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INTRODUCTION
Afar is a Lowland East Cushitic language spoken by more than 1.700.000 people, in Djibouti (ca 310.000), Eritrea (ca 305.000) and Ethiopia (ca 1.100.000).
We have collected our data on the field¹, with different speakers in Djibouti, in Eritrea and in Ethiopia. Only a few examples were elicited.

SOME PRELIMINARY LINGUISTIC REMARKS
Afar is typically a SOV language, with postpositions.
The canonic order in the noun phrase is determiner/qualifier + determined/qualified
In the verb phrase V + auxiliary; and in the sentence: dependent clause before Matrix clause
It is a partially inflected language (only some masculine marked nouns with non-stressed vowel final are concerned). Three cases are marked by apophony of the vowel final (-i) and switching of the stress on the final : : Absolutive vs Nominative / Genitive.
There are two genders M., F. and two numbers SG., PL.
The gender is marked on the SG. and PL. nouns. The PL. is marked on the nouns and pronouns. There is a gender opposition for the 3rd SG of the personal pronouns
There are three types of verb conjugations: the number is always marked, the gender is marked only in two types of verbs and exclusively for the 3rd SG.

INTRODUCTION
In many languages of the world, agreement is a matter of syntax and of covariance. Reusing Steele’s definition of agreement (1978: 610), quoted by Corbett (2006:4) “[...] there is systematic covariance between a semantic or formal property of one element and a formal property of another”. In Afar sentence, there is covariance between the subject (personal

¹ The surveys have been carried out with the financial support of LLACAN-INALCO, CEFAS (Sanaa) and ILD (Djibouti). We thank all the Afar native speakers in Djibouti, Eritrea and Ethiopia who have collaborated to this research. We are also indebted to Maki Houmed Gaba for his help to transcribe some texts, in Paris.
pronoun / noun (phrase)), and the verb\(^2\). Following Givon (1970), Hayward (1988), and Corbett (2006: 4) we can consider that the subject pronoun/noun (phrase) is the controller\(^3\), and the verb the target\(^4\).

Only the plural personal pronouns and a few nouns referring to sex-differentiated animates require the plural agreement. For the other nouns, covariance usually concerns the gender, characterized by inverse gender between SG and PL, as in many Cushitic and Omotic languages.

Referring to Corbett (2006: 4), it can be said that the ‘agreement features’ are gender, and eventually number. The predominant situation is that of syntactic agreement, but we shall see that the role of semantics is not insignificant even though it is underlying.

GENDER AND NUMBER MARKS

**Verb**

In Afar there are three types of conjugations. Whatever the type all the verbs have the number indices suffixed to their stem. There are 3 persons (3 for SG and 3 for PL) with gender opposition (M. vs F.) marked for the 3\(^{rd}\) SG only. Types 1 and 2 differ by the position of their personal indices: prefixed for type 1 and suffixed for type 2.

- **CI: PI+ ASPECTUAL MARK + STEM + (NI)**

\[\text{\textbf{1}}} \quad \begin{align*}
3M-\text{IPFV-come(SG)} & \quad \text{t-a-maté} \\
\text{He comes} & \quad 3F/2-\text{IPFV-come(SG)} \\
& \quad \text{j-a-maté-(e)n(i)} \\
\end{align*}\]

- **CII: STEM + ASPECTUAL MARK + PI +(NI)**

\[\text{\textbf{2}}} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{go- 1/3M.PFV(SG)} & \quad \text{ged-te} \\
I/\text{He went} & \quad \text{go-3F/2-IPFV(SG)} \\
& \quad \text{ged-te} \quad \text{ge[d][d]} \\
& \quad \text{go-3PFV-PL(LF)} \\
& \quad \text{They come (F/M)} \\
\end{align*}\]

- Conjugation of type III is apart. Morphologically: specific markers suffixed to the stem, no gender opposition, no aspectual opposition.

