Ivona Kučerová NYU
McMaster, ivona@alum.mit.edu May 16, 2016

The rise and fall of nominatives[1]

What is a Nominative (NOM)?

- a Syntax 101: abstract case assigned to DPs in the spec,TP (feature checking)[2]
- morphological case theories (and 'hybrid' theories): preserve a licensing component;[3] the least marked form/DP without a K(ase) layer (Marantz, 1991; Rezac, 2008; Richards, 2008, among others)
- (at least) the licensing component cannot be right:
  - NOMs appear in environments where they cannot be licensed by finite T (for instance, because there is no finite T or T at all, as in Icelandic infinitival complements)
  - a local structure may contain more than one NOM per one finite T (as in NP-NP copular clauses, Japanese/Korean focus structures etc.)
  - yet, if a DP is morphologically NOM, it triggers agreement, interacts with other DPs in PCC constructions, and shows restrictions on person in general – irrespective of its licensing environment (Bobaljik, 2008; Bartošová and Kučerová, 2015; Kučerová, 2016, and references cited there)[4]

The goal:

- to look away from the question of licensing and investigate the internal structure of NOM DPs
- to argue that NOM has a structural signature, i.e., there are structural properties internal to a DP that are necessary for the DP to be NOM
- being 'small'/lack of a K-layer is not sufficient
- structural NOM = nominal structure labeled by a PERSON feature associated with the D head (Chomsky, 2013)
- $\Rightarrow$ only a structure labeled by PERSON may become a goal of syntactic ϕ-feature Agree
- labeling by PERSON feature ($\sim$ [+D]; Sudo 2012; Longobardi 2008; Landau 2010) formally corresponds to CI licensing of the PERSON feature $\Rightarrow$ an interaction with an (referential?) index
- empirical motivation: microvariation in numeral constructions in Slavic

[1]This research would have not been possible without funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Insight Grant #435-2012-1567 (PI: I. Kučerová). My first and foremost intellectual thank you goes to David Pesetsky. It has been a real pleasure to work with his latest monograph on Russian numeral morphology. I would also like to thank to Pavel Caha, Mojmír Dočekal, Lída Veselovská and Markéta Ziková for their insightful questions and data suggestions and to Jitka Bartošová for her help with data collection. The remaining errors are mine.

[2]Some authors, including myself, have argued that nominative is assigned by v (Marantz, 2007; Schäfer, 2012; Sigurðsson, 2012; Kučerová, 2016). The distinction between T and v is inconsequential for the data discussed in this paper but has consequences for the theory of nominative and argument licensing.

[3]For instance, in Marantz's original system the licensing part requires a V+I structure etc. in the relevant domain.

[4]I put aside the notion of NOM as a morphological default. See for instance, Legate (2008) for some relevant data.

Ivona Kučerová
McMaster, ivona@alum.mit.edu

NYU
May 16, 2016

1 The puzzle

Russian paucals and 5&UP[5] numerals:

- heterogenous case properties
- structurally lower parts = GEN
- structurally higher parts = NOM

(1) èti posledn-ie || dv-a || krasiv-ych stol-a
these-[NOM.PL] last-[NOM.PL] **two**-M.NOM beautiful-[GEN.PL] table-[GEN.**SG**]
'these last two beautiful tables' RUSSIAN PAUCAL

(2) èt-i posledn-ie || pjat' || krasiv-ych stol-ov
these-[NOM.PL] last-[NOM.PL] **five**-NOM beautiful-[GEN.PL] table-[GEN.**PL**]
'these last five beautiful tables' RUSSIAN 5&UP

Pesetsky (2013)

- case stacking is real: the Russian numeral system reveals it in a language seemingly without case stacking
- Russian nouns are born GEN
- GEN can get phonologically rewritten by a structurally higher case assignment
- Feature Assignment $\approx$ locality restricted feature spreading
- special type of D: DNOM $\Rightarrow$ assigns NOM
- normally, NOM spreads through the whole DP
- numerals are different because the nature of the number feature on the numeral enforces head movement to D[6]
- head movement blocks Feature Assignment
- consequently, the structurally lower part remains in GEN
- $\Rightarrow$ heterogenous case pattern

The take-home message

- all DNOM DPs are by default NOM
- under exceptional circumstances the lower part (NP) may phonologically preserve the underlying GEN but the D domain is still in NOM

[5]The 5&UP terminology for numerals 5 and higher is from Marušič et al. (2015) and the work cited there.

