2

The syntax of possessor prominence in Maithili

YOGENDRA P. YADAVA, OLIVER BOND,
IRINA NIKOLAEVA, AND SANDY RITCHIE

2.1 Introduction

Maithili has a complex agreement system in which many terms and non-terms including subjects, objects, obliques, extra-clausal 'deictic referents', and, crucially, possessors within any of these can potentially control agreement on the verb (Yadav 1996; Bickel *et al.* 1999).

Some of the extreme complexity of the Maithili agreement system is highlighted by the examples in (1) where the verbal target realizes various feature values, depending on the nature of its controller. The morphosyntactic features of Maithili include those that are frequently encountered in other languages, such as person (1, 2, 3) and gender (M, F), but it also includes a number of values related to a less commonly encountered morphosyntactic feature, RESPECT (Corbett 2006, 2012), for which we distinguish four values. The highest levels of respect involve the respect value (R). This value can be associated with controllers that are second and third person, but not first person.[1] Second person controllers distinguish three further levels of respect: high grade (H), mid grade (M) and low grade (L), on a scale from most polite/formal to least polite/informal. In (1a) the subject phrase 'my brother's wife' controls agreement in person (3) and respect (R) on the verb. In the remaining examples, agreement cross-references two controllers: in (1b), it indexes the subject

[1] The glosses 2R (second person respect) and 3R (third person respect) correspond to 2HH/2hh (second person high honorific), and 3H/3h (third person honorific) in earlier descriptions such as Stump and Yadav (1988), Yadav (1996), and Bickel *et al.* (1999). The glosses 2H (second person high respect), 2M (second person mid respect), and 2L (second person low respect) in our description correspond to 2H (second person honorific), 2M (second person mid-honorific), and 2NH (second person non-honorific) respectively. Forms glossed as 3NH/3nh (third person non-honorific) in earlier work are unspecified for a respect value in the current description. The motivation for adopting a different system of feature values is discussed in Section 2.2.

Prominent Internal Possessors. First edition. András Bárány, Oliver Bond, and Irina Nikolaeva.

First published 2019 by Oxford University Press.

and object; in (1c), the subject and the possessor internal to the oblique; and in (1d) the subject and the possessor of this subject.

(1) a. [həm-ər bhai-ək **pətni**]$_{\text{SUBJ}}$ [sikshək-ək nokər-ke]$_{\text{OBJ}}$
1-GEN brother-GEN wife(R)[NOM] teacher(R)-GEN servant-ACC
[əhã-k ghər pər]$_{\text{OBL}}$ dekh-l-əith
2H-GEN house[NOM] LOC see-PST-3R
'My brother's wife (R) saw the teacher's (R) servant in your (H) house.'

b. [həm-ər bhai-ək **pətni**]$_{\text{SUBJ}}$ [sikshək-ək **nokər-ke**]$_{\text{OBJ}}$
1-GEN brother-GEN wife(R)[NOM] teacher(R)-GEN servant-ACC
[əhã-k ghər pər]$_{\text{OBL}}$ dekh-l-əthin(h)
2H-GEN house[NOM] LOC see-PST-3R>3
'My brother's wife (R) saw the teacher's (R) servant in your (H) house.'

c. [həm-ər bhai-ək **pətni**]$_{\text{SUBJ}}$ [sikshək-ək nokər-ke]$_{\text{OBJ}}$
1-GEN brother-GEN wife(R)[NOM] teacher(R)-GEN servant-ACC
[**əhã-k** ghər pər]$_{\text{OBL}}$ dekh-əl-k(əh)unh
2H-GEN house[NOM] LOC see-PST-3R>2
'My brother's wife (R) saw the teacher's (R) servant in your (H) house.'

d. [**həm-ər** bhai-ək **pətni**]$_{\text{SUBJ}}$ [sikshək-ək nokər-ke]$_{\text{OBJ}}$
1-GEN brother-GEN wife(R)[NOM] teacher(R)-GEN servant-ACC
[əhã-k ghər pər]$_{\text{OBL}}$ dekh-l-əinh
2H-GEN house[NOM] LOC see-PST-3R>1
'My brother's wife (R) saw the teacher's (R) servant in your (H) house.'

This paradigm is not exhaustive. The other nominals could also control secondary agreement, though not all combinations are possible.

This kind of agreement system requires further investigation because (i) it is not immediately apparent what enables one potential agreement controller to 'win out' over the others and whether there is a functional motivation for using one or other of these constructions; (ii) the syntactic mechanism by which various grammatical functions, including possessors, can control agreement on the verb is not clear. Seminal papers by Stump and Yadav (1988), Yadava (1999), and Bickel *et al.* (1999) make several important claims about the Maithili agreement system. We hope to complement this literature and provide further insights using further data. They partly confirm previous observations but also bring forward some new dimensions.

Our main claims are as follows: agreement in Maithili is determined by syntactic factors, such as the argument structure of the verb, and the grammatical function of the controller, but in many instances non-syntactic factors condition morphosyntactic behaviour. In such cases, the functional prominence (i.e. the semantic or information structural prominence) of the agreement controller overrides syntactic prominence. This is particularly clear when possessors internal to an argument or adjunct can control agreement, even though viable alternatives appear to be available, as seen with the PROMINENT INTERNAL POSSESSORS in (1c) and (1d). The functional prominence of a possessor referent is determined by FOCUS. The focal possessors (typically, but not necessarily, with the respect value R) trigger the use of agreement

on the verb, thereby overriding the agreement values that would otherwise be expected if the controllers were clause-level arguments. While these factors were mentioned in the previous literature (see Section 2.4.3), we hope to spell out the relationship between them in a more transparent manner by (i) adopting a set of morphosyntactic respect values driven by the organization of the agreement system, (ii) specifying the discourse properties of focal controllers, and (iii) examining their behavioural syntax. Using this approach, we show that the functional prominence of the internal possessor may also have a syntactic correlate: the possessor that controls agreement may be in a more prominent position within the phrase headed by the possessed nominal, and this is what enables it to participate in clause-level syntactic processes.

The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows. Section 2.2 introduces the Maithili language and provides necessary background on its grammar. Section 2.3 describes agreement with a single controller. In Section 2.4, we demonstrate which types of controllers are possible in the situation when agreement is simultaneously controlled by two nominals within the clause, before we turn to investigating their grammatical status in more detail in Section 2.5. Sections 2.6 and 2.7 discuss the functional factors which contribute to the choice of agreement controllers, while Section 2.8 provides general observations about possible analyses of the Maithili agreement system and studies their implications for the typology of prominent internal possessors (PIPs).

2.2 Background on Maithili

Maithili is an Indo-Aryan language spoken by around 34 million people across the world. The highest concentration of the speaker population—approximately 30 million speakers—live in the north-eastern part of the Indian state of Bihar (Simons and Fennig 2018). Approximately 3 million Maithili speakers live in the south-eastern Tarai region of Nepal, comprising nearly 12% of the total population of the country (Central Bureau of Statistics 2012; Yadava 2014). The Maithili-speaking areas in India and Nepal are adjacent; Maithili is thus a cross-border language (Yadava 2011a).

There are several regional and social dialects of Maithili: at least ten varieties are distinguished in India (Simons and Fennig 2018; cf. three dialects in Jha 1958) and there are at least three regional dialects in Nepal (Yadava 2011b; Yadava and Mahato 2011; cf. eleven varieties of Maithili in Nepal listed by Simons and Fennig 2018). In addition, the language exhibits rather a high degree of variation in terms of social factors such as the caste, sex, and educational level of the speakers, as well as the social context of use (e.g. Hugoniot 1997). In particular, the social status of the speaker determines the extent to which they use the honorific agreement system. Agreement based on the RESPECT GRADE of a referent will play an important role in our discussion below: speakers from so-called lower social classes tend to make use of a reduced version of this system (Bickel *et al.* 1999: 512). For further information on the sociolinguistic status of honorification and the context of its use, see Hugoniot (1997) and Yadava (1999), among others.

In many respects, Maithili morphosyntax is typical of an Indo-Aryan language. It has basic SOV constituent order, strict head finality in nominal, verbal, and adpositional phrases, and it exhibits both head and dependent marking through case on nominals and agreement on verbs. The paradigm of the finite verb includes the synthetic present, past, and future tenses, as well as periphrastic aspectual forms in the perfective, imperfective, and progressive. The modal and passive constructions are also periphrastic, whereas the non-finite verbal forms, infinitives, gerunds, and participles, are nominalizations which function as secondary predicates or head various types of dependent clauses.

The variety of Maithili we will be discussing in this chapter is the variety spoken in Siraha District of Province 2, Nepal, of which the first author is a native speaker. This section summarizes the basic facts about its morphosyntax. Supplementary support comes from Yadava's (1998, 1999) and Bickel *et al.*'s (1999) description of the same variety, as well as the description of the Janakpur variety (Dhanusa District, Province 2, Nepal) in Yadav (1996) and Stump and Yadav (1988). The transcription is largely based on Yadav (1996).

2.2.1 Nominals

Nouns in Maithili occur in a variety of different case forms.[2] As observed by Yadava (2004: 253), there is no one-to-one correspondence between grammatical functions of core arguments and grammatical case-marking. Nominative is the morphologically unmarked case form, used for most intransitive and (dynamic) transitive subjects in finite clauses. The accusative-dative case (henceforth 'accusative') is marked with the suffix *-ke/-kẽ*.[3] It occurs on the patient or theme objects (2a) and recipients in ditransitive constructions (2b).

(2) a. həm kukur-ke piṭ-l-aũ(h)
1[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-1
'I hit the dog.'

b. həm Mohən-ke bəcha de-l-iæn(h)
1[NOM] Mohan(R)-ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>3R
'I gave Mohan (R) the baby.'

Use of the accusative case on objects is conditioned, rather than absolute: accusative case-marking is usually only found with human definite objects, objects with a pronominal possessor or determiner, personal pronouns, and certain definite demonstratives (Yadav 1996: 73–81). In other words, Maithili exhibits so-called differential object marking by case. Other functions of the accusative include marking the experiencer argument of certain verbs expressing subjective experiences (i.e. the so-called 'dative subject': see Yadava 1998, 2004), and marking the pronominal

[2] Note that although Yadav (1996) refers to the accusative/dative, the instrumental, and the locative as 'postpositions', he notes that they behave differently from true postpositions and analyses them as grammatical cases (see also Yadava 2004).

[3] Nasalization on case markers is a characteristic feature of high prestige dialects such as the Brahmin dialect, but no meaningful contrast is signalled by its presence (Yadav 1996: 72).

objects of some postpositions (e.g. the instrumental). Non-finite clauses block overt subject NPs in nominative case. Instead, their case is demoted to genitive or accusative (Bickel and Yadava 2000: 352–4; Yadava 2004: 261).

The possessive construction is strictly head-final and dependent-marked, e.g. *kaka-k kitab* (uncle-GEN book[NOM]) 'the uncle's book'.

The instrumental in *-sə/-sə̃* renders a wide range of instrumental and ablative meanings, while the locatives in *me* and *pər* express location. Other grammatical roles of nominals within the clause are indicated by postpositional phrases (Yadav 1996: 249–59).

2.2.2 Pronominals

The pronominal system of Maithili distinguishes forms on the basis of case (in all persons), respect (in the second and third persons), and deixis (in the third person only). As mentioned above, our description differs somewhat from previous accounts of Maithili in terms of the values we use to analyse the system. This is central to our account of agreement in Section 2.2.3, and the full justification for the featural distinction adopted will be provided therein.

In previous descriptions, the labels 'non-honorific' (NH/nh) and 'honorific' (H/h) have been used in glossing conventions and paradigms as if they are feature values that cross-cut person distinctions, giving rise to de facto feature sets like 2NH, 2H, 3NH, and 3H. However, the morphological and morphosyntactic evidence to support these distinctions is not compelling. Based on the morphosyntactic evidence, we propose that second person low-grade controllers (2L), traditionally glossed as 2NH, do not share a non-honorific feature value with the third person controllers that lack the respect value (usually glossed 3NH). Conversely, second person respect-grade controllers (2R), traditionally glossed as 2HH (second person high honorific), do share a feature value with the third person respect-grade controllers (usually glossed 3H).

