

Agreement: a partial specification, based on Slavonic data¹

GREVILLE G. CORBETT

Abstract

The paper attempts to determine some of the requirements of that portion of linguistic theory concerned with agreement. Within Slavonic there are numerous difficulties, which may be classified into three types, according to whether they are caused by the controller, the target, or the agreement features. There are difficulties in identifying the controller, in establishing its features, and in handling 'reluctant' controllers (which do not appear in surface structure in a form which matches that of the target). The major target problems involve compound targets and reluctant targets. Features require resolution rules and rules to assign default values.

Various constructions discussed permit agreement choices, whose distribution is determined by a range of linguistic and sociolinguistic factors. Patterns can be established for the use of agreement options, but some of these must be stated at corpus level rather than at sentence level. The conclusion is that even within a closely related and relatively conservative set of Indo-European languages there are several constructions which are problematic for linguistic theory.

1. Introduction

This paper is an attempt to specify what is required of that portion of linguistic theory which is concerned with agreement. The data are taken from Slavonic languages. Even within this limited area, there are ample difficulties; naturally, a linguistic theory must meet these and many more from beyond Slavonic for it to be considered an adequate account of agreement. The justification for a paper of this type is that theorists, after long treating agreement merely as a diagnostic (with notable exceptions, such as Morgan 1972), are now increasingly viewing it as an important problem in its own right. This new approach is shared by linguists of

different persuasions. There is now the danger that old problems will be 'rediscovered' and time wasted going over old ground. Therefore the range of problematic agreement data from Slavonic is set out in a form which will be accessible to other investigators, so that at least the groundwork need not be repeated. In order to make the survey of wider use, I have tried, as far as is possible, to keep it neutral relative to different theories. Of course, data which cause severe difficulties in one theoretical framework may be completely straightforward in another, and so some sections are likely to be of greater interest than others to individual readers.

2. Basic requirements

Any linguistic theory should allow us to incorporate the equivalent of traditional statements such as 'in Polish, attributive adjectives agree with their head nouns in number'; or, more generally, 'in a given language X agrees with Y in Z'. The definition of 'agrees with' is problematic but need not detain us, since it is intimately bound up with the particular theory adopted. We shall use agreement in the traditional sense, to refer to the matching of properties between elements in specified syntactic configurations. Whether there is any directionality involved and, if so, the way it goes, depends on the theory and so will be left open. We shall follow normal usage, whereby adjectives are said to agree with nouns, predicates with subjects, without implying more than a matching of properties.

When we state that 'X agrees with Y', we specify the *domain* of agreement. We shall refer to the X element (the attributive adjective, for example) as the *target* and the Y element (the head noun) as the *controller*. This usage mirrors the relationship implied by 'agrees with', but nothing crucial depends on the terms adopted. While any theory must be able to specify the domains of agreement, if it can predict them (as, for example, in Keenan 1974), this is clearly a considerable advantage. In addition to specifying the domain, we must indicate the agreement properties involved (agreement *in Z*). Following Moravcsik (1978) we shall refer to them as *agreement features*, whether or not they are to be handled by feature notation.

If we are to give an adequate theoretical description of agreement in Slavonic, the theory will have to enable us to include the following, in a principled way:

- a. the attributive adjective normally agrees with its head noun in number, case, and gender;
- b. the predicate normally agrees with the subject in some combination of number, case, person, and gender;

c. the relative and personal pronouns normally agree with their antecedent in number and gender.

Difficulties arise as soon as we try to make this account more precise and to leave out the occurrences of 'normally'. These difficulties will be dealt with under *controller problems* (section 3), *target problems* (section 4), and *feature problems* (section 5), but it is important to note that several of the difficulties cut across this classification. An important set of problems involves agreement choices — situations in which alternative agreement features can be assigned. We shall note these in the appropriate section and then consider the general questions of choices separately (section 6). Thus sections 3–5 are concerned with the possibilities which occur, including the existence of options, while section 6 concentrates on constructions which permit alternative agreement forms and on the factors which influence the choice.

3. Controller problems

We need to be able to specify what is the controller (section 3.1) and what agreement features it carries (section 3.2). Hence there are two potential sources of difficulty. A third set of problems arises from the effect of other rules, which make the status of the controller less clear (section 3.3).

3.1. Identifying the controller

Most problems of identifying the controller are structural, relating to particular constructions rather than lexical items. These are of two main types: first, those where it is clear which constituent is the 'overall' controller, but where it is not clear which is the element within it whose features match those of the target; and second, instances where different constituents are potential controllers.

3.1.1. *Competition within the controller.* There are three types of phrase in Slavonic which may function as the overall controller, yet present problems as to which element within them is the controller. They occur in various domains, of which we shall consider subject–predicate agreement. The first type is familiar; it consists of conjoined noun phrases. Consider the following Russian examples:

- (1) *prepodavaliś* (pl) *matematika* (sg fem) i *fizika* (sg fem)
were taught mathematics and physics

- (2) prepodavalaš (sg fem) matematika (sg fem) i fizika (sg fem)
 was taught mathematics and physics
 (Graudina et al. 1976: 31)

In (1) the predicate verb is plural, showing agreement with the conjoined noun phrases as a whole. Since neither of the conjoined noun phrases is plural, some sort of feature computation is required. Such feature computations, or 'resolution rules', pose problems for certain theories. Example (2), on the other hand, shows predicate agreement with just one of the conjoined noun phrases. Given that both are of the same gender, we cannot tell which controls the agreement. We must therefore look at an example with NPs of different gender:

- (3) byla (sg fem) v nej i skromnost' (sg fem), i
 was in her and modesty and
 izjaščestvo (sg neut), i dostoinstvo (sg neut)
 elegance and dignity
 (Pravda, quoted by Graudina et al. 1976: 31)

In this example it is clear that agreement is with *skromnost'* as this noun is feminine singular. Agreement with one of the other nouns would be ungrammatical. *Skromnost'* is both the first noun phrase in the series and the nearest to the verb; it is the latter characteristic which is the more important, as is shown by comparison with examples with the subject before the predicate. It should be said that Slavonic languages are classified as SVO, but that VS order, as in the examples so far, is very common; word order depends, to a significant extent, on information structure. In examples with the subject preceding the predicate, the normal possibilities are again agreement with all the NPs or with just the nearest.² This appears to be the case throughout the Slavonic family.

There is, however, a further possibility, which is uncommon. It is *distant agreement*, that is to say agreement with the first conjunct, which, with subject-verb word order, is not the nearest. Examples occur in Slovenian, a South Slavonic language:

- (4) knjige (pl fem) in peresa (pl neut) so se podražile (pl fem).
 books and pens are selves got dear
 'Books and pens have become more expensive.'
 (Lenček 1972: 59)

Similar examples occur in Slovenian's closest relative, Serbo-Croat; the most extensive source is Mearns (1976). (It has also been claimed that agreement in Čakavian dialects of the 16th-17th centuries could be with

the most important conjunct, even if this was not the nearest or the first: Glavan 1927–1928: 143–145; the evidence is very limited.)