[6]According to Pesetsky (2013) the syntax of paucal and 5&UP constructions is not identical: They differ in their base generated position, and in turn in number of movement steps, a fact relevant for the number morphology of the head noun, but not for the facts discussed here.

The problem:

- the Russian heterogeneous case pattern cross-linguistically rare (even within Slavic; Russian, Ukrainian, partially Polish)
- Czech, Slovenian…: homogeneous GEN case marking throughout[7]

(3) tě-ch/*t-y posledn-ích/*posledn-í pět krásných
those-GEN.PL/*NOM.PL last-GEN.PL/*NOM.PL **five**-NOM beautiful-GEN.PL
stolů
table-GEN.PL
'those last five beautiful tables' CZECH 5&UP

Non-Russian languages:

- the pre-numeral elements: GEN
- the numeral: NOM

Pesetsky (2013, 144, fn. 3):

- Polish structurally identical to Russian; the distinction is purely morphological

The argument to be developed here:

- the difference is structural
- Czech GEN numeral constructions systematically differ from their Russian counterpart:
  - do not trigger agreement on finite predicates
  - cannot form a boolean conjunction
  - cannot license (or only marginally) secondary predicates
- in turn, the variation sheds light on the nature of structural NOM

2 Genitive throughout

- no paucals in Czech
- Czech equivalents to Russian paucals are formally adjectives and appear in a homogeneous nominative pattern

(4) t-y-to posledn-í dv-a krásn-é stol-y
DEF-M.PL-this.NOM last-NOM.PL **two**-M.NOM beautiful-NOM.PL table-NOM.PL
'these last two beautiful tables' CZECH <5: ✓NOM

[7]Note that these languages do not have paucals. For reasons of space, the data here are only from Russian and Czech. The Polish situation is empirically more diverse as Polish partially patterns with Czech and partially with Russian (Adam Szczegielniak, Ora Matushansky, p.c.).

- 5&UP: a strictly homogeneous case pattern[8]

(5) t-ěch posledn-ích pět krásn-ých stol-ů
these-GEN.PL last-GEN.PL **five**-NOM beautiful-GEN.PL table-GEN.PL
'these last five beautiful tables' CZECH 5&UP: ✓GEN

2.1 Scrambling?

- could the heterogeneous pattern be a result of scrambling of structurally lower GEN?
- demonstratives, (5), and possessive determiners obligatorily in GEN:

(6) našich pět studentů
our.GEN.PL five.NOM students.GEN.PL
'our five students'

- D-dependent quantifiers are NOM in Russian but GEN in Czech:[9]

(7) každye/ vse pjat' krasivych stolov
each.NOM.PL/ all.NOM.PL five.NOM beautiful.GEN.PL tables.GEN.PL
'each/all five beautiful tables' RUSSIAN: NOM

(8) každých/ všech pět krásných stolů
each.GEN.PL/ all.GEN.PL five.NOM beautiful.GEN.PL tables.GEN.PL
'each/all five beautiful tables' CZECH: GEN

2.2 Are Czech 5&UP numerals DPs?

- that these numerals may contain definiteness markers and that they can be specific in and of itself does not guarantee they are of type e (Endriss, 2009; Rothstein, 2012)[10]

Additional suggestive evidence:

- 5&UP numerals can be coordinated with DPs of type e:

(9) Já/ Marie/ tyto studentky a pět chlapců
I.NOM/ Marie.NOM/ these students.F.PL and five.NOM boys.GEN.PL
'I/ Marie/ these students and five boys'

[8]Following Pesetsky (2013) I gloss the numeral as nominative. This is not an obvious choice as this type of numeral has an unusual syncretic morphological paradigm. The system distinguishes only two forms: {nominative/accusative} and oblique. If the analysis put forward here is on the right track, the distinction might be better captured as [±CASE].

[9]The genitive pattern is rather stable. Jiranová (2008), an extensive corpus-based study of Contemporary Czech, argues that the homogeneous genitive pattern increasingly spreads even to numerals and quantificational expressions that in Standard Czech have a distinct case and agreement pattern.

[10]To determine the NP/DP distinction in a language like Czech is far from trivial, and I am not aware of any definitive test. I follow here the logic of Winter (2001) who argues that even though type-shifting is available, it is structurally restricted.