Case forms of the pronouns are provided in Table 2.1 in three grammatical cases: nominative, accusative, and genitive.[4] The pronouns presented here from the Siraha variety are largely consistent with those reported by Yadav for the Janakpur variety (1996: 105–11).

Four levels of politeness are formally distinguished in nominative forms of the second person pronouns. From most polite to least polite, we distinguish the following values: utmost respect (2R), high respect (2H), mid respect (2M), low respect (2L). Note that these distinctions correspond directly to the following labels used in most existing works on Maithili agreement: high honorific (2HH), honorific (2H), mid-honorific (2MH) and non-honorific (2NH).

The process of identifying the correct pronoun to address or refer to an interlocutor depends on various factors, such as kinship relations and the speaker's estimation of the addressee's age, caste, position, educational level, etc. In brief, the pronoun *əpne* is used for persons of the highest social rank, *əhã* is a general polite form used to refer to any person to whom the speaker wants to be polite, *to*/*tõ* is a

[4] The locative and instrumental pronouns are formed by adding the respective 'postpositions' to the accusative form of a pronoun.

Table 2.1 Pronominal case forms

CONTROLLER FEATURES		NOMINATIVE	ACCUSATIVE/DATIVE	GENITIVE
1		həm	həmra	həmər
2R		əpne	əpnẽkẽ	əpnek
2H		əhã	əhãkẽ	əhãk
2M		to ~ tõ	tora	tohər
2L		tu ~ tũ		
3R	PROX	i	hinka	hinək
	DIST	o	hunka	hunkər, hunək
3	PROX	i	ekra	ekər
	DIST	u	okra	okər

familiar polite form used for elders and relatives, such as father, uncle, or elder brother, while *tũ* is an informal pronoun used to address certain relatives, young children, and junior servants.

Third person human referents can be referred to by a respect pronoun (3R) or the general pronoun (3). All non-human referents are expressed with the general pronoun. In previous research on this topic, these values have been glossed as 3H (third person honorific) and 3NH (third person non-honorific), respectively. The third person pronouns have proximal and distal forms. In our data, the distal forms occur most frequently. An investigation into the distribution of the two series of pronouns awaits future research.

Number in both nouns and pronouns is signalled periphrastically by means of the quantifier words *səb(h)* and in some cases *lokæn*, lit. 'all', which have been grammaticalized as plural markers, e.g. *jən səb* 'labourers', *həm səb* 'we', etc. Number plays no role in the system of verbal agreement and therefore plural nominals are not discussed further here.

Gender is not formally distinguished in the pronominal series, but is a relevant feature of referents, since gender agreement with subjects is observed in the intransitive paradigm of high-caste registers (see Section 2.2.3).

We will introduce other relevant aspects of Maithili grammar as we proceed, while in the next subsection we will look more closely at the verbal agreement paradigms, since they are of primary importance for the topic of this chapter.

2.2.3 Predicate agreement paradigms

The finite verb forms obligatorily carry agreement features. In this chapter we will only discuss the synthetic past tense of regular (non-auxiliary) verbs. Other tenses and auxiliary verbs show agreement inflections which only partly overlap with the past tense. We believe the basic conditions on agreement to be the same in non-past tenses, but do not exclude the possibility that there are notable differences. In the past tense, agreement suffixes follow the tense suffix *-(ə)l-*. The features of nominals that

are referenced by verbal agreement are person and respect (in all varieties), and gender (in some high-caste varieties).

Some lexical nouns have an inherent honorific value and thus always trigger particular honorific agreement patterns. Proper nouns can acquire this value through suffixation of *-ji* or lose the value through suffixation of *-yā, -bā*, or *-mā* (see Bickel *et al.* 1999: 495–6 for examples). The third person honorific pronouns also always trigger the honorific agreement patterns.

Agreement inflections must be chosen from one of three paradigms, depending on the number of agreement controllers that are indexed (one vs two) and the semantic or formal properties of the controller. We will refer to them as the 'single nominative paradigm', 'single non-nominative paradigm', and 'double paradigm'. The nominative agreement paradigms are shown in Tables 2.2 and 2.3. The non-nominative agreement paradigm is given in Table 2.4.

Agreement morphology in the single paradigms indexes a single controller. The nominative agreement paradigm cross-references the S argument of an intransitive clause (Table 2.2, intransitive sub-paradigm) and the A argument of a transitive clause (Table 2.3, transitive sub-paradigm) (see Section 2.3.1).

Table 2.2 Single nominative intransitive agreement sub-paradigm

S-CONTROLLER	
CONTROLLER FEATURES	FORM
1	-i, -aũ(h)
2R	-i, -aũ(h), -Ø AUX-Ø, -kin(h)
2H	-i, -aũ(h)
2M	-ə(h)
2L	-æ, ahi
3R.MASC*	-ah, -əith, -kin(h)
3R.F	-ih, -əith, -kin(h)
3	-Ø, -əi

* We gloss masculine as MASC instead if M in this chapter, in order to distinguish it from mid-honorific.

The optional final *h* and *k* (indicated by parentheses) are only pronounced in careful speech (Bickel *et al.* 1999: 487ff.). The use of the variants *-Ø* and *-əi*, observed in Table 2.2 and Table 2.3, depends on the register: *-Ø* is more formal and *-əi* is more informal. The alternation between *-aũ(h)* and *-i* is thought to be sociolectal; *-aũ(h)* is only found in past tense contexts, while *-i* is also found in the present tense. Other possible allomorphy is either due to prosodic reasons or lexically governed. We will ignore all kinds of variation within the cells of the paradigms for the present purposes.

Gender has a highly restricted distribution in contemporary Maithili: 3R.MASC and 3R.F gender agreement forms in the nominative paradigm are primarily

restricted to the formal language of the highest Brahmin caste and are only found in the past and future intransitives; otherwise, gender-neutral inflections *-əith* and *-kin(h)* are used, resulting in the overabundance in Table 2.2. There are also periphrastic options for 2R, in which an uninflected auxiliary follows the uninflected stem (represented in Table 2.2 as -Ø AUX-Ø).

The shaded areas indicate gaps in the paradigms. Unless they have the respect value, R, third person A-arguments cannot control single nominative agreement, as indicated by the greyed-out cell in Table 2.3. Only double agreement is permitted in such instances (see Section 2.6 for discussion).[5]

TABLE 2.3 Single nominative transitive agreement sub-paradigm

A-CONTROLLER	
CONTROLLER FEATURES	FORM
1	-i, -aũ(h)
2R	-i, -aũ(h), -Ø AUX-Ø, -kin(h)
2H	-i, -aũ(h)
2M	-ə(h)
2L	-æ
3R	-əith, -kin(h)
3	

The non-nominative agreement paradigm in Table 2.4, discussed further in Section 2.3.2, indexes controllers in a wider range of roles, including non-terms. However, it cannot be controlled by an agentive noun phrase in the nominative case.

TABLE 2.4 Single non-nominative agreement paradigm

CONTROLLER FEATURES	FORM
1	-Ø
2R	-Ø
2H	-Ø, -əi
2M	-ə(h)
2L	-əu(k)
3R	-əin(h)
3	-Ø, -əi

[5] In other varieties of Maithili, the (non-honorific) third person nominative inflections take the form *-ək, -kəi(k)*. They are therefore homonymous with a number of double agreement inflections, which can potentially lead to a different analysis of double agreement.

Before we turn to the double paradigm, it is important to mention that our description of it is in part different from the description offered in Bickel *et al.* (1999) and Yadava (1999). In their analysis, the structure of the verbal form includes three agreement slots which can be filled in by up to three agreement morphemes cross-referencing up to three different controllers. Single agreement only involves slot 1, which must be filled by inflections from either the nominative single paradigm or the non-nominative single paradigm. In double agreement there are (at least) two slots. Slot 1 is filled by inflections from the nominative single paradigm and slot 2 must be filled in by inflections from the non-nominative single paradigm. In other words, double agreement inflections are decomposed: they are morphotactic combinations of nominative and non-nominative single agreement inflections.[6] For example, they analyse the string *iauk* (in our transcription iəuk as a combination of two distinct morphemes *-i* and *-auk*. The former corresponds to the first person agreement from the single nominative paradigm and the latter to the second person low-grade (2L) agreement from the single non-nominative paradigm (2NH in their description). In double agreement they each index one separate agreement controller. Not all such combinations of morphemes are possible, and there are many cases of syncretism and null expressions. The main claim of Bickel *et al.*'s (1999) paper is that these patterns are predicted by a number of pragmatic principles (see Section 2.4.2 below).

In contrast, in the present chapter we will be assuming that inflections in the double paradigm are not decomposable into such subunits, so there are no separate 'agreement slots'. Each inflection in the double paradigm occupies one cell and cumulatively conveys the features of two controllers. This means that, e.g., *iəuk* is morphologically simplex and simultaneously expresses first person (1) and second person low grade (2L).

This approach relies on the word-based view of morphology, which treats the grammatical word as a minimal meaningful unit of analysis (Anderson 1992; Aronoff 1994; Stump 2001; Blevins 2006, 2016), and is more consistent with the description in Stump and Yadav (1988) and Yadav (1996); see especially Yadav (1996: 173). We also believe that it provides a better account of our data: as we will see below, some inflections from the double paradigms are not morphologically equivalent to the agglutinative combinations of single nominative and non-nominative inflections.

In our analysis, a crucial difference between the two single agreement paradigms cited above, on the one hand, and the double agreement paradigm, on the other hand, is that, in the former, agreement is controlled by a single controller, while the latter cross-references two different controllers. The two agreement controllers in the double paradigm will be called the 'primary' and 'secondary' controller, and, respectively, we will talk about 'primary' and 'secondary' components of double agreement.

The double paradigm is shown in Tables 2.5 and 2.6. The non-honorific double agreement sub-paradigm in Table 2.5 shows the paradigm to use when the secondary

[6] 'Triple agreement', in which an additional controller is cross-referenced on the verb, is said to be limited to the combination 1-2NH/MH-3H (1-2L/2M-3R in our notation) for prosodic reasons (Bickel *et al.* 1999: 488). We will not be dealing with the purported case of triple agreement here.

controller does not have the respect value R. The honorific double agreement sub-paradigm in Table 2.6 shows the paradigm to use when the secondary controller does have the R value. The need to divide the double paradigm into these two sub-paradigms is the primary motivation for introducing a special feature RESPECT, not employed in previous descriptions.

Each cell in the tables shows an agreement suffix that cumulatively expresses the features of the primary and secondary controller. For instance, the combination 1>2M, where 1 is the primary controller and 2M is the secondary controller, results in *-iəh* and so on.

In Table 2.5, the two variants of 3>1/3, *-ək* and *-kəi(k)*, are formal and informal, respectively. The 3R>2 variants *-k(əh)unh* and *-thunh* are in free variation (*-thunh* can also be used in the present tense).

TABLE 2.5 Double agreement: non-honorific secondary controller sub-paradigm

PRIMARY CONTROLLER	SECONDARY CONTROLLER				
	1	3	2		
			H	M	L
1		-i, -aũ(h)	-iəh	-iəu(k)	
2R	-iæ(k)	-iæ(k)			
2H	-i, -aũ(h)				
2M	-əhə(k)				
2L	-əhi(k)				
3R	-əin(h)	-thin	-k(əh)unh, -thunh		
3	-ək, -kəi(k)		-əin(h)	-kəh	-kəu(k)

It should be noted that the paradigm in Table 2.5 differs in part from the one described by Yadav (1996) and Stump and Yadav (1988) for the Janakpur variety and the one described by Yadava (1999) and Bickel *et al.* (1999) for the Siraha variety. Perhaps the most significant difference from the latter is that in our data the 3>2L (3NH>2NH) and 3>2M (3NH>2M) situations are expressed by *-kəu(k)* and *-kəh,* respectively. In contrast, Yadava (1999) and Bickel *et al.* (1999) cite the syncretic *-akau(k)* for both cells, and it is analysed as the agglutinative combination of the third person nominative single inflection *-ak* (in our transcription *-ək*) and the 2L non-nominative single inflection *-au(k)* (in our transcription *-əuk*).

Our reanalysis of the respect values underlying the Maithili agreement paradigms reveals patterns of organization that are not easily captured using the traditional labels applied in the grammar. In particular, Table 2.6 indicates that if the secondary controller of the double agreement paradigm has the respect value (R), a distinct set of forms must be used.