The marks are arranged as follows:

- **CIII: STEM + PI + (NI)**

\[\text{\textbf{3}}} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{be_black-3(SG)} & \quad \text{be_black-3PL (LF)} \\
\text{He/She is/was black} & \quad \text{be_black-3PL (LF)} \\
\text{They are/were black (F/M)} \\
\end{align*}\]

In the three conjugations the number is marked in PL by the same suffix morpheme \(-n-\).

---

\(^2\) In the noun phrase, there is covariance in gender between the demonstrative determiner and the determined noun. There is no adjective category in this language. The quality is expressed by means of a restrictive relative clause (Simeone-Senelle 2007)

\(^3\) “The element which determines the agreement”

\(^4\) “The element whose form is determined by agreement”
It is to be noted that the negative – perfective conjugation of CI and CII has no gender mark

(4)  má-ɖʰ-inna  
NEG-say-PFV.NEG.3SG  
(S)he did not say (CI)

(5)  má-rab-inna  
NEG-die-PFV.NEG.3SG  
(S)he did not die (CII)

NOUN

1. GENDER MARK

There are two genders in Afar. All the nouns are overtly marked in gender (M. and F.). Gender is an inherent property of the noun and is always marked morpho-phonologically.

For animates, gender is correlated to sex and is lexical for inanimates.

The feminine noun is marked by a stressed vowel final. This latter may be any vowel of the phonological system: -á awká ‘girl’, -ú turú ‘joke’, -í aytí ‘ear’, -ó lakų ‘money’, -é duyyé ‘things’. The feminine nouns are invariable (no declension).

Masculine nouns have either a non-stressed vowel final (except for abbá ‘father’ M., and kataysá M./F. ‘friend’) or a consonant final.

Only the M. nouns with a final vowel are submitted to the declension where nominative / genitive case is marked by apophony of the final vowel of the absolutive case (unmarked citation form), with shifting of the stress on the final. Nominative and genitive are marked by –í. In absolutive, the final vowel is never –o or –e with –a: áwka ublé ‘I saw a boy’, awkí yeme -te ‘a boy arrived’

with –u: ífu ‘light’, ñfí yani ‘there is light’

with –i: wagári ‘peace’, wagári yani ‘it is the peace’

As for the other M. nouns, they have a consonant final. They are invariable and have a short and a long form. The form does not mark the case, it depends on the predicate and phonetic rules. The vocalic extension is similar or isotimbre to the previous stem vowel: rob > robu ‘rain’, num > numu ‘man’.

When the noun is predicative

(6)  áh numu  
DEM.COP man(EF)  
This is a man

Short form: noun is subject or object.

(7)  num jemeté - num ublé  
man 3M.PFV.arrive.SG - man 1SG.PFV.see  
A man arrived I saw a man

When the noun has a consonant postposition: an epenthetic vowel is inserted

5 With vocalic extension, there is always a final epenthetic vowel. In some nouns, the mid-vowel is lengthened.
2. NUMBER

Referring to Parker and Hayward (1985: 227) “There are three categories of number in Afar: singular, plural and singulative”. It however seems more adequate to consider that there are two numbers organized into two systems. The main system is SG versus PL. Whereby the PL form is derived from SG by the modification of the SG stem: 1) by internal derivation corresponding to the so-called broken plural in Semitic languages, 2) by suffixation of a morpheme (the so-called external plural).

The secondary system is Collective vs Singulative, where SING is derived from COLL by suffix. The general Plural vs SG-PL may be joined to this sub-system. This system is rare. Cf. Corbett (2000: 126).

While plural and singulative are marked, singular and collective are not marked as such in the nouns. SG and COLL are lexical. PL. is derived from singular and SING. from COLL.