The data from agreement with conjoined noun phrases require a theory to incorporate the following: resolution rules or their equivalent (to which we shall return) to cover the cases where agreement is with all the conjuncts; the ability to identify the conjunct nearest the predicate, when agreement is with one conjunct only. This information must be obtainable from that level of representation where word order dependent on information structure has been determined. For some languages there is the additional requirement that it must be possible to identify the first conjunct.³

In a related construction, the place of the conjoined noun phrases is taken by noun phrases linked with the preposition *s(o)* or its equivalent; in this construction we again find both singular and plural agreement, as in this Russian example (Nichols et al. 1980: 375):

- (5) Fon Manšejna čut' bylo ne otopravil (sg)/ 'otpravili (pl)
 Von Mannstein [object] almost sent sent
 na tot svet Avdeev so svoim vedomym.
 to the other world Avdeev with his own copilot
 'Avdeev and his copilot almost sent Von Mannstein to the other world.'

The point of interest is that while in previous examples all the conjuncts were in the nominative case, in this construction the structure is NP(nominative) + preposition + NP(instrumental). If agreement is singular, then it is with the NP standing in the nominative; this is entirely as expected, since in Slavonic subjects must stand in the nominative to control subject–verb agreement. When plural agreement is found in examples like (5), this indicates that the oblique conjunct is in some sense 'taken into account'.⁴ Thus the agreement rules must be able to identify the comitative phrase as a whole as being nominative and then include the oblique NP in the feature computations.

Similar situations arise with quantified expressions. These are particularly varied and complex in Slavonic; only the most salient difficulties will be described here. Though it is impossible to talk of a typical Slavonic numeral, we will start with the Russian numeral *pjat'* 'five' as a representative quantifier. When itself in the nominative case, it requires quantified nouns to stand in the genitive. A subject consisting of such a quantified expression may take either neuter singular or plural agreement:

- (6) vošlo (sg neut) pjat' (nom) devušek (gen pl)
 (7) vošli (pl) pjat' (nom) devušek (gen pl)
 came in five girls

Both (6) and (7) are fully acceptable. The question arises as to what exactly is the controller. One analysis of (6) is that it shows the failure of the subject to provide the required features: *pjat'* is not marked for number and gender, and so the verb stands in the *default form* (section 3.2). Sentence (7) is more difficult. It appears that, as in the comitative construction just discussed, the fact that part of the subject is in the nominative is sufficient to allow access to the features of an NP in an oblique case. Thus the plural feature comes from the noun (see Corbett 1983a: 216–220 for justification). This position is strengthened by reference to Serbo-Croat, which, unlike Russian, preserves gender distinctions in the plural:

- (8) pet devojaka (gen pl) su (pl) došle (pl fem).
 five girls are come
 'Five girls have come.'

Though the singular is more likely in Serbo-Croat, when the plural occurs it shows agreement in gender with the noun, as in (8). West Slavonic languages go further, in that adjectival predicates agree with the noun in case, as the following Polish example demonstrates:

- (9) pięć (nom) piór (gen pl) jest (sg) nowych (gen pl)
 five pens is new

Here *nowych* obviously agrees fully with the noun; it is not so clear what controls the agreement of the verb; one interpretation would be that it is the default form, as in (6), which results because the verb cannot reflect both genitive and plural. The main point is that the overall controller can be identified but that isolating the element which controls agreement is not so straightforward. It is evident that with this one numeral the relations are different in the three languages. On top of that, there are profound differences in the agreement and other syntactic behavior of numerals within individual languages. As an example, consider the Russian numeral *tysjača* 'thousand'. Like *pjat'*, it can take neuter singular agreement or plural agreement; in addition, it can take feminine singular agreement:

- (10) ljubaja tysjača (nom) načal'nikov (gen pl) dannogo ranga
 any thousand chiefs of a given rank (is)
 ravnocenna (sg fem) ljuboj drugoj togo že ranga (Zinov'ev)
 equivalent to any other of the same rank

In this example, *tysjača*, which is in many respects like a feminine singular noun, controls the agreement.

Even between controllers which allow only plural or neuter singular

agreement, there is great variation in the relative frequency of these options, as Table 1 illustrates. It can be seen from these data (derived from Suprun 1969: 185, 188) that plural predicate agreement is more likely with the numerals '2-4' than with '5-10' (there is, in fact, a difference between '2', '3', and '4'). *Neskol'ko* 'a few' is less likely than any of these to take plural agreement, while the plural with quantifiers like *mnogo* 'many' is quite unusual. It appears that a theory must allow a great deal of idiosyncratic information about the different quantifiers to be stored. However, it has been shown⁵ that there is a correlation between the degree to which the syntactic behavior of a quantifier approximates to that of a noun and the likelihood of singular agreement (the more nounlike the numeral, the more likely is singular agreement). Furthermore, the higher the arithmetic value of simple cardinal numerals, the more nounlike they become. These correlations hold both within the Slavonic family and beyond. On the one hand, they indicate the presence of clear patterns in an apparently very confused area; on the other hand, it is not clear where in a grammar information of this type should be incorporated. This necessarily brief discussion of quantified expressions has shown that there are instances where there is genuine doubt as to which element in the subject NP controls agreement. Furthermore, there is great variation between controllers, which must be reflected in a grammar in some way.

3.1.2. *Constituents competing to be controller.* An interesting instance of competition between potential controllers arises in sentences of the form NP + copula + NP. Various grammarians state that, besides the

Table 1. *Predicate agreement with quantified subjects in Russian: 18th-20th centuries*

Quantifier	18th century			19th century			20th century		
	sg	pl	%pl	sg	pl	%pl	sg	pl	%pl
2-4	55	357	87	54	357	87	146	710	83
5-10	19	34	64	74	82	53	110	110	50
Collectives (e.g. <i>dvoe</i> 'two')	25	41	62	23	82	78	35	255	88
Complex numbers (e.g. <i>dvadcat'</i> '20')	48	26	35	71	62	47	103	65	39
Compound numbers (e.g. <i>sorok pjat'</i> '45')	45	24	35	72	71	50	57	40	41
<i>neskol'ko</i> 'a few'	105	28	21	151	139	48	137	78	36
<i>mnogo</i> 'many', <i>skol'ko</i> 'how many', <i>stol'ko</i> 'so many'	42	0	0	not given			282	9	3

expected agreement with the subject, agreement of the copula with the noun phrase in the predicate also occurs. This phenomenon is sometimes called *attraction*, or *back* or *backward agreement*. Many of the examples quoted are not convincing; given the frequency of predicate–subject order in Slavonic, it is not sufficient merely to find examples of agreement with the second noun phrase.⁶ The following Czech sentences, however, do argue for the attraction analysis:⁷

- (11) jedna a dvě jsou (pl) tři
 one and two are three
 (12) jedna a tři jsou (pl) čtyři
 one and three are four
 (13) dvě a tři je (sg) pět
 two and three is five
 (14) tři a tři je (sg) šest
 three and three is six

The regularity is that as long as the numeral to the right of the copula is 'two', 'three', or 'four', then the copula takes plural agreement, while if it is 'five' or above, then the singular is found. The numeral on the right would certainly appear to be part of the predicate, which would mean that we have an instance of agreement with the predicate. Two syntactic tests tend to confirm this. The predicate NP normally stands in the nominative in Czech, as in (15):

- (15) Ivan je geniis
 Ivan is a genius

However, with a different copula, the instrumental can occur:

- (16) Ivan se stane geniem (inst)
 Ivan will become a genius

We can, given a suitable context, apply this test to our numerals:

- (17) v nové matematice, dvě a dvě se stanou pěti (inst)
 in the new mathematics, two and two will become five

In (17) *pěti* 'five' is clearly the predicate, as the instrumental case shows; furthermore, since it is in the instrumental it can no longer control agreement, and the expected plural is found. The second test is analogous to subject raising. Compare (18) with (15) above:

- (18) pokládám Ivana (acc) za geniia (acc)
 I consider Ivan for a genius
 'I consider Ivan a genius.'