Table 2.6 Double agreement: honorific (R) secondary controller sub-paradigm

PRIMARY CONTROLLER	SECONDARY CONTROLLER	
	3R	2R
1	-iəinh	-iænh
2R		
2H		
2M	-əhunh	
2L	-əhunh ~ -əhinh	
3R	-(k)əinh	

2.3 Agreement with a single controller

This section describes the basic distributions of single agreement. In what follows single nominative inflections are not indicated with a special gloss, while single non-nominative inflections are marked as NN.

2.3.1 Single nominative agreement

The controller of single nominative agreement is always a nominative NP. As the examples in (3) demonstrate, single nominative agreement is observed with both transitive and intransitive verbs.

(3) a. **tu** ae-l-æ
2L.NOM come-PST-2L
'You (L) came.'

b. **tu** həm-ra piṭ-l-æ
2L.NOM 1-ACC hit-PST-2L
'You (L) hit me.'

c. **sikshək** ae-l-kin(h)
teacher(R)[NOM] come-PST-3R
'The teacher (R) came.'

d. **sikshək** nokər-ke piṭ-əl-kin(h)
teacher(R)[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-3R
'The teacher (R) hit the servant.'

Bickel *et al.* (1999: 492ff.) note that there is little (if any) evidence for grammatical relations/functions in Maithili, but their arguments are primarily based on semantic roles and do not address behavioural syntax. For us there is (so far) no clear indication that the notions of subject, object, etc. are not applicable to this language. Since we follow the line of thinking of grammatical theories such as LFG, we assume that grammatical functions must be diagnosed on the basis of abstract behavioural

properties. We will discuss one such test for objects below, but the examples in (3) appear to demonstrate that the combination of the nominative case-marking and the ability to control single nominative agreement identifies the highest nominative argument of intransitive and transitive verbs as grammatical subject; cf. Yadav (1996) and Yadava (1998). Similarly, we will later see that primary agreement in the double paradigm must always target the subject (or an NP internal to the subject).

2.3.2 Single non-nominative agreement

Single non-nominative agreement (distinguished by NN in glosses) can be with a range of non-nominative controllers. These include the experiencer arguments of some modal and complex predicates, which most often stand in the accusative, as in (4), but sometimes in other non-nominative cases, such as the instrumental (see Section 2.5 and Yadava 1999, 2004 for discussion). The type of case frame employed is specified in the lexical entry of the predicate. Therefore, a lexical feature is required to ensure the experiencer argument occurs in the correct case.

(4) a. **tora** bhukh ləg-l-əu(k)
2L.ACC hunger[NOM] felt-PST-2L.NN
'You (L) were hungry.'

b. **sishak-ke** bhukh ləg-l-əin(h)
teacher(R)-ACC hunger[NOM] felt-PST-3R.NN
'The teacher (R) was hungry.'

c. **hunka** chiṭṭhi likhae-ke chə-l-əin(h)
3R.ACC letter[NOM] write-ACC be-PST-3R.NN
'He (R) had to write a letter.' (Yadava 1999: 146)

d. **hunka** me saphe dəya nəhi chə-l-əin(h)
3R.ACC LOC at.all mercy[NOM] NEG be-PST-3R.NN
'He (R) had no mercy at all.' (Yadava 1999: 146)

The data in (4) raise the obvious question of grammatical functions. Like Mishra (1990), Yadav (1996) analyses constructions like (4a) and (4b) as containing a fronted accusative object and a third person subject. The latter corresponds either to the nominal component of the complex predicate (i.e. *bhukh* 'hunger' in (4a)) or some kind of expletive dummy 'it'. Thus, in his analysis the literal translation of (4a) would be something like 'Hunger affected you'. Similar analyses have been considered for other languages of the region, e.g. Nepali (Masica 1976; Verma and Mohanan 1990; Ichihashi-Nakayama 1994).

A crucial aspect of Yadav's (1996) 'fronted object' proposal for the Janakpur variety is that agreement is selected from the double paradigm; following this argument, the verb in (4a) cross-references the third person subject as primary controller and the fronted 2L object as secondary controller. However, in the variety of Maithili we are describing, the combination of primary third person agreement with 2L secondary agreement in the double paradigm produces a different result from the verb forms observed in (4). For instance, the combination 3>2L results in *-kəu(k),* as shown in Table 2.4. Therefore, the *-əu(k)* observed in (4a) is unexpected

under Yadav's proposal. His analysis incorrectly predicts the form **lag-əl-kəu(k)* (3>2L) for (4a), but this form is ungrammatical here. It is therefore impossible to analyse the single non-nominative agreement as double agreement with a (non-honorific) third person primary controller.

It is of course a matter of empirical demonstration whether *tora* or *bhukh* is associated with the behavioural properties of a subject in this example, but the patterns of agreement in (4) point towards the experiencer argument as subject. In the absence of other evidence, we will be assuming that these examples involve so-called 'quirky' non-nominative subjects. Such an analysis may be contrary to Bickel *et al.* (1999) and Mishra (1990), but is consistent with the approach of Yadava (1998, 2004) and with what has been proposed for a number of other Indo-Aryan languages (for instance, see papers in Verma and Mohanan 1990, and Joshi 1993).

We can then conclude that both types of single agreement, the single nominative and non-nominative agreement, must be controlled by the grammatical subject, even though subjecthood does not correspond on a one-to-one basis to the nominative case. However, there are three types of deviation from this pattern in which non-nominative agreement does not appear to be with the subject.

First, single non-nominative agreement can register the features of a referent that is only vaguely associated with the content of the proposition. In this instance it does not correspond to any overt element in the clause, and there is no evidence that it can be construed as a null argument or possessor. Bickel *et al.* (1999) call this type 'deictic agreement' and note that it may be functionally comparable to the so-called 'ethical datives' found in a number of languages. We will not be dealing with deictic agreement further in this chapter.

Second, and more relevant for the topic of the chapter, single non-nominative agreement is possible with the possessor internal to the subject of an intransitive verb (typically in the absence of another potential non-subject controller). As is generally required by Maithili grammar, the possessor is marked with the genitive and is internal to the same NP to which the possessed noun belongs (see Section 2.5 for a discussion of this issue). For instance, in (5a), the possessed noun stands in the nominative and the subject phrase triggers single nominative subject agreement, whereas in (5b) we observe non-nominative agreement with the 2L genitive possessor of the subject.

(5) a. [tohər **nokər**] əe-l-əi
2L.GEN servant[NOM] come-PST-3
'Your (L) servant came.'

b. [**tohər** nokər] əe-l-əu
2L.GEN servant[NOM] come-PST-2L.NN
'Your (L) servant came.'

It also appears that if agreement targets the possessor of a non-nominative subject, it has to take the single non-nominative form. For instance, like the third person subject itself in (6a), the 2L possessor of the non-nominative subject in (6b) can control the non-nominative agreement:

(6) a. [tohər **nokər-ke**] bhukh ləg-l-əi
2L.GEN servant-ACC hunger[NOM] feel-PST-3.NN
'Your (L) servant was hungry.'

b. [**tohər** nokər-ke] bhukh ləg-l-əu
2L.GEN servant-ACC hunger[NOM] feel-PST-2L.NN
'Your (L) servant was hungry.'

Examples (5) and (6) show that the choice of the agreement controller (nominative subject vs its possessor, and the non-nominative NP vs the possessor of a non-nominative NP) is 'optional' in the sense that two alternative constructions express (roughly) identical propositions.

Non-nominative agreement is also found with other non-terms. The same pattern extends to NPs embedded within non-subject phrases in clauses with non-nominative subjects, as shown in (7) with a possessor of an adjunct, and in (8) with an object of a postposition.

(7) a. tora [**okər** ghər] me bhukh leg-l-əi
2L.ACC 3.GEN house[NOM] LOC hunger[NOM] feel-PST-3.NN
'You (L) were hungry in his house.'

b. tora [**hunkər** ghər] me bhukh leg-l-əin(h)
2L.ACC 3R.GEN house[NOM] LOC hunger[NOM] feel-PST-3R.NN
'You (L) were hungry in his (R) house.'

(8) a. hunka [**tora** səŋe] chiṭṭhi likhae-ke chə-l-əu(k)
3R.ACC 2L.ACC with letter[NOM] write-ACC be-PST-2L.NN
'He (R) had to write a letter with you (L).'

b. tora [**hunka** səŋe] chiṭṭhi likhae-ke chə-l-əin(h)
2L.ACC 3R.ACC with letter[NOM] write-ACC be-PST-3R.NN
'You (L) had to write a letter with him (R).'

The functional factors that determine the choice of the agreement controller in such situations will be discussed in Sections 2.6 and 2.7.

2.4 Double agreement

We saw in Section 2.2.3 that double agreement simultaneously cross-references two controllers within the same clause, the primary controller and the secondary controller. In Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 we describe the basic pattern of double agreement and the possible range of controllers, while Section 2.4.3 surveys previous accounts of double agreement.

2.4.1 Primary controller

The primary controller in double agreement is always nominative. It can be the A argument of a transitive (9a) or ditransitive clause (9b) or the S argument of an intransitive (9c).

(9) a. həm **tora** piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit you (L).'

b. to **həmra** chiṭṭhi pəthəu-l-əhi
2L[NOM] 1.ACC letter[NOM] send-PST-2L>1
'You (L) sent me a letter.'

c. həm **ghər** me suta-l-iæk
1[NOM] house[NOM] LOC sleep-PST-1>3
'I slept in the house.'

Double agreement paradigm is ungrammatical with verbs that have a non-nominative experiencer subject (that is, clauses that lack a nominative argument), as argued in Section 2.3.2, but it can occur in passives, providing the primary controller is the nominative subject, as shown in Section 2.4.2.

2.4.2 Secondary controllers

Secondary agreement can be with a number of potential controllers, including objects of monotransitive verbs (10a), recipients (10b) and themes (10c) of ditransitive verbs, and objects of oblique postpositional phrases (10d) and (10e), so essentially all non-subject clause-level nominals, both arguments and adjuncts, can control secondary agreement under appropriate conditions.[7]

(10) a. həm **tora** piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit you (L).'

b. həm **tora** bəcha de-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>2L
'I gave you (L) the baby.'

c. həm tora **bəcha** de-l-iæ
1[NOM] 2L.ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>3
'I gave you (L) the baby.'

d. həm [**tohər** səŋe] khana pəkəu-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN COMIT food[NOM] cook-PST-1>2L
'I cooked food with you (L).'

e. həm [**tora** sə̃] kələm chhin-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC INS pen[NOM] take-PST-1>2L
'I took the pen from you (L).'

[7] Stump and Yadav (1988: 308) and Yadav (1996: 185) mention that secondary agreement cannot be controlled by the object of a postposition, so in the variety of Maithili they describe, examples (10d) and (10e) would be ungrammatical. However, in the variety described in the present chapter and in Bickel *et al.* (1999) these examples are well formed.

Crucially for our purposes, possessors internal to all these elements are also able to function as controllers of secondary agreement. Compare the examples in (10) and (11).

(11) a. həm [**tohər** nokər-ke]$_{P}$ piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit your (L) servant.'

b. həm [**tohər** guru-ji-ke]$_{R}$ bəcha de-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN teacher(R)-HON-ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>2L
'I gave your (L) teacher (R) the baby.'

c. həm [**tohər** bəcha]$_{T}$ guru-ji-ke de-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN baby[NOM] teacher(R)-HON-ACC give-PST-1>2L
'I gave your (L) baby to the teacher (R).'

d. həm [**tohər** guru-ji-ke sənɟe]$_{OBL}$ khana pəkəu-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN teacher(R)-HON-ACC INS food[NOM] cook-PST-1>2L
'I cooked food with your (L) teacher (R).'

e. həm [**tohər** guru-ji sə̃]$_{OBL}$ kələm chhin-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN teacher(R)-HON[NOM] INS pen[NOM] take-PST-1>2L
'I took the pen from your (L) teacher (R).'

