

Chapter 1

Introduction

Matthew Reeve

Zhejiang University

Mihaela Marchis Moreno

FCSH, Universidade Nova de Lisboa

Ludovico Franco

Università degli Studi di Firenze

1 Opening remarks

The past two decades or so have seen a considerable amount of investigation into the nature of syntactic dependencies involving the operation Agree. In particular, there has been much discussion of the relations between Agree and its morphological realisations (agreement and case), and between Agree and other syntactic dependencies (e.g., movement, binding, control). The chapters in this volume examine a diverse set of cross-linguistic phenomena involving agreement and case from a variety of theoretical perspectives, with a view to elucidating the nature of the abstract operations (in particular, Agree) that underlie them.¹ The phenomena discussed include backward control, passivisation, progressive aspectual constructions, extraction from nominals, possessives, relative clauses and the phasal status of PPs. In this introductory chapter, we provide a brief overview of recent research on Agree, and its involvement in other syntactic dependencies, in order to provide a background for the chapters that follow. We do not aim to give an exhaustive treatment of the theories of Agreement and Case

¹The chapters in this volume derive from a workshop organised by the editors, entitled *Local and non-local dependencies in the nominal and verbal domains* (Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas (FCSH), Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 13 November 2015).



here, as there already exist more comprehensive overviews, to which we refer the reader (e.g., Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2008; Polinsky & Preminger 2014).

2 Case and agreement: Their location, interrelation and realisation

Our starting point – because of its relative familiarity – is the treatment of case and agreement in more recent versions of Minimalism (esp. Chomsky 2000; Pesetsky & Torrego 2001; 2007). As in earlier GB and Minimalist approaches (e.g., Chomsky 1980; 1981; 1995), both Case and Agreement (which we capitalise here to distinguish them from the relevant morphological notions) are “abstract” in the sense that, while they do bear a relation to the morphological phenomena of case and agreement, this relation is only indirect. In other words, Case and Agreement within Minimalism are concerned primarily with the distribution of DPs, rather than with morphology (cf. Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2008). The basis of the approach is the operation Agree, which relates a head (a “probe”, such as T or *v*) bearing uninterpretable (and/or “unvalued”) phi-features to a “goal” DP, c-commanded by the probe, that bears counterparts of one or more of those features. This results in deletion at LF of the uninterpretable/unvalued features on the probe, ensuring “legibility” at LF. Thus, in a transitive sentence the functional heads T and *v*, both bearing uninterpretable phi-features and Case, initiate Agree with the DPs they most immediately c-command, the subject and direct object respectively:

- (1) [TP Sue T_[uφ Nom, EPP] [_vP Sue_[uφ, Nom] *v*_[uφ, Acc] [VP likes cake_[uφ, Acc]]]]

The assumption here is that the checking of Case features, which are uninterpretable and hence must be deleted, is dependent on the Agree relation established by the phi-feature sets of the functional head and the DP (cf. the discussions of “Person Case Constraint” effects in Anagnostopoulou 2003; Rezac 2008). That is, under this view case is simply a reflex of phi-feature-checking that appears on nominal constituents. As it is presented in (1), Chomsky’s proposal only directly covers nominative and accusative (reflexes of phi-feature checking on T and *v* respectively). As for oblique cases such as dative, it has recently been argued that these are checked by a functional head such as Appl (e.g., Cuervo 2003; Pylkkänen 2008). More specifically, one possibility is that datives/obliques are simply the reflex of phi-feature agreement between Appl and a DP (see Marchis Moreno & Franco 2017).

An important difference between the model in (1) and previous GB and Minimalist models is that movement to the specifier of TP, previously held to be crucial for feature-checking (Chomsky 1995), is now triggered by a distinct feature (an EPP-feature) on the probe. Thus, Agree need not entail the movement of the goal to the probe's specifier, but merely makes this movement available in principle via the EPP-feature that it licenses (cf. Pesetsky & Torrego 2001, who treat EPP as a "subfeature" of an uninterpretable feature). The Agree relation is thus intended to account for the distribution of DPs in two senses: a DP must at some point be local enough to an appropriate probe in order for Agree to be established and the relevant uninterpretable features to be checked, and Agree additionally allows for movement of the DP to the probe's specifier if an EPP-feature is present.

One recent debate about Agree has concerned the directionality of the operation; that is, whether Agree must always be "downward", as in the above presentation (e.g., Chomsky 2000; 2001; Preminger 2013), or whether it may or must operate upwards (e.g., Zeijlstra 2012; Ackema & Neeleman 2018). A further debate has concerned the extent to which Agree is involved in mediating other grammatical dependencies. For example, Reuland (2001), Hicks (2009) and Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd (2011) argue that Agree plays a central role in anaphoric relations (though see Safir 2014 for a dissenting view). Landau (2000) argues that the control relation is mediated by Agree relations between the controller, PRO and one or more functional heads in the clause. This approach can be contrasted with the movement-based approach to control (Hornstein 1999; Hornstein & Polinsky 2010). One piece of evidence favouring an Agree-based approach is the existence of partial and finite control, which had proven problematic for previous approaches (Landau 2013: 65ff.).

