Agreement
I sleep
you sleep
he/she sleeps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I sleep</td>
<td>dormo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you sleep</td>
<td>dormi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he/she sleeps</td>
<td>dorme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we sleep</td>
<td>dormiamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you (pl.) sleep</td>
<td>dormite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they sleep</td>
<td>dormono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sleep</td>
<td>dormo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you sleep</td>
<td>dormi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he/she sleeps</td>
<td>dorme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we sleep</td>
<td>dormiamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you (pl.) sleep</td>
<td>dormite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they sleep</td>
<td>dormono</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
terminology break:

1st person: the speaker (I, we)
2nd person: the listener (you)
3rd person: everyone else (she, he, it, the linguist, the Stata Center...)
terminology break:

1st person: the speaker (I, we)
2nd person: the listener (you)
3rd person: everyone else (she, he, it, the linguist, the Stata Center...)

Some languages have a further division among 3rd person nominals, between the ‘topic of discussion’ and the other ones...
Skitap nomiyal muwinuwoł \textit{(Passamaquoddy)}

‘The man (\textit{proximate}) saw the bear (\textit{obviative})’

(makes the \textit{man} the ‘topic of the story’\textit{)}
Skitap nomiyal muwinuwol  
(Passamaquoddy)
‘The man (proximate) saw the bear (obviative)’

(makes the man the ‘topic of the story’)  

Skitapiyil nomiyukul muwin
‘The man (obviative) saw the bear (proximate)’

(makes the bear the ‘topic of the story’)

(called “fourth person” in some languages, e.g. the Inuit languages)
Some languages (like Italian and English) only have the verb agreeing with the subject.

Others have the verb agreeing with both the subject and the object...

Nya-ngu-**rna-ngku** *(Warlpiri)*
see-PAST-1SG-2SG.OBJECT
‘I saw you’

Nya-ngu-**npa-ju**
see-PAST-2SG-1SG.OBJECT
‘You saw me’

Parnka-ja-**rna**
run-PAST-1SG
‘I ran’
Some languages (like Italian and English) only have the verb agreeing with the subject.

Others have the verb agreeing with both the subject and the object…

…and still others have no agreement at all.

watashi/kimi/gakusei-wa neteiru [Japanese]
I/you/the student is.sleeping
‘I/you/the student am/are/is sleeping’
Now recall that we saw several different systems for *Case*…

**nominative-accusative**
She left.
She saw her.

**ergative-absolutive**
Na’e kata ‘a Sione.  ‘John laughed’  *(Tongan)*
Na’e langa ‘e Sione ‘a e fale.  ‘John built a house’

**three-way**
Agherre nterreke.  ‘The kangaroo ran’
Artwe-le agherre-nhe weke.  ‘The man shot the kangaroo’  *(Antekerrepenhe)*
Patterns of structural case

- **nominative-accusative**
  - $S \rightarrow V_{\text{intransitive}}$
  - $S \rightarrow V_{\text{transitive}} \rightarrow O$

- **ergative-absolutive**
  - $S \rightarrow V_{\text{intransitive}}$
  - $S \rightarrow V_{\text{transitive}} \rightarrow O$

- **three-way**
  - $S \rightarrow V_{\text{intransitive}}$
  - $S \rightarrow V_{\text{transitive}} \rightarrow O$
We get similar patterns for agreement systems.

**A-li-ni-pig-a** (Swahili)
3SG.SUBJ-PAST-1SG.OBJ-hit-IND nominative-accusative
‘He hit me’

**Ni-li-m-pig-a**
1SG.SUBJ-PAST-3SG.OBJ-hit-IND
‘I hit him’

**Ni-me-fik-a**
1SG.SUBJ-PERF-arrive-IND
‘I have arrived’
We get similar patterns for agreement systems.

**Swahili**

A-li-ni-pig-a

3SG.SUBJ-PAST-1SG.OBJ-hit-IND

nominative-accusative

‘He hit me’

**Chol**

Tyi i-jats’ä-yoñ.

PRFV 3SG.ERG-hit-1SG.ABS

ergative-absolutive

‘She hit me’

Tyi majli-yoñ.

PRFV go-1SG.ABS

‘I went’
Now, remember ‘split ergative’ case systems?

Raam rotii khaataa thaa. [Hindi]
‘Raam ate bread (habitually)’

Raam-ne rotii khaayii thii
‘Raam has eaten bread’ $\rightarrow$ perfect tenses are ergative
There are also split ergative agreement systems...