3. NUMBER AND GENDER

All forms whatever their number are marked in gender. One of the most remarkable features in some Cushitic languages like ‘Afar and Somali (Dubnov, 2003: 27-9) is that the majority of the animate or inanimate nouns, masculine in the singular are feminine in the plural and vice versa. As for the singulative, it may have a different gender from that of the collective if the SING. noun is correlated to sexual animate it can be marked as M. or F.

The inverse gender between singular and plural is a phenomenon common to many Cushitic and Omotic languages. It is generally named ‘gender polarity’.

Some examples of inverse gender for animates and inanimates: SG vs marked PL

(9) dabéla (M.SG) ‘billy goat’ vs PL. dabelwá (F.)

garbó (F.SG) ‘thicket, wooded area’ vs PL. gárab(a) or gárob(u) (M)

However, few nouns do not obey the canonic rule of the inverse gender. They are mainly inanimates, marked as feminine or masculine. Among them many are borrowed from Arabic.

Same gender for SG. and PL

(10) šalé (F.) ‘hill, mountain’, has three plurals, all marked as feminine šalwá / šalélwá / šaléľá

boohá (F.) ‘hole, puncture’, with a PL. boohahí (PH) marked as F.

wahró (F.) ‘she-panther’, PL wahrórá panthers. SG and PL are F.

The same with
borosí/barosí (F.) ‘anchor’, PL. barosijá / barosiját(a) ...boroysiyatá (PH) (Arabic borrowing)
warkát(a) (M.) ‘paper, letter (post)’, PL. warákáit(i) (PH) (Arabic borrowing)

COLL vs SING

Like plural collective is marked in gender, but unlike plural it is unmarked in number.
Semantically, plural refers to ‘a multiplicity of referents’ (Parker & Hayward 1985: 227) and collective refers to a group of animates (humans, animals) or inanimates (for species of plants). A unity, a singulative, can be extracted from the set by a specific derivation. The singulative is marked in gender and in number.

(11) agábu ‘women’ COLL marked as M., SING ag(a)boytá (F).

kimbir ‘birds’. COLL. marked as M., SING kimbiró (F.)
eʃéb(i) Acacia (M.), SING eʃeštó (F.)

As for SG and PL, see (10), few nouns have the same gender mark in COLL and SING.

(12) ūungá (F.) Doum palm (Hyphaene Thebaica), SING. ūungaytó (F.)

kullúm (M.) ‘fish’, SING kullúnta (M.)

COLL without SING

Lastly, another category of nouns (animates: human and animals), have a semantic value of COLL, but there is no derived singulative form. They may function as suppletive plural for some nouns which have no derived plural.

(13) Examples for animals:

wadár(a) ‘goats’. COLL. (M.), including females and males, is used as the suppletive PL of reytá (F. SG) ‘goat’. There is no derived PL. from (F.) SG reytá. On the other hand, for the male ‘billy goat’, there is PL. dabelwá (F.) derived from SG dábéía (M.) ‘billy goat’, with reverse gender.

gála (M.) ‘camels (mostly female)’, there is no singulative, but the COLL. does not function as suppletive plural. The feminine and masculine singulars have both their own derived plural (with reverse gender for the males): álá ‘she-camel’(F.), PL. alolí (F.), and rakúb (M.) ‘bull camel’ with PL rakibá (F).

(14) For humans:

úrru (M) ‘children’ is a COLL. including áwka (M) ‘boy’ and awká (F) ‘girl’, without SING form.

Likewise djajó (F. COLL) ‘children, offspring’ has no derived SING.

In some dialects spoken in Djibouti,

agábu ‘women’ is a COLL. without SING. In this dialect, the COLL. is semantically a suppletive plural for barrá (F. SG) ‘woman’. Elsewhere ag(a)boytá is SING. of agábu (barrá is not used).
The noun referring to people, tribes, usually marked as M. have no SING.

\text{siná} ‘people’, \text{mára} ‘people’, \text{ʕafár} ‘Afar people’,

In this category of nouns, some are marked as F. and have SING. with differentiated gender. Among them are loanwords borrowed from Arabic.