Under the approaches outlined above, Case and Agreement are both "narrow-syntactic" phenomena that may or may not have an effect at the PF interface, resulting in morphological case and agreement respectively. This view can usefully be contrasted with an approach that was first proposed by Marantz (1991) and has since had considerable influence (e.g., Harley 1995; Schütze 1997; McFadden 2004; Bobaljik 2008; Baker & Vinokurova 2010; Titov 2012). Marantz argues that generalisations about C/case, such as Burzio's generalisation (Burzio 1986) and certain restrictions on ergative case assignment in languages such as Georgian and Hindi, are about morphological case (m-case), not about Abstract Case. Furthermore, he argues on the basis of Icelandic "quirky case" (cf. Zaenen et al. 1985) that there is no relation between the positional licensing of DPs and the morphological case that they bear. His overall message is that DP-licensing is

not about case, and hence that Abstract Case should be eliminated from the theory of syntax. Instead, DP-licensing should be handled entirely by the mapping between thematic roles and argument positions, supplemented by the Extended Projection Principle.

Under Marantz's model, *m*-case, as well as agreement morphemes, are assigned at a level of "Morphological Structure" (MS) intervening between S-Structure and PF. Thus, in this model both case and agreement are "post-syntactic" phenomena that do not enter into the licensing of DP/NPs. *M*-cases are assigned according to a case hierarchy (cf. Yip et al. 1987); at the top of the hierarchy are the "lexically governed" cases (e.g., "quirky" and inherent cases), followed by the dependent cases (accusative, ergative), followed by the unmarked cases (nominative or absolutive in clauses; genitive in DP/NP). Finally, there is a "default" case (e.g., accusative in English) that applies when no other case realisation is possible. Indeed, Marantz emphasises that the provision of a default form when no other form is available is characteristic of morphology; a sentence will never be ungrammatical because no features are assigned to a case affix. Case "merely interprets syntactic structures and does not filter them" (Marantz 1991: 24). Marantz suggests that a similar hierarchy applies in the determination of agreement, but he allows for a relatively flexible relation between case and agreement in order to account for certain case-agreement "mismatches" that are found in split ergative systems.

Bobaljik (2008) takes up the question of how agreement is determined in the context of Marantz's proposal. His main idea is in a sense the opposite of Chomsky's (2000; 2001), namely that agreement is parasitic on case (cf. Bittner & Hale 1996). Thus, if Marantz's argument that *m*-case is post-syntactic is correct, then agreement must also be post-syntactic. More specifically, Bobaljik argues that the finite verb (or other head) agrees with the highest "accessible" NP in its "domain", where "accessibility" is defined in terms of the case hierarchy proposed by Marantz (see also McFadden 2004). In the spirit of Moravcsik (1974) (who stated the hierarchy in terms of grammatical functions rather than cases), the unmarked cases (nominative or absolutive in clauses; genitive in DP/NP) are said to be maximally accessible, with the dependent cases (accusative, ergative) being less accessible, and the "lexically governed" (e.g., "quirky" and inherent cases) being the least accessible. Among other things, this hierarchy accounts for the fact that, in nominative-accusative languages, if a verb agrees with any DP, it at least agrees with subjects (e.g., Moravcsik 1974; Gilligan 1987), while in ergative-absolutive languages, if a verb agrees with any DP, it at least agrees with absolutive DPs (e.g., Croft 1990). Further evidence comes from mismatches between case and grammatical function in Icelandic, where it is case, not grammatical

function, that turns out to determine the agreement controller (Sigurðsson 1993). Finally, long-distance agreement in languages such as Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001) suggests that there is no need for a particular grammatical relation with the agreement target beyond locality (i.e., only “accessibility” and “domain” are relevant).

Other “post-syntactic” treatments of case and agreement can be found in Embick & Noyer (2006) and Marchis Moreno (2015; 2018). These authors argue that case and agreement nodes/features are added after syntax in accordance with language-specific requirements, and are never essential to semantic interpretation. One advantage of this type of approach is that it could explain certain mismatches at the syntax-morphology interface that arise with certain word categories that are in complementary distribution, such as denominal relational adjectives and prepositional genitives in Romance. Semantically and syntactically, these are nouns, but morphologically they instantiate different word categories with different case assignment requirements (Marchis Moreno 2018). In the spirit of Embick & Noyer (2006), Marchis Moreno (2015; 2018) argues that the Case features of the underlying nouns in the structure of thematic relational adjectives are relevant only at PF, and that their countability (or lack thereof) in the syntax conditions the choice of Vocabulary Items expressing Case. That is, their underspecification for number triggers deficient Case features on thematic relational adjectives that are valued only at PF, determining the introduction of an Agreement node (AGR) that turns the noun into an adjective through suffixation, instead of introducing the Genitive Case feature, spelled out as the preposition *de* in Romance languages.