The noun phrase that would be the subject of the simple sentence is marked by the accusative, the predicate by the preposition *za* plus accusative. Sentence (19) shows the application of this test to the numeral examples (again the context of a sceptical speaker is required):

- (19) *v nové matematice, pokládají jednu a dvě za šest.*
in the new mathematics they consider one and two for six
'In the new mathematics they consider one and two to be six.'

This test too suggests that in our original examples we have NP(subject) + copula + NP(predicate) and that it is the predicative noun phrase which controls the agreement of the copula.

Much more needs to be done to specify exactly the conditions under which this type of agreement can occur in different Slavonic languages and the factors which favor it as opposed to the normal agreement with the subject. However, given its existence, linguistic theory must take it into account. Certainly in some theoretical frameworks it is difficult to accommodate the possibility of the subject being, as it were, overruled in determining the agreement features of the predicate.⁸

3.2. *Establishing the controller's features*

There are numerous instances in which there is no problem in identifying the controller but where there are difficulties in establishing what features it carries. Many of these, but certainly not all, relate to particular lexical items. We will begin with controllers which appear to have insufficient features and progress to those with superfluous features.

Certain controllers do not carry the features found on ordinary noun phrases. The most clear-cut examples are infinitive phrases, clauses, and missing subjects (Slavonic does not employ dummy subjects). Targets typically take third singular neuter agreements when agreeing with such controllers, as in the following Russian examples:

- (20) *kurit' vospreščaetsja* (3rd sg).
to smoke forbids itself
'It is forbidden to smoke.'
- (21) *jasno* (sg neut), *čto on pridet.*
clear that he will come
'It is clear that he will come.'
- (22) *svetalo* (sg neut).
dawned
'Day was dawning.'

The data demonstrate the need for a mechanism to assign default agreements when the controller does not carry the required features. It is important to note, however, that it is insufficient merely to assign the default features to the controllers in question, for both syntactic and morphological reasons. The syntactic reason is that if infinitives or clauses are conjoined in Slavonic they cannot take plural agreement, which would be the case if they were marked as neuter singular. The morphological reason concerns the target. While for verbs in Russian the form found for neutral agreement is identical to the neuter singular, this is not so for adjectives. In ordinary predicates two forms may occur — the long form and the short form. The factors which determine the choice are complex and need not detain us. However, given a controller which is not specified for gender and number, only the short form can be used. This is the form in (21) above; the long form **jasnoe* is ungrammatical.

Agreement of the type under discussion has been termed *neutral agreement*. While the agreement marker on the target is often the same as that found for a more usual set of features, this is not always the case. In Ukrainian, predicative adjectives have a special form used for neutral agreement:

- (23) sobakam (dat) dušno
for the dogs (it is) stifling
- (24) v odnij simji nam žyti i lehko i prekrasno
in one family for us to live (is) both easy and wonderful

In (23) there is no subject, while in (24) it is the infinitive phrase. The form in *-o*, which we find in these cases, cannot be used with a neuter noun as subject; the neuter agreement form is in *-e*: for example, *prekrasne* 'wonderful'.⁹ Theory must therefore allow for neutral agreement, both in cases where a default agreement form is used and in languages where a special form is required. One interpretation of these data is that the absence of a feature must be distinguished from its negative value. Thus neuter would be [-masculine, -feminine], while neutral agreement would result from the lack of a gender feature.

A stage onward from controllers with no features we find those with insufficient agreement features. Russian *kto* 'who' is marked as animate and cannot take neuter agreement. It normally takes masculine singular agreements by default, both when used as an interrogative and when used as a relative:

- (25) kto prišel (sg masc)?
who came?
- (26) te, kto prišel (sg masc)
those who came

However, given a plural antecedent, as in (26), plural agreement is also possible:

- (27) te, kto prišli (pl)
 those who came

There must therefore be provision for a target, in this case the verb *prišli* in the subordinate clause, to agree with a controller which is partially specified and which can itself gain features from elsewhere.

The next set of controllers is those with exactly the required set of features, which cause no special problems. We move on to those which have superfluous or contradictory features. Consider, for instance, the honorific pronoun (*vi* or *vy* in most of the Slavonic languages). On the one hand, it is a plural pronoun; on the other, it takes a singular referent. The result is that it can take singular and plural agreement (the conditions vary from language to language). It is important to note that both agreement forms can occur in the same sentence, as in the following Slovak example:

- (28) Mama, vy ste (pl) taká dobrá (sg)!
 Mother you are so kind

Another common problem in Slavonic concerns names of professions. Some of these appear to be masculine but, when referring to a woman, may take both masculine and feminine agreements. The Russian word *vrač* 'doctor' is a well-studied example:

- (29) novyj (masc) vrač skazala (fem) ...
 the new doctor said ...

The agreement form chosen depends to a large extent on the target, the feminine being more likely to occur in the predicate than with an attributive modifier (see section 6.2.1).¹⁰

A somewhat different problem arises in Serbo-Croat. Nouns like *gazda* 'master' have the appearance of feminine nouns but denote masculines. In the singular, masculine agreement is normal; in the plural, both masculine and feminine forms occur:

- (30) naši (pl masc) / naše (pl fem) gazde
 our masters

It is also possible for controllers of this type to occur with both types of agreement in the same sentence.¹¹

The problem under discussion is similar to the familiar problem of agreement with nouns like *committee* in English (though the restrictions according to gender or number are an added complication in Slavonic). In

Slavonic languages it is less usual than in English to find a singular noun, with no dependent plural noun, taking plural agreement. Examples do occur, however, like the following one recorded in Russian speech by Lapteva (1976: 69):

- (31) vot zdes' stojat (pl) očered' (sg)
 look here stand a queue
 'Look, there's a queue here.'

Like the English examples, controllers of this type are nouns referring to groups of people. However, there are two more sets of examples which cannot be defined so easily. In Slovenian, and in various other Slavonic languages, any noun referring to a person could take plural agreement, to indicate respect:

- (32) oč so (pl) šli (pl)
 father are gone
 'Father went.'

This construction has largely died out.¹² The other construction is found in the Talitsk dialect of Russian (Bogdanov 1968). In this dialect, a plural verb can be used with a singular noun, to indicate that the noun refers to a person or persons besides the one indicated directly:

- (33) M'it'ixa dral'is' (pl)
 Mitixa had a fight

This refers to a fight between husband and wife. Once again, conflicting agreements can be found in the same sentence:

- (34) moj (sg) brat (sg) tam toža žyl'i (pl)
 my brother there also lived
 'My brother and his family also lived there.'

We require, therefore, that a theory must be able to cope not only with agreement with straightforward NPs, but also with those which have no agreement features, insufficient features, or a superfluity of features. The last case can give rise to conflicting agreements within a single sentence. Some of these problems can be associated with particular constructions (such as infinitive phrases) or particular types of lexical item (such as nouns referring to profession); however, the last two cases discussed can be restricted no further than to nouns referring to humans.