\text{habʃá} ‘Ethiopian people’ > \text{habʃità} (M.) and \text{habʃíta} (F.) ‘Ethiopian man’ and ‘Ethiopian woman’

\text{somalí} ‘Somalian people’ > \text{somalíta} (M.SG), \text{somalítá} (F.SG)

\text{faransa}wí ‘French people’ > \text{faransa}wíta (M.SG), \text{faransa}wítá (F.SG)

\textbf{AGREEMENT CONTROLLER-TARGET}

The agreement of the verb with its subject depends on the noun category in which the subject belongs. It can be complete or partial.

1. Complete agreement (gender and number).

When the subject is an independent personal pronoun referring to sexual animate, the agreement of the verb with its controller is complete: it agrees in person, in gender (in the 3rd SG), and in number (SG vs PL).

When the subject is an explicit personal pronoun, the verb agrees in person, gender, and number with its subject.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
17 & \textit{is} & \textit{t-a-maːt̚e} & \textit{fsin} \textit{ab-t̚-á-n} \\
   & PR.S.3F.SG & 3F.IPFV-come & PR.S.2PL speak-2-IPFV-PL \\
   & She comes & - & You speak \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
18 & \textit{úsun} & \textit{dat-on} & \textit{nanú} \textit{ụnd-ino} \\
   & PR.S.3PL & be_black-3PL & PR.S.1PL be_young-1PL \\
   & They are/were black & - & We are/were young \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

In other cases, the agreement is partial, it concerns, with a very few exceptions, the feature of gender only.

2. Partial agreement

\checkmark 2.1. When the subject is a noun referring to animates or inanimates and marked as plural, it requires the 3rd singular verb form.

The agreement is partial when the verb agrees with the marked gender but not with the marked number of the noun. The verb is in SG.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
\text{Singular} & \text{vs} & \text{Plural} \\
\hline
\text{dabelf} & gedé & - \\
\text{billy_goat.M.S} & go.3MSG.PFV & - \\
A/the billy goat left & - & (The) billy goats left \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{6} There is neither gender nor aspectual opposition in the conjugation of this type of verb
For the male, there is another word kábí, with inverse gender in the PL.: kabaːá.

The only exception in our data concerns a category of boats, borrowed from Arabic. The agreement in gender does not correspond to the morpho-phonological mark. The noun is marked as masculine but the verb is in the 3F.SG.

Here F. is a default gender in the agreement with inanimate controller marked as M.

In the plural there is not reverse gender, the agreement is F.: dowáːnik  goːdʒa.

In the same semantic field, two other nouns borrowed from Arabic, do not follow the same agreement rules.

2.2 When the subject is a collective, it is always marked as M. The rules of agreement depend on the semantic value of the COLL, and on the degree of semantic definiteness.

2.2.1 For a very restricted list

There is alternative in the agreement: the verb agrees with the marked gender of the collective or with the semantic meaning of the COLL.
Both nouns together with agábu are exceptions in this system. They may have an agreement in plural but allow for alternatives between syntactic and semantic agreement. There are some examples where the speaker uses syzygy and the verb is in the plural. It can be said:

(27) urrf / marí abalán / rabén
    children.S / people.S play.IPFV.3PL /die.PFV.3PL
    Children/People play / died

(28) agabí jemété / jemétén
    women.S come.IPFV.3M /come.PFV.3PL
    Women come

Only these three three nouns are concerned by this phenomenon (cf. Hayward and Mous 2012).

2.2.2 COLL. without SING.

 COLL. refers to a more undifferentiated set from which no unity or group can be extracted. The verb agrees in F. Concerned care the nouns referring to people, tribes, nationalities, and cattle. We are not aware of any exception from this rule.