An interesting contrast is provided by the work of Preminger (2014), who argues against the “post-syntactic” view of agreement and case, but agrees with Bobaljik that phi-agreement is sensitive to morphological case. Preminger notes that Marantz’s argument for a post-syntactic treatment of case is based on the purported absence of grammatical processes that refer to case. Preminger argues, however, that the distinction between “quirky-subject” and “non-quirky-subject” languages with respect to raising and agreement over experiencers exemplifies such a process. More specifically, he argues that movement to subject position is “case-discriminating” in languages such as English and French, and hence that case must be part of syntax proper. Nevertheless, Preminger makes crucial use of Marantz’s case hierarchy, which he attempts to derive from independently established principles of syntactic structure-building.

A quite different approach to case and agreement is found in the work of Manzini & Franco (2016), Franco & Manzini (2017) and Manzini et al. (this volume). These authors question the idea of an “accessibility hierarchy” of cases, arguing

that such a hierarchy has no special advantage over a pure stipulation of the facts, such as the VIVA (Visibility of Inherent Case to Verbal Agreement) parameter of Anand & Nevins (2006). Furthermore, they argue that it is both unnecessary and unprofitable to define Agree in terms of (un)interpretable and (un)valued features (cf. Brody 1997). Finally, they argue that certain types of case are unsuited to treatment in terms of uninterpretable features, as they actually have inherent semantic content. For example, they propose that “oblique” cases should be analysed in terms of what they call an “elementary relator” with a “part/whole” semantic content. The general approach proposed in these works is adopted in Reeve (2019), which argues that extraction from DP/NP cross-linguistically is dependent on the Agree operation, where Agree relates sets of interpretable features as in the above works. However, Agree is only possible where the language independently shows overt evidence of agreement. This accounts for the observation that languages with left-branch extraction tend to be languages with overt agreement in DP/NP (cf. Ross 1967: 237–238; Horn 1983: 188). (See Mensching’s chapter for an alternative analysis of extraction from DP/NP.)

A final prominent issue in research on case and agreement is the analysis of syncretism – the phenomenon whereby two morphosyntactically distinct categories may receive identical morphophonological realisations. Case syncretism has been analysed in terms of implicational hierarchies of the type discussed above with respect to Marantz’s (1991) proposal. Blake (2001) proposes the implicational hierarchy in (2), such that cases on the right are progressively less likely to occur. Caha (2009) modifies Blake’s hierarchy (not taking ergative into account) as in (3), conceived of as an f-sequence in the Nanosyntactic framework. His main reason for adopting this particular hierarchy is that it can account for possible syncretisms between cases, given a constraint blocking non-accidental syncretism between non-adjacent categories (cf. the *ABA constraint of Bobaljik 2012).

(2) (Blake 2001: 156)

NOMINATIVE > ACCUSATIVE / ERGATIVE > GENITIVE > DATIVE > LOCATIVE
> ABLATIVE/INSTRUMENTAL > OTHER

(3) (Caha 2009: 32)

NOM > ACC > LOC1 > GEN/PART > LOC2 > DAT > LOC3 > INS/COM

A related approach is that of Calabrese (2008), who adopts the tenets of Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz 1993, Embick & Noyer 2006, among others). Calabrese is specifically interested in absolute syncretism – i.e., in the fact

that certain cases or case oppositions are missing altogether in some languages. He assumes that functional categories are represented by abstract feature clusters in syntax, which are only realised by actual exponents at the PF interface. His key proposal is that there is a markedness hierarchy of cases, not unlike the descriptive hierarchies in (2)–(3). Following Blake (2001), lower cases in the hierarchy are more likely to be blocked. If they are, the corresponding feature cluster cannot surface at PF, but must be readjusted by the morphological component (including the key rule of Impoverishment) yielding surface syncretism.

In a series of recent works, Manzini & Savoia (2011), Manzini & Franco (2016) and Franco & Manzini (2017) reject these approaches, arguing that they leave the traditional cases, and the traditional notion of case itself, unanalysed. The latter series of works instead analyses (oblique) case as the inflectional realisation of elementary predicative content (‘includes’/‘is included by’) on a noun. Correspondingly, there is no externally imposed hierarchy ordering the relevant primitives, but rather a conceptual network determined by the primitive predicates we use and the relations they entertain with each other. These authors argue that neither Calabrese’s markedness hierarchies nor Caha’s nanosyntactic functional hierarchies are necessary, because syncretism depends essentially on natural class (Müller 2007). Seen from this perspective, case hierarchies essentially reduce to a binary split between direct case (reduced to the agreement system; Chomsky 2001) and oblique case, reducing to part-whole operators. Other so-called cases are analysable into a case core (typically oblique) and some additional structure, yielding something similar to the internally articulated PPs of Svenonius (2006).

Syncretism has also been shown to have effects on other aspects of the grammar. For example, it has been reported to have the property of repairing violations of syntactic constraints; for example, with agreement (Schütze 2003; Bhatt & Walkow 2013) or case-matching (Citko 2005; Van Craenenbroeck 2012; Hein & Murphy 2016). On the face of it, this property of syncretism appears to pose a challenge to post-syntactic views of morphology such as DM. Citko (2005) and Asarina (2011) attempt to maintain a DM view by appealing to underspecification. However, Hein & Murphy (2016) argue on the basis of Polish data that underspecification approaches cannot account for the repair effect of syncretism on violations of the case-matching requirement in Across-the-Board (ATB) constructions, and that the problem for DM remains.

