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Dargwa: General information

- A group of East Caucasian languages
- SOV, ergative alignment
- Complex verb and noun morphology
- Person and gender agreement
Gender markers are uniform across different agreement targets
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Gender agreement regularly occurs in the following contexts:
- prefix on most verb stems
- suffix on attributive forms
- suffix on essive nouns and adverbs

At clause level, the controller is the P/S (absolutive) argument:
- pat‘imat j-id.až.i
  P. F-went.out
  ‘Patimat went out.’
Agreement in Dargwa

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gender markers are uniform across different agreement targets
- Gender agreement regularly occurs in the following contexts:
  - prefix on most verb stems
  - suffix on attributive forms
  - suffix on essive nouns and adverbs
- At clause level, the controller is the P/S (absolutive) argument:
  - pat’imat j-id.aż.i
    P. F-went.out
    ‘Patimat went out.’
  - murad-li wac’a.c:i-j pat’imat j-us.aj
    M.-erg in.forest-f P. F-caught
    ‘Murad caught Patimat in the forest.’
Person

- The clitic set:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>=da</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>=di</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(sa-b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The preterite set:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-t:i</td>
<td>-t:-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-aj, -in, -i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rules of agreement resolution
(see general description in Sumbatova 2011)

- In intransitive clauses, person agreement is with P
- In transitive clauses, agreement in Ashti (A vs. P) is determined by the following hierarchy:
  - 1,2 (SAP) > 3
- If both arguments are SAPs, the absolutive argument “wins”
  - di-l murad us-a-d
    me-ERG M. [M]catch.PFV-PRET-1
    ‘I caught Murad.’ (A = 1, P = 3 → 1)
  - muradli du usa-d
    ‘Murad caught me.’ (A = 3, P = 1 → 1)
  - dil u usa-t:i
    ‘I caught you.’ (A = 1, P = 2 → 2)
  - u-dil du usa-d
    ‘You caught me.’ (A = 2, P = 1 → 1)
  - murad-li rasul us-aj
    ‘Murad caught Rasul.’ (A = 3, P = 3 → 3)
The Backward Control hypothesis

Ergative agreement of the auxiliary

- However, this clear picture faces problems if we look at how the copula (which has a gender agreement slot) behaves
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Ergative agreement of the auxiliary

- However, this clear picture faces problems if we look at how the copula (which has a gender agreement slot) behaves.
- Sumbatova (2014) has shown that in Tanti Dargwa, the copula can agree alternatively with the absolutive or the ergative:

  - \[ \text{murad-li} \ t'ant'i-b \ qali \ b-irq'.u.le=sa-j \]
  - M.-\text{ERG} \ \text{in.T.-N} \ \text{house} \ \text{n-building=COPI-M} \]
  - \[ \text{murad-li} \ t'ant'i-b \ [\text{qali}] \ b-irq'.u-le=sa-b \]

  ‘Murad is building a house in Tanti.’
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The Backward Control hypothesis

Ergative agreement of the auxiliary

- However, this clear picture faces problems if we look at how the copula (which has a gender agreement slot) behaves
- Sumbatova (2014) has shown that in Tanti Dargwa, the copula can agree alternatively with the absolutive or the ergative:
  - \[
  \text{murad-li t’ant’i-b qali b irq’u.le=sa-j} \\
  \text{M.-ERG in.T.-N house n-building=cop-M}
  \]
  - \[
  \text{murad-li t’ant’i-b qali b irq’.u-le=sa-b}
  \]
  ‘Murad is building a house in Tanti.’

- The controller is determined by topicality
- Cf. also Sumbatova and Lander (2015, Chapter 5)
Notably, in Tanti both A and P gender agreement are available even if one of the arguments is a SAP (although P agreement requires a certain “emphasis”)

- ṣaˁli rursːi quli-r r-alt.un.ne=sa-j=de
  thou:ERG girl in.house-F F-keeping=COP-M=2SG
  ‘You are keeping the girl at home.’
- ṣaˁli rursːi quli-r r-alt.un.ne=sa-r=de
  ‘You are keeping the girl home alone.’ (Sumbatova 2014)
Notably, in Tanti both A and P gender agreement are available even if one of the arguments is a SAP (although P agreement requires a certain “emphasis”)

- Ꝣaˁli rursːi quli-r r-alt.un.ne=sa-j=de
  thou:ERG girl in.house-F F-keeping=COP-M=2SG
  ‘You are keeping the girl at home.’