3.3. 'Reluctant' controllers

Reluctant controllers are those which do not occur in surface structure in a form which matches that of the target. A familiar example occurs in pro-drop languages such as Serbo-Croat:

- (35) čitaš (2nd sg)
(you) are reading

In such examples the controller *ti* 'you' is regularly omitted in surface structure.¹³

A much more complex problem occurs in Upper Sorbian, which is a West Slavonic language spoken in Lusatia in East Germany, (GDR), surrounded by German. Consider the following phrase in Upper Sorbian:¹⁴

- (36) mojeho (gen sg masc) bratrowe (nom pl) džěći (nom pl)
my brother's children

The possessive adjective *bratrowe* agrees normally with *džěći*. *Mojeho*, however, seems to have no controller. A possible source for its agreement features can be found in the synonymous phrase:

- (37) džěći (nom pl) mojeho (gen sg masc) bratra (gen sg masc)
children of my brother

In (37) there is, of course, no difficulty about the agreement of *mojeho*. The next pair of examples show the same correspondence:

- (38) stareje (gen sg fem) žonina (nom sg fem) drasta (nom sg fem)
old woman's dress
(39) drasta (nom sg fem) stareje (gen sg fem) žony (gen sg fem)
dress of old woman
'The old woman's dress.'

Once again it appears that the noun which is the source of the possessive adjective is somehow available for agreement purposes. Example (40) shows that the noun is also available for anaphoric reference:

- (40) To je našeho (gen sg masc) wučerjowa (nom sg fem)
that is our teacher's
zahrodka (nom sg fem). Wón wjele w njej džěła.
garden he a lot in it works

The antecedent of *wón* 'he' is *nās wučer* 'our teacher', the noun which underlies the phrase headed by *wučerjowa*. The main point, however, is that in Upper Sorbian adjectives can agree with a reluctant controller, apparently with a noun which is the source of a possessive adjective in surface structure.

There is a further complication; besides the now familiar examples like (41),

- (41) w našeho (gen sg masc) nanowej (loc sg fem) chěži (loc sg fem)
 in our father's house

there are also instances which show what in Upper Sorbian grammar is termed *attraction*:

- (42) w našej (loc sg fem) nanowej (loc sg fem) chěži (loc sg fem)
 in our father's house

In such examples the adjective agrees with the head of the noun phrase, rather than with the reluctant controller. This is another example of competing controllers, discussed in section 3.1.2.

Another reluctant controller is to be found in Russian quantified expressions. The numerals *dva* 'two', *tri* 'three', and *četyre* 'four', when themselves in the nominative, take a noun in the genitive singular. *Dva* has the form *dve*, which occurs with feminine nouns:

- (43) dve (nom fem) sosný (gen sg fem)¹⁵
 two pines

The problem is that the numeral governs the form of the noun; if the noun were not singular, then there would be no agreement in gender, since gender is not distinguished in the plural in Russian. This genitive singular noun, then, serves as the controller for agreement in gender of the numeral which governs it.

The noun also serves as a reluctant controller for attributive adjectives, which may stand in the nominative or genitive plural:

- (44) dve (nom fem) krasivye (nom pl) sosný (gen sg fem)
 (45) dve (nom fem) krasivyx (gen pl) sosný (gen sg fem)
 two beautiful pines

One would expect the adjective to agree with the noun, but it clearly does not do so in surface structure. One analysis would have the noun as plural, prior to the imposition of the genitive singular by the numeral.

In general, the data discussed in this subsection appear less difficult for transformational grammar than for its successors, though even there problems arose as to the place of agreement relative to other rules. The main difficulty to be faced is that elements occur in surface structure which appear to be agreement targets, yet whose controllers are either absent or at least not in a form which matches the features shown by the target.

4. Target problems

We now turn to problems which center on the target, though several are closely connected to the controller problems just discussed. Target problems are of two main types: those arising from the existence of compound targets and those caused by 'reluctant' targets.

4.1. Compound targets

Compound targets are usually predicates, as in this Serbo-Croat example:

- (46) Jovan je (3rd sg) došao (sg masc)
 Jovan is come
 'Jovan has come/came.'

The commonest auxiliary in Slavonic is the irregular verb *biti* 'to be'. In (46) it shows agreement in person and number with the controller, as does any other present tense verb. It does not vary for gender. The active participle *došao*, on the other hand, does not vary for person but does agree in number and gender. In any analysis which involves the copying of features onto the target, the problem arises as to whether person, number, and gender features are to be copied onto both parts of the predicate and then the redundant feature in each case discarded, or whether the unnecessary features will not be copied.¹⁶ Whatever the analysis, it is clear that the agreements shown in (46) depend in large measure on properties of the target.

In (46), the two parts of the predicate agree in different features, but the feature which they share (number) shows the same value. However, compound predicates may show different values of the same feature, as in the Slovak example already discussed:

- (47)=(28) Mama, vy ste (2nd pl) taká dobrá (sg fem)!
 Mother you are so kind

In this example with honorific *vy*, the two parts of the predicate agree in number, but they show different forms.¹⁷ (This would create problems for an analysis copying all features onto a higher node, say a VP node, and copying just those required onto the auxiliary and participle.)

4.2. Reluctant targets

These are targets which do not occur in surface structure in a form which matches that of their controller. The phenomenon is, of course, similar to

that of reluctant controllers; an example will clarify the distinction. In Russian, given the actual presence of a copula verb (that is, not the null form of *byť* 'to be'), the predicative adjective may stand in the nominative or the instrumental:

- (48) ona (nom sg fem) byla (sg fem) krasivaja (nom sg fem)
 (49) ona (nom sg fem) byla (sg fem) krasivoj (inst sg fem)
 she was beautiful

In (49) the predicative adjective agrees with the subject in gender and number but not case.¹⁸ Unlike the reluctant-controller examples, here the controller is exactly as expected, in the normal case for subjects in Slavonic, while the target has undergone a rule which makes it match the controller less completely.¹⁹

The second type of reluctant target is the predicate noun. It might be thought that there is no question of the predicate noun showing agreement. Yet predicate nouns are possible agreement targets (in Tatar, for example, they can show agreement in person; Poppe 1963: 122–123). As Comrie (1975) has shown, however, they are the least likely type of predicate to show agreement. Normally in Slavonic, the form of a predicate noun is not determined by agreement. Nevertheless, agreement in number does occur, though very rarely. In Russian of the last century, the less well educated used a plural predicate noun for polite address to a single addressee, as in the following example from Chekhov:

- (50) izmenniki (pl) vy, čto li?
 traitors you is it
 'Are you a traitor, then?'

Thus while the number of predicate nouns is normally determined solely by semantic considerations, there must be provision for them to be agreement targets.

The final type of problematic target is that which simply does not appear, because speakers avoid it. In Russian, adjectival predicates with quantified subjects are very rare. When faced with a sentence like (51),

- (51) ?pjat' mal'čikov umnye (pl)
 five boys (are) clever

Russian informants are uneasy; they do not correct the example, but prefer to use a different construction. In Polish, too, speakers are unhappy about certain combinations and so avoid them (Boguslavski 1973: 31).