3 Issues arising in this volume

We will now outline a few issues in the syntax of case and agreement that have become prominent in the literature and are discussed in one or more contribu-

tions to the present volume. Our aim here is to identify a number of common issues and perspectives among the chapters, which on the face of it are quite diverse in their content.

The first such issue is the question of what the relation is between A/agreement and C/case. As we have seen, in Chomsky's probe-goal system Case-checking/valuation is dependent on the application of Agree, while in approaches such as Bobaljik (2008) and Preminger (2014), agreement depends on the output of C/case-assignment. In other approaches, such as Baker (2015) and Manzini & Franco (2016), C/case and A/agreement are essentially independent. A number of contributions to this volume could be said to argue in favour of a tight relation between case and agreement. Marchis Moreno's chapter argues that backward object control in Brazilian Portuguese occurs only in the presence of an inflected infinitive, and that this inflection diagnoses the percolation of default nominative case onto embedded T, which must then be assigned to an overt DP in SpecTP. Such an analysis is only feasible if C/case and agreement go hand in hand. Giurgea's chapter argues that the "person constraint" on *se*-passives in Romanian can be accounted for if a person feature intervenes to block case-assignment by V to its internal argument. Again, this presupposes that person features are of the "same type" as Case features, in the sense that one can block an operation targeting the other.

Other chapters argue for or suggest that the relation between case and agreement goes in one or the other direction. Łęska's chapter focuses on the nature of "Case attraction" in Polish relative clauses, arguing that the Agree relation occurring between a numeral quantifier and a relative pronoun may optionally result in transmission of the numeral quantifier's Case onto the relative pronoun. On the other hand, because agreement (full vs. default) on the relative clause predicate depends on whether Case transmission has taken place, Agree must be able to detect the output of Case attraction; in other words, agreement must be parasitic on C/case, as in the work of Marantz (1991) and Preminger (2014). By contrast, Mensching's chapter argues that Agree (in the Chomskyan sense) is crucially involved in licensing extraction from nominals, in that an XP must undergo Agree with D in order to be extracted from DP. In particular, he argues that the argument/adjunct asymmetry in extraction can be accounted for if arguments undergo Agree with D to value Case, while adjuncts cannot. Thus, extraction depends on Case, which depends on Agree(ment). Finally, Manzini, Franco & Savoia argue that, while the so-called "direct cases" (e.g., nominative, accusative) are parasitic on agreement, as in Chomsky's work, "oblique cases" (dative, genitive, instrumental) are a different type of phenomenon. They argue that it is problematic to adopt an Agree approach to "concord" within DP (e.g.,

Carstens 2001), involving one goal (N) checking multiple probes (agreeing determiners and modifiers). Instead, as noted above, they propose that oblique involves an “elementary relator” with a “part/whole” semantic content.

A second prominent topic in this volume concerns the extent to which the operation Agree is crucially involved in establishing other grammatical dependencies. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou and Marchis Moreno both argue that backward control (in Greek and Brazilian Portuguese respectively) relies on an Agree relation between a head in the control predicate’s clause and a head in the clause embedded by that predicate. This relation enables the realization of either the higher copy in forward control or the lower copy in backward control. Lorusso argues that agreement in aspectual constructions coincides with the semantic operation of event identification, which is responsible for a number of syntactic and semantic properties of these constructions, as compared with similar constructions lacking agreement. Mensching argues – following the general framework of Chomsky (2000; 2001) – that Agree, and the Case-valuation that goes along with it, are crucially involved in movement dependencies, specifically extraction from nominals. Manzini, Franco & Savoia argue that Agree is also involved in the mediation of thematic dependencies. They focus on what is often called “concord” – agreement in the nominal domain – arguing that this type of agreement is a morphological equivalent of Higginbotham’s (1985) theta-binding relation. Finally, a contrastive perspective is provided by Weingart’s chapter, which argues that null possessive pronominals in Portuguese should not be derived in terms of Agree (pace Hicks 2009) or Move (pace Floripi & Nunes 2009; Rodrigues 2010).

Locality conditions on Agree play an important role in several chapters in this volume. Mensching argues, in common with a number of other authors (e.g., Svenonius 2004; Bošković 2005; Heck 2009; Reeve 2019), that DP is a phase, which means that extraction from DP is blocked unless the moving item first moves to SpecDP. In particular, Mensching argues that this, in conjunction with the proposal that SpecDP is only accessible to items that agree with D, can account for the often-observed argument/adjunct asymmetry in extraction from DP. Gallego argues that PP is a phase (Abels 2003; 2012), and that this normally blocks Agree between a verb and a DP within PP. As well as accounting for the general lack of overt agreement, this can account for the ban on preposition-stranding and pseudopassives in the majority of languages, including (most) Spanish (Law 2006). However, Gallego argues that cases of agreement between V and PP’s complement in certain dialects of Spanish can be accounted for if P incorporates with the verb (cf. Hornstein & Weinberg 1981; Law 2006). Ackema & Neeleman’s chapter can be seen as providing something of a contrast, in that it argues for a relatively reduced role for locality in restricting agreement

possibilities. In particular, they argue against Preminger's (2014) claim that the phenomenon of "omnivorous agreement" is regulated by relativised minimality conditions on Agree. Instead, they argue that it is necessary for both syntactic and morphological accounts of agreement to postulate cross-linguistic distinctions in feature hierarchies; thus, the syntactic account has no special advantage here. Similarly, Weingart's chapter argues that null possessive pronouns in Portuguese are not restricted by locality conditions, as part of her overall argument that they should not be derived in terms of Agree or Move.