- Ꝣaˁli rursːi quli-r r-alt.un.ne=sa-r=de
  ‘You are keeping the girl home alone.’ (Sumbatova 2014)

Unfortunately, there is no data on what happens when both arguments are SAPs, or when a SAP is in the direct object position
Sumbatova’s solution is to divide the clause into two layers (roughly IP and VP) and situate a zero absolutive argument in the upper layer:

\[ \Delta_{i(\text{ABS})} \left[ \text{murad-li}_i \ t^\text{ant’i-b qali b-irq’-u-le} \right] = \text{sa-j} \]
\[ \Delta_{i(\text{ABS})} \left[ \text{murad-li t^ant’i-b qali}_i \ b-irq’-u-le \right] = \text{sa-b} \]
Sumbatova’s solution is to divide the clause into two layers (roughly IP and VP) and situate a zero absolutive argument in the upper layer:

1. \( \Delta_i(ABS) \left[ \text{murad-li}_i \ t\text{'ant'i-b qali b-irq'-u-le} \right]=\text{sa-}j \)
2. \( \Delta_i(ABS) \left[ \text{murad-li t\text{'ant'i-b qali}_i b-irq'-u-le} \right]=\text{sa-b} \)

An additional confirmation of this idea is that clause-peripheral adverbs may agree with A:

1. \( \text{ma}^{\text{h}}\text{ha}^{\text{m}}\text{mad.li.}\text{s:u-w} / \text{-b} \left[ \text{rasul-li dig b-uk:-un-ne} \right]=\text{sa-j} \)
   
   chez.\text{M.-M} \quad -\text{N} \quad \text{R.-ERG} \quad \text{meat N-eating COP-M}

   ‘At Muhammad’s place Rasul is eating meat.’ (Sumbatova 2014)
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Sumbatova’s solution is to divide the clause into two layers (roughly IP and VP) and situate a zero absolutive argument in the upper layer:

\[ \Delta_i(\text{ABS}) \left[ \text{murad-li}_i \ t’ant’i-b \ qali \ b-irq’-u-le \right] = \text{sa-j} \]
\[ \Delta_i(\text{ABS}) \left[ \text{murad-li} \ t’ant’i-b \ qali}_i \ b-irq’-u-le \right] = \text{sa-b} \]

An additional confirmation of this idea is that clause-peripheral adverbs may agree with A:

\[ \left[ \text{maˁḥaˁmmad.li.šːu-w / -b} \left[ \text{rasul-li} \ \text{dig} \ b-\text{ukː-un-ne} \right] = \text{sa-j} \right] \]
\[ \text{chez.M.-M -N R.-ERG meat N-eating COP-M} \]

‘At Muhammad’s place Rasul is eating meat.’ (Sumbatova 2014)

In general, the analysis seems justified for Tanti based on available data.

Ashti behaves in the same way in most respects, but some additional data show that this analysis is not applicable.
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    M. [M]going be-M[3]
    ‘Murad is going.’
  - du ?weep‘.un li-w=da
    I [M]going be-M=1
    ‘I am going.’

In Sumbatova (2014), they are shown to have the same behaviour as ordinary periphrastic forms
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Ergative gender agreement: Ashti data

- Ashti does not use a copula in the 3rd person in non-negative contexts.
- Therefore, I will use existential-based forms:
  - murad ?uqd`un li-w
    M. [M]going be-M[3]
    ‘Murad is going.’
  - du ?uqd`un li-w=da
    I [M]going be-M=1
    ‘I am going.’

- In Sumbatova (2014), they are shown to have the same behaviour as ordinary periphrastic forms.

- Using existentials has an important advantage: there is a gender marker in each person.
Auxiliary agreement

Just like in Tanti, the auxiliary can agree in gender with A in the 3rd person

\[
\text{rasul-li pat’imat j-u:s.u li-} j / \text{li-w li-}\]
R.-ERG P. F-catching be-F be-M

‘Rasul is catching Patimat.’
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Auxiliary agreement

- Just like in Tanti, the auxiliary can agree in gender with A in the 3rd person
  
  \[
  \text{rasul-li} \quad \text{pat'imat} \quad j-u:s.u \quad li-j / li-\underline{w} \\
  \text{R.-ERG} \quad \text{P.} \quad \text{F-catching be-F be-M}
  \]

  ‘Rasul is catching Patimat.’