Thus targets require that a theory should have the ability to handle compound targets taking different features or different values of the same feature. The target may not match the controller in other features

(notably case) as expected, and predicate nouns must be included as potential targets. Finally, in particular constructions some targets must be marked as unnatural though possible.

5. Feature problems

In this section we assume that target and controller can be identified and consider problems which may arise as to the agreement categories or features they share (whether or not these are analyzed in feature notation). The main problems concern resolution rules (section 5.1), default values (section 5.2), and the number of genders (section 5.3).

5.1. *Resolution rules*

The question as to whether agreement will be with one of a set of conjuncts or with all was raised in section 3.1.1. A theory must also provide a mechanism (resolution rules) to specify what feature value will result from all possible combinations, when agreement is with more than one conjunct;²⁰ if the theory can predict these values, so much the better. Since these problems have been considered at length elsewhere (Corbett 1983a: 177–214), only the main points will be raised here. We will begin with Slovenian data (from Lenček 1972).

For person resolution, Slavonic has the usual rules in which the first person has priority over the second and the second over the third. Example (52) shows first and third persons conjoined:

(52) jaz in Tonček sva (1st dual) prizadevna (dual masc)
I and Tonček are assiduous

The verb stands in the first person. (52) also illustrates the first number resolution rule required for languages which, like Slovenian, have the dual number: if there are two conjuncts only, both of which are in the singular, then dual agreement forms will be used. Other cases of agreement with more than one conjunct require the plural.

It is mainly in gender resolution that the problems occur. Slovenian has three genders, masculine, feminine, and neuter; the gender resolution rules, somewhat surprisingly, are as follows:

1. if all conjuncts are feminine, then the feminine form is used;
2. otherwise the masculine form is used.

The operation of the first rule can be seen in (53):

- (53) Marina (fem), Marta (fem) in Marjanca (fem) so (pl)
 Marina Marta and Marjanca are
 prizadevne (pl fem)
 assiduous

Any other type of combination produces masculine agreement, even though there is no masculine conjunct present:

- (54) ta streha (fem), okno (neut) in gnezdo (neut) pod njim
 that roof window and nest under it
 mi bodo (pl) ostali (pl masc) v spominu
 to me will remain in memory
 = 'will remain in my memory.'
- (55) to okno (neut), drevo (neut) in gnezdo (neut) pod njim
 that window tree and nest under it
 mi bodo (pl) ostali (pl masc) v spominu
 to me will remain in memory

Slovenian is relatively straightforward, in that the resolution rules need refer only to the syntactic gender of nouns. Cases occur, however, where the resolution rules require access to morphological or semantic information. Serbo-Croat has a gender system similar to that of Slovenian and the same resolution rules operate. In addition there must be provision for examples like the following:

- (56) Vredali (pl masc) su (pl) ga nebriga (fem) i
 offended him carelessness and
 lakomislenost (fem) Tahir-begova (Andrić)
 capriciousness of Tahir-beg
 'The carelessness and capriciousness of Tahir-beg offended him.'

In this example we find masculine agreement, even though both conjuncts are feminine (Serbo-Croat has lost the dual number). Feminine nouns in Serbo-Croat fall into two main declensional classes: the majority are like *nebriga*, ending in *-a* in the nominative singular; there is also a sizable minority like *lakomislenost*, with no ending in the nominative singular. Provided that one of the conjuncts belongs to this second morphological class, then masculine agreement is possible.²¹

To find an example where semantic considerations apply, we turn to Polish, which has a rather different gender system. The important examples are those like (57):

- (57) Hania (fem) i Reks (masc) bawili (masc pers) się piłką
 Hania and Rex played with a ball

Normally for masculine personal agreement forms to result, at least one of the conjuncts must be masculine personal (the rules are quite different from those of the South Slavonic languages). In (57) *Reks* is a dog, masculine but not personal. The use of the masculine personal in (57), which is the more common choice, though the nonmasculine personal form also occurs, results from the combination of *Hania* being semantically human (personal) and *Reks* being syntactically masculine.

Thus Slavonic data require resolution rules to specify the values resulting from various feature combinations, and there is evidence to suggest that these rules may require access not only to syntactic gender but also to morphological or semantic information.

5.2. *Default values*

As has already been discussed in section 3.2, there must be provision for assigning default values to features, particularly in the case of controllers which have no agreement features. Similarly, some controllers have insufficient features, and we noted the case of *kto*, a controller marked as animate, which took masculine agreement by default. While masculine is the normal default for animates in Slavonic, there is a special usage in Polish, which deserves attention:

- (58) *któreś* (neut) *z małżonków* (masc pers) *jest winne* (neut)
 one of spouses is guilty
zarcucanej mu zbrodni
 of imputed to it crime
 'One of the spouses is guilty of the crime he or she has been accused of.'

Małżonkowie is masculine personal and means 'husband and wife'. When either the husband or wife is potentially the referent, then Polish uses the *evasive neuter* (see Gotteri 1984 for the term and data). Thus even default choices can be language specific.

5.3. *The number of genders*

It is not always self-evident how many genders a language has. The first complication involves subgenders. Continuing with Polish, we may say that there are at least three genders in the singular, as agreement with nominative case forms shows:

- | | | | |
|------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| (59) | duż-y stół | dùz-a książka | duż-e okno |
| | large table | large book | large window |
| | masculine | feminine | neuter |

Within the masculine gender, different agreement forms are found with certain nouns:

- | | | | |
|------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| (60) | nominative | duż-y stół | duż-y koń |
| | accusative | duż-y stół | duż-ego konia |
| | genitive | duż-ego stołu | duż-ego konia |
| | | large table | large horse |
| | | inanimate | animate |

In the accusative, *stół* takes agreement forms as for the nominative, while *kón* takes forms equivalent to those of the genitive.²² Most nouns in the latter class refer to humans or animals, so the class is called 'animate', but there are many nouns which are treated as animate but refer to inanimates. If we restrict our attention to the singular, we find that animacy is relevant only in the accusative case. The question then arises as to whether all adjectives must agree with their head noun in the feature of animacy, even though it is relevant only for masculines and only in the accusative case.

When we turn to the nominative plural we find that targets can show only two agreement markers:

- | | | | | | |
|------|--------------------|--------------|----------|---------|---------|
| (61) | duz-i mnisi | duż-e stoły | konie | książki | okna |
| | large monks | large tables | horses | books | windows |
| | masculine personal | nonmasculine | personal | | |

The distinction is between nouns referring to male humans (masculine personal) and the rest. This situation has led some linguists to treat gender in the singular as distinct from gender in the plural. In fact, the question of the number of genders in Polish has been the subject of considerable debate; at least the following numbers have been proposed: three, five, six, seven, and nine. The number one decides on depends in part on one's theory of agreement; one can count either the number of different controllers to be accounted for or the number of different forms of targets. The point, then, is that agreement categories may not be straightforward; the number to be recognized may depend on the theory adopted.

6. Agreement choices

We have noted several constructions in which alternative agreement forms occur. We must now consider the significance of these constructions and the factors which constrain the choice.

6.1. *The significance of agreement choices*

The first point to note about agreement choices is that they exist and are quite common. Yet they have received relatively little attention from theorists. Of the examples discussed above, conjoined noun phrases and quantified expressions frequently involve agreement choices in languages outside the Slavonic group. Furthermore, agreement choices are common in the sense that they occur frequently in language use. Some idea of their frequency can be gained from the following figures. A corpus of about 49,000 words of spoken Russian (Zemskaja and Kapanadze 1978) was scanned for examples of the two choices just mentioned plus the choice of agreement with relative *kto* described in section 3.2. There were 22 examples; in other words, examples occurred more frequently than once in 2,500 words. In addition, there were other agreement choices which were not included in the count.

It should also be stressed that the familiar dichotomy of syntactic and semantic agreement is insufficient, since in some constructions in Slavonic we find three agreement options. The case of *tysjača* has already been mentioned (section 3.1.1). Another example is Russian *rjad* 'series, number':

- | | | | |
|------|------|---------|------------------|
| (62) | rjad | čelovek | sidel (sg masc) |
| (63) | rjad | čelovek | sidelo (sg neut) |
| (64) | rjad | čelovek | sideli (pl) |
- a number of people was/were sitting

These examples²³ show that instead of talking about syntactic and semantic agreement, we should rather talk of one form having greater semantic justification than another.

Using significance in a different sense, it is worth asking whether agreement choices have semantic significance. Informants sometimes claim that there is a semantic difference between certain agreement options. In some cases it appears that they are imposing a logical interpretation on surprising and troublesome facts about their own language; they feel there ought to be a difference in meaning, and so they find one. There is a need for very skilled informant work to establish whether some or all agreement choices are semantically significant.

6.2. *Factors which determine the distribution of agreement options*

Whether or not they are semantically significant, it is certainly true to say that the distribution of agreement options is heavily constrained. The

major constraints are the linguistic ones, though sociolinguistic factors, in the broadest sense, also have a role. These factors have been analyzed in detail elsewhere (Corbett 1983a) and so will be outlined very briefly here.

6.2.1. *Linguistic factors.* The first obvious factor which determines agreement choices is the controller: it must be one of those which permits a choice. A grammar must be able to include detailed information about individual controllers since, as Table 1 shows clearly, they differ dramatically in the frequency with which they take different agreement forms. There are more general factors which relate to controllers of various different types. Controllers which refer to animates are more likely to take agreement forms with a greater degree of semantic justification than are inanimates. Similarly, controllers which precede their targets are more likely to take agreement forms with a greater degree of semantic justification than are those which follow. The effect of these two factors is illustrated in Table 2, which records agreement with a set of quantifiers in a selection of Russian literary texts of the last two centuries (details in Corbett 1983a: 150–153).

It is clear that both animacy and precedence can exert a major influence on the agreement form selected. The plural, the form with greater semantic justification, is more likely if the subject is animate and if it precedes the predicate. In addition, *real distance* — the degree of separation counted in intervening words — between controller and target has an effect.²⁴

It is not, of course, sufficient merely to demonstrate that the actual quantifier involved, animacy, and precedence all have an effect, since they could be interconnected; it could be the case, for example, that animate subjects are more likely to precede than are inanimates. However, Table 2 establishes that both these factors have an independent effect. The data available suggest that both these factors operate independently of the quantifier involved (Akopdžanjan 1965: 113; Patton 1969: 35, 63, 148, 160; Spear 1984: 21, 27, 34). Revzin (1978: 262–272) argues that plural (semantic) agreement with quantified noun phrases may be determined by the noun phrase being definite; this links with word order, since definite

Table 2. *Predicate agreement with quantified expressions in Russian*

	Animate			Inanimate		
	sg	pl	%pl	sg	pl	%pl
Subject–predicate	11	48	81	21	20	49
Predicate–subject	24	23	49	70	18	20

noun phrases in Slavonic are much more likely to precede the verb than are indefinites.

When we turn from controller factors to target factors, we find that strong claims have been made here, constraining the distribution of agreement options in Slavonic. The agreement hierarchy consists of the following basic positions:

attributive — predicate — $\begin{array}{l} \text{relative} \\ \text{pronoun} \end{array}$ — $\begin{array}{l} \text{personal} \\ \text{pronoun} \end{array}$

The original claim was that as one moved rightward along the hierarchy, so the likelihood of semantic agreement would increase monotonically. In its latest formulation (Corbett 1983a: 87–88) it incorporates Comrie's predicate hierarchy (Comrie 1975) and includes predictions concerning the case of the target.

A satisfactory theory must be able to handle these data and to incorporate the regularities indicated insofar as they prove justified by subsequent research. For some theories, the mere fact that the target has a major effect on the agreement form found is difficult to accommodate. More generally, the complex interaction of controller and target factors is potentially very hard to handle. On top of all this there is the important fact that most of the patterns discovered are statable not at sentence level, which is what most linguists have been concerned with in recent years, but at corpus level (see Johnson and Postal 1980: 20–21, 677–687). That is to say, they are statements not about individual sentences but about the whole collection of sentences of a language (or, at least, a representative sample of them). To take a specific example, in Russian the relative pronoun is more likely to show plural agreement with conjoined noun phrases than is the predicate. This regularity, demonstrated by scanning a representative sample of sentences, is in accordance with the agreement hierarchy. However, it is possible for an individual sentence in Russian to have conjoined noun phrases with a predicate showing plural agreement and a relative pronoun showing singular agreement. The problem of stating regularities of this sort has still to be faced in many theoretical frameworks.

While the regularities stated at corpus level cause obvious difficulties, sentence-level constraints on parallel and stacked targets, which complement the agreement hierarchy, are also interesting (Corbett 1983a: 69–74). Recall that Serbo-Croat nouns like *gazda* 'master', when in the plural, permit both masculine and feminine modifiers (as in [30]). Suppose that targets are stacked. Usually both take the same form, but this is not always the case, as in the following example (Marković 1954: 95):

- | | | | |
|------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|
| (65) | ovi (pl masc) | privatne (pl fem) | zanatlije |
| | these | private | artisans |

The two agreement possibilities are found together. However, they must be as in (65), with the form with greater semantic justification, the masculine, further from the controller (**ove privatni zanatlije* is ungrammatical). The constraint is as follows:

- (66) If stacked targets show different agreement forms, the target further from the controller will show the form with greater semantic justification.

To incorporate a constraint of this type means allowing the agreement shown by one target to be determined in part by that of another target.

6.2.2. *Sociolinguistic factors.* Besides the various linguistic factors described, the choice between agreement options is influenced by a range of sociolinguistic factors. There is evidence to show that all of the following operate in Slavonic: the educational level of the speaker, occupation, region within the area of a standard language (there is also considerable variation between standard language and dialects), and the sex and age of the speaker (Corbett 1983a: 30–39). The fact that differences can be correlated with age suggests, of course, that agreement is subject to diachronic change. There is evidence for this in Table 1. It should be noted, however, that diachronic change does not always involve change in favor of forms with greater semantic justification; Table 1 illustrates change in both directions.

The fact that there are so many sociolinguistic variables, which interact with the target and controller factors described above, makes it very difficult to pin down the effect of one particular factor. Such analysis will require either extensive and careful informant work or the scanning of large corpora (or preferably both).

7. Conclusion

Agreement is an apparently simple phenomenon, the evidence for which is easily available on the surface. Yet this attempt to set out a basic specification of agreement in Slavonic has revealed numerous complications, all within a single language group, which have been spelled out at various points. A recurring theme is the interaction of the target, the controller, and the agreement features. While data of this type are of potential interest to any theorist, agreement data would appear to be of particular relevance to those concerned with features and to those trying

to provide a more satisfactory account of performance data within linguistic models. The problems outlined in the paper may seem daunting; that is not the effect intended. Rather, it is hoped that data provided here will be of use in attempts to bring linguistic theory closer to an adequate account of agreement.