Another prominent topic in this volume is the specific nature of the features related by Agree. One issue already touched on here is the question of whether phi-features are uninterpretable features, as in most of the contributions here, or interpretable features, as Manzini, Franco & Savoia argue. They also argue against the idea, developed in particular in Chomsky (2000) and Pesetsky & Torrego (2007), that features should be distinguished in terms of whether they enter the derivation as valued or unvalued. The structure of phi-features is also the central topic of Ackema & Neeleman's chapter, which focuses on distinctions between person and number: in particular, that agreement conflicts between third person and first/second person result in ungrammaticality, while conflicts between singular and plural number do not, but result in a default. Mensching's chapter crucially proposes a particular feature structure for Ds that license extraction from DP, involving an unvalued phi-set that probes the head noun, together with an optional second probe with a case-assigning property, enriched with an unvalued operator feature associated with an EPP-feature.

Finally, the issue of syncretism, discussed at the end of §2, becomes relevant in two chapters in this volume. In their discussion of omnivorous agreement, Ackema & Neeleman note that although feature clashes between the phi-features of the subject and object may prevent the realisation of agreement in such systems, the problem may be averted if the two feature-sets give rise to identical morphophonological realisations. (They give examples from agreement with nominative objects in Icelandic and agreement with the focus in Dutch clefts.) In Łęska's chapter, case syncretism between a relative operator and a numeral quantifier is a precondition for Case transmission from the numeral to the relative operator, resulting in default agreement on the relative clause predicate.

4 Summary of the chapters

We now provide a summary of each chapter in this volume. In the first chapter, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou discuss an asymmetry between backward subject

and backward object control in Greek: backward subject control is fully productive, while backward object control is limited. They argue, following Tsakali et al. (2017), that backward control in Greek is derived not through movement, but through the formation of a chain between the phi-features of the controller (and ultimately the head licensing it) and those of a functional head in the matrix clause. While a chain can be formed between matrix T and the embedded subject and T, allowing for backward subject control, chain-formation between a higher Voice/vAppl and the embedded subject is generally impossible, presumably because T has pronominal phi-features while Voice does not. Backward object control is thus normally ruled out in Greek. This restriction, however, can be overridden in cases where an experiencer argument in the embedded clause is doubled by a dative or accusative clitic and matrix Voice also hosts a dative or accusative clitic (i.e., in cases of “resumption”). The authors hypothesise that this is due to a condition on Backward Agree requiring it to apply to heads of the same type – T in the case of backward subject control; dative/accusative clitics in the case of backward object control.

In the same vein, Marchis Moreno focuses on backward object control, providing evidence that such control is possible in Brazilian Portuguese because both the external and internal copies are marked with default nominative case; hence there is no case mismatch and no case competition. Specifically, the paper argues that the inflected infinitive can be regarded as a diagnostic for backward object control patterns, because the percolation of default nominative case from the matrix T to the embedded T requires a local checking relation with an overt DP in the absence of a preposition. The overt realization of the lower copy in backward control is made possible by the loss of the [+person] feature. According to Cyrino (2010), the absence of the [+person] feature both in finite and non-finite domains allows nominative subjects to occupy the Spec of the inflected infinitival T, just as in finite clauses.

The relation between person and case features constitutes the focus of Ion Giurgea’s chapter. He shows that the “person constraint” on *se*-passives in Romanian and other Romance languages can be accounted for on the basis of the intervening person feature associated with the external argument. Giurgea documents the crosslinguistic variation in “impersonal” *se* constructions in Romance and shows that Romanian only allows a *se*-passive construction where the verb agrees with the internal argument and the accusative cannot be assigned. Building on Cornilescu (1998), Giurgea provides additional evidence that the person constraint on *se*-passives does not exclusively involve [+participant] pronouns (1st or 2nd person), but also affects DPs that require differential object-marking and are high on the person/animacy/definiteness hierarchy. From this, Giurgea

derives an intervention-based account of passive *se* according to which the person feature triggered by the external argument (syntactically projected as a null arbitrary PRO in *se*-passives) intervenes in the case-licensing of internal arguments bearing a [Person] feature. By contrast, *by*-phrases do not count as interveners, as they do not have a Case to check.