- Again, as in Tanti, this seems to correlate with topicality

- However, more research is needed in order to see which factors specifically influence the choice of agreement controller
Kubachi examples
(stories about Mullah Nasruddin, Šamov 1994)

- na qːala.l saʁ.ib, wagzal.li-b čumɑdan sa now to.Mamedkala when.he.reached at.station-N bag one hambal.li.cːe b-ičː.ib=sa-w to.porter N-gave=COP-M

‘When he reached Mamedkala, at the station [he] gave his bag to a porter.’

- jiš.te ɣulžin d-ačː.ib kʷi<dič.ib.li=sa-d malla.cːe these bag NPL-having.found return<NPL>=COP-NPL to.Mullah

‘Having found the bag, they returned [it] to the Mullah.’
Kubachi examples

(stories about Mullah Nasruddin, Šamov 1994)

- na qːala.l saʁ.ib, wagzal.li-b ćumɑdan sa
  now to.Mamedkala when.he.reached  at.station-N  bag  one
  hambal.li.cːe b-ičː.:ib=sa-W
  to.porter  N-gave=COP-M

  ‘When he reached Mamedkala, at the station [he] gave his bag to a
  porter.’

- jiš.te χulžin d-ačː.:ib  kʰi<did>ič.ib.li=sa-d  malla.cːe
  these bag  NPL-having.found return<NPL>=COP-NPL to.Mullah

  ‘Having found the bag, they returned [it] to the Mullah.’

- du-dil ha.? ila-žu-d  si.k’al.dix ʔaːʔa-dil dučː.i.al
  I-ERG  said-ATTR-NPL  something  hen-ERG  at.night
  haʔ.ila-žu-d=sa-d
  said-ATTR-NPL=COP-NPL

  (Mullah, why has the judge acquitted you without you even saying
  anything?) ‘At night the hen has already said [everything] for me.’
wah, malla, si uk’.u.t.nu, allah-le duna eːk bac.le
oh mullah what art.thou.saying Allah-ERG world six in.month
a-sa-b=q’al, eːk:-il sa-b b-aːq’.ib-zi-b
NEG-COP-N=PTCL six-day COP-N N-done-ATTR-N
‘Oh, Mullah, what are you saying, God created the world in six days, not months!’

eːk:-il b-aːq’.ib-zi-w=sa-w b-uk’.ne dammi=ja=q’el
six-day N-done-ATTR-M=COP-M N-that.is.said to.me=also=PTCL
b-ak’u.q’a.nnu
N-is.known
‘I do also know that it is said that He has created the world in six days.’ (... but would you believe me if I told you that?)
Agreement in 1st and 2nd persons

- So far, everything seems to behave according to the zero absolutive hypothesis
Agreement in 1st and 2nd persons

- So far, everything seems to behave according to the zero absolutive hypothesis
- But when one of the arguments is 1st or 2nd person, and the other is 3rd person, gender agreement can only be with the SAP argument (corresponding to person agreement)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{di-} & \quad \text{pat’imat j-u:s.u li-w=da / *li-j=da / *li-w / *li-j me-ERG P. F-catching be-M=1 be-F=1 be-M be-F} \\
\text{I (m.) am catching Patimat.’ (1 > 3)} \\
\text{pat’imat-li } & \quad \text{du u:s.u li-w=da / *li-j=da / *li-w / *li-j P.-ERG I [M]catching be-M=1 be-F=1 be-M be-F} \\
\text{‘Patimat is catching me (m.).’}
\end{align*}
\]
Agreement in 1st and 2nd persons

Similarly, when both arguments are SAPs, gender agreement can only be with the absolutive (again, like person agreement)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{di-l} & \quad \text{u} \quad \text{j-u:s.u} \quad \text{li-j=di} / \quad \text{*li-w=di} / \quad \text{*li-w=da} / \quad \text{*li-j=da} \\
\text{me-ERG thou f-catching be-f=2} & \quad \text{be-m=2} \quad \text{be-m=1} \quad \text{be-f=1} \\
\text{‘I (m.) am catching you (f.).’} \\
\text{u-dil} & \quad \text{du} \quad \text{u:s.u} \quad \text{li-w=da} / \quad \text{*li-j=da} / \quad \text{*li-j=di} / \quad \text{*li-w=di} \\
\text{thee-ERG I [M]catching be-m=1} & \quad \text{be-f=1} \quad \text{be-f=2} \quad \text{be-m=2} \\
\text{‘You (f.) are catching me (m.).’}
\end{align*}
\]
Agreement in 1st and 2nd persons

- Similarly, when both arguments are SAPs, gender agreement can only be with the absolutive (again, like person agreement)
  
  ▷ di-l \( \underline{u} \) j-u:s.u li-j=di / *li-w=di / *li-w=da / *li-j=da me-ERG thou F-catching be-F=2 be-M=2 be-M=1 be-F=1
  ‘I (m.) am catching you (f.).’
  
  ▷ u-dil \( \underline{du} \) u:s.u li-w=da / *li-j=da / *li-j=di / *li-w=di thee-ERG I [M]catching be-M=1 be-F=1 be-F=2 be-M=2
  ‘You (f.) are catching me (m.).’

- This does not seem to agree well with the idea of a zero absolutive argument: why would it behave in a different way for SAPs?
Adverb agreement

- Ashti still allows peripheral adverbs to agree in the ergative
  - wac’a.cːi-w / wac’a-cːi-j [rasul-li] pat’imat j-u:s-u li-w
  - in.forest-M in.forest-F R.-ERG P. f-catching be-M
  - ‘In the forest Rasul is catching Patimati.’

But this phenomenon seems to be completely independent from auxiliary agreement: the adverb may agree with A even when the auxiliary agrees with P

‘null absolutive’ coreferent with P, A agreement should be impossible!

A better explanation is that such adverbs are in fact secondary predicates (‘while being in the forest…’)

Cf. the fact that when the adverb agrees in the ergative, it is preferable to use -muːtil

‘when’
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Adverb agreement

- Ashti still allows peripheral adverbs to agree in the ergative
  - \textit{wac’a.c:i-w / wac’a-c:i-j rasul-li pat’imat j-u:s-u li-w}
  - \textit{in.forest-M in.forest-F R.-ERG P. F-catching be-M}
  - ‘In the forest Rasul is catching Patimata.’

- But this phenomenon seems to be completely independent from auxiliary agreement: the adverb may agree with A even when the auxiliary agrees with P
  - \textit{wac’a.c:i-w / wac’a.c:i-j rasul-li pat’imat j-u:s.u li-j}
  - ‘null absolutive’ coreferent with P, A agreement should be impossible!

- A better explanation is that such adverbs are in fact secondary predicates (‘while being in the forest...’)
- Cf. the fact that when the adverb agrees in the ergative, it is preferable to use -\textit{mu:til} ‘when’:
  - \textit{wac’a.c:i-w-mu:til rasul-li pat’imat j-u:s.u li-w}
Secondary predication also explains why “split control” of agreement on the adverb is possible in Tanti:

- dars.li.ja-b \( \Delta_{i+j} \) [ ja=ra musa-li_i gezet:e d-uč’.un.ne ], [ ja=ra at.lesson-hpl or=ADD M.-ERG newspapers npl-reading or=ADD pat’imat-li_j šajt’un.t.a.lla surrat:e d-irq’.u.le ]=sa-b P.-ERG of.devils images npl-doing=cop-hpl

‘At the lesson either Musa reads newspapers or Patimata draws devils.’ (Sumbatova 2014)
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I could not elicit such examples for Ashti, but this could be due to pragmatic reasons.
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Sumbatova’s explanation is that the zero absolutive has the A participants of the coordinated lower clauses as its split antecedents
Secondary predication also explains why “split control” of agreement on the adverb is possible in Tanti:

- dars.li.ja-b $\Delta_{i+j}$ [ ja=ra musa-li \textit{gezet}:e d-uč’.un.ne ], [ ja=ra at.lesson-HPL \textit{or}=ADD M.-\textit{erg} newspapers npl-reading \textit{or}=ADD pat’imat-li j šajt’un.t.a.lla surrat:e d-irq’.u.le ]=sa-b P.-\textit{erg} of.devils images npl-doing=cop-HPL

‘At the lesson either Musa reads newspapers or Patimat draws devils.’ (Sumbatova 2014)

I could not elicit such examples for Ashti, but this could be due to pragmatic reasons.

Sumbatova’s explanation is that the zero absolutive has the A participants of the coordinated lower clauses as its split antecedents.

But it seems equally plausible to assume that we deal with a secondary predication whose zero subject gets its reference according to the standard rules.
Generalization

- There seems to be no positive evidence in favour of the “Backward Control hypothesis” in Ashti
Generalization
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- Rather, the controller of gender agreement on the auxiliary is identical to the controller of person agreement.
  - A similar line of reasoning can be found as early as Magometov (1963, 155).
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  - A similar line of reasoning can be found as early as Magometov (1963, 155).
- Extrapolated to the 3rd person, it means that there is also competition between 3rd person controllers:
  - SAP vs. non-SAP: SAP wins
  - SAP vs. SAP: P argument wins
  - non-SAP vs. non-SAP: “topic” wins
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- Rather, the controller of gender agreement on the auxiliary is identical to the controller of person agreement.
  - A similar line of reasoning can be found as early as Magometov (1963, 155).
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  - SAP vs. non-SAP  SAP wins
  - SAP vs. SAP  P argument wins
  - non-SAP vs. non-SAP  “topic” wins
- We can thus modify the “person” hierarchy:
  - Person 1,2 > 3\textsubscript{TOP} > 3
- Grammatical relations  P > A
- The agreement rule stays the same.
Generalization

- There seems to be no positive evidence in favour of the “Backward Control hypothesis” in Ashti.

- Rather, the controller of gender agreement on the auxiliary is identical to the controller of person agreement.
  - A similar line of reasoning can be found as early as Magometov (1963, 155).

- Extrapolated to the 3rd person, it means that there is also competition between 3rd person controllers:
  - SAP vs. non-SAP: SAP wins
  - SAP vs. SAP: P argument wins
  - non-SAP vs. non-SAP: “topic” wins

- We can thus modify the “person” hierarchy:
  - Person $1,2 > 3_{TOP} > 3$
  - Grammatical relations $P > A$

- The agreement rule stays the same.

- This is reminiscent of a typical proximate-obviative system (cf. e.g. Aissen 1997).
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Problems for the traditional view

- A problem remains: “person” agreement seems to involve not only person and number, but also gender
- But the terms “person” and “gender” agreement are misleading anyway
- “Gender” agreement may involve person (cf. Corbett 2013 for Archi)
- In Dargwa (incl. Ashti), the same phenomenon as in Archi occurs: the neuter pl. marker -d- is used for 1/2PL arguments
  - rasul.li.j [ du ] j-ʔulh.ʔ-d
    R.DAT I f-saw-1
    ‘Rasul saw me (f.).’
  - rasul.li.j [ nus:a ] d-ʔulh.ʔ-d-a ∕ *b-ʔulh.ʔ-d-a
    R.DAT we 1PL-saw-1-PL HPL-saw-1-PL
    ‘Rasul saw us.’
  - rasul.li.j [ du=ba murad ] d-ʔulh.ʔ-d-a ∕ *b-ʔulh.ʔ-d-a
    R.DAT I=and M. 1PL-saw-1-PL HPL-saw-1-PL
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Analysis

Problems for the traditional view

- A problem remains: "person" agreement seems to involve not only person and number, but also gender
- But the terms "person" and "gender" agreement are misleading anyway
- "Gender" agreement may involve person (cf. Corbett 2013 for Archi)
- In Dargwa (incl. Ashti), the same phenomenon as in Archi occurs: the neuter pl. marker -d- is used for 1/2PL arguments
  - rasul.li.j [ du ] j-ylh.į-d
    R.DAT I F-saw-1
    ‘Rasul saw me (f.).’
  - rasul.li.j [ nus:a ] d-ylh.į-d-a / *b-ylh.į-d-a
    R.DAT we 1PL-saw-1-PL HPL-saw-1-PL
    ‘Rasul saw us.’
  - rasul.li.j [ du=ba murad ] d-ylh.į-d-a / *b-ylh.į-d-a
    R.DAT I=and M. 1PL-saw-1-PL HPL-saw-1-PL
    ‘Rasul saw me and Murad.’

- Last example: “gender” agreement does genuinely mark person features.
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- therefore, when we see gender agreement with the ergative, we try to show that there is in fact an absolutive there somewhere
- and when we see “gender” markers reflecting person features, we try to handwave it as a “special gender” for certain pronouns

Rather, agreement always involves all features

- there is only a target and a controller
- which of the features are actually reflected on the target is a morphological issue
  - e.g. normally only the 3rd person marker has a “gender” slot, but existential forms have it in all persons
  - sg. “gender” markers are unmarked for person, while plural markers are marked (1/2 vs. 3)
The solution is to move away from a view of agreement tied to feature types

- standard description of Dargwa agreement: “gender agreement is with the absolutive, person agreement is hierarchical”
- therefore, when we see gender agreement with the ergative, we try to show that there is in fact an absolutive there somewhere
- and when we see “gender” markers reflecting person features, we try to handwave it as a “special gender” for certain pronouns

Rather, agreement always involves all features

- there is only a target and a controller
- which of the features are actually reflected on the target is a morphological issue
  - e.g. normally only the 3rd person marker has a “gender” slot, but existential forms have it in all persons
  - sg. “gender” markers are unmarked for person, while plural markers are marked (1/2 vs. 3)

Each clause has two domains and two targets (Sumbatova 2014), so we can define separate rules for each
Feature sharing

- Haug and Nikitina 2015: symmetric feature sharing (LFG)
Feature sharing

- Haug and Nikitina 2015: symmetric feature sharing (LFG)
- ¡Qué desgraciad-as somos las mujer-es! ‘How unfortunate we women are!’ (Ackema and Neeleman 2013)

```
[“BE”
  TENSE
  AGR
  “WOMAN”
  [SUBJ
    [AGR
      [PERSON 1
        [NUMBER pl
          [GENDER f]]]]]]
```
Feature sharing in Dargwa

- We can handle agreement in Dargwa in a similar way...
Feature sharing in Dargwa

- We can handle agreement in Dargwa in a similar way.
- E.g., a clause with ergative “person” agreement will have the following c- and f-structures (ergativity as in Falk 2006, A = \( \widehat{GF} \), P/S = PIV):

```
IP
  /\ 
 S  I
 /\ 
NP NP V
```

```
“BE”
TENSE
AGR
```

```
“CATCH”
ASP
```

```
“PATIMAT”
PiV
```

```
pres
```

```
perf
```

```
li-w=da be-M=1
```

```
di-l me-ERG
```

```
pat’imat P.
```

```
j-u:s-u f-catching
```

```
“BE”
```

```
“AVERN”
```

```
AGR
```

```
PERS 1
```

```
GEND m
```

```
NUM sg
```

```
“PATIMAT”
```

```
PERS 3
```

```
GEND f
```

```
NUM sg
```
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Motivation for the two tiers

- There is nothing that would *force* us to use AGR sharing for both person and gender agreement.
- In fact, since gender is always with ABS, we could do it the old-fashioned way, through feature co-specification, and keep AGR only for the person (hierarchical) type.
- This allows us to do away with the two tiers of clause structure.
However, there does seem to be independent evidence in favour of a two-tier analysis:

- ergative agreement of adverbs only possible at clause edge (see above)
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\[\text{Murad probably would have seen Rasul.}\]

\[\text{If you do not love me, go away.}\]
However, there does seem to be independent evidence in favour of a two-tier analysis:

- ergative agreement of adverbs only possible at clause edge (see above)
- only clause-edge converbs can be different-subject:

  \[ \text{\textasciitilde}\text{\textquotesingle\text{Ali gave money}, and Rasul entered the university\textquotesingle}} \]

  \[ \text{\textasciitilde}\text{\textquotesingle\text{Rasul gave money} and entered the university.\textquotesingle}} \]

- second-level perphrastic forms, with the auxiliary having its own TAM features

  \[ \text{\textasciitilde}\text{\textquotesingle Murad probably would have seen Rasul.\textquotesingle}} \]

- two negation types

  \[ \text{\textasciitilde}\text{\textquotesingle If you do not love me, go away.\textquotesingle}} \]
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However, there does seem to be independent evidence in favour of a two-tier analysis:

- ergative agreement of adverbs only possible at clause edge (see above)
- only clause-edge converbs can be different-subject:
  
  
  \[
  \text{[?ali-dil a:s b-ič:.ib]}, \text{ rasul uniwersitet-li ke:χ^{w}.i} \\
  \text{A.-\text{ERG} money N-having.given R. university-IN LAT entered} \\
  \text{[Ali gave money], and Rasul entered the university’}
  \]

  \[
  \text{* rasul, [ ?ali-dil a:s b-ič:.ib ], uniwersitet-li ke:χ^{w}.i} \\
  \text{[Rasul gave money] and entered the university’}
  \]

  \[
  \text{OK rasul, [ a:s b-ič:.ib ], uniwersitet-li ke:χ^{w}.i} \\
  \text{[Rasul gave money] and entered the university’}
  \]

  \[
  \text{OK uniwersitet-li, [ rasul-li a:s b-ič:.ib ], ke:χ^{w}.i} \\
  \]
However, there does seem to be independent evidence in favour of a two-tier analysis:

- ergative agreement of adverbs only possible at clause edge (see above)
- only clause-edge converbs can be different-subject:
  - [ ?a̰li-dil a:s b-ičː.ib ], rasul uniwersitet-li ke:χ\textsuperscript{w}.i
    A.-erg money N-having.given R. university-IN[lat] entered
    ‘[Ali gave money], and Rasul entered the university’
  - * rasul, [ ?a̰li-dil a:s b-ičː.ib ], uniwersitet-li ke:χ\textsuperscript{w}.i
  - OK rasul, [ a:s b-ičː.ib ], uniwersitet-li ke:χ\textsuperscript{w}.i
    ‘[Rasul gave money] and entered the university.’
  - OK uniwersitet-li, [ rasul-li a:s b-ičː.ib ], ke:χ\textsuperscript{w}.i
- second-level perphrastic forms, with the auxiliary having its own TAM features
  - murad-li rasul ฬh-an-ni uχ-ij=di
    M.-erg R. [m]see.ipfv-fut-3 [m]be.pfv-inf=pst
    ‘Murad probably would have seen Rasul.’
- two negation types
  - at:.ij du a-w-ikː.ul j-uχutːi, j-at<j>iš:i jani.j
    thee:dat I neg-m-loving F-if.you.are F-go.away F from here
  - at:.ij du w-ikː.ul a-j-uχutːi, j-at<j>iš:i jani.j
    ‘If you do not love me, go away.’
This can be achieved by using the following lexical entries for the verb and auxiliary:

- IP → S I
  \( (\uparrow \text{COMP}) = \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \)

- S → NP* V
  \( (\uparrow \text{GF}) = \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \)

- \textit{b-iːq-ul} V
  \( (\uparrow \text{PRED}) = \text{‘do} \langle \text{GF PIV} \rangle \text{’} \)
  \( (\uparrow \text{AGR}) = (\uparrow \text{PIV AGR}) \)
  \( (\uparrow \text{AGR GEND}) = c n \)
  \( (\uparrow \text{AGR NUM}) = c \text{sg} \)
This can be achieved by using the following lexical entries for the verb and auxiliary:

- **IP → S  I**
  \( (↑ \text{COMP}) = ↓ \quad ↑ = ↓ \)
- **S → NP*  V**
  \( (↑ GF) = ↓ \quad ↑ = ↓ \)
- **b-iːq-ul  V**
  \( (↑ PRED) = 'do<GF PIV>' \)
  \( (↑ AGR) = (↑ PIV AGR) \)
  \( (↑ AGR GEND) = c n \)
  \( (↑ AGR NUM) = c sg \)
- **li-w=da  I**
  \( (↑ PRED) = 'be<COMP>' \)
  \( \{ (↑ AGR) = (↑ COMP GF AGR) \mid \)
  \( (↑ AGR) = (↑ COMP PIV AGR) \} \)
  \( (↑ AGR PERS) = c 1 \)
  \( (↑ AGR GEND) = c m \)
  \( (↑ AGR NUM) = c sg \)
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Person agreement: OT constraints

- My earlier analysis in Belyaev (2013) has to be only slightly modified to be compatible with this approach.
- The input should be an incomplete f-structure (without the AGR) of the higher stratum.
- The following constraints then handle the choice of controller:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{AGR-2} & (\uparrow \text{AGR PERS}) = 2 \\
\text{AGR-1} & (\uparrow \text{AGR PERS}) = 1 \\
\text{AGR-3}_{\text{TOP}} & (\uparrow \text{AGR PERS}) = 3 \\
& (\text{AGR}(\uparrow \text{AGR}) \sigma \text{DF}) = \text{TOPIC} \\
\text{AGR-\text{GF}} & (\text{GF AGR}(\uparrow \text{AGR})) \\
\text{AGR-\text{PIV}} & (\text{PIV AGR}(\uparrow \text{AGR}))
\end{align*}
\]
Person agreement: OT constraints

- My earlier analysis in Belyaev (2013) has to be only slightly modified to be compatible with this approach
- The input should be an incomplete f-structure (without the AGR) of the higher stratum
- The following constraints then handle the choice of controller:
  \[
  \text{AGR-2} (\uparrow \text{AGR PERS}) = 2 \\
  \text{AGR-1} (\uparrow \text{AGR PERS}) = 1 \\
  \text{AGR-3}_{\text{TOP}} (\uparrow \text{AGR PERS}) = 3 \\
  \left( (\text{AGR}(\uparrow \text{AGR})_{\sigma} \text{ DF}) \right) = \text{TOPIC} \\
  \text{AGR-\text{GF}} (\text{GF AGR}(\uparrow \text{AGR})) \\
  \text{AGR-\text{PIV}} (\text{PIV AGR}(\uparrow \text{AGR}))
  \]
- The ranking for Ashti: \( \text{AGR-1} \lor \text{AGR-2} > \text{AGR-3}_{\text{TOP}} > \text{AGR-\text{PIV}} > \text{AGR-\text{GF}} \)
  ▶ on constraint disjunction see Crowhurst and Hewitt (1997)
Some sample tableaux

- A = 1p m sg, P = 3p$_{\text{TOP}}$ f sg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>di-l pat’imat</th>
<th>AGR-1 $\lor$ AGR-2</th>
<th>AGR-3$_{\text{TOP}}$</th>
<th>AGR-PIV</th>
<th>AGR-GF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j-us-u ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li-w=da (A)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li-j (P)</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some sample tableaux

- **A = 1p m sg, P = 3p**
  - **TOP**
  - **f sg**
  - **di-l pat’imat**
  - **j-us-u ...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>di-l pat’imat</th>
<th>AGR-1 ∨ AGR-2</th>
<th>AGR-3_{TOP}</th>
<th>AGR-PIV</th>
<th>AGR-(\text{GF})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>li-w=da (A)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li-j (P)</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A = 1p m sg, P = 2p f sg**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>di-l u j-us-u ...</th>
<th>AGR-1 ∨ AGR-2</th>
<th>AGR-3_{TOP}</th>
<th>AGR-PIV</th>
<th>AGR-(\text{GF})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>li-w=da (A)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li-j=di (P)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some sample tableaux

- **A = 1p m sg, P = 3p**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>di-l pat’imat</th>
<th>AGR-1 ∨ AGR-2</th>
<th>AGR-3\textsubscript{TOP}</th>
<th>AGR-PIV</th>
<th>AGR-G\textsubscript{F}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j-us-u ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| li-w=da (A)   | *             | *               |         |                 |
| li-j (P)      | *!            |                 |         | *               |

- **A = 1p m sg, P = 2p**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>di-l u j-us-u ...</th>
<th>AGR-1 ∨ AGR-2</th>
<th>AGR-3\textsubscript{TOP}</th>
<th>AGR-PIV</th>
<th>AGR-G\textsubscript{F}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| li-w=da (A)   | *             | *               |         |                 |
| li-j=di (P)   | *             |                 | *       |                 |

- **A = 3p**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rasul-li pat’imat</th>
<th>AGR-1 ∨ AGR-2</th>
<th>AGR-3\textsubscript{TOP}</th>
<th>AGR-PIV</th>
<th>AGR-G\textsubscript{F}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j-us-u ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| li-w (A)         | *             |                 |         |                 |
| li-j (P)         | *             |                 | *       |                 |
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- The 3rd person is split based on topicality
  - 1 vs. 2 determined by syntax (absolutive/P wins)

This analysis is typologically more motivated, as similar hierarchical systems with this kind of obviation are well-known.

If we keep the clause structure multi-tiered, agreement patterns can be tied to clausal tiers rather than features.

The OT approach of Belyaev (2013), slightly modified, can account for the relevant data.
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  - 3 vs. 3 determined by topicality (topic wins)
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Conclusions

- Ashti data do not support the Backward Control hypothesis.
- Gender agreement on the auxiliary merely reflects the gender feature of the person agreement controller.
- The 3rd person is split based on topicality:
  - 1 vs. 2 determined by syntax (absolutive/P wins)
  - 3 vs. 3 determined by topicality (topic wins)
  - In other words, 1,2 > 3 > 3'
  - This is typical of proximate-obviative systems, most of which only display the distinction in the 3rd person.
- This analysis is typologically more motivated, as similar hierarchical systems with this kind of obviation are well-known.
- If we keep the clause structure multi-tiered, agreement patterns can be tied to clausal tiers rather than features.
- The OT approach of Belyaev (2013), slightly modified, can account for the relevant data.