Tyi i-jats’ä-yoñ.  
PRFV 3SG.ERG-hit-1SG.ABS  
‘She hit me’  

(Chol)

Tyi majli-yoñ.  
PRFV go-1SG.ABS  
‘I went’  

Choñkol i-jats’-oñ  
PROG 3SG.NOM-hit-1SG.ACC  
‘She’s hitting me’  

Choñkol i-majlel.  
PROG 3SG.NOM-go  
‘She’s going’
Now let’s consider case and agreement together.

There are plenty of languages with nominative-accusative systems for both case and agreement:

I see **him**.  
I sleep.  
He see-s **me**.  
He sleep-s
Now let’s consider case and agreement together.

There are also languages with ergative-absolutive systems for both case and agreement:

\[
\text{Ni-}k\ \text{asko}\ \text{ikusi}\ \text{d-}it-u-t. \quad \text{(Basque)}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{I-ERG}\ & \text{many.ABS}\ \text{seen}\ \\
\text{AUX-3PL.ABS-AUX-1SG.ERG}
\end{array}
\]

‘I saw many’

\[
\text{Asko-}k\ \text{ni}\ \text{ikusi}\ \text{na-u-te}.
\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{many-ERG}\ & \text{me.ABS}\ \text{seen}\ \\
\text{1SG.ABS-AUX-3PL.ERG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Many saw me’

\[
\text{Ni}\ \text{etorri}\ \text{na-iz}.
\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{I.ABS}\ & \text{come}\ \\
\text{1SG.ABS-AUX}
\end{array}
\]

‘I came’
And there are languages with nominative-accusative agreement systems, but ergative-absolutive case systems!

Ngajulu-**rlu-rna-ngku** nyuntu nya-ngu
I-**ERG-1SG-2SG.OBJECT** you.ABS see-PAST
‘I-ERG saw you-ABS’

Nyuntu-**rlu-npa-ju** nya-ngu ngaju
you-**ERG-2SG-1SG.OBJECT** see-PAST me.ABS
‘You-ERG saw me-ABS’

Ngaju-**rna** parnka-ja
I.ABS-**1SG** run-PAST
‘I-ABS ran’

(one complication: Warlpiri agreement goes on whatever is **first** in the sentence)
There appears to be no ‘anti-Warlpiri’--that is, there are no languages in which the agreement system is ergative, but the case system is nominative-accusative.
Remember dative subjects in Icelandic?

Húnl kyssti Maríu.
‘She (NOMINATIVE) kissed Mary (ACCUSATIVE)’

Henni líkuðu hestarnir.
‘She (DATIVE) liked the horses (NOMINATIVE)’

➔ ‘like’ assigns quirky dative case to the subject…

…and it turns out that whenever the subject is dative, the object in Icelandic is nominative.
→ ‘like’ assigns quirky **dative** case to the **subject**...

...and it turns out that whenever the subject is **dative**, the object in Icelandic is **nominative**....

...and these nominative objects are what the verb agrees with:

**Henni líkuðu hestarnir.**

‘She (**DATIVE**) liked-**PL** the horses (**NOMINATIVE**)’

**Henni líkaði hesturinn.**

‘She (**DATIVE**) liked-**SG** the horse (**NOMINATIVE**)’
More generally, there seems to be a hierarchy (Bobaljik, Moravcsik):

• if there’s only agreement with one thing,
  it’s the NOMINATIVE or ABSOLUTIVE thing.

• if there’s agreement with two things,
  the second is the ACCUSATIVE or ERGATIVE thing.

• if there’s agreement with three things,
  the third thing is typically DATIVE.
More generally, there seems to be a hierarchy:

- if there’s only agreement with one thing, it’s the NOMINATIVE or ABSOLUTIVE thing. ("the case that you always get")

- if there’s agreement with two things, the second is the ACCUSATIVE or ERGATIVE thing. ("the case that you only get if there are 2")

- if there’s agreement with three things, the third thing is typically DATIVE.
But not all agreement systems care about case…
But not all agreement systems care about case…

nu-nâw-ô-ak ‘I see them’ (Wampanoag)

nu-nâw-uq-ak ‘They see me’
But not all agreement systems care about case…

nu-nâw-ô-ak  ‘I see them’  
(\textit{Wampanoag})

nu-nâw-uq-ak  ‘They see me’

ku-nâw-ô-ak  ‘You see them’

ku-nâw-uq-ak  ‘They see you’
But not all agreement systems care about case…

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nu-nâw-ô-ak} & \quad \text{‘I see them’} \quad (Wampanoag) \\
\text{nu-nâw-uq-ak} & \quad \text{‘They see me’} \\
\text{ku-nâw-ô-ak} & \quad \text{‘You see them’} \\
\text{ku-nâw-uq-ak} & \quad \text{‘They see you’}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{nu-} = \text{“something in this clause is 1st person”} \\
\text{ku-} = \text{“something in this clause is 2nd person”}
But not all agreement systems care about case…

nu-nâw-ô-ak   ‘I see them’          \textit{(Wampanoag)}

nu-nâw-uq-ak   ‘They see me’

ku-nâw-ô-ak   ‘You see them’

ku-nâw-uq-ak   ‘They see you’