Ackema & Neeleman's chapter discusses the feature structure of agreement and, in particular, a curious difference between person and number: while both third person and singular number may behave as defaults, third person gives rise to feature clashes that singular does not. The authors argue that this difference can be accounted for if third person has feature content while singular number does not (see also Nevins 2007; 2011). Specifically, third person is characterised by a feature DIST that is shared with second person (which also bears PROX, a feature shared with first person). What allows third person to act as a default is that it can deliver an empty set of referents: this follows if DIST operates on the set of discourse referents, eliminating the speaker and addressee and their "associates", leaving a subset that only optionally contains referents. As singular number lacks features imposing a cardinality on the output of the person system, it may also deliver an empty set and hence act as a default. Ackema & Neeleman show that this difference in feature content between third person and singular number can account for cases of omnivorous number agreement in languages such as Dutch, Icelandic and Eastern Abruzzese, and they argue that their account also has advantages over a locality-based Agree account (e.g., Preminger 2014) with respect to capturing omnivorous person agreement in languages such as Ojibwe and Kaqchikel. Their contribution thus bears on both the feature makeup of agreement and the morphosyntactic mechanisms that give rise to agreement.

The effects of person and number features on agreement patterns also constitute the main topic of Lorusso's paper, which explores the patterns of agreement with progressive aspect in Apulian dialects. In many of these varieties, the present continuous is expressed through an aspectual inflected construction formed by an inflected stative verb, an optional prepositional element and a lexical verb that either appears in a present indicative form, agreeing in person and number with the matrix verb, or in a non-agreeing infinitival form. Lorusso argues that both constructions involve a locative derivation, but that in the inflected construction the preposition selects a full IP, while in the uninflected construction the preposition selects an "indefinite CP" (CP_I in the terms of Manzini & Savoia 2003). He uses this syntactic difference to account for a number of differences between the two constructions (e.g., placement of frequency adverbs). The inflected construction seems to involve an instance of event identification (Kratzer 1996) between the auxiliary and the lexical verb, and shows a number of

properties in common with restructuring or serial verb constructions (e.g. clitic-climbing). By contrast, the uninflected construction gives rise to a frequentative reading which is not found with genuine progressive constructions (Chierchia 1995), and shows properties in common with control/aspectual verbs. The author further describes and discusses person splits and number asymmetries that occur in the inflected construction, suggesting an analysis along the lines of Bobaljik (2008) and Manzini & Savoia (2007; 2011).

The tight link between case and agreement proposed in Chomsky's (2000; 2001) probe-goal system is the focus of Mensching's contribution. He reopens a topic that has been debated ever since Ross's (1967) dissertation: how to constrain extraction from nominals. The empirical focus is on PP-extraction from DP in French, and specifically on the question of why certain types of *de*-PPs can be extracted from DP, while other types of *de*-PP, along with adjunct PPs, cannot. For example, if a DP contains both a Possessor *de*-PP and an Agent *de*-PP, only the Possessor can be extracted. His solution is based on Kolliakou's (1999) proposal that extraction is restricted by the semantics of the *de*-PP, which has the consequence that if there are two *de*-PPs, only one can be an argument; the other must be an adjunct. The argument/adjunct distinction in extraction is then accounted for in terms of case-valuation: DP-internal arguments have their case feature valued as genitive under Agree with D, while DP-internal adjuncts do not enter into case-valuation. Given the idea that SpecDP is an "escape hatch" for movement that only accommodates XPs that enter an Agree relation with D, only arguments will be able to move to SpecDP and hence out of DP. Mensching's paper can thus be seen as an argument in favour of the probe-goal theory of Case and Agree in terms of its ability to constrain extraction.

The topic of possessives is also discussed in Weingart's paper, but from a very different perspective. Weingart shows, on the basis of a full set of clear diagnostics, that null (and simple) possessive pronouns in Portuguese have apparently contradictory properties that argue against analyses in terms of Agree (e.g., Hicks 2009) or Move (e.g., Floripi & Nunes 2009; Rodrigues 2010), or in terms of an operation on predicates (e.g., Reinhart 2006). Specifically, null possessives appear to have something in between a bound variable and an indexical interpretation. Weingart thus suggests that they should be classified as logophoric *pro*, and outlines a syntactic proposal, based on the semantic analysis of Partee (1997), to account for their restriction to relational nouns.

Łęska's paper analyses the patterns of subject-verb agreement resulting from the interaction of Genitive of Quantification (GoQ) and relativisation in Polish. She shows that relative clauses modifying GoQ head nouns show distinct agreement patterns depending on whether the head noun is a subject or an object.

When it is a subject, GoQ forces default agreement on the relative clause predicate (cf. Łęska 2016), but when it is an object, agreement may vary between default and full agreement, depending on the type of relative clause (introduced by *który* vs. *co*) and the gender of the head noun. Łęska argues that the option of default agreement is due to “Case attraction” (Bader & Bayer 2006): provided the morphological form of the relative pronoun is compatible with the case required by the numeral, the Case feature of the quantifier may be shared with the relative pronoun (or null operator), resulting in default agreement on the relative clause predicate. Because such extension is only seen when the head noun is a subject, however, the mechanism of case attraction must be restricted so that it does not overgenerate.