- can appear in argument positions:

(10) Pět chlapců poslalo dopis.
five.NOM boys.GEN.PL sent letter.ACC
'Five boys sent a/the letter.'

- but are excluded from predicative positions, as in NP-NP copular clauses (Mojmír Dočekal, p.c.):

- note that the ungrammaticality of (11-b) does not stem from NP_2 being in case other than NOM; NP_2 may be in INSTR as well

(11) a. Ti vrazi byli tři cizinci.
those.PL murderers were.PL **three**.NOM foreigners.NOM.PL
'The murderers were three foreigners.' ✓3

b. *Ti vrazi byli/bylo pět cizinců.
those.PL murderers were.PL/was.N.SG **five**.NOM foreigners.GEN.PL
'The murderers were five foreigners.' *5

(12) Ten vrah byl lékařem.
that murderer.NOM was doctor.INSTR
'The murderer was a doctor.'

2.3 Licensing of secondary predicates

- if 5&UP numerals are underlyingly in NOM, we expect them to license secondary predicates

- at first sight this seems to be marginally possible:

(13) %**Pět chlapců** tancovalo ***unavení/** ?**unavených**.
five.NOM boys.GEN.PL danced tired.NOM.PL/ tired.GEN.PL
intended: 'Five boys danced tired.'

- speaker variation (about 10 speakers): some speakers accept secondary predicates in genitive, others find them degraded or entirely impossible[11]

- marginal acceptability results from a post-syntactic copying of the morphological GEN onto the secondary predicate, by a mechanism similar to that found with closest conjunct agreement (Bhatt and Walkow, 2013)

- adding an additional DP material disrupts morphological copying (Lída Veselovská, p.c.):

(14) **Pět chlapců** sledovalo **čtyři děvčata** ***unavených/** ***unavení**.
five boys.GEN.PL watched.N.SG four.ACC girls.ACC.PL tired.GEN.PL/ tired.NOM.PL
'Five boys$_i$ watched four girls tired$_i$.'

[11] Secondary predication can be misplaced for a split DP, a non-trivial confound.

- if morphological copying is responsible for (13) being better than (14), we predict that (14) improves if the word order is OVS (scrambling):

(15) **Čtyři děvčata** sledovalo **pět** **chlapců** ?**unavených/** ***unavení**.
four girls.ACC.PL watched.N.SG five.NOM boys.GEN.PL tired.GEN.PL/ tired.NOM.PL
'Five boys$_i$ watched four girls tired$_i$.'

- if 5&UPs were underlyingly NOM, they should always license nominative secondary predicates
- however, they do so only under particular morpho-phonological adjacency conditions

2.4 Failed Agree

- Pesetsky (2013): paucals and 5&UP numerals are numberless
- technically: no valued number feature from the lexicon
- this is confirmed by the fact that agreement with these numerals can be 3N.SG:

(16) pjat' malčikov prišlo
five.NOM boys.GEN.PL came.N.SG
'(the) five boys came' RUSSIAN: ✓SG

- however, Russian paucals and 5&UPs trigger plural agreement on the predicate as well:

(17) pjat' malčikov prišli
five.NOM boys.GEN.PL came.PL
'(the) five boys came' RUSSIAN: ✓PL

- this is surprising if there is no valued number feature and semantic agreement is restricted to non-local Agree
- Czech more in line with Pesetsky's analysis: 5&UP ⇒ failed agreement
- failed agreement: default values attested in the absence of a valued probe (neuter singular)[12,13]

[12]Semantic agreement within a clause might be possible under rather specific circumstances. Jiranová (2008, 98) cites an attested example of semantic agreement within a clause. Note that there are two instances of semantic agreement: within an adjunct clause and on the agreeing predicate of the matrix clause. Crucially, the adjunct clause linearly intervenes between the numeral subject and the agreeing predicate. It is plausible that the semantic agreement on the matrix predicate arises via a morphological linear effect:

(i) Pět jejích prvních absolventů, poté, co získali inženýrské tituly, založili v
five.NOM their.GEN.PL first.GEN.PL graduates.GEN.PL after what gained.M.PL engineer titles founded in
roce 1956 továrnu na petrolejová kamna.
year 1956 factory on kerosene stoves
'Five of their first graduates, after they received their engineering degrees, founded a kerosene stove factory in 1956.'