\textit{nu-}= “something in this clause is 1st person”

\textit{ku-}= “something in this clause is 2nd person”

\textit{-ak}= “something in this clause is 3rd plural”
But not all agreement systems care about case…

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nu-nâw-ô-ak} & \quad \text{‘I see them’} \quad (\text{Wampanoag}) \\
\text{nu-nâw-uq-ak} & \quad \text{‘They see me’} \\
\text{ku-nâw-ô-ak} & \quad \text{‘You see them’} \\
\text{ku-nâw-uq-ak} & \quad \text{‘They see you’}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{nu-} = \text{“something in this clause is 1st person”} \\
\text{ku-} = \text{“something in this clause is 2nd person”} \\
\text{-ak} = \text{“something in this clause is 3rd plural”} \\
\text{-ô} = \text{“the prefix is the subject…”}
But not all agreement systems care about case…

nu-nâw-ô-ak  ‘I see them’  (Wampanoag)

nu-nâw-uq-ak  ‘They see me’

ku-nâw-ô-ak  ‘You see them’

ku-nâw-uq-ak  ‘They see you’

nu- = “something in this clause is 1st person”
ku- = “something in this clause is 2nd person”
-ak = “something in this clause is 3rd plural”
-ô = “the prefix is the subject…”
-uq = “the prefix is the object…”
Algonquian prefixal agreement goes by a hierarchy:

2 > 1 > 3
Algonquian prefixal agreement goes by a hierarchy:

2 > 1 > 3

➔ agree with a 2nd person if there is one,
➔ or with a 1st person, if not,
➔ failing that, with a 3rd person.

The prefix doesn’t care about what the subject is…
Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.
Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.

Hi-k egingo du-\textbf{k}
you-\textbf{ERG} do AUX-\textbf{2SG.MASC.ERG}
‘You (masc) will do it’

Hi-\textbf{ri} emango di-\textbf{a-t}
you-\textbf{DAT} give AUX-\textbf{2SG.MASC.DAT-1SG.ERG}
‘I will give it to you (masc)’
Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.

Hi-k egingo du-\textcolor{red}{k}  
\textcolor{red}{you-ERG} do AUX-\textcolor{red}{2SG.MASC.ERG}  
‘You (masc) will do it’

Hi-k egingo du-\textcolor{blue}{n}  
\textcolor{blue}{you-ERG} do AUX-\textcolor{blue}{2SG.FEM.ERG}  
‘You (fem) will do it’

Hi-\textcolor{red}{ri} emango di-\textcolor{red}{a-t}  
\textcolor{red}{you-DAT} give AUX-\textcolor{red}{2SG.MSC.DAT-1SG.ERG}  
‘I will give it to you (masc)’

Hi-\textcolor{blue}{ri} emango di-\textcolor{blue}{na-t}  
\textcolor{blue}{you-DAT} give AUX-\textcolor{blue}{2SG.MSC.DAT-1SG.ERG}  
‘I will give it to you (fem)’
Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.
(some morphemes to remember:)

Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.

(some morphemes to remember:)


Kotxea garestia izango du-k
car.ABS expensive be AUX-2.SG.ERG.MASC
‘The car is going to be expensive’
Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.
(some morphemes to remember:)
-k ‘you.erg.masc’ , -n ‘you.erg.fem’ , -a ‘you.dat.masc’ , -na ‘you.dat.fem’

Kotxea garestia izango du-k
car.ABS expensive be AUX-2.SG.ERG.MASC
‘The car is going to be expensive’

Kotxea garestia izango du-n
car.ABS expensive be AUX-2.SG.ERG.FEM
‘The car is going to be expensive’
Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.
(some morphemes to remember:)

Bihar egingo di-\textbf{a-t}
tomorrow do AUX-2SG.MASC.DAT-1SG.ERG
‘Tomorrow I will do it’

Bihar egingo di-\textbf{na-t}
tomorrow do AUX-2SG.FEM.DAT-1SG.ERG
‘Tomorrow I will do it’
Allocutive agreement

Basque has a lot of agreement on the auxiliary, as we’ve already seen.

(some morphemes to remember:)


Bihar egingo di-a-t

tomorrow do AUX-2SG.MASC.DAT-1SG.ERG

‘Tomorrow I will do it’

Bihar egingo di-na-t

tomorrow do AUX-2SG.FEM.DAT-1SG.ERG

‘Tomorrow I will do it’

→ use leftover agreement slots in the auxiliary to agree with

the person you are talking to.