Gallego’s chapter focuses on dialects of Spanish that exhibit long-distance agreement between T and a DP inside a PP. Given the standard assumption that phi-probes cannot probe inside a PP in Spanish, which is held to be responsible for the ban on preposition-stranding and pseudopassives (cf. Law 2006), the existence of such long-distance agreement is unexpected. Gallego compares this phenomenon with similar evidence concerning the differential object marker *a* (e.g., Torrego 1998; López 2012), arguing that there are three types of prepositions: P is merged external to TP; P is inserted at PF; P is reanalysed with V. While the differential object marker *a* is plausibly of the first type, allowing T to probe the DP object directly, this and the second option are less plausible for prepositions with a more “semantic” flavour. Gallego thus suggests that such prepositions may reanalyse or incorporate with the verb, allowing the DP to be probed by T. His findings have implications for the typology of prepositions in Spanish, and more generally for the interaction of micro- and macro-parameters.

Almost all of the authors discussing the tight relation between case and agreement acknowledge that oblique case represents a distinct phenomenon, with no syntactic theory offering a satisfactory analysis. Manzini, Franco & Savoia attempt to fill this gap, offering an overview of oblique case and a set of phenomena discussed in the typological literature under the label of “Suffixaufnahme”. The theoretical focus of the contribution is on the Minimalist operation Agree and the notion of case, specifically oblique case. The authors question the necessity of referring to [interpretable] and [valued] features in the formulation of Agree. They suggest that a more primitive syntactic notion underlies the descriptive label “oblique”, specifically that of an elementary relator with a part/whole content. Thus, a DP embedded under a genitive case morpheme or adposition is interpreted as a possessor or “whole” with respect to a local superordinate DP (the possessum or “part”). They argue that case/agreement-stacking in languages such as Lardil (also discussed in Łęska’s chapter) corresponds crosslinguistically

to the presence of a partial copy of this second argument within the phrasal projection of the relator.

Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by a grant (IF/00846/2013: “The case of grammatical relations”) from the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT).

References

- Abels, Klaus. 2003. *Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Abels, Klaus. 2012. *Phases: An essay on cyclicity in syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ackema, Peter & Ad Neeleman. 2018. *Features of person: From the inventory of persons to their morphological realization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: Evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anand, Pranav & Andrew Nevins. 2006. The locus of ergative case assignment: Evidence from scope. In Alana Johns, Diane Massam & Juvenal Ndayiragije (eds.), *Ergativity: Emerging issues*, 3–25. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Asarina, Alevtina. 2011. *Case in Uyghur and beyond*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Bader, Markus & Josef Bayer. 2006. *Case and linking in language comprehension: Evidence from German*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Baker, Mark. 2015. *Case: Its principles and its parameters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mark & Nadya Vinokurova. 2010. Two modalities of case assignment in Sakha. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28. 593–642.
- Bhatt, Rajesh & Martin Walkow. 2013. Locating agreement in grammar: An argument from agreement in conjunctions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 31. 951–1013.
- Bittner, Maria & Kenneth Hale. 1996. The structural determination of case and agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27. 1–68.
- Blake, Barry. 2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D. 2008. Where’s phi? Agreement as a post-syntactic operation. In Daniel Harbour, David Adger & Susana Béjar (eds.), *Phi-theory: phi-features across interfaces and modules*, 295–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bobaljik, Jonathan D. 2012. *Universals in comparative morphology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D. & Susi Wurmbrand. 2008. Case in GB/Minimalism. In Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of case*, 44–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59. 1–45.
- Brody, Michael. 1997. Perfect chains. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*, 139–167. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax: A government-binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Caha, Pavel. 2009. *The nanosyntax of case*. Tromsø: CASTL. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Calabrese, Andrea. 2008. On absolute and contextual syncretism. In Andrew Nevins & Asaf Bachrach (eds.), *The bases of inflectional identity*, 156–205. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carstens, Vicki. 2001. Multiple agreement and case deletion: Against phi-(in)completeness. *Syntax* 4. 147–163.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. Individual-level predicates as inherent generics. In Greg N. Carlson & Francis Jeffry Pelletier (eds.), *The generic book*, 176–223. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1980. On binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11. 1–46.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding. The Pisa lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Citko, Barbara. 2005. On the nature of Merge: External Merge, Internal Merge, and Parallel Merge. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36. 475–496.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 1998. Remarks on the syntax and the interpretation of Romanian middle passive *se* sentences. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 43. 317–342.
- Croft, William. 1990. *Typology and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuervo, María Cristina. 2003. *Datives at large*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).