Received 3 March 1986

University of Surrey

Revised version received

21 July 1986

Notes

1. Versions of this paper were read at the Conference on Agreement, Department of Linguistics and Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University, and in the Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, in October 1984. I am grateful to the British Academy for sponsoring the visit, and to all those who made comments, especially to Bernard Comrie and J. van Marle.

A version of the paper is to appear in the proceedings of the Stanford conference: *Agreement in Natural Language: Approaches, Theories, Descriptions*, edited by Michael Barlow and Charles A. Ferguson (Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information). A number of revisions to the paper, to produce the present version, were carried out during the tenure of research grant C00232218, awarded by the Economic and Social Research Council (UK). The support of the ESRC is gratefully acknowledged. Correspondence address: Department of Linguistic and International Studies, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2 5XH, England.

2. See Corbett (1983a: 98–99) for examples. This work is referred to several times, since it is in English and gives details of other sources. Data which are set out fully in that work are dealt with only briefly here, and certain claims made in this paper are more adequately justified there. While a proportion of the material covered has been discussed before, this paper focuses on those data which are most problematic for linguistic theory.
3. In certain frameworks it may matter whether one claims, in examples like (2)–(4), that agreement is with just one NP, or with all the NPs, though taking the features of just one. This latter claim would be possible if there were a higher NP node which could take features from just one of the dominated NPs.
4. Note that when the NP in the nominative is a pronoun, then this alone controls the agreement.
5. Corbett (1983a: 215–240); this source also gives information on the extensive literature on agreement with quantified expressions in Slavonic.
6. It may seem surprising that the problem has not been resolved. Part of the difficulty is that, given sentences of the form NP + copula + NP, the proportion in which the controller is clear is relatively small; in such sentences the subject and predicate NPs are almost always of the same number, so that one must look for a clash of gender. In the East Slavonic languages the present tense of the verb 'to be' has the null form, and in several languages the predicate NP often stands in the instrumental case, both precluding back agreement. For discussion of some of the Russian evidence, see Revzin (1973: 129–136; 1978: 236–255), Crockett (1976: 406–418, 425–428), and

Nichols (1981: 48–54; 1985: 282–283). Progress depends on being able to identify subject and predicate without, of course, using agreement as a test. The approach of Padučeva and Uspenskij (1979), based on the denotative status of the NPs, appears promising; it seems to justify the analysis of at least some of the commonly quoted examples as showing agreement with the predicate NP.

In an attempt to obtain more data on back agreement, informant work was undertaken, using sentences given by Peškovskij (1956: 241) and discussed by Nichols (1981: 53–54). Ten native speakers of Russian were asked for their judgments on the following sentences (I am grateful to Anna Maslennikova for her help with this):

- (i) ego ljubimoe zanjatie (nom) bylo (neut) igra (nom) v šaxmaty
- (ii) ego ljubimoe zanjatie (nom) byla (fem) igra (nom) v šaxmaty
- (iii) ego ljubimym zanjatiem (inst) byla (fem) igra (nom) v šaxmaty
- (iv) ego ljubimoe zanjatie (nom) bylo (neut) igroj (inst) v šaxmaty
his favorite occupation was playing at chess

Zanjatie is neuter, while *igra* is feminine. The reason for including the sentences with the instrumental case is that these indicate clearly which element is subject and which predicate. All informants rejected (iv), while all but one accepted (iii), demonstrating that *igra v šaxmaty* is the subject. Thus (i) would show back agreement and (ii) ordinary subject–verb agreement. Only one speaker accepted (ii). On the other hand, two informants out of the ten accepted example (i), which shows back agreement (one of the two was the informant who rejected [iii]). The speaker who accepted (ii) also found (i) marginally acceptable. This suggests that back agreement is a possibility, though more evidence is needed. It is of interest that one informant suggested that example (i) would have been acceptable in the last century. And Peškovskij accepted all except (iv); note that the first edition of his work dates from the beginning of the century. The point is that although this informant work provides a little evidence for back agreement in Russian, the rapid increase in the use of the instrumental in the nominal predicate means that the environment for back agreement is disappearing. For Serbo-Croat data see Mogaard (1976: 144–150), and for Czech see Panevová (1983).

7. This construction is noted in Vanek (1970: 53). The sentences quoted in the text are based on the intuitions of Robert Slonek, confirmed by Magda Newman and Otto Pick. I am very grateful to them.
8. Another example of competition between potential controllers is between the subject of a matrix verb and the postulated subject of an infinitive in determining the agreement of second predicates. This problem was raised by Comrie (1974: 136) and has been recently discussed by Neidle (1982: 416).
9. For a more detailed account and sources see Corbett (1980).
10. *Vrač* and similar nouns may take a feminine attributive modifier, instead of the masculine, as in (29), but only when in the nominative case. In the oblique cases, the masculine is normal (but see Švedova 1980: 57).
11. These nouns must be distinguished from those like Serbo-Croat *oko* 'eye', which is neuter in the singular but has the plural *oči*, which is feminine. *Oko* and similar controllers present no choice of agreement. On the other hand, Serbo-Croat *deca* 'children' shows complexities well beyond that of *gazda* (see Corbett 1983a: 76–93).
12. See Corbett (1983a: 41) for sources.
13. For another example of a missing controller, the subject of the infinitive, see Comrie (1974), especially page 108.
14. Data from Fasske (1981: 385), Michalk (1974: 510), and Šewc-Schuster (1976: 27, 100–101). For further details, as well as information on control possibilities of the possessive adjective in the other Slavonic language, see Corbett (forthcoming).

15. Note that *sosny* cannot be interpreted as nominative plural, since the latter is stem-stressed: *sósny*.
16. This is a problem comparable to that raised by Huddleston (1975).
17. In this example the clash of features is the normal case. A similar situation may arise when there is a choice of agreement forms. Though it is then usual for compound predicates to show consistent agreements, this does not always happen. For example, in agreement with conjoined noun phrases, the finite verb may be singular and the participle plural; see Corbett (1983a: 214) for examples from Czech and Old Church Slavonic.
18. There is also the question as to whether the nominative predicate in examples like (48) shows agreement with the subject or whether the nominative results as the default if no other case is assigned. Russian provides no clear evidence on this point.
19. A similar situation arises in 'subject-raising' sentences:

(i) on sčítact ee (acc sg fem) krasivoj (inst sg fem)
 he considers her beautiful

Here again the target *krasivoj* agrees with the controller *ee* in number and gender. If we were to accept the subject-raising analysis, then we would have a reluctant controller as well as a reluctant target, since neither the subject nor the predicate of the embedded clause appears in the expected nominative case.