The data in (11) shows that secondary agreement can be controlled by a possessor internal to a clause-level non-subject noun phrase. Furthermore, in constructions with stacked possessors (e.g. [[[your] teacher's] servant]), either of the two possessors can control secondary agreement, so in (12), for instance, there are three potential controllers of secondary agreement, the head of the object phrase 'servant' in (12a), the possessor of the head of the object 'teacher (R)' in (12b), or the possessor of the possessed head 'your (L)' in (12c).

(12) a. həm [toh-ər sikshək-ək **nokər-ke**] piṭ-əl-iæ
1[NOM] 2L-GEN teacher(R)-GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>3
'I hit your (L) teacher's (R) servant.'

b. həm [toh-ər **sikshək-ək** nokər-ke] piṭ-əl-iænh
1[NOM] 2L-GEN teacher(R)-GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>3R
'I hit your (L) teacher's (R) servant.'

c. həm [**toh-ər** sikshək-ək nokər-ke] piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L-GEN teacher(R)-GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit your (L) teacher's (R) servant.'

The possessor of an intransitive nominative subject cannot serve as the secondary controller in double agreement: it can only be cross-referenced by single non-nominative agreement, as we saw in Section 2.3. However, the possessor of a transitive nominative subject can be cross-referenced by secondary agreement, as in (13a), as an alternative to the object controlling secondary agreement, as in (13b). Non-nominative agreement cannot be controlled by the possessor of a nominative transitive subject, as in (13c).

(13) a. [**tohər** bhai] həm-ra piṭ-əl-kəu
2L.GEN brother[NOM] 1-ACC hit-PST-3>2L
'Your (L) brother hit me.'

b. [tohər bhai] **həm-ra** piṭ-əl-kəi
2L.GEN brother[NOM] 1-ACC hit-PST-3>1
'Your (L) brother hit me.'

c. *[**tohər** bhai] həm-ra piṭ-l-əu
2L.GEN brother[NOM] 1-ACC hit-PST-2L.NN
intended: 'Your (L) brother hit me.'

It is equally ungrammatical to use double agreement when there is a non-nominative subject: the examples in (14) demonstrate that the accusative subject *hunka* cannot be the primary agreement controller with the nominative object (14a) or the possessor of the nominative object (14b) controlling secondary agreement. Only non-nominative agreement is possible, as in (14c).

(14) a. *hunka [tohər chiṭṭhi] likhae-ke chə-lə-thin
3R.ACC 2L.GEN letter[NOM] write-ACC be-PST-3R>3
intended: 'He (R) had to write your (L) letter.'

b. *hunka [tohər chiṭṭhi] likhae-ke chə-l-k(ah)unh
3R.ACC 2L.GEN letter[NOM] write-ACC be-PST-3R>2
intended: 'He (R) had to write your (L) letter.'

c. **hunka** [tohər chiṭṭhi] likhae-ke chə-l-əin(h)
3R.ACC 2L.GEN letter[NOM] write-ACC be-PST-3R.NN
'He (R) had to write your (L) letter.'

The restrictions in (14) confirm the general rule that the primary controller in double agreement is always the nominative subject.

Double agreement is also permitted in passives, providing the primary controller is the nominative. In (15a), agreement is with the intransitive subject, using agreement inflection from the paradigm in Table 2.2. In (15b), where the nominative subject is 2M and the oblique is first person, double agreement is permissible. The sentence is ungrammatical, however, if the indexing of primary and secondary controllers is inverted, as in (15c).

(15) a. həm-ra sə̃ **to** piṭ-əl ge-l-əh
1-ACC INS 2M[NOM] hit-PTCP AUX-PST-2M
'You (M) were hit by me.'

b. **həm-ra** sə̃ to piṭ-əl ge-l-əhə(k)
1-ACC INS 2M[NOM] hit-PTCP AUX-PST-2M>1
'You (M) were hit by me.'

c. ***həm-ra** sə̃ to piṭ-əl ge-l-iəh
1-ACC INS 2M[NOM] hit-PTCP AUX-PST-1>2M
intended: 'You (M) were hit by me.'

While the passives in our data involve single agreement from the nominative paradigm, Yadava (1999: 146) discusses examples where the passive agent controls single non-nominative agreement. This suggests that the passive agent is sufficiently subject-like to control morphosyntactic processes in such examples. It may ultimately prove to be the case that the distribution of subject properties across nominals in passives is a matter of inter-speaker or intra-speaker variation.

It is important to note at this point that double agreement is not obligatory, even if the sentence contains more than one potential controller. For instance, we saw in (1a) above that a transitive verb can host single nominative agreement in a clause with several referential NPs. Moreover, there is a high degree of optionality in the choice of the secondary controller, as is demonstrated in (1b–d). This choice appears to be governed by a rather complex set of conditions, which naturally raises the question of how to best analyse them.

2.4.3 Previous analyses of double agreement

All previous accounts of Maithili agree that it is the functional prominence of the potential agreement controllers (including internal possessors) which enables them to control secondary agreement. This was probably first explicitly stated by Jha (1958: 472) and Singh (1979), although these authors did not explain what exactly prominence involves. Stump and Yadav (1988) also claimed that secondary agreement targets the 'most prominent' NP in the clause other than the subject. Prominence is defined in terms of two major aspects in the representation of a clause: the inherent semantic features of the respective NP (animacy and honorific grade), on the one hand, and the role the referent plays in the information-structural construal of the proposition (focus or emphasis). Animacy and honorific grade (respect grade in our terminology) do not automatically ensure agreement, but work on a relative basis. Inanimate participants rarely trigger agreement, whereas among animates, and where different options are available, agreement is typically triggered by a human participant with the highest honorific grade. The two aspects are assumed to be partially interrelated, but how exactly referential features interact with focus/emphasis remained unclear on Stump and Yadav's (1988) account.

Other references to information structure in relation to Maithili secondary agreement include Comrie (2003), who mentioned in passing that topicality may be the relevant feature, and Dalrymple and Nikolaeva' (2005), who largely followed Comrie's insights. However, they admit that their claims are impossible to verify in the absence of relevant contexts, and in their later work these authors state that 'a more general notion of prominence or contrast may better characterize agreement patterns in Maithili' (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011: 121).

The most detailed and elaborate analyses, however, are those of Yadava (1999) and, especially, Bickel *et al.* (1999). Recall from Section 2.2.3 that the latter authors decompose agreement inflections into distinct meaningful morphological sub-units. The patterns of their combinations are claimed to be a function of two general interaction principles operative in Maithili society: the principle of social hierarchy underlying the evaluation of people's 'face' (Brown and Levinson 1987) and the principle of social solidarity defining degrees of 'empathy' to which people identify

with others (Kuno 1987). When modelled in terms of OT-style constraints, the FACE family of constraints ensures agreement with 3H (3R in our terms) and requires the suppression of distinct marking of first person and 2H because the unique identification of these referents must be avoided. As a result, first person and 2H are always encoded identically, yielding morphological neutralization (as shown here in Tables 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4). For example, in their description, the same inflection *-aũ(h), -i* in the single nominative paradigm cross-references the first person and the 2H subject, and *-õ* is used to signal both the situations 1>2H and 2H>1 (cf. *-aũ(h), -i* in the current work). The EMPATHY family of constraints requires distinct cross-referencing of a nominal whose referent is treated with a high degree of empathy by the speaker. These constraints target either the inherent person feature (e.g. second person) or a 3H nominal with the situational information-structure role of focus: the latter must always be cross-referenced on the verb. When the two families of constraints come into conflict in the case of first person and 2H referents, FACE overrides EMPATHY. These principles operate for argument controllers, while for non-arguments (possessors and objects of postpositions) agreement is always optional and generally occurs only when they are in focus (Bickel *et al.* 1999: 510–11).

The main goal of this analysis was 'to predict which scenario distinctions are formally neutralized in particular forms' (Bickel *et al.* 1999: 484–83). It does indeed explain the general structure of the paradigm and the patterns of syncretism (morphological neutralization) in it. Moreover, as Bickel *et al.* (1999: 512) remark, the application of pragmatic principles may have affected the historical development of the Maithili agreement system. However, their paper does not deal with variations such as those illustrated in (1) and (5–8) above, where we can see that there are alternative ways of expressing seemingly identical propositions as far as agreement is concerned. As we will see below, even for arguments, secondary agreement is often optional in the sense that, for at least some clauses where it appears, a different agreement pattern is available, namely the single nominative subject agreement. This leaves the speaker a choice.

The questions we are asking in this chapter are different from the question that is central to Bickel *et al.*'s (1999) work, but more in line with Stump and Yadav (1988), Comrie (2003), and Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2005): what determines the choice between several potential controllers and what implications does this have for the analysis of the Maithili agreement system? Before we turn to these questions in Sections 2.6 and 2.7, in the next section we will take a closer look at the syntax of double agreement.

2.5 The grammatical function of secondary controllers

We can first ask whether the choice of the secondary agreement controller correlates with a change of grammatical functions. Since control of verbal agreement is a property which typically distinguishes terms from non-terms (Johnson 1977; Moravscik 1978), a reasonable hypothesis to test is whether controllers of secondary agreement, including possessors, function as arguments and thus involve some kind of valence-changing process. This issue was first raised and investigated by Stump and Yadav (1988), who

surveyed various types of evidence against a possessor-raising kind of analysis for Maithili agreeing possessors in the Janakpur variety. Our data from the Siraha variety confirm their findings, but before we discuss possessor controllers, we might want to also verify whether secondary agreement with non-possessor controllers is even defined on grammatical functions, specifically, the object function.

To this end, consider again the data presented in (10), repeated as (16). Assuming that the secondary agreement controller is the (direct) object of transitive and ditransitive clauses in (16a) and (16b), do the recipient object, in (16c), and the objects of postpositions, in (16d) and (16e), control agreement by virtue of acquiring object status via some kind of applicativization-like process? Or is some other syntactic or information structural notion required to account for the agreement patterns observed? To our knowledge, this question has not yet been addressed in the literature on Maithili.

(16) a. həm **tora** piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit you (L).'

b. həm **tora** bəcha de-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>2L
'I gave you (L) the baby.'

c. həm tora **bəcha** de-l-iæ
1[NOM] 2L.ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>3
'I gave you (L) the baby.'

d. həm [**tohər** səŋe] khana pəkəu-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN COMIT food[NOM] cook-PST-1>2L
'I cooked food with you (L).'

e. həm [**tora** sə̃] kələm chhin-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC INS pen[NOM] take-PST-1>2L
'I took the pen from you (L).'

One diagnostic test for objecthood is passivization. The passive construction in Maithili is periphrastic: it consists of a respective tense/agreement form of the auxiliary verb *ja* 'to go' (its suppletive stem is *ge*) and the past participle of the lexical verb derived with the suffix *-(ə)l*.[8] The passive operation involves the promotion of the object argument to the nominative subject, which triggers the single nominative agreement, and the demotion of the original subject to an optional oblique expressed by the instrumental in *-sə/-sə̃*. The passive counterpart to (16a) can be seen in (17). As we saw above, the agreement on the auxiliary comes from the single nominative agreement paradigm.

(17) həm-ra sə̃ **tu** piṭ-əl ge-l-æ / *ge-l-aũ(h)
1-ACC INS 2L[NOM] hit-PTCP AUX-PST-2L AUX-PST-1
'You (L) were hit by me.'

[8] Yadav (1996: 209) also mentions a non-periphrastic inflectional passive.

For the purposes of agreement, passives behave like intransitives, as demonstrated by (18), where the third person masculine honorific agreement form *-ah* is used. Recall from Table 2.2 that gender agreement is restricted to honorific intransitives.

(18) [nokər sə̃] **raja** piṭ-əl ge-l-ah /
servant[NOM] INS king(R.MASC)[NOM] hit-PTCP AUX-PST-3MASC.R
*ge-l
AUX-PST[3]
'The king (R) was hit by the servant.'

Passivization can target either the single object of monotransitive verbs, as in (17) and (18), or the theme object of ditransitives, as shown by the contrast between the active ditransitive in (19a) and the passivized counterpart in (19b). In (19b), *bəcha* 'baby' is the subject—it controls single intransitive agreement on the verb.

(19) a. həm **Mohən-ke** bəcha de-l-iæn(h)
1[NOM] Mohan(R)-ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>3R
'I gave Mohan (R) the baby.'

b. həm-ra sə̃ Mohan-ke **bəcha** de-l ge-l
1-ACC INS Mohan(R)-ACC baby[NOM] give-PTCP AUX-PST[3]
'The baby was given to Mohan (R) by me.'