- Cyrino, Sonia. 2010. On Romance syntactic complex predicates: Why Brazilian Portuguese is different. *Estudos da Língua(gem)* 8. 187–222.
- Embick, David & Rolf Noyer. 2006. Distributed Morphology and the syntax-morphology interface. In Charles Reiss & Gillian Ramchand (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic interfaces*, 289–324. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Floripi, Simone & Jairo Nunes. 2009. Movement and resumption in null possessor constructions in Brazilian Portuguese. In Jairo Nunes (ed.), *Minimalist essays on Brazilian Portuguese syntax*, 51–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franco, Ludovico & M. Rita Manzini. 2017. Instrumental prepositions and case: Contexts of occurrence and alternations with datives. *Glossa* 2. 1–37.
- Gilligan, Gary. 1987. *A cross-linguistic approach to the pro-drop parameter*. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20*, 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 1995. Abstracting away from abstract case. In Jill N. Beckman (ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 25*, 207–221. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Heck, Fabian. 2009. On certain properties of pied-piping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40. 75–111.
- Hein, Johannes & Andrew Murphy. 2016. *Case matching and syncretism in ATB dependencies*. (Leipzig: Universität Leipzig.)
- Hicks, Glyn. 2009. *The derivation of anaphoric relations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16. 547–621.
- Horn, George M. 1983. *Lexical-functional grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 69–96.
- Hornstein, Norbert & Maria Polinsky (eds.). 2010. *Movement theory of control*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hornstein, Norbert & Amy Weinberg. 1981. Case theory and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12. 55–91.
- Kolliakou, Dimitra. 1999. De-phrase extractability and individual/property denotation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 17. 713–781.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from the verb. In Johan Rooryck & Laurie Zaring (eds.), *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, 109–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Law, Paul. 2006. Preposition stranding. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, 631–684. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Łęska, Paulina. 2016. Agreement under case matching in Polish *co* and *który* relative clauses headed by numerically quantified nouns. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 24. 113–136.
- López, Luis. 2012. *Indefinite objects: Differential object marking, scrambling and choice functions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Ludovico Franco. 2016. Goal and DOM datives. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34. 197–240.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2003. The nature of complementizers. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 28. 87–110.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2007. *A unification of morphology and syntax: Studies in Romance and Albanian varieties*. London: Routledge.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2011. *Grammatical categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. (Paper presented at the 8th Eastern States Conference on Linguistics, University of Maryland, Baltimore.)
- Marchis Moreno, Mihaela. 2015. Relational adjectives at the interfaces. *Studia Linguistica* 69. 304–332.
- Marchis Moreno, Mihaela. 2018. *Relational adjectives in Romance and English: Mismatches at interfaces*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marchis Moreno, Mihaela & Ludovico Franco. 2017. Case opacity and cliticization: On intervention and the triggers of different agreement patterns. *Linguística* 12. 99–127.
- McFadden, Thomas. 2004. *The position of morphological case in the derivation: A study on the syntax-morphology interface*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1974. Object-verb agreement. *Working Papers on Language Universals* 15. 25–140.
- Müller, Gereon. 2007. Notes on paradigm economy. *Morphology* 17. 1–38.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25. 273–313.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2011. Multiple Agree with clitics: Person complementarity vs omnivorous number. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29. 939–971.
- Partee, Barbara H. 1997. Genitives: A case study. Appendix to Janssen, Theo. 1997. Compositionality. In Johan van Benthem & Alice ter Meulen (eds.), *Handbook of logic and language*, 464–470. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

- Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2001. T-to-C movement: Causes and consequences. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 355–426. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian & Wendy K. Wilkins (eds.), *Phrasal and clausal architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation*, 262–294. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam. 2001. Long distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19. 583–646.
- Polinsky, Maria & Omer Preminger. 2014. Case and grammatical relations. In Andrew Carnie, Yosuke Sato & Daniel Siddiqi (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of syntax*, 150–166. London: Routledge.
- Preminger, Omer. 2013. That’s not how you Agree: A reply to Zeijlstra. *The Linguistic Review* 30. 491–500.
- Preminger, Omer. 2014. *Agreement and its failures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reeve, Matthew. 2019. An agreement-based analysis of extraction from nominals. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37. 263–314.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2006. *Interface strategies: Optimal and costly computations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reuland, Eric. 2001. Primitives of binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32. 439–492.
- Rezac, Milan. 2008. The syntax of eccentric agreement: The person case constraint and absolutive displacement in Basque. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26. 61–106.
- Rodrigues, Cilene. 2010. Possessor raising through thematic positions. In Norbert Hornstein & Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Movement theory of control*, 119–146. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rooryck, Johan & Guido Vanden Wyngaerd. 2011. *Dissolving binding theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Safir, Ken. 2014. One true anaphor. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45. 91–124.
- Schütze, Carson T. 1997. *INFL in child and adult language: Agreement, case and licensing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Schütze, Carson T. 2003. Syncretism and double agreement with Icelandic nominative objects. In Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson & Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (eds.), *Grammatik i focus/Grammar in focus: Festschrift for Christer Platzack*, 295–303. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages.

- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1993. Agreement as head visible feature government. *Studia Linguistica* 47. 32–56.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2004. On the edge. In David Adger, Cécile De Cat & George Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries: Syntactic edges and their effects*, 259–287. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2006. The emergence of axial parts. *Nordlyd* 33. 1–22.
- Titov, Elena. 2012. *Information structure of argument order alternations*. London: UCL. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Torrego, Esther. 1998. *The dependencies of objects*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tsakali, Vina, Elena Anagnostopoulou & Artemis Alexiadou. 2017. A new pattern of CP transparency: Implications for the analysis of Backward Control. (Paper presented at GLOW 40, Leiden.)
- Van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2012. Invisible Last Resort: A note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120. 1714–1726.
- Yip, Moira, Joan Maling & Ray Jackendoff. 1987. Case in tiers. *Language* 63. 217–250.
- Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling & Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and grammatical functions: The Icelandic passive. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 3. 441–483.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2012. There's only one way to agree. *The Linguistic Review* 29. 491–539.