>ʕ</sup>en  
 rolling.stone(III)[SG.ABS] III.SG-come.PFV river(IV)-SG.OBL-INTER-LAT up.to<III.SG>  
 ‘The rolling stone went up to the river.’ (The stone is near the river, but dry.)
- (64) zari    q<sup>ʕ</sup>onq<sup>ʕ</sup>                      okłni                      ja-b                      maq<sup>ʕ</sup>al-li-ra-k                      eq<sup>ʕ</sup>en  
 1SG.ERG book(IV)[SG.ABS] [IV.SG]read.PFV this-III.SG chapter(III)-SG.OBL-CONT-LAT [IV.SG]up.to  
 ‘I read the book up to this chapter.’
- (65) ja-b                      maq<sup>ʕ</sup>al-li-ra-k                      eq<sup>ʕ</sup>en                      zari                      q<sup>ʕ</sup>onq<sup>ʕ</sup>                      okłni  
 this-III.SG chapter(III)-SG.OBL-CONT-LAT [IV.SG]up.to 1SG.ERG book(IV)[SG.ABS] [IV.SG]read.PFV  
 ‘I read the book up to this chapter.’

As a postposition, *eq<sup>ʕ</sup>en* governs the lative case and can be used in a clause with an intransitive verb as in (63) or with a transitive verb as in (64). In (63) and (64), the postpositional phrase follows the verb. It can also appear at the beginning of the clause, just as with other postpositional phrases in Archi as demonstrated in (65).

These examples demonstrate that the postpositional phrase is clearly a syntactic constituent, with strict order of elements and preferences for its linear order in the clause; there is an identifiable head, the postposition, which governs a particular case of the noun. There is also a clear semantic connection between the noun and the postposition.

While clause initial and final positions are typical for the postpositional phrase, *eq<sup>ʕ</sup>en* sometimes occurs clause medially, between subject and object.

- (66) to-w-mi                      ɬ:<sup>w</sup>ak-du-t                      duχriq<sup>ʕ</sup>a-k                      e<b>q<sup>ʕ</sup>en  
 that-I.SG-SG.ERG near-ATTR-IV.SG village(IV).SG.INTER-LAT <III.SG>up.to  
 deq<sup>ʕ</sup>                      a<b>u  
 road(III)[SG.ABS] <III.SG>make.PFV  
 ‘He made (i.e. built) the road up to the next village.’ (based on Kibrik et al. 1977a: 227)

Here the postposition *ebq<sup>ʕ</sup>en* ‘up to’ governs the lative case of the noun *duχ:ur* ‘village’ (gender IV), but agrees with the absolutive *deq<sup>ʕ</sup>* ‘road’ (gender III).

### 3.3.6 The emphatic clitic =*ejt<sup>ʕ</sup>u*.

The emphatic clitic =*ejt<sup>ʕ</sup>u* is a phonologically bound form that can attach to any part of speech. It has a range of meanings related to scalar focus and can be roughly translated as ‘very’, ‘only’ or ‘even’, etc. depending on the context. Like other agreement targets in the clausal domain, it agrees with the absolutive argument of the clause, making it a rather unusual clitic. For instance, in (67a), the emphatic clitic attaches to the absolutive



- (70) jamu-t s:aʃal-li-t:=ij<w>u uq<sup>ʃ</sup>a-li ju-w jemim-me-s  
 that-IV.SG time(IV)-SG.OBL-SUP= EMPH<I.SG> I.SG.go.PFV-EVID this-I.SG[ABS] that.PL-PL.OBL-DAT  
 χir  
 after  
 ‘He went after them immediately.’ (= ‘He went after them at that very time.’)  
 (T26: 37)

Here the emphatic clitic attaches to the SUPER localization case form of the fourth gender noun *s:aʃat* ‘time’. The emphasis is on the whole noun phrase *jamut s:aʃallit* ‘at that time’ and in combination with the emphatic clitic the meaning is ‘at that very time’. The agreement, however, is with the absolutive of the clause *juw* ‘he’ with which the emphatic clitic has no semantic or syntactic connection.

### 3.4 Conclusion

The facts about Archi agreement domains presented here demonstrate that an adequate account in many instances requires access to lexical information associated with the agreement target, as well as a clear account of the structure of the target’s morphological paradigm.

Agreement in the Archi noun phrase presents a relatively familiar picture where the controller of agreement is always the head of the noun phrase, regardless of its case marking, and demonstratives and attributives always participate in agreement. The behaviour of the genitive pronouns poses a potential challenge for syntactic modelling, as only a subset of these agree. Numerals present a different type of problem in relation to the interaction between the target and the controller, because the noun modified by the numeral controls gender agreement while at the same time requiring the noun to take singular number.

Agreement in the clause is even more challenging. First, the problem of lexical specification remains: although all parts of speech can serve as targets for agreement, the actual items showing agreement have to be somehow specified for each part of speech and, while there are some factors regulating this specification for verbs, other parts of speech do not seem to exhibit any regularities in this regard. Second, the morphological ergativity of Archi is a problem for agreement: since it is impossible to ascribe grammatical functions based on case, the agreement rules cannot be formulated in terms of grammatical functions such as subject and object. Finally, agreement of dative pronouns, the postposition *eq’en* and emphatic clitic is not only typologically unusual, and as such has no syntactic account so far, but it adds another layer of complexity; this is because agreement obtains between two phrases which are not necessarily syntactically connected. Thus, the absolutive can control the agreement of the postposition or the dative which codes a non-argument in the clause.