

**The correlation of agreement domains and phrase structure:  
the Archi perspective on different frameworks**

Archi raises some interesting questions for the formulation of constraints on agreement within different syntactic frameworks. In Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), constraints on agreement can be stated on order domains (Borsley 2013: 6), or on constituent units built by ID-schemata. For the Minimalist Program (MP) it is a relative necessity for there to be a close relationship between the agreement domain and the articulation of the phrase structure. In Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG), f-structure is the natural location for generalizations about agreement (Sadler 2012). We consider two types of construction in Archi that are relevant for our understanding of these alternatives: i) a subset of Archi constructions that show ‘plurilingual’ behaviour (Den Dikken 2001); ii) bi-absolutive constructions in Archi, where two absolutive arguments appear, instead of an absolutive and (typically) an ergative.

In (1) the first exclusive pronoun is followed by a phrase containing the numeral meaning ‘two’. An Archi numeral requires its head noun (absent here) to be in the singular and agrees with it in gender (here, by infixal marking of gender II). In (1a) both the converb and the main verb appear to agree in gender and number with the absent head noun. (The noun meaning ‘girls’ would be in the singular form and have gender II.) The agreement in (1b) is an alternative.

1a. *nen*                      *q'we<r>u*    *do-q'c'o-li*                      *q'a<r>di-li*  
1.PL.EXCL[ABS]    two<II.SG>    II.SG-reconcile.PFV-CVB    <II.SG>sit.PFV-EVID

b. *nen*                      *q'we<r>u*    *q'oc'o-li*                      *q'i'jdi-li*  
1.PL.EXCL[ABS]    two<II.SG>    [1PL]reconcile.PFV-CVB    [1PL]sit.PFV-EVID  
'we two (girls) had made up (by then) and were sitting there ...' (literally:  
'we two having reconciled were sitting')

A reasonable analysis for *nen* ‘we (excl.)’ in (1a) is that it is in apposition, rather than forming a constituent with the numeral phrase (Polinsky 2013: 5). This contrasts with (1b) where it contributes the feature [+PLURAL] directly to the subject.

A third agreement profile is also possible: the converb ‘reconcile’ can agree with the implicit singular head of the NP within the numeral phrase (‘girls’), while the verb ‘sit’ agrees with the first exclusive plural pronoun. A fourth alternative is ungrammatical: this is where ‘reconcile’ would agree with the first exclusive plural pronoun and ‘sit’ would agree with the implicit singular head of the NP. The third (grammatical) agreement possibility involves nested agreement relations, while the fourth (which is ungrammatical) involves crossing relations.

However, crossing agreement relations are possible in a bi-absolutive example such as (2). The auxiliary *w-i* agrees with *tu-w* (gender I), but the verb *o<r>kɬin-ši* and the adverb *dit:at'u* agree with *q'onq'* (gender IV):

2. *tu-w*                      *q'onq'*                      *o<r>kɬin-ši*                      *w-i*                      *dit:a<t'>u*  
that-I.SG.ABS    book(IV)[SG.ABS]    IV.SG.read<IPFV>-CVB    I.SG-be.PRS    early<IV.SG>  
'He is reading a book early.'

The data above may be best dealt with in terms of constituent structure (Borsley 2013:6), Polinsky and Radkevich (2014), articulated differently in the plurilingual and bi-absolutive constructions. In addition, the precise mechanisms ensuring agreement with the absolutive argument(s) (a pervasive property of Archi) may require other means. This mixture of challenges from the Archi agreement system is therefore a good way of comparing the analytical possibilities in different theoretical frameworks.