[13]Old Czech 5&up numerals triggered plural agreement (Markéta Ziková, p.c.).

(18) Pět chlapců přišlo / *přišli.
five.nom boys-gen.pl came.n.sg / *came.m.pl
'Five boys came.' CZECH 5&UP: ✓SG/ *PL

- numerals 2–4: homogeneous NOM case pattern ⇒ regular plural agreement:

(19) Dva/ tři/ čtyři chlapci *přišl-o/ přišl-i.
two.NOM/ three.NOM/ four.NOM boys.NOM came.N.SG/ came.M.PL
'Two/three/four boys came.' CZECH <5: *SG/ ✓PL

Additional evidence for failed agreement:

- if ϕ-features on a DP are valued as N.SG but the semantic values of such a DP are distinct (e.g., neuter nouns denoting females), intra-sentential anaphors may agree either with the semantic value, or the grammatical value:

(20) Děvče přišlo. Ono/ ona...
girl.N.SG came.N.SG it.N.SG/ she.F.SG
'A/the girl came. She [=the girl]...' ✓N/ ✓F

- however, intra-sentential anaphors to 5&UP DPs must agree with the semantic plural:

(21) Pět chlapců přišlo. *Ono/ oni...
five.NOM boys-GEN.PL came.N.SG it.N.SG/ they.M.PL
'Five boys came. They [=the five boys] ...' *N.SG/ ✓M.PL

- ⇒ N.SG a default morphological realization for failed Agree, not a reflex of valued ϕ-features on the numeral

- ⇒ no ϕ-features visible on the 5&UP numeral

2.5 Number in coordination

- Czech: the agreement on a postverbal predicate in number determined by the boolean conjunction of the coordinated DPs (Munn, 1993)

- if the conjuncts are heterogenous in person and/or gender, the ϕ-features of the agreeing predicate match the ϕ-features of a pronoun that would be anaphoric to the coordination (Farkaş and Zec, 1995):

(22) Marie a Pavel přišl-i / *přišl-a / *přišel. Oni...
Marie.NOM and Pavel.NOM came.[M.PL] / *came.F.SG / *came.M.SG they.[M.PL]
'Marie and Petr came. They [=Marie and Petr] ...'

- holds for numerals with homogeneous NOM pattern as well:

(23) Dva chlapci a tři děvčata přišli. Oni...
two.NOM boys.NOM and three.NOM girls.NOM came.[M.PL] they.[M.PL]
'Two boys and three girls came. They [=two boys and three girls] ...'

- however, coordination of 5&UP numerals still yields failed agree:

(24) Pět chlapců a pět dívek se sešlo/ *sešli v klubu.
five boys.GEN and five girls.GEN REFL get-together.N.SG/ *M.PL in club
'Five boys and five girls met in the club.'

- in the light of previous facts, it is not surprising that the agreement should not be able to access the ϕ-features
- however, that the coordination agreement cannot access the semantic plurality is unexpected
- this pattern shows that not only 5&UP numerals are ϕ-feature deficient but also they lack whatever structure is needed for the computation of semantic plurality

2.6 Interim summary

- Czech 5&UP numerals are DPs
- but if they appear in a syntactic position associated with NOM they do not behave like their morphologically NOM counterparts
- their label is ϕ-feature deficient, they cannot license secondary predication and they even cannot form a boolean coordination in coordinated DPs
- whatever they are, they are not structural NOM in the Russian sense

3 Wanted persons

- the key to the difference between Czech and Russian lies in the fact that Russian 5&UPs may trigger plural agreement even if morpho-syntactically they are singular
- I argue that Russian 5&UPs trigger semantic agreement because their DP is labeled for PERSON
- in contrast, PERSON in Czech 5&UPs is too deeply embedded to be minimally searchable and to label (Chomsky, 2013)
- independent evidence that PERSON is not part of the label in Czech comes from DP coordinations, and from differences in binding

3.1 Person in a DP coordination

- features of a coordinated DP are computed as a combination of semantic and morpho-syntactic features (Farkaş and Zec, 1995; King and Dalrymple, 2004; Heycock and Zamparelli, 2005, among others)[14]

[14]Strictly morpho-syntactic (e.g., Marušič et al. 2015) and semantic approaches have been proposed as well (e.g., Lasersohn 2013). As far as I can tell, none of the existing approaches fully predicts the morpho-syntactic pattern that interