

# CONCISE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES

Edited by

KEITH BROWN  
*University of Cambridge*

and

JIM MILLER  
*University of Edinburgh*

Consulting Editor

R. E. ASHER  
*University of Edinburgh*



1999

ELSEVIER

AMSTERDAM – LAUSANNE – NEW YORK – OXFORD – SHANNON – SINGAPORE – TOKYO

Elsevier Science Ltd, The Boulevard, Langford Lane,  
Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK

---

Copyright © 1999 Elsevier Science Ltd

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from the publishers.*

**Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication  
Data**

Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories / edited  
by Keith Brown and Jim Miller.

p. cm.

Includes indexes.

ISBN 0-08-043164-X

I. Grammar, Comparative and general--Grammatical  
categories--Encyclopedias. I. Brown, E. K. II. Miller,  
Jim.

P240.5.C66 1999  
415--dc21

99-046995

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the  
British Library.

ISBN 0-08-043164-X (HC)

©<sup>TM</sup> The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the  
American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for  
Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Typeset by Bibliocraft, Dundee, UK.  
Printed and bound in Great Britain by Cambridge University Press,  
UK.

CONCISE  
ENCYCLOPEDIA  
OF GRAMMATICAL  
CATEGORIES

Pinkster H 1972 *On Latin Adverbs*. North-Holland, Amsterdam  
 Ramat P, Ricca D 1994 Prototypical adverbs: On the scalarity/radiality of the notion of ADVERB. *Rivista di Linguistica* 6: 289–326  
 Sapir E 1921 *Language*. Harcourt Brace, New York  
 Thompson S A, Longacre R E 1985 Adverbial clauses. In:

Shopen T (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Vol. II: Complex Constructions. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge  
 van der Auwera J (ed.) in collaboration with D P Ó Baoill 1998 *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin  
 Weydt H (ed.) 1989 *Sprechen mit Partikeln*. De Gruyter, Berlin

## Agreement

G. G. Corbett

'Agreement' is widespread, being found in three-quarters of the world's languages, according to Mallinson and Blake (1981: 184). There are many instances which almost any linguist would accept as examples of agreement, yet there is no generally accepted definition. A useful starting point is provided by Steele (1978: 610):

The term *agreement* commonly refers to some systematic covariance between a semantic or formal property of one element and a formal property of another. For example, adjectives may take some formal indication of the number and gender of the noun they modify.

The essential point is the covariance or matching of features between two separate elements, such as noun and adjective. Other attempts at a definition can be found in Keenan (1978: 167), Lehmann (1982: 203), and Lapointe (1988). Most writers treat 'concord' as synonymous with agreement; there is no distinction which is consistently drawn between the two terms.

There is a question as to whether the determination of the form of anaphoric pronouns (as in examples like *the girl ... she*) is a part of agreement. The definition above covers such cases, and indeed most mainstream work on agreement uses the term in the wider sense to include pronouns. Barlow (1992: 134–52) reviews the research and concludes that there are no good grounds for distinguishing between agreement and antecedent-anaphora relations.

Traditional grammar recognized agreement as an interesting problem; it seemed relatively easy to state the general rules for agreement in languages like Latin, but several types of exception were identified. In modern linguistics, agreement was treated for some years primarily as a mere diagnostic for investigating superficially more interesting problems. However, Morgan (1972) showed that it is exceptionally difficult just to state the rules for verb agreement in English. Interest in the phenomenon has been increasing steadily, to the extent that there have been meetings devoted to the topic (see Alvarez, et al. 1984; Barlow and Ferguson 1988; Brentari, et al. 1988). The

literature on the subject is extensive, and there is considerable research in progress, in different theoretical frameworks (see Corbett, in press). Given the scope of the problem, this article will concentrate on the major topics.

Some of these topics arise even in the simplest statements about agreement. Statements of the type: 'X agrees with Y in Z,' are common, for example, 'predicate verbs agree with subject noun phrases in number.' The Y element, which determines the agreement, the subject noun phrase in this case, is called the 'controller.' The X element, whose form is determined by agreement, is the 'target.' 'X agrees with Y' specifies the 'domain' of agreement. And when the properties involved are indicated (agreement in Z, number in this instance), one is referring to agreement 'categories' (or agreement 'features'). Each of these topics will be examined; then the nature of agreement, its function, and the way in which it arises will be reviewed.

### 1. Categories

It makes sense to start with agreement categories, since they are essential to the subsequent discussion, and to look first at the possibilities, then at the problems.

#### 1.1 Category Possibilities

Agreement in gender is common; adjectives may agree with their head noun in gender, as in these Russian examples (1–3):

- |                   |                      |     |
|-------------------|----------------------|-----|
| bol's- <i>oj</i>  | avtomobil'           | (1) |
| large             | car (a large car)    |     |
| bol's- <i>aja</i> | mašina               | (2) |
| large             | car (a large car)    |     |
| bol's- <i>oe</i>  | taksi                | (3) |
| large             | taxi (a large taxi). |     |

The adjective changes its form according to the noun: in (1) it takes *-oj* because the noun *avtomobil'* 'car' is of masculine gender (a similar gender agreement form would occur with nouns denoting males);

in (2) it takes *-aja* because the alternative word for 'car'—*mašina*—is feminine; and (3) shows the neuter ending. While such three-gender patterns are quite common, as are two-gender systems, languages with four, and five genders are not unusual, and much larger numbers are occasionally found. Gender systems may have sex as a component, as in languages with masculine and feminine genders; but equally sex may be irrelevant; the distinction may be between animate and inanimate, for example.

The Russian examples also show agreement in number; all the adjectives are singular, to agree with the singular nouns. If the first noun is changed to a plural, the form of the adjective must change to match (4):

bol'shie avtomobili (4)  
large cars

The contrast here is just between singular and plural. Many languages have a third member of the number system, the dual, used for denoting two items. More complex systems may also be found, for example, with special forms for three items (the *trial*), or for a small but unspecified number of items (the *paucal*).

These same Russian examples also illustrate agreement in case: all the examples above are in the nominative case, as would be appropriate for subject position. If one is included in a prepositional phrase, the form changes again (5):

v bol'shom avtomobile (5)  
in large car (in a large car)

The preposition *v* 'in' governs the locative case, and the adjective, like the noun, stands in this case. Russian has six cases and there are many Indo-European languages with similar systems. Much larger case inventories can be found, in some of the languages of the Caucasus, for example.

The other commonly occurring agreement category is person. Systems with three persons, like Russian *ja čitaju* 'I read,' *ty čitaesh* 'you read,' and *on čitaet* 'he reads,' are familiar. Larger inventories occur in languages which sub-divide one or more of these three persons in some way. For example, some languages (such as Quechua), subdivide the first person plural into the first person inclusive and exclusive; and the third person may be divided into obviative and non-obviative, as in Algonquian languages.

The final category for consideration is that of 'definiteness.' This is not often included in the agreement categories, but there is a case for its inclusion, as evidence particularly from Afro-Asiatic languages suggests. These examples are from Syrian Arabic (Ferguson and Barlow 1988: 6) (6-7):

rižžaal kbiir (6)  
man big (a big man)

r-rižžaal l-kbiir (7)  
the-man the-big (the big man)

For further exemplification of these categories see Moravcsik (1978: 336-62), and the entries on *Gender and Gender Systems; Number and Number Systems; Case.*)

### 1.2 Category Problems

While it is true to say that, for example, Russian adjectives agree with their noun in gender, such statements generally need qualification. This is because there are frequently restrictions on agreement. Thus German adjectives also show agreement in gender. But this agreement is restricted syntactically: within the noun phrase there is agreement, but when an adjective functions as a predicate (with the copula), then there is no agreement. There are often morphological restrictions too. The Russian examples (1-3), show agreement in gender; however, if the same phrases are made plural, the adjective in each case takes the same form as in (4); that is, agreement in gender is restricted to the singular number. And the restriction may be lexical: in the northeast Caucasian language Khinalug, most verbs show agreement but some do not.

The second type of qualification to the general statements of agreement possibilities is that the categories are different in nature. In the case of gender, it is an inherent feature of the noun. Gender is found on the target, say the adjective, as a consequence, in some sense, of its presence in the noun. In example (1), the masculine ending on *bol'soj* has nothing to do with the lexical meaning of the adjective, but results from the fact that the adjective is modifying a masculine noun. A somewhat similar situation obtains for person; in the Russian sentences *ja čitaju* 'I read,' 'first person' is an inherent feature of the pronoun, but not of the verb. In number, things are a little different, and more debatable. Number is an inherent property of some nouns: nouns which are only singular (like English *prestige*), or only plural (like *scissors*), impose this feature on their modifiers. Typically, however, a considerable proportion of the nouns of a given language can be associated with both (or all) numbers. In straightforward examples involving such nouns, like (4), the number feature appears to relate primarily to the noun; the property denoted by the adjective (largeness in this instance), is not affected by the change in number, which is again just a result of the fact that it modifies a noun which has this feature.

With case, the picture is different again; clearly not an inherent feature, case is imposed by government by some other syntactic element (the preposition in example (5)). Thus the noun and adjective in (5) are in the same case because it is imposed on both. They do indeed covary for case, but this covariance differs from that found with, say, gender; as a result some would not recognize case as an agreement category. Speaking metaphorically, it can be said that nouns start out having gender and impose it on their modifiers (similarly pronouns have person which they

impose on their agreement targets); nouns typically gain number, which they impose on their modifiers. However, nouns gain case 'at the same time' as their modifiers and so come to have the same case. While this holds for the straightforward instances of matching of case within the noun phrase, there are more complex instances of covariance in case between predicate complements and their controllers (for which see Timberlake 1988 on Lithuanian, and references there to earlier work, especially by Andrews). Finally, agreement in definiteness is an instance of a feature imposed on the noun phrase as a whole, which may be indicated at more than one point in the phrase; this gives rise to a matching of the definiteness feature. Previewing the later discussion, it might be said whether such instances count as agreement or not depends in part on whether it is considered *directional*. If 'X agrees with Y' implies that Y has the feature 'first' and then this is matched by X, then there is a strong case for saying that (5) does not in fact show agreement in case, nor (7) agreement in definiteness; if simple matching is all that is required, then they are instances of agreement.

The third type of problem with general statements of agreement possibilities is that there are instances where the features expressed by the morphology do not in fact match. A familiar one is found in English. The statement that predicate verbs agree with the subject noun phrase is contradicted, particularly in British English, by examples like the following (8):

The committee have decided. (8)

The subject stands in the singular, yet the verb is plural (see Sect. 5.2).

## 2. Controllers

Typical controllers present little difficulty of identification, yet there are numerous problems with the less straightforward cases.

### 2.1 Controller Possibilities

The discussion of categories suggests that the features involved in agreement are associated originally or primarily with nouns; traditionally nouns and pronouns are considered the normal agreement controllers. However, in subject-verb agreement, and indeed any agreement extending beyond the noun phrase, it appears that it is the noun phrase rather than the noun which is the controller. (A clear instance is agreement with conjoined noun phrases.) This poses little difficulty in that many would claim that the noun phrase's features depend on those of the head noun and so the noun is still in a sense the controller. On the other hand there is an asymmetry here, and there are examples where agreement even within the noun phrase cannot easily be explained as agreement with the noun; for these reasons, some, like Lehmann (1982: 221-24), claim that agreement is always controlled by

a noun phrase. Either way, it is established that possible controllers are 'virtually always constituents in the N projection' (Pullum 1984: 82).

### 2.2 Controller Problems

The analysis of agreement controllers presents several problems. First, there are cases where different elements within the controller compete to control agreement. Thus if the subject consists of conjoined noun phrases, the verb may well agree with just one of them. In quantified expressions there is often competition between the quantifier and the quantified noun for the role of controller. Then there are instances where different potential controllers are in competition; for example, the predicate complement may compete with the subject noun phrase in determining the agreement form of the copula verb; this phenomenon is known as 'attraction' or 'back agreement.' (For examples of all these see Corbett 1988: 25-32; and for a case of complex interaction of competing factors in determining the controller see Tsunoda 1981 on Djaru, and compare Mallinson and Blake 1981: 88-89, and Comrie 1989: 191-92.)

Another common problem, and a serious one in some theoretical frameworks, is the existence of so-called 'prodrop' languages. It may be desirable to say of certain languages, for example, Serbo-Croatian, that verbs agree with their subject in person and number, as in *ja čitam* 'I read,' *ty čitaš* 'you read.' In most circumstances, the more natural utterances would be *čitam* and *čitaš*. The problem is that the pronominal agreement controller is normally not present. For other problematic controllers see the remarkable data on Chamorro and Palauan presented by Chung and Georgopoulos (1988), and the Upper Sorbian data discussed by Corbett (1987).

## 3. Targets

Targets vary widely, and involve considerable problems of analysis.

### 3.1 Target Possibilities

Examples of agreement of adjectives within the noun phrase have already been noted. Demonstratives may also be found agreeing similarly, as may articles (definite and indefinite), various possessives, and numerals. The latter type of target is perhaps less familiar and so will be illustrated with examples from the Bantu language Chichewa;

chi-pewa chi-modzi (9)  
hat one (one hat)

zi-pewa zi-wiri (10)  
hats two (two hats)

Here the numeral agrees in gender and number with the noun.

In many languages predicate verbs agree with the subject noun phrase. They may also agree with the

direct object (as in various Bantu languages), and with various other arguments. Personal pronouns agree with their antecedents (though some would exclude them from agreement, as discussed earlier), as do relative pronouns. Surprisingly, perhaps, the list continues. Adverbs can show agreement (in Lak and in Kala Lagaw Ya, for example), as can adpositions (Abkhaz), and there is even evidence (from West Flemish) that complementizers can agree. The possessed noun may show agreement with the possessor (again found in Abkhaz), and, more rarely, the possessor may agree with the possessed (as in Chamalal). For illustrations of all of these target types see Corbett (1991: 106–15); see also Lehmann (1982: 207–15) for useful data.

### 3.2 Target Problems

A problem which targets cause for accounts of agreement is that the realization of agreement may differ according to the target. In its simplest form, this difference is widespread in Indo-European; consider this example from Serbo-Croatian (11):

Milica je došla (11)  
Milica is come (Milica came)

The auxiliary verb shows agreement in person and number (it is third person singular), while the participle shows agreement in number and gender (feminine singular). These targets, then, show agreement in different features, but in the feature they share, namely number, they show the same value (singular). This identity of the shared feature is not always found, however, as this Slovak example shows (12):

Mama, vy ste taká dobrá (12)  
Mother, you are so kind!

Here, there is agreement with the plural pronoun *vy* 'you,' used honorifically; both parts of the predicate agree in number, but *ste* is plural, while *taká dobrá* is singular (and feminine). And when controllers allow agreement options (as, say, English nouns like *committee*, which allow singular and plural agreement), the particular target involved may have a major influence on the form chosen. (For detailed analysis of such problems see Corbett 1983.)

### 4. Domains

As noted earlier, when both the controller and the target can be identified the agreement domain is specified. Given the range of possible targets, it is evident that the number of possible domains is also large, both when looking at the possible domains in human language, and even when considering certain individual languages (see Moravcsik 1978: 362–66 for discussion). Ideally it should be feasible to derive the possible agreement domains from some more general principle. The most influential attempt to do this is that of Keenan (1978). In a nutshell, Keenan claims

that X may agree with Y if, and only if, in the logical form of a given syntactic structure, the logical forms of expressions of X are interpreted as functions taking the interpretations of expression of Y as arguments: in other words, targets are functions and controllers are arguments. This account covers a large proportion of the attested domains: controllers, as demonstrated, are typically nominal, while targets, at least the common ones, may be viewed as functions or operators semantically (compare Pullum 1984: 82). Keenan's generalization is the basis for the *control agreement principle* of Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (Gazdar, et al, 1985: 83–94), and of similar constructs in other theories. The important point here is that the *control agreement principle* specifies possible agreement domains by reference to the semantic types of the elements involved.

Before leaving domains it is necessary to consider some of the complexity involved. First, note that agreement may be 'downwards,' in the sense that dependents can agree with their heads, and as Nichols (1985) shows, it may be 'upwards,' since heads can agree with dependents. And then it should be said that there are instances of domains which seem to stretch the range beyond anything which might have been predicted. Consider the following data from the northeast Caucasian language Archi (Kibrik 1972: 124) (13–16):

w-ez dĩa k'anši w-i (13)  
I father like is (I like father)

d-ez buwa k'anši d-i (14)  
I mother like is (I like mother)

b-ez dogi k'anši b-i (15)  
I donkey like is (I like the donkey)

Ø-ez motol k'anši Ø-i (16)  
I young goat like is (I like the kid)

Archi is an ergative language: the part of the verb which shows agreement agrees with the object of a transitive verb; there are four different forms in (13–16), corresponding to the four genders of Archi. With verbs of emotion and perception, the subject stands in the dative case; in the examples (13–16) it is a personal pronoun with an agreement slot, and this also agrees with the object. Thus one argument of the verb agrees, through it, with another. (Another remarkable agreement domain is described in Troike 1981.)

### 5. The Nature of Agreement

There are two problems which have dominated attempts to give a satisfying account of agreement: the question of directionality and the nature of the link between controller and target.

#### 5.1 Directionality

As illustrated in the discussion of categories (Sect. 1), there is a clear intuition that agreement is in a

sense directional. Consider this Russian example (17):

Irina čitala (17)  
Irina was reading.

The noun *Irina* is feminine because it denotes a female. The verb shows feminine agreement (-a) because its subject is feminine—the reading is not feminine. A noun typically has only one gender, while the verb has alternative forms to match the features of a particular subject in a given sentence.

Early accounts of agreement, in Transformational Grammar, captured this intuition by copying features from the controller to the target. This works in many cases, but there are problems, several of which have already been encountered above. The controller may be absent (as in the pro-drop cases). This was handled by having the controller present, copying its features, and then deleting it (an approach not available in more recent theories). However, the controller may be present but be underspecified, as in this French example (Ferguson and Barlow 1988: 12) (18):

je suis heureux / je suis heureuse. (18)  
I am happy / I am happy.

The first variant would be used by a male speaker, and has masculine agreement, while the second is appropriate for a female as it shows feminine agreement. A copying account of agreement requires two forms of the first person pronoun, even though there is no formal difference. Finally, copying analyses have problems with instances where the features on the controller and the target do not match (as with nouns like *committee*).

More recent approaches, notably that of Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, allow free instantiation of feature on controllers and targets. Only those structures meeting certain constraints, typically, the identity of certain features, are grammatical. Thus matching of features occurs but without copying. The work is done by 'unification,' which has a vital role in several different frameworks. In such accounts there need not be any directionality of agreement—yet it represents an important intuition. In Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar this notion is reintroduced by the *control agreement principle* (see Sect. 4), which specifies possible controllers and targets, and gives them different statuses. Since, however, there is no movement of features in such a model, it is more accurate to talk of the asymmetry of agreement rather than directionality.

Unification does not require that feature sets should be fully specified; it will allow analyses of the examples with absent and underspecified controllers. If, as in the second variant of (18) above, the controller is first person and singular but is unspecified for gender, while the target is singular and feminine but is unspecified for person, unification of the two

will give the values: first person, singular, feminine. Thus agreement can be seen as a matter of cumulating partial information from controller and target (see Barlow 1992; Pollard and Sag 1994). It is still asymmetric in that the information relates primarily to the controller. (Note that this view would exclude from agreement most instances of case and definiteness matching.)

### 5.2 The Link between Controller and Target

The traditional view of agreement was that the link was a matter of syntax. To those who had worked on Latin, it seemed obvious that most cases of agreement could be covered by relatively straightforward syntactic rules. They were careful to note exceptions, where the features of the controller and target do not match (analogous to the English *committee* problem), and suggested that these show interference from semantic factors. This is still the dominant view. Those who appeal to the *control agreement principle* or some similar principle are claiming that the domains of agreement can be specified by appeal to semantics but the domains themselves remain a matter of syntax.

Others, however, follow a different line. Barlow 1992: 230), for example, cites examples like the following (19–21):

Five dollars is too much. (19)

John and only John is allowed in here. (20)

This team are going to win the cup. (21)

In such cases it appears that agreement is semantically motivated (taking semantics broadly). There is a plural subject in (19), yet a singular verb. The conjoined noun phrases in (20) have a single referent and so there is a singular verb. Example (21) is the opposite of (19); there is a singular subject and plural verb.

If an appeal has to be made to semantic factors in such instances, a logical move is to try to treat the whole of agreement as a matter of semantics (as suggested by Dowty and Jacobson 1988, for example). To take a straightforward example:

The cat sits on the mat. (22)

It can be argued that *sits* is singular because its controller *cat* denotes a singular entity. This is in the nature of the agreement categories of gender, number, and person; they all display a greater or lesser degree of overlap with the real world and therefore many instances of their use can be equally well treated as syntactic or semantic. It is significant that those who favor the semantic approach typically start from English data; English allows greater scope for semantics/pragmatics than almost any other language whose agreement system has been analyzed in any depth.

Just as there are cases where the syntactic view of agreement has to appeal to semantic factors, so it

would seem that a semantic view will need to appeal to syntactic factors. An obvious case involves languages with grammatical gender, where the gender, say of inanimates, is not determined by their meaning (see *Gender and Gender Systems*). It is hard to construct a convincing semantic account of the feminine agreements with *mašina* 'car' in (2), as opposed to the use of the masculine with *avtomobil* 'car' in (1). Another difficulty is examples like the following (H. Clarke cited in Barlow 1988: 227):

I am parked on the hill. (23)

While the intended referent is clearly a car, there is no possibility of a third person verb—syntactic person agreement is required. Perhaps the most serious problem for the semantic approach to agreement, as indeed for the syntactic approach, is sentences like (21) above, where both 'syntactic' agreement of the determiner *this* and 'semantic' agreement of the verb *are* are found. Here it appears that semantic accounts have to leave a place for syntax.

The evidence suggests that both syntax and semantics are involved in agreement. Their relative importance varies from language to language. The conflict between the two can give rise to considerable variation—constructions where alternative agreement forms are found. However, this variation is tightly constrained, for example, by the *agreement hierarchy* and associated constraints (Corbett 1983: 1987: 319–22).

## 6. The Functions of Agreement

Given its pervasiveness and complexity, it is reasonable to ask what agreement does. The old answer is that it introduces redundancy, so that if part of the message is lost, owing to noise in the communication channel, there is a greater chance that the original message can be reconstituted. This may well be part of the answer. More recently, researchers have pointed to a more specific function of agreement, namely its role in allowing the speaker to keep track of referents in a discourse, by means of the agreement categories. This is easy to see in English, if the control of the pronouns (*he/she/it/they*) is part of agreement. In languages with fuller agreement systems, other types of agreement may carry a comparable load (see Lehmann 1982: 233; 1988; Foley and Van Valin (1984: 327). This view is consistent with that of Barlow (1988: 3, 7), according to whom the controller and target 'instigate discourse referents'; he proposes a discourse-linking theory, in which agreement relates to utterances in discourse. Pollard and Sag (1994: 242), also see the role of agreement as being to keep track of referents in discourse. The old and new suggestions as to the role of agreement may be seen as complementary. And, as with word order, for example, its functions and importance may vary considerably from language to language.

## 7. The Origin of Agreement

The major work on the rise of agreement is Givón (1976). He claims that subject-verb agreement develops from pronouns in topic-shifting constructions. This is shown schematically as follows; in (24) there is a shifted topic:

the man, he came (24)  
TOPIC PRONOMINAL SUBJECT VERB.

Here the pronoun represents topic agreement. This marked construction may become reanalyzed as a neutral sentence type, as has occurred in many non-standard dialects of American English (25):

the man he-came (25)  
SUBJECT AGREEMENT MARKER-VERB.

This reanalysis results from the overuse of a powerful discourse device, which is a reasonable strategy, particularly if conditions for communication are difficult. Givón claims that evidence for pronouns becoming subject agreement markers can be found in English and French dialects and in related pidgins and creoles. Various Bantu languages also provide confirming data, as is illustrated from Swahili (26):

kikopo ki-li-vunjika (26)  
up AGREEMENT.MARKER-PAST-BREAK (the cup broke)

The subject agreement markers retain their older anaphoric function (27):

ki-li-vunjika (27)  
it-PAST-break (It, the cup, broke)

Thus the marker *ki* (which shows gender and number), allows the hearer to establish the intended referent in context in (27); it also occurs as an agreement marker when there is explicit reference to the referent as in (26). As is implicit in the account above, Givón claims that agreement and pronominalization are 'fundamentally one and the same phenomenon.' While pronouns are no longer believed to be the only source of agreement systems, they are certainly a primary one. And the fact that pronouns, which are particularly susceptible to semantic/pragmatic factors, become increasingly grammaticalized to form agreement morphology contributes to the understanding of why synchronic accounts of agreement require reference both to syntax and to semantics.

## 8. Conclusion

Agreement remains something of an enigma. It is widespread, yet its functions are still poorly understood. Despite a great deal of research from the mid-1970s onwards, in a variety of theoretical frameworks, a reasonable account of the phenomenon has yet to be formulated.

## Bibliography

Alvarez G, Brodie B, McCoy T (eds.) 1984 *ESCOL '84: Proceedings of the First Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*. Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

- Barlow M 1992 *A Situated Theory of Agreement*. Garland, New York
- Barlow M, Ferguson C A (eds.) 1988 *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University, Stanford, CA
- Brentari D, Larson G, MacLeod L (eds.) 1988 *CLS 24: Papers from the 24th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Part II: Parasession on Agreement in Grammatical Theory*. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, IL
- Chung S, Georgopoulos C 1988 Agreement with gaps in Chamorro and Palauan. In: Barlow M, Ferguson C A (eds.)
- Comrie B 1989 *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, 2nd edn. Blackwell, Oxford
- Corbett G G 1983 *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers: Agreement Patterns in Slavic*. Croom Helm, London
- Corbett G G 1987 The morphology/syntax interface: Evidence from possessive adjectives in Slavonic. *Lg* 63: 299-345
- Corbett G G 1988 Agreement: A partial specification, based on Slavonic data. In: Barlow M, Ferguson C A (eds.)
- Corbett G G 1991 *Gender*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Corbett G G 1995 Research into syntactic change: Agreement. In: Jacobs J, von Stechow A, Sternefeld W, Vennemann T (eds.) *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research II* de Gruyter, Berlin
- Corbett G G (ed.) in press Agreement. Special issue of *Folia Linguistica*
- Dowty D, Jacobson P 1988 Agreement as a semantic phenomenon. In: Powers J, de Jong J (eds.) *ESCOL '88: Proceedings of the Fifth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*. Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
- Ferguson C A, Barlow M 1988 Introduction. In: Barlow M, Ferguson C A (eds.)
- Foley W A, Van Valin R D 1984 *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Gazdar G, Klein E, Pullum G, Sag I 1985 *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*. Blackwell, Oxford
- Givón T 1976 Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement. In: Li C N (ed.) *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press, New York
- Keenan E L 1978 On surface form and logical form. In: Kachru B B (ed.) *Linguistics in the Seventies: Directions and Prospects*. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 8, 2. Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL
- Kibrik A E 1972 O formal'nom vydelenii soglasovatel'nykh klassov v arčinskom jazyke. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1: 124-31
- Lapointe S G 1988 Towards a unified theory of agreement. In: Barlow M, Ferguson C A (eds.)
- Lehmann C 1982 Universal and typological aspects of agreement. In: Seiler H, Stachowiak F J (eds.) *Apprehension: Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen. II: Die Techniken und ihre Zusammenhang in Einzelsprachen*. Narr, Tübingen
- Lehmann C 1988 On the function of agreement. In: Barlow M, Ferguson C A (eds.)
- Mallinson G, Blake B J 1981 *Language Typology: Cross-linguistic Studies in Syntax*. North-Holland, Amsterdam
- Moravcsik E A 1978 Agreement. In: Greenberg J H, Ferguson C A, Moravcsik E A (eds.) *Universals of Human Language. vol. 4: Syntax*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA
- Morgan J L 1972 Verb agreement as a rule of English. In: Peranteau P M, Levi J N, Phares G C (eds.) *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society, April 14-16 1972*. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, IL
- Nichols J 1985 The directionality of agreement. In: Niepokuj M, Van Clay M, Nikiforidou V, Feder D (eds.) *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. BLS, University of California, Berkeley, CA
- Pollard C, Sag I A 1994 *Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Pullum G K 1984 How complex could an agreement system be? In: Alvarez G, Brodie B, McCoy T (eds.) *ESCOL '84: Proceedings of the First Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*. Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
- Steele S 1978 Word order variation: A typological study. In: Greenberg J H, Ferguson C A, Moravcsik E A (eds.) *Universals of Human Language. Vol. 4: Syntax*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA
- Timberlake A 1988 Case agreement in Lithuanian. In: Barlow M, Ferguson C A (eds.) *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University, Stanford, CA
- Troike R C 1981 Subject-object concord in Coahuilteco. *Lg* 57: 658-73
- Tsunoda T 1981 Interaction of phonological, grammatical, and semantic factors: An Australian example. *OL* 20: 45-92

## Anaphora

P. Sells and T. Wasow

The term 'anaphora,' as it has come to be used in modern grammatical theory, encompasses the phenomena of pronominal reference and various kinds of ellipsis. What these have in common is that an element or construction is dependent for its inter-

pretation on being associated with something else in the context. Developing an understanding of these phenomena has become an area of intense activity among linguists, although many major questions remain unsolved.