(29) wadár t-a-lolé
    sheep, goats 3F-IPFV-graze.SG
    Sheep/goats graze

(30) Šafár t-e-meté
    Afar people 3F-PFV-come.SG
    Afar people came

(31) sinám rabté
    people die,3F.PFV.SG
    People died

(32) sinám rabté ímmay dajlisén marí má-rabínm
    people die,3F.PFV.SG but cure.PFV.3PL people.S NEG-die.PFV.NEG.3SG
    People died but the people who have been cured did not die.

When the collective refers to an indefinite set, the word has a low degree of definiteness. This semantic property explains the syntax of these words thus they cannot be marked as definite by a demonstrative or a restrictive relative clause. Extraction of some elements from the mass is impossible, consequently on the morphological level, these collectives have no derived singulatives.

The collective mára can be determined by a demonstrative á mara ‘this people’ á mará rabé /rabén (cf. ex. 26 & 27) ‘these people died’, or by a restrictive relative clause (cf. ex. 32).

The word can be considered semantically as an equivalent of a suppletive plural for num ‘man/human being’.

With sinam/sinamá none of these constructions is possible

Both nouns have different syntactic functioning linked to their different semantic values. They are not semantically equivalent, contrary to some assertions (example Morin 2012 'sinam = mará'),
The feminine agreement for the marked masculine collective nouns, referring to a mass in which particular elements are not distinguishable, cannot be considered as an agreement in gender, but as an agreement by default. Moreover in Cushitic languages ‘Feminine is associated with multiple reference’ (Mous 2012). F. is at the same time a default gender for few inanimate nouns (cf. ex. 23 domî) and a default number for the COLL referring to animates.

2. CONJOINED NOUNS
When there are two or more subjects joined by a connective (postclitic = j or the morpheme kee ‘and’), the agreement depends on the grammatical category of subjects:

1) the subjects of the predicate are personal pronouns in the absolutive case.
The verb is in the plural, and agreement in person depends on the person hierarchy (1rst, 2nd, 3rd)

(33) ko: kee yo: n-e-mëtë
PR.2SG and PR.1SG 1PL.-PFV-come
You and me came

(34) keñ ke: sim tagorri-h t-a-mëtën
PR.3PL and PR.2PL Tadjoura-to 2-IPV-go.PL
They and you go to Tadjoura

2) The subjects are pronoun and noun :

(35) nee kee ni baburá gëta alfennó'
PR.1PL COORD POSS.1PL cars road close.FUT.1PL
We and our cars we’ll close the road

3) The subjects are nouns SG, PL, COLL. or SING. marked in gender.
With proper nouns
The verb is at the 3rd F.SG

(36) málko ke: ‘âbdø gillábì-uwwa bej-t-a-h
Malkø and ‘Abdo. fishing.GEN-goods take-3F-IPFV-CON
Malkø and ‘Abdo take the fishing equipment and
gillâbi-h ged-ç-a
fishing-to go-3F-IPFV.SG
they go to fish (MHK 2004: 137)

With nouns referring to animates

(37) labhâ-j agâbu-j ûru ke: idodá
men-CON women-CON children and old_people
The men, the women, the children and the old people

7 The speaker is a bus driver on strike.
hadá  gúba-l  tan
  tree  underneath-in  3F.IPFV.be
are under the tree. (MHK 2004: 47)

Cf. (38)
(38)  nikɔla  ke:  kaj  wixdα[...]  hajsit-én
  Nicolas and  POS.3.M.SG  guide [..]  lace-PFV-3PL
Nicolas and his guide placed for themselves (MHK 2004: 128)

It is to be noticed that the grammatical subjects, noun or pronoun, are not in nominative case
(agábu not agbf, úrru and not urrf)

In these examples, feminine agreement is to be considered as a default agreement (cf. also
Corbett 2000: 205). cf. above ex. ***, and it seems to be norm
Nevertheless, as for few exceptions with collectives, when controllers refer to animates,
there may be syllepsis, and a semantic agreement with the verb in PL. We have some
examples only when the subjects refer to humans or animals. For Corbett (2000: 205) 'With
noun phrases headed by non-human animates there is a degree of uncertainty about the
acceptability of plural agreement' He gives the following example with a question mark
before the verb in PL.