Crucially, recipient objects of ditransitive verbs cannot acquire the nominative case form associated with the subjects of passives. The example in (20) is ungrammatical because the recipient object cannot be promoted to be the nominative subject of a passivized verb. This sentence is ungrammatical whether the object *bəcha* 'baby' bears the accusative or nominative case and with any permutations of constituent order.

(20) *həmra sə̃ Mohən bəcha(-ke) de-l ge-l-əinh
1.ACC INS Mohan(R)[NOM] baby-ACC give-PTCP AUX-PST-3R
'Mohan (R) was given a baby by me.'

We take these facts to mean that the two objects of ditransitive constructions are different in grammatical status despite bearing the same case-marking in non-passive clauses (subject to conditions on differential object marking) and despite the fact that either of them can control secondary agreement: the theme corresponds to the primary object which shares properties with the object of monotransitive verbs, while the recipient is arguably a secondary object. Much of the LFG literature, starting from Bresnan and Kanerva (1989), analyses secondary objects as semantically restricted; we can then treat Maithili secondary objects as inherently associated with the recipient role. Passivization in Maithili only targets primary objects.

In a similar way, it is not possible to passivize oblique objects and adjuncts expressed by postpositional phrases even though they can trigger secondary agreement. Compare (21a) with the ungrammatical example in (21b), which is equally bad, with or without a stranded postposition.

(21) a. həm tora səŋe rəh-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC COMIT live-PST-1>2L
'I lived with you (L).'

b. *həm-ra sə̃ tu (səŋe) rəh-əl ge-l-æ
1-ACC INS 2L[NOM] COMIT live-PTCP AUX-PST-2L
intended: 'You (L) were lived with by me.'

If passivization is meant to be a diagnostic for the (primary) object, the ungrammaticality of (21b) indicates that the object of a postposition cannot have object status as it fails to appear as the subject of the corresponding passive verb. So there seems to be no applicative-like operation that promotes non-object arguments or adjuncts to direct objects. This, in turn, suggests that secondary agreement in (21a), and other instances where it cross-references elements other than single objects of monotransitives and theme objects of ditransitives, does not refer to objecthood and so cannot be termed 'object agreement' (contrary to Yadav 1996).

Since alternations in grammatical behaviours are not always a reliable test for determining grammatical functions (Ackerman and Moore 2001; Dalrymple 2001), we could in theory consider an alternative analysis in which passivization does not identify objects, but secondary agreement does. However, we saw in Section 2.4.2 that secondary agreement can target possessors, and possessors are not even immediate subconstituents of the clause. Stump and Yadav (1988) cite the following types of evidence to support this claim. First, the agreeing possessor invariably bears the genitive case, and when the possessed noun is the direct object, the possessor cannot take the accusative in the absence of the accusative on its head (shown in (22)), as would be expected on the possessor-raising analysis:

(22) *həm tora nokər piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC servant[NOM] hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit your (2L) servant.'

In our data we do indeed have examples where the possessor bears the accusative, but this appears to be due to some general collapse of the distinction between the accusative/dative, on the one hand, and the genitive, on the other hand. For instance, it is occasionally possible to find accusative/dative pronouns functioning as possessors, as in (23).

(23) həm tohər / tora nokər-ke piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN 2L.ACC servant-ACC hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit your (L) servant.'

However, in (23) the accusative is required on the object 'servant' unlike in (22), so the pattern of case inflection leads to the conclusion that the object does not lose its argument status even if its possessor is marked with the accusative.

Second, although the order of non-verbal constituents is relatively free (see Yadava 1998: 21ff.), the genitive possessor cannot occupy any position except the position in which it immediately precedes the possessed noun. Stump and Yadav (1988) illustrate this observation at length, and we can also confirm it based on our own material. In (24) the adverbial *kailh* 'yesterday' can be placed in any position except in between the genitive possessor 'your' and the possessed noun 'servant', suggesting that they form a syntactic constituent.

(24) (kailh) həm (kailh) tohər (*kailh) nokər-ke (kailh)
yesterday 1[NOM] 2L.GEN servant-ACC
piṭ-əl-iəu
hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit your (L) servant yesterday.'

The possessor-possessed combination behaves as one constituent with respect to reordering operations triggered by discourse-related factors. For instance, in (25a) it undergoes fronting under contrastive focus, but it appears impossible to front the genitive possessor alone (25b).

(25) a. tohər nokər-ke həm piṭ-əl-iəu, naeki tohər
2L.GEN servant-ACC 1[NOM] hit-PST-1>2L NEG 2L.GEN
guru-ji-ke
teacher-HON-ACC
'It was your (L) servant that I hit, not your (L) teacher (R).'

b. *tohər həm nokər-ke piṭ-l-iəu, naeki həmər
2L.GEN 1[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-1>2L NEG 1.GEN
nokər-ke
servant-ACC
intended: 'It was your (L) servant that I hit, not my servant.'

Finally, Stump and Yadav (1988) argue that possessors never behave like arguments for the purposes of transitivization, causativization, or passivization. Let us look at the last of these. It is always possible to passivize the whole possessive phrase if it corresponds to the primary object; then either the derived subject itself controls the nominative agreement (26a) or the possessor internal to the passive subject controls the non-nominative agreement (26b). These patterns are consistent with what we described above and do not indicate the subject status of the possessor. Crucially, passivization cannot target the possessor alone (26c), suggesting that the possessor does not acquire the status of the clausal object.

(26) a. tohər nokər həmra sə̃ piṭ-əl ge-l
2L.GEN servant[NOM] 1.ACC INS hit-PTCP AUX-PST[3]
'Your (L) servant was hit by me.'

b. tohər nokər həmra sə̃ piṭ-əl ge-l-əu
2L.GEN servant[NOM] 1.ACC INS hit-PTCP AUX-PST-2L.NN
'Your (L) servant was hit by me.'

c. *tu nokər həmra sə̃ piṭ-əl ge-l-æ
2L servant[NOM] 1.ACC INS hit-PTCP AUX-PST-2L
intended: 'Your (L) servant was hit by me.'

The tests discussed here indicate that agreeing possessors are unambiguously NP-internal and therefore fit our definition of PIPs. There is no possessor-raising mechanism that promotes such possessors to an argument role, so possessors retain

their non-argument status even if they control agreement on the verb.[9] This, together with evidence for non-possessor controllers, further leads to the more general conclusion that secondary agreement does not presuppose any change of grammatical function. It is therefore genuinely 'trigger-happy' in the sense of Comrie (2003).

2.6 The role of referential features

We have seen that agreeing possessors remain internal to the possessive phrase and that, more generally, secondary controllers do not correspond to one grammatical function, as they do in many other languages. Instead, the choice of the non-subject controller appears to be conditioned by non-syntactic factors, at least to some extent. In this section we discuss the role of referential features. By 'referential features' we will understand the features of animacy, person, and honorific grade, since they grammaticalize the extralinguistic properties of the respective referent. They appear to work differently for non-possessor controllers and for possessor controllers, so the section is structured accordingly.

2.6.1 Non-possessor controllers

Recall that in double agreement the primary controller is always the nominative subject; the non-possessor secondary controller can be any argument other than the subject, or a clause-level adjunct expressed by a postpositional phrase (Section 2.4.2). Certain combinations of the referential features of the primary controller and non-possessor secondary controller require double agreement, while for other combinations double agreement is optional and agreement from the single nominative paradigm can alternatively be used.

2.6.1.1 First and second person secondary controllers The patterns that emerge from our data are summarized in Table 2.7 for secondary agreement with first and second person non-possessor controllers.

To illustrate the distributions in Table 2.7, consider the examples in (27), with a second person primary controller and a first person secondary controller.[10] In each case, agreement with a secondary controller is optional. For the configuration 2H>1 the double agreement form is identical to the single nominative agreement form for 2H, and therefore (27b) neither supports nor conflicts with this general observation.

(27) a. əpne həmra piṭ-əl-iæk / piṭ-əl ge-l / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2R[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-2R>1 hit-PTCP AUX-PST[2R] hit-PST-2R
'You (R) hit me.'

b. əhã həmra piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2H[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-2H>1 / hit-PST-2H
'You (H) hit me.'

[9] External possessor constructions in which the possessor assumes the object role do exist in Maithili, though they behave differently and appear to be limited to occurring with body part expressions.

[10] Note that periphrastic constructions in *piṭ-əl gel* are not attested as alternatives to (27a).

c. to həmra piṭ-l-əhə(k) / piṭ-l-əh
2M[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-2M>1 hit-PST-2M
'You (M) hit me.'

d. tu həmra piṭ-l-əhi / piṭ-l-æ
2L[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-2L>1 hit-PST-2L
'You (L) hit me.'

With third person non-honorific primary controllers, secondary agreement is obligatory; no single nominative alternative is ever possible, including the single agreement forms (see Tables 2.2 and 2.4), as in (28a). If the subject is third person honorific, secondary agreement is optional, as shown in (28b).

(28) a. u həmra piṭ-l-ək / piṭ-əl-kəi / *piṭ-əl / *piṭ-l-əi
3[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-3>1 hit-PST-3>1 hit-PST[3] hit-PST-3
'He hit me.'

b. o həmra piṭ-l-əin / piṭ-l-əith
3R[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-3R>1 hit-PST-3R
'He (R) hit me.'

Next consider first person primary controllers with second person secondary controllers. Double agreement is obligatory when the subject is first person and the clause contains a second person secondary controller. Single nominative subject agreement is ungrammatical here. However, for the 1>2H combination as in (30c) it is impossible to tell if there is single or double agreement because the single nominative form for first person (*-i, –aũ*) is identical to the relevant double agreement form.

TABLE 2.7 Occurrence of double agreement paradigm with pronominal subjects and first and second person non-possessor secondary controllers

	SECONDARY CONTROLLER				
PRIMARY CONTROLLER	1	2R	2H	2M	2L
1		Obligatory (29d)	Identical to single (29c)	Obligatory (29b)	Obligatory (29a)
2R	Optional (27a)				
2H	Identical to single (27b)				
2M	Optional (27c)				
2L	Optional (27a)				
3R	Optional (28b)	Optional (31c)	Optional (31b)	Obligatory (31a)	Obligatory (31a)
3	No single alternative (28a)	No single alternative (30d)	No single alternative (30c)	No single alternative (30b)	No single alternative (30a)

(29) a. həm **tora** piṭ-əl-iəu / *piṭ-l-aũ
1[NOM] 2L.ACC hit-PST-1>2L hit-PST-1
'I hit you (L).'

b. həm **tora** piṭ-əl-iəh / *piṭ-l-aũ
1[NOM] 2M.ACC hit-PST-1>2M hit-PST-1
'I hit you (M).'

c. həm **əhã-ke** piṭ-l-aũ
1[NOM] 2H-ACC hit-PST-1>2H
'I hit you (H).'

d. həm **əpne-ke** piṭ-əl-iəinh / *piṭ-l-aũ
1[NOM] 2R-ACC hit-PST-1>2R hit-PST-1
'I hit you (R).'

When there is a (non-honorific) third person primary controller, double agreement is obligatory because there is no single alternative for transitive verbs (see Table 2.3), as shown in (30).

(30) a. u **tora** piṭ-əl-kəu(k) / *piṭ-əl / *piṭ-l-əi
3[NOM] 2L.ACC hit-PST-3>2L hit-PST[3] hit-PST-3
'He hit you (L/M).'

b. u **tora** piṭ-əl-kəh / *piṭ-əl / *piṭ-l-əi
3[NOM] 2M.ACC hit-PST-3>2M hit-PST[3] hit-PST-3
'He hit you (L/M).'

c. u **əhã-kẽ** piṭ-l-əih(n) / *piṭ-əl / *piṭ-l-əi
3[NOM] 2H-ACC hit-PST-3>2H hit-PST[3] hit-PST-3
'He hit you (H).'

d. u **əpne-ke** piṭ-l-(k)əinh / *piṭ-əl / *piṭ-l-əi
3[NOM] 2R-ACC hit-PST-3>2R hit-PST[3] hit-PST-3
'He hit you (R).'

Finally, we turn to third person honorific (R) primary controllers, with second person secondary controllers. Unlike with third person (non-honorific) forms, single agreement with a 3R subject is possible; however, this is restricted by respect grade, as illustrated in (31). If the secondary controller is 2L or 2M, agreement with the secondary controller is obligatory. If the secondary controller is 2H or 2R, agreement with the secondary controller is optional. We assume secondary agreement with low-grade referents is obligatory because the asymmetry between the status of the subject and the object is enough to warrant using the honorific paradigm; the final word on this awaits future research.

(31) a. o **tora** piṭ-əl-k(əh)unh / *piṭ-əl-kinh
3R[NOM] 2L/M.ACC hit-PST-3R>2 hit-PST-3R
'He (R) hit you (L/M).'

b. o əhã-kẽ piṭ-əl-kəinh / piṭ-əl-kinh / *piṭ-əl-k(əh)unh
3R[NOM] 2H-ACC hit-PST-3R>2H hit-PST-3R hit-PST-3R>2
'He (R) hit you (H).'

c. o əpne-kẽ piṭ-əl-kəinh / piṭ-əl-kinh / *piṭ-əl-k(əh)unh
3R[NOM] 2R-ACC hit-PST-3R>2R hit-PST-3R hit-PST-3R>2
'He (R) hit you (R).'

In sum, we can make the following generalizations about first and second person secondary controllers: if the secondary controller is a first person object, double agreement is optional unless there is a (non-honorific) third person subject; if the secondary controller is a second person object, double agreement is obligatory, except where both controllers have a high respect grade (R or H).

2.6.1.2 Third person secondary controllers Table 2.8 presents relevant distributions for secondary agreement with third person controllers.

TABLE 2.8 Occurrence of double agreement paradigm with third person secondary controllers

	SECONDARY CONTROLLER			
PRIMARY CONTROLLER	3R	3		
	ANIMATE			INANIMATE
	HUMAN		NON-HUMAN	
1	Obligatory (32a)	Optional (32b)	Optional (32c)	Optional (39a)
2R	Optional (33a)	Optional (33b)	Optional (33c)	Optional (39b)
2H	Optional (34a)	Optional (34b)	Optional (34c)	Optional (39c)
2M	Optional (35a)	Optional (35b)	Optional (35c)	Optional (39d)
2L	Optional (36a)	Optional (36b)	Optional (36c)	Optional (39e)
3R	Optional (37a)	Optional (37b)	Optional (37c)	Optional (39f)
3	No single alternative (38a)	No single alternative (38b)	No single alternative (38c)	No single alternative (39g)

For first person nominative subjects, double agreement is required when there is a 3R human object, but is optional for other types of object. Examples in (32) show that double agreement is obligatory when the subject is first person and the clause contains a third person honorific human non-subject NP (3R). Single nominative subject agreement is ungrammatical here. When the third person non-subject is non-honorific animate (3), secondary agreement is optional. When the option of double agreement is not chosen, agreement is with the subject only.

(32) a. həm **sikshək-ke** piṭ-l-iəinh / *piṭ-l-aũ(h)
1[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-1>3R hit-PST-1
'I hit the teacher (R).'

b. həm **nokər-ke** piṭ-l-iæ(k) / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
1[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-1>3 hit-PST-1
'I hit the servant.'

c. həm **kukur-ke** piṭ-əl-iæ(k) / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
1[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-1>3 hit-PST-1
'I hit the dog.'

When the subject is second person, double agreement with an animate object is always optional, as shown in (33–36). Note that periphrastic agreement forms are not permitted here with a 2R subject.

(33) a. əpne **sikshək-ke** piṭ-l-iænh / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2R[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-2R>3R hit-PST-2H
'You (R) hit the teacher (R).'

b. əpne **nokər-ke** piṭ-l-iæ(k) / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2R[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-2R>3 hit-PST-2H
'You (R) hit the servant.'

c. əpne **kukur-ke** piṭ-l-iæ(k) / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2R[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-2R>3 hit-PST-2H
'You (R) hit the dog.'

(34) a. əhã **sikshək-ke** piṭ-l-iəinh / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2H[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-2H>3R hit-PST-2H
'You (H) hit the teacher (R).'

b. əhã **nokər-ke** piṭ-l-iæ(k) / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2H[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-2H>3 hit-PST-2H
'You (H) hit the servant.'

c. əhã **kukur-ke** piṭ-l-iæ(k) / piṭ-l-aũ(h)
2H[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-2H>3 hit-PST-2H
'You (H) hit the dog.'

(35) a. to **sikshək-ke** piṭ-l-əhunh / piṭ-l-əh
2M[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-2M>3R hit-PST-2M
'You (M) hit the teacher (R).'

b. to **nokər-ke** piṭ-l-əhə(k) / piṭ-l-əh
2M[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-2M>3 hit-PST-2M
'You (M) hit the servant.'

c. to **kukur-ke** piṭ-l-əhə(k) / piṭ-l-əh
2M[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-2M>3 hit-PST-2M
'You (M) hit the dog.'

(36) a. tu **sikshək-ke** piṭ-l-əhunh / piṭ-l-əhinh / piṭ-l-æ
2L[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-2L>3R hit-PST-2L>3R hit-PST-2L
'You (L) hit the teacher (R).'

b. tu **nokər-ke** piṭ-l-əhi(k) / piṭ-l-æ
2L[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-2L>3 hit-PST-2L
'You (L) hit the servant.'

c. tu **kukur-ke** piṭ-l-əhi(k) / piṭ-l-æ
2L[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-2L>3 hit-PST-2L
'You (L) hit the dog.'

The examples in (37) show that double agreement is optional if there is a third person honorific subject, while those in (38) demonstrate that double agreement is required if there is a (non-honorific) third person subject.

(37) a. o **sikshək-ke** piṭ-lə-kəinh / piṭ-əl-kin(h)
3R[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-3R>3R hit-PST-3R
'He (R) hit the teacher (R).'

b. o **nokər-ke** piṭ-lə-thin / piṭ-əl-kin(h)
3R[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-3R>3 hit-PST-3R
'He (R) hit the servant.'

c. o **kukur-ke** piṭ-lə-thin / piṭ-əl-kin(h)
3R[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-3R>3 hit-PST-3R
'He (R) hit the dog.'

(38) a. u **sikshək-ke** piṭ-lə-kəinh / *piṭ-l-ək / *piṭ-əl
3[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-3>3R hit-PST-3>3 hit-PST[3]
'He hit the teacher (R).'

b. u **nokər-ke** piṭ-l-ək / piṭ-lə-kəi / *piṭ-əl
3[NOM] servant-ACC hit-PST-3>3 hit-PST-3>3 hit-PST[3]
'He hit the servant.'

c. u **kukur-ke** piṭ-l-ək / piṭ-lə-kəi / *piṭ-əl
3[NOM] dog-ACC hit-PST-3>3 hit-PST-3>3 hit-PST[3]
'He hit the dog.'

With inanimate third person secondary controllers, double agreement is always optional, except where the subject is (non-honorific) third person, as confirmed by the data in (39).

(39) a. həm **kitab** le-l-iæ(k) / le-l-aũ(h)
1[NOM] book[NOM] take-PST-1>3 take-PST-1
'I took the book.'

b. əpne **kitab** le-l-iæ(k) / le-l-aũ(h)
2H[NOM] book[NOM] take-PST-2R>3 take-PST-1
'You (R) took the book.'

c. əhã **kitab** le-l-iæ(k) / le-l-aũ(h)
2H[NOM] book[NOM] take-PST-2H>3 take-PST-2H
'You (H) took the book.'

d. to **kitab** le-l-əh(k) / le-l-əh
2M[NOM] book[NOM] take-PST-2M>3 take-PST-2M
'You (M) took the book.'

e. tu **kitab** le-l-əhi(k) / le-l-æ
2L[NOM] book[NOM] take-PST-2L>3 take-PST-2M
'You (L) took the book.'

f. o **kitab** le-l-thin / le-l-kin(h)
3R[NOM] book[NOM] take-PST-3R>3 take-PST-3R
'He (R) took the book.'

g. u **kitab** le-l-ək / le-l-kəi / *le-əl /*le-l-əi
3[NOM] book[NOM] take-PST-3>3 take-PST-3>3 take-PST[3]/ take-PST-3
'He took the book.'

When there are two controllers which potentially must trigger secondary agreement as in (40), only one of them agrees, but single agreement with the subject alone would be impossible in all these situations.

(40) a. həm tora bəcha de-l-iəu / de-l-iæ /
1[NOM] 2L.ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>2L give-PST-1>3
*de-l-aũ
give-PST-1
'I gave a baby to you (L).'

b. həm [tora səŋe] khana pəkəu-l-iəu / pəkəu-l-iæ /
1[NOM] 2L.ACC COMIT food[NOM] cook-PST-1>2L cook-PST-1>3
*pəkəu-l-aũ
cook-PST-1
'I cooked food with you (L).'

c. həm sikshək-ke tora de-l-iəu / de-l-iəin(h) /
1[NOM] teacher(R)-ACC 2L.ACC give-PST-1>2L give-PST-1>3R
*de-l-aũ
give-PST-1
'I gave you (L) to the teacher (R).'

To conclude this section, secondary agreement with third person controllers is always optional, except when 1>3R and when the primary controller is underspecified for respect.

2.6.1.3 Summary The judgements we discussed above indicate that, as was noted in the previous works, the need to respect honoured people is one of the factors motivating secondary agreement. The patterns we have identified are partly similar to the patterns of morphological syncretism described by Bickel *et al.* (1999), but there are also differences. In part these differences may be explainable by different analyses of agreement paradigms, but independently of this, our data show a higher degree of optionality.

Contrary to some previous claims, it is rather difficult to formulate the relevant generalizations in terms of one unidirectional hierarchy. Instead, the basic generalizations seem to be as follows. We can generalize the facts concerning the distribution of double agreement by making reference to key referential features. The first generalizations concern person values:

(i) If the subject is non-honorific third person (3), secondary agreement is always obligatory:

3 > 1, 2, 3 = Obligatory

(ii) If the subject is first person (1), and the secondary controller is 2, secondary agreement is always obligatory:

1 > 2 = Obligatory

(iii) If the subject is second person (2), secondary agreement is optional:

2 > 1, 3 = Optional

The second set of constraints concerns both person and respect grade.

(i) If the subject is first person (1), and the secondary controller is 3R, secondary agreement is always obligatory:

1 > 3R = Obligatory

(ii) If the subject is first person (1), and the third person secondary controller does not have the R value, secondary agreement is optional.

1 > 3 = Optional

(iii) If the subject is third person honorific (3R), and secondary agreement is second person 2L or 2M, secondary agreement is always obligatory.

3R > 2L/2M = Obligatory

(iv) If the subject is third person honorific (3R), and secondary agreement is second person 2R or 2H, secondary agreement is optional.

3R > 2R/2H = Optional

(v) If the subject is third person honorific (3R), and secondary agreement is third person, secondary agreement is optional.

3R > 3 = Optional

This gives rise to differential argument marking based on person and respect grade. Double agreement is obligatory when there is a first person primary controller (except in the situation 1>3), when there is a third person non-honorific primary controller, and when there is a third person honorific primary controller acting on 2L/2M. In all other situations it is optional. Note that the optionality of double agreement marking appears to reflect a pragmatic condition that motivates the avoidance of double agreement with a potential secondary controller when both controllers have a high respect grade (R or H).

Having established the role of referential features in determining when double agreement is obligatory with non-possessor controllers, we now turn to the role of referential features in determining when possessors may control secondary agreement.

2.6.2 Possessor controllers

In this section we address the role of the referential features of possessor controllers, both possessors that trigger non-nominative single agreement (Section 2.3.2) and secondary possessor controllers in double agreement (Section 2.4.2). It is important to note from the start that agreement with a possessor is always optional, because there is always an alternative pattern: since the possessed noun is by definition third person (3 or 3R), it can always trigger agreement.

Recall from Section 2.3.2 that single non-nominative agreement with the possessor is only available for possessors of nominative or non-nominative intransitive subjects, and on non-subjects when there is a non-nominative subject. However,

non-nominative agreement with the possessor is ruled out if its honorific grade is lower than the honorific grade of the possessed noun.

If the possessed noun lacks the R value, agreement with possessors of all persons and all respect grades is possible. This was shown in (5b) above, repeated here as (41a). However, when the possessed noun is honorific (R), only the 2H, 2R, or 3R possessor (i.e. those controllers with a high respect value) can control non-nominative single agreement. This can be shown by the contrast between (41a), where the possessor and possessee's respect grades are non-honorific, and the ungrammatical or strongly dispreferred example in (41b), where the possessor's respect grade is lower than that of the possessed. In (41c) the same possessed noun *sikshək* 'teacher (R)' combines with the 3R possessor *hunək* 'his/her' and the latter triggers non-nominative agreement.

(41) a. [**tohər** nokər] əe-l-əu
2L.GEN servant[NOM] come-PST-2L.NN
'Your (L) servant came.'

b. */?[**tohər** sikshək] əe-l-əu
2L.GEN teacher(R)[NOM] come-PST-2L.NN
intended: 'Your (L) teacher (R) came.'

c. [**hunək** sikshək] əe-l-əin(h)
3R.GEN teacher(R)[NOM] come-PST-3R.NN
'His (R) teacher (R) came.'

Even if the possessed noun is lower in respect grade than the possessor, agreement with the possessor is by no means required. It is still optional, as we saw in (5), so there are additional factors that appear to determine the choice.

Turning now to secondary agreement, we have seen that it is available on the possessors of non-subjects when there is a nominative subject (Section 2.4.2). Just as single non-nominative agreement is never obligatory with possessors, secondary agreement with possessors is also never obligatory: instead, the verb can 'optionally' show secondary agreement with the possessed non-subject (42a) or single nominative agreement if the possessed noun is a subject of an intransitive verb (42b).

(42) a. həm [tohər ghər me] sut-əl-iəu / sut-l-iæ
1[NOM] 2L.GEN house[NOM] LOC sleep-PST-1>2L sleep-PST-1>3
'I slept in your (L) house.'

b. [tohər sikshək] hunka piṭ-l-əith / piṭ-əl-(k)əinh /
2L.GEN teacher(R)[NOM] 3R.ACC hit-PST-3R hit-PST-3R>3R
piṭ-əl-kəhunh
hit-PST-3R>2
'Your (L) teacher (R) hit him (R).'

In (42a), the secondary controller is either the non-subject 'house' or its possessor (2L). In (42b), secondary agreement is not required in accordance with the rules

described above, so the verb can agree with the subject alone ('teacher (R)'). Alternatively, double agreement is possible; the secondary controller is either the object ('him (R)') or the possessor of the subject ('your (L)').

Unlike single non-nominative agreement, which can be controlled by the possessors of subjects, secondary agreement with possessors does not seem to be sensitive to the respect grade of the possessor in relation to that of the possessed noun. The former can be lower in respect grade than the latter, as exemplified in (43):

(43) a. həm [okər sikshək sə̃] bhet-əl-iænh / bhet-əl-iæ(k)
1[NOM] 3.GEN teacher(R)[NOM] INS meet-PST-1>3R meet-PST-1>3
'I met with his teacher (R).'

b. həm [tohər sikshək-ke] chiṭṭhi
1[NOM] 2L.GEN teacher(R)-ACC letter[NOM]
pathəu-l-iænh / pathəu-l-iæ / pathəu-l-iəu
send-PST-1>3R send-PST-1>3 send-PST-1>2L
'I sent a letter to your (L) teacher (R).'

c. o həmər sikshək-ke piṭ-lə-kinh / piṭ-l-aenh / piṭ-lə-kəinh
3R.NOM 1.GEN teacher(R)-ACC hit-PST-3R hit-PST-3R>1 hit-PST-3R>3R
'He (R) hit my teacher (R).'

In (43a), secondary agreement is either with the object, 'teacher (R)', or the possessor of the object, 'his'. In (43b), secondary agreement can target either the primary object, 'letter', or secondary object, 'teacher (R)', in accordance with the principles described above. In addition, it can target the possessor of the secondary object, 'your (L)', even though its respect grade is lower than the respect grade of the possessed noun, 'teacher (R)'. This contrasts with example (41b) above, where the possessor in the phrase 'your (L) teacher (R)' cannot trigger single non-nominative agreement over the possessed subject, arguably, because its honorific degree is lower. The exact reason for this difference remains to be determined.

Overall, this distribution suggests that the presence of a possessor can block the application of the generalizations discussed in Section 2.6.1.3. For instance, although the combination 1>3R normally requires secondary agreement, when a 3R non-subject heads its own possessor, secondary agreement can target its possessor instead (44).

(44) tu [hunək nokər-ke] piṭ-l-əhunh / piṭ-l-əhi
2L[NOM] 3R.GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-2L>3R hit-PST-2L>3
'You (L) hit his (R) servant.'

To conclude this section, we have seen that certain combinations of referential features require secondary agreement with non-possessor controllers, but there are also situations in which double agreement is optional even if the clause contains a potential controller. With possessor controllers, secondary agreement is always optional. The next question is then what factors trigger secondary agreement when it is not the only option. This is the topic of the next section.

2.7 Non-subject agreement and focus

According to previous literature (Stump and Yadav 1988; Bickel *et al.* 1999; Yadava 1999), when secondary agreement is not required by the appropriate combination of referential features, it is conditioned by the focus status of a non-subject controller. We explore this issue in more detail below.

2.7.1 Focussed non-possessors

Previous authors did not provide an explicit definition of focus in their accounts of Maithili agreement. We will understand focus following the basics of the Alternative Semantics approach (Rooth 1992; Krifka 2007; Krifka and Musan 2012, among others), as the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of a linguistic expression. The role of focus is to exclude alternatives, either partially or fully. In this view all focus is essentially contrastive; but we will distinguish between strong contrastive focus, where the alternatives are excluded more explicitly, and weak or non-contrastive focus (Repp 2010; van der Wal 2011). They appear to behave differently in many languages, and possibly in Maithili too.

We have seen previously that for Bickel *et al.* (1999) focus only plays a role for 3R argument controllers (focussing a 3R nominal is said to increase empathy and therefore makes agreement obligatory) and for non-arguments (only focussed non-arguments can control agreement). The effect of contrastive focus is illustrated in (45) from Bickel *et al.* (1999: 504–5) (glossing and transcription modified). The example in (45a) demonstrates that in the situation 3R>3R double agreement is not required in a pragmatically neutral sentence (presumably only involving weak focus). In contrast, in (45b) the object is associated with strong focus and must agree.

(45) a. o hunka dekh-l-əith
3R.NOM 3R.ACC see-PST-3R
'He (R) saw him (R).'

b. **hunke** o dekhə-l-kəinh / *dekh-l-əith
3R.ACC.FOC 3R.NOM see-PST-3R>3R see-PST-3R
'He (R) saw [him (R)]$_{FOC}$.'

In (45b), contrastive focussing involves the raising of the final vowel *a>e* and the fronting of the focussed constituent. According to Yadava (1998: 31–2), these are the properties of the focussing cleft-like construction ('It is X that/who . . . '), while Yadav (1996: 259ff.) refers to *-e* as the 'exclusive' clitic.[11] In these constructions the focussed elements must be sentence-initial. However, our data reveal that constituents marked with the focus clitic need not be in initial position, as shown by (46).

(46) o **hunke** dekhə-l-kəinh
3R.NOM 3R.ACC.FOC see-PST-3R>3R
'He (R) saw [him (R)]$_{FOC}$.'

[11] Another realization of exclusive focus associated with the sentence-initial position is the element that falls under the scope of the focussing operator *-eta* 'only'.

Elsewhere, focussed elements unmarked by focussed clitics need not be sentence-initial and, for instance, in all examples of *wh*-questions in Yadava (1996) a *wh*-word is located in an immediately preverbal position. In our examples this does not seem to be required either, and the *wh*-word (presumably also an answer to it) can also be *in situ*. We take this to imply that fronting is associated with additional pragmatic effects (possibly strongest contrastivity), but even *in situ* elements can fall within the scope of focus, although they are not necessarily interpreted as strongly contrastive.

We found that focus is the triggering feature of non-subject agreement in all situations where it is not required by the appropriate combinations of referential features according to the principles described in Section 2.6.1. However, this is only obligatory with strong contrastive focus. This means that agreement is always required when focus is sentence-initial, but it is not necessarily required when it is *in situ*, as shown by the grammaticality of the pairs of sentences in (47–49).

(47) a. tu həmra piṭ-l-æ
2L.NOM 1.ACC hit-PST-2L
'You (L) hit me.'

b. tu **həmra** piṭ-l-əhi(k)
2L.NOM 1.ACC hit-PST-2L>1
'You (L) hit [me]$_{FOC}$ (not someone else).'

(48) a. həm **tora** bəcha de-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>2L
'I gave a baby to you (L).'

b. həm tora **bəcha** de-l-iæ
1[NOM] 2L.ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>3
'I gave a [baby]$_{FOC}$ to you (L) (not something else).'

(49) a. həm tora sə khana pak-au-l-i
1[NOM] 2L.ACC INS food[NOM] cook-CAUS-PST-1
'I cooked food with you (L).'

b. həm **tora** sə khana pak-au-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.ACC INS food[NOM] cook-CAUS-PST-1>2L
'I cooked food with [you (L)]$_{FOC}$ (not someone else).'

In our data, then, focus plays a bigger role than in Bickel *et al.*'s (1999) description. When secondary agreement is not made obligatory by referential features following the rules described in Section 2.6.1, it is conditioned by the contrastive focus status of the secondary controller. This does not depend on its position or the presence of any dedicated focus markers.

2.7.2 Focussed possessors

We have stated above that agreement for possessors is always one of the possible options. This means that, when it is present, it is always conditioned by focus.

The effect of focussing on the possessor is shown in (50), modified from Bickel *et al.* (1999: 511). In (50a), the predicate agrees with the intransitive subject only,

while in (50b) the focussed possessor of the adjunct controls secondary agreement in addition to the primary agreement controlled by the subject. Note that in (50b), as in (45b), focus is indicated through vowel raising.

(50) a. həm tohər ghər pər ge-l chə-l-i
1[NOM] 2M.GEN house[NOM] LOC GO-PTCP AUX-PST-1
'I had been to your (M) house.'

b. həm **tore** ghər pər ge-l chə-l-iəh
1[NOM] 2M.GEN.FOC house[NOM] LOC GO-PTCP AUX-PST-1>2M
'I had been to [your (M)]$_{FOC}$ house (not somebody else's).'

In our data, possessors of the subject in intransitive clauses control non-nominative single agreement when focussed, as shown in (51).

(51) a. tohər nokər əe-l-əi / #əe-l-əu
2L.ACC servant[NOM] come-PST-3 come-PST-2L.NN
'Your (L) servant (NH) came.'

b. **tohər** nokər əe-l-əu / #əe-l-əi
2L.ACC servant[NOM] come-PST-2L.NN come-PST-3
'[Your (L)]$_{FOC}$ servant came (not somebody else's).'

The possessor of a transitive subject can also control secondary agreement. In such instances the single/primary controller is always the subject, as in (52). In (52a), agreement is with the 3R subject only. In (52b), the subject is the 3R primary controller, and the 3R object pronoun is the secondary controller. In (52c), where the possessor of the subject is in contrastive focus, it controls secondary agreement.

(52) a. tohər sikshək hunka piṭ-l-əith
2L.GEN teacher(R)[NOM] 3R.ACC hit-PST-3R
'Your (L) teacher (R) hit him (R).'

b. tohər sikshək hunka piṭ-əl-kəinh
2L.GEN teacher(R)[NOM] 3R.ACC hit-PST-3R>3R
'Your (L) teacher (R) hit him (R).'

c. **tohər** sikshək hunka piṭ-əl-kəhunh
2L.GEN teacher(R)[NOM] 3R.ACC hit-PST-3R>2
'[Your]$_{FOC}$ (L) teacher (R) hit him (R) (not someone else's teacher).'

Similar examples showing agreement with the possessor of the (primary) object of a transitive and with the secondary object of a ditransitive are shown in (53) and (54) respectively.

(53) a. həm tohər nokər-ke piṭ-əl-iae naeki Dilip
1[NOM] 2L.GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>3 NEG Dilip
'I hit [your servant]$_{FOC}$ not Dilip.'

b. həm **tohər** nokər-ke piṭ-əl-iau naeki Dilip
1[NOM] 2L.GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>2L NEG Dilip
'I hit [your]$_{FOC}$ servant not Dilip's.'

(54) a. həm tohər sikshək-ke bəcha de-l-iəinh
1[NOM] 2L.GEN teacher(R)-ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>3R
'I gave a baby to your (L) teacher (R).'

b. həm **tohər** sikshək-ke bəcha de-l-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN teacher(R)-ACC baby[NOM] give-PST-1>2L
'I gave a baby to [your (L)]$_{FOC}$ teacher (R).'

We saw that apart from PIPs, all other elements that can control secondary agreement are clause-level elements. They do not seem to be associated with a particular structural position. The key question in relation to PIPs is whether their functional prominence has a structural corollary. We have (inconclusive) evidence that the focussed possessor occupies a structurally more prominent position than a non-focussed possessor. This arguably allows it to compete with clause-level elements for the status of agreement controller.

Internal possessors in Maithili can combine with determiners. For example, the demonstrative *i* 'this' is compatible with possessors, as in (55):

(55) a. i tohər nokər əe-l-əi
this 2L.GEN servant[NOM] come-PST-3
'This servant of yours (L) came.'

b. tohər i nokər əe-l-əu
2L.GEN this servant[NOM] come-PST-2L.NN
'This servant of yours (L) came.'

The determiner can either precede the possessor, as (55a), or follow it, as in (55b). Note, however, the difference in agreement on the verbs in (55). When the determiner precedes the possessor, the possessed noun controls agreement. When the possessor precedes the determiner, it controls agreement.

In fact, the reverse of (55), in which the determiner precedes the possessor but the possessor controls agreement and vice versa, is pragmatically infelicitous.

(56) a. #i tohər nokər əe-l-əu
this 2L.GEN servant[NOM] come-PST-2L.NN
'This servant of yours (L) came.'

b. #tohər i nokər əe-l-əi
2L.GEN this servant[NOM] come-PST-3
'This servant of yours (L) came.'

This is because the sentences in (55) have different readings: when the possessor precedes the determiner and controls agreement, it is in focus, while when the determiner precedes the possessor and the possessed noun controls agreement, the determiner is in focus, as shown in (57):

(57) a. i tohər nokər əe-l-əi
this 2L.GEN servant[NOM] come-PST-3
'[This]$_{FOC}$ servant of yours came (not another servant).'

b. tohər i nokər əe-l-əu
2L.GEN this servant[NOM] come-PST-2L.NN
'This servant of [yours (L)]$_{FOC}$ came (not someone else's servant).'

The same readings can be found with possessive phrases featuring determiners which bear other grammatical functions. This contrast is seen with the subjects of transitive verbs in (58) and (59).

(58) a i tohər bəcha həmra piṭ-l-ək
this 2L.GEN baby[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-3>1

b. #tohər i bəcha həmra piṭ-l-ək
2L.GEN this baby[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-3>1
'[This]$_{FOC}$ child of yours hit me.'

(59) a. tohər i bəcha həmra piṭ-əl-kəu
2L.GEN this baby[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-3>2L

b. #i tohər bəcha həmra piṭ-əl-kəu
this 2L.GEN baby[NOM] 1.ACC hit-PST-3>2L
'This child of [yours]$_{FOC}$ hit me.'

The same is true for the objects of transitive verbs, as illustrated by the contrast between the pairs of sentences in (60) and (61).

(60) a. həm ehi tohər nokər-ke piṭ-əl-iæ(k)
1[NOM] this.ACC 2L.GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>3

b. #həm tohər ehi nokər-ke piṭ-əl-iæ(k)
1[NOM] 2L.GEN this.ACC servant-ACC hit-PST-1>3
'I hit [this]$_{FOC}$ servant of yours.'

(61) a. həm tohər ehi nokər-ke piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] 2L.GEN this.ACC servant-ACC hit-PST-1>2L

b. #həm ehi tohər nokər-ke piṭ-əl-iəu
1[NOM] this.ACC 2L.GEN servant-ACC hit-PST-1>2L
'I hit this servant of [yours]$_{FOC}$.'

What these examples show is that functional prominence (in this case focus) seems to have a structural correlate. When the possessor is focussed, there is a preference for it to precede the determiner. If the data are confirmed, we have evidence that PIPs in Maithili are associated with a more structurally prominent position in the DP. The exact status of this position is a matter of analysis: it can possibly be analysed as some kind of functional phrase like a focus phrase (FocP), or the specifier position of the DP headed by the possessed noun (SpecDP), or as an adjunct projected only if a strong focus reading is required. We are not committed to any of these options. What is important for us at this stage is that this position is located at the very left periphery of a possessive DP and is accessible to agreement. Since PIPs are less deeply embedded than non-agreeing non-focussed possessors, they are allowed to compete with clause-level elements for the status of agreement controller, following the same functional principles.

2.8 Discussion

In this section we discuss the implications our data have for the analysis of Maithili agreement in general, before examining what possessor prominence in Maithili tells us about possible agreement controllers and the domains in which they operate. Our exploration of the principles underlying agreement in Maithili has shown that some types of agreement are strongly associated with subjecthood and for other types the choice of a potential controller is determined by a combination of properties beyond its grammatical function.

Contrary to Bickel *et al.* (1999), who claim that agreement in Maithili primarily reflects social relations and does not appeal to grammatical functions, we have argued that syntax is an important factor in determining possible agreement relations. Agreement is largely subject-oriented, and the ability for a verbal target to agree with a subject NP can be taken as one of the diagnostics for subjecthood. We can think of agreement as having a syntactic basis in the sense that the nominative single agreement paradigm is always controlled by a clause-level argument NP (S=A) (Section 2.3.1), as is the primary controller in a double agreement paradigm (Section 2.4.1). Non-nominative agreement is also defined over the subject relation, albeit when the subject bears a semantic role other than agent (Section 2.3.2). This is essentially a type of semantically motivated differential argument marking indicated through agreement. Each of these types of agreement has a syntactic basis.

There is also non-subject agreement, i.e. the secondary component of double agreement. Syntactically, it can be controlled by (i) any clause-level NP, (ii) a salient deictic referent (that need not even be a semantic element of the proposition), and (iii) sub-clausal-level elements: objects of postpositions (in some varieties of Maithili) and—crucially for the topic of the volume—internal possessors. However, there are also non-syntactic factors in play, so non-subject agreement is ultimately defined on functional properties, rather than grammatical relations. Certain configurations of referential features (i.e. person, animacy, and respect grade) associated with subject and non-subject result in obligatory non-subject agreement (Section 2.6). We have, also encountered a high degree of optionality in terms of when non-subject agreement occurs, because for some combinations of referential features it is not necessarily required. Non-subject agreement is present when a clause-level element has sufficient functional prominence, but prominence does not reflect its referential features in such cases. We have proposed that it is then contrastive focus that enables a clause-level element to be a secondary controller (Section 2.7.1). Thus, when none of the potential controllers is sufficiently focal, single nominative agreement is the norm. The general argument we put forward is that the very presence of double agreement is conditioned by the prominence of the potential controllers, such that the most prominent non-subject will control secondary agreement. The functional basis of prominence is twofold: to index a combination of inherent referential features relative to other nominals in the clause, and to highlight the situational information-structure role of focus. In this sense the non-subject agreement is indeed not wholly defined by syntax. The question is then whether it is 'true' grammatical agreement.

Maithili belongs to the set of languages in which the degree of respect or honorification attributed to clausal arguments systematically determines the appropriate form of a verb to use. In languages with 'honorific feature matching', the respect value or honorific grade of one element within the clause is matched on another. An example is seen in (62) from Korean, where the subject 'President Kim' and the verbs in each conjoined predicate are marked with honorific morphology indicating a high respect level.

(62) Kim sacang-nimi-un ilccik chulkun-ha-si ko ilccik
Kim president-HON-TOP early arrive.office-do-HON CONJ early
toykun-ha-si-ess-ta.
leave.office-do-HON-PST-DECL
'President Kim arrived at the office early and left early.'
(Korean; Koopman 2005: 621)

Honorific feature matching of this type is usually explained using one of two analyses. The first type of analysis involves regular syntactic agreement between a verb and an argument (Koopman 2005; Hasegawa 2005, among others). For instance, Koopman (2005) argues that matching in honorific grade between the subject and verb in (62) is an instance of syntactic agreement that requires a binary honorific feature [+/−HON]. Under this analysis, the verbal predicates bear honorific morphology because of the [+HON] value of their subject.

In the second type of analysis of honorific feature matching identified in the literature, apparent honorific feature matching is not grammatical agreement, but rather some kind of expressive device which only requires a privative feature [HON]. This is the position taken by Kim and Sells (2007) with respect to Korean. In support of this view, they propose that honorific marking on an NP and honorific marking on the verb in Korean do not mean the same thing, rather multiple honorific marking within the clause progressively 'elevates' the status of the referent. In examples like (63), then, there is a less direct relationship between the feature profiles of the nominal subject and the verbal predicates.

Regardless of the correct analysis for the Korean data in (63), it is reasonable to consider whether the respect feature matching observed in Maithili could be alternatively analysed as an instance of expressive morphology. We argued that respect in Maithili is clearly a morphosyntactic feature that participates in agreement; in line with this, there is no evidence to support extending the 'expressive' analysis to our data. Here we briefly provide possible arguments against an 'expressive' morphology account:

(i) Expressive accounts of honorification rest on the principle that the addition of honorific morphology is semantically additive (i.e. it monotonically increases the expression of honour). However, this principle does not fit with our data. For instance, when a subject of an intransitive verb has the respect feature value (R), there is no choice as to whether the verb will also express this value. In such cases, feature matching is obligatory. Similarly, there is no evidence to suggest that double agreement indicates that the secondary controller referent has an elevated honorification status when

compared to a corresponding clause with single agreement or that indexation of non-subject arguments makes any other semantic contribution (although it sometimes has the information-structural function of indicating strong contrastive focus).

(ii) Secondary agreement does not only concern honorification; it also indicates the person value of the indexed referent and so more closely resembles grammatical agreement than expressive morphology.

(iii) Four honorific grades need to be distinguished to account for the properties of independent second person pronouns (Section 2.2.2), not simply [HON] and not even [+/−HON], and this same set of values is required to account for the distribution of verb forms discussed in Section 2.2.3.

Hence, honorific feature matching in Maithili is an instance of grammatical agreement and requires four different values (four respect grades or degrees of honorification) to account for the observed distinctions. For details of other languages where a syntactic account for honorific feature matching is plausible, see Corbett (2012: 141–5).

Turning now to possessors, Maithili also has agreement controllers that are non-clausal elements, that is, prominent internal possessors. We have argued that when possessors control agreement, they are always in contrastive focus (Section 2.7.2). The second part of our proposal is that, alongside functional prominence, formal prominence of the internal possessor may in fact play a role in enabling internal possessors to control secondary agreement. We have presented data suggesting that PIPs in Maithili appear higher in the NP/DP structure than internal possessors that do not control agreement. It is clear from languages with non-configurational syntax that structural prominence is not a necessary corollary of functional prominence (see Bond, Meakins, and Nordlinger, this volume, ch.3), while in languages with more rigid syntax, the structural position of the possessor is an important factor for controlling anaphora (see Nikolaeva and Bárány, this volume, ch.8). In this sense, formally prominent PIPs in Maithili partially resemble the prominent internal possessors observed in Tundra Nenets, as described by Nikolaeva and Bárány.

Taking the two parts of the analysis together, it can then be stated that formal prominence reflects (or is the syntactic reflex of) functional prominence. A question that remains unresolved here is exactly how this should be modelled within an explicit syntactic framework such as LFG. In particular, we need to find a way to formalize the argument that possessors in lower structural positions cannot control agreement on the verb, while the higher possessors can. The answer to this question will largely depend on a thorough analysis of the NP/DP structure in Maithili, which is yet to be achieved.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Matthew Baerman, András Bárány, Grev Corbett, Steven Kaye, and Anna Thornton for providing helpful comments on a draft chapter, and to Penny Everson for proof-reading the final version.