20. For a discussion of this problem within a GPSG framework, based on French, Hungarian, and Spanish data, see Farkas and Ojeda (1983).
21. See Corbett (1983b: 201–205) for more details.
22. This is not a simple case of syncretism since it extends beyond single paradigms; one solution is to adopt feature-change rules (Corbett 1981: 69–70). The data in this section are taken from Wertz (1977); further complications are considered there.
23. For further examples see Corbett (1983a: 76–83).
24. It has been claimed on several occasions that if the predicate is widely separated from the subject, then the form with greater semantic justification is more likely. Evidence presented by Spear (1984) suggests that this is definitely true for subject–predicate order; with predicate–subject order (for which separation is less common and data thus more difficult to obtain), greater separation appears to make the form with greater semantic justification less likely. Thus it is not just a question of the controller preceding or following the target but also of the degree by which it does so.

References

- Akopdžanjan, A. A. (1965). O forme čisla glagola-skazuemogo v predloženijax s količestvennym podležaščim: Forma glagola-skazuemogo v predloženijax s podležaščim tipa 'tri čeloveka'. *Voprosy teorii i metodiki izučenija ruskogo jazyka* (Iževsk) 4, 104–113.
- Bogdanov, V. N. (1968). Osobyj slučaj dialektnogo soglasovanija skazuemogo s podležaščim po smyslu i kategorija predstavitel'nosti. *Naučnye doklady vysšej školy: filologičeskie nauki* 4, 68–75.
- Bogusławski, A. (1973). Nazwy pospolite przedmiotów konkretnych i niektóre właściwości ich form licbowych i połączeń z liczebnikami w języku polskim. In Z. Topolińska, and M. Grochowski (eds.), *Liczba, ilość, miara*, 7–35. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- Comrie, B. (1974). The second dative: a transformational approach. In R. D. Brecht and C. V. Chvany (eds.), *Slavic Transformational Syntax*, 123–150. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- (1975). Polite plurals and predicate agreement. *Language* 51, 406–418.
- Corbett, G. G. (1980). Neutral agreement. *Quinquereme — New Studies in Modern Languages* 3, 164–170.
- (1981). Syntactic features. *Journal of Linguistics* 17, 55–76.
- (1983a). *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers: Agreement Patterns in Slavic*. London: Croom Helm; University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- (1983b). Resolution rules: agreement in person, number and gender. In G. Gazdar, E. Klein, and G. K. Pullum (eds.), *Order, Concord and Constituency*, 175–206. Linguistic Models 4. Dordrecht: Foris.
- (forthcoming). The morphology–syntax interface: evidence from possessive adjectives in Slavonic. *Language* 63.
- Crockett, D. B. (1976). *Agreement in Contemporary Standard Russian*. Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica.
- Farkas, D., and Ojeda, A. (1983). Agreement and coordinate NPs. *Linguistics* 21, 659–673.
- Fasske, H. (1981). *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart: Morphologie*. Bautzen: VEB Domowina.
- Glavan, V. (1927–1928). Kongruencija u jeziku starih čakavskih pisaca. *Južnoslovenski filolog* 7, 111–159.
- Gotteri, N. (1984). The evasive neuter in Polish. In F. E. Knowles and J. I. Press (eds.), *Papers in Slavonic Linguistics II*, 1–8. Birmingham: Department of Modern Languages, University of Aston in Birmingham.
- Graudina, L. K., Ickovič, V. A., and Katlinskaja, L. P. (1976). *Grammatičeskaja pravil'nost' russkoj reči: opyt častotno-stilističeskogo slovarja variantov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Huddleston, R. (1975). Homonymy in the English verbal paradigm. *Lingua* 37, 151–176.
- Johnson, D. E., and Postal, P. M. (1980). *Arc Pair Grammar*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keenan, E. L. (1974). The functional principle: generalizing the notion of 'subject of'. In *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 298–310. Chicago: CLS.
- Lapteva, O. A. (1976). *Russkij razgovornyj sintaksis*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Lenček, R. (1972). O zaznamovanosti in neutralizaciji slovnice kategorije spola v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku. *Slavistična revija* 20, 55–63.
- Markovič, S. V. (1954). O kolebljivosti slaganja u rodu kod imenica čiji se prirodni i gramatički rod ne slažu (i o rodu ovih imenica). *Pitanja književnosti i jezika* (Sarajevo) 1, 87–110.
- Megaard, J. (1976). Predikatets kongruens i serbokroatisk i setninger med koordinerte subjektsnominalfraser. Unpublished dissertation, University of Oslo.
- Michalk, F. (1974). Kratkij očerk grammatiki verxnelužičkogo jazyka. In K. K. Trofimovič (ed.), *Hornjoserbski-ruski słownik*, 472–511. Budyšin: Ludowe Nakladnistwo Domowina.
- Moravcsik, E. A. (1978). Agreement. In J. H. Greenberg, C. A. Ferguson, and E. A. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of Human Language IV: Syntax*, 331–374. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Morgan, J. L. (1972). Verb agreement as a rule of English. In *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 278–286. Chicago: CLS.
- Neidle, C. (1982). Case agreement in Russian. In J. Bresnan (ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, 391–426. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Nichols, J. (1981). *Predicate Nominals: A Partial Surface Syntax of Russian*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (1985). The directionality of agreement. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 273–286. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- , Rappaport, G., and Timberlake, A. (1980). Subject, topic and control in Russian. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 372–386. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Padučeva, E. V., and Uspenskij, V. A. (1979). Podležaščee ili skazuemoe? Semantičeskij kriterij različienija podležaščego i skazuemogo v binominativnyx predloženijax. *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Serija literatury i jazyka* 38, 349–360.
- Panevová, J. (1983). Opisanie soglasovanija v funkcional'noj poroždajuščej modeli: Čast' II. *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 40, 43–58.
- Patton, H. (1969). A study of the agreement of the predicate with a quantitative subject in contemporary Russian. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. (Distributed by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 70–7839.)
- Peškovskij, A. M. (1956). *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščeenii*, 7th edition. Moscow: Učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva prosvveščeenija RSFSR.
- Poppe, N. (1963). *Tartar Manual: Descriptive Grammar and Texts with A Tartar-English Glossary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Revzin, I. I. (1973). Nekotorye sredstva vyražeenija protivopostavlennija po opredelennosti v sovremennom russkom jazyke. In A. A. Zaliznjak (ed.), *Problemy grammatičeskogo modelirovanija*, 121–137. Moscow: Nauka.
- (1978). *Struktura jazyka kak modelirujuščej sistemy*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Šewc-Schuster, H. (1976). *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje reče, 2. zvjazk-syntaksa*. Budyšin: Ludowe nakładnistwo Domowina.
- Spear, S. M. (1984). Soglasovanie skazuemogo s količestvennym podležaščim. Unpublished undergraduate dissertation, University of Surrey.
- Suprun, A. E. (1969). *Slavjanskije čislitel'nye (stanovlenie čislitel'nyx kak osoboj časti reči)*. Minsk: Belorussian State University.
- Švedova, N. J. (1980). Podčinitel'nye svjazi slov i slovosočetanija. In *Russkaja grammatika: II: sintaksis*, 13–82. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vanek, A. L. (1970). *Aspects of Subject-Verb Agreement*. Studies in Slavic Linguistics 1. Edmonton: Department of Slavic Languages, University of Alberta. (Republished 1977 in the series Current Inquiry into Language and Linguistics 23. Edmonton: Linguistic Research.)
- Wertz, C. A. (1977). The number of genders in Polish. *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 19, 50–63.
- Zemskaja, E. A., and Kapanadze, L. A. (eds.) (1978). *Russkaja razgovornaja reč': teksty*. Moscow: Nauka.