  wákrii-kee yangúla kudde/ ? kuden
  jackal.SG.MASC-and / hyena.DG.MASC / ran.away.SG.FEM / ran.away.PL
The jackal and the hyena ran away (Corbett 2000: 205 (50))

For our informants in the north-west of the Afar area in Ethiopia both occurrences are valid:
kudde (3F.SG) or kuden (3PL)

Hayward and Corbett (1988) give some examples with semantic agreement in other
contexts: with inanimates and animates, with animates in the nominative case ... No example
of this type is attested in our data. The mismatch of the agreement rules may be due to the
fact that (Hayward & Corbett 1988: 276) had one single Afar speaker as informant and some
occurrences have been obviously elicited.

CONCLUSION
Considering the Gender-polarity in Afar, the agreement rules for the plural marked nouns
can be summarized as follows:

  SG.M + V.3M.SG  vs  PL.F. + V.3F.SG
  SG.F + V.3F.SG  vs  PL.M + V.3M.SG

The exceptions concern the nouns which have the same marked gender in SG and in PL,
consequently not submitted to reverse gender.

Concerning the collectives marked as M., never not marked in number. The gender
agreement depends on semantics of the COLL and its degree of definiteness: the agreement
of the verb is not systematically linked to the marked gender of the noun.
A few loanwords marked as masculine have a feminine agreement.

1. \text{COLL.M} + \text{V.3M.SG} \quad \text{Or (for few words in limited list) COLL.M} + \text{V.3PL}
2. \text{COLL.M} + \text{V.3F.SG}

\text{COLL} type 1 and 2 are not equivalent on the semantic level.

The Collective set can be subdivided into two: those which require a syntactic agreement,
gender agreement (verb in M/F. SG), with three exceptions (ex. (27), (28)) where there is
alternative between syntactic and semantic agreement, and the second sub-set requiring a
default agreement, the verb is then in F.SG

With conjoined subjects, usually the feminine singular default agreement is applied,
but if the subjects refer to sex-differentiated animates there may be syllepsis and semantic
agreement. The verb is then in PL.. If one of the subject is marked as nominative then the
agreement is obligatory semantic. Resolution rules applied for conjoined subject nouns are
analyzed in detail by Hayward and Corbett (1988). It issues from this study that the
variability of agreement rules and the alternative between a semantic agreement and an
agreement by default concerns more controllers than one could expect.

Considering that Feminine mark refers to a notion of plurality, the agreement in
\text{F.SG} with some \text{COLL} and with conjoined nouns can be considered as semantic agreement,
and not as a syntactic one. Indeed three \text{M. COLL} and conjoined nouns referring to sexual
animates have an alternative agreement with the target in PL, it is an overtly semantic
agreement, overruling the syntactic agreement.

Agreement in \text{F.SG} with some \text{COLL} and with conjoined nouns makes obvious that
the semantics of the word can play a more important role than the marked gender. There is
semantic agreement (notion of plurality to whom \text{F.} refers) and not syntactic agreement in
this case. With three \text{M. COLL} and with conjoined nouns referring to sexual animates the
agreement is overtly semantic because /since agreement in number is an alternative to the
\text{F.SG} agreement.

\textbf{ABBREVIATIONS}
\text{CI} conjugation of type I – \text{CII} conjugation of type II – \text{CIII} conjugation of type III - \text{COLL}
collective – \text{CON} connective - \text{EF} extended form - \text{F. feminine} – \text{M. masculine} – \text{PI personal}
index – \text{NI} number index - \text{PL. plural} – \text{PLUR} plurative – \text{S subject} – \text{SG singular} – \text{SING}
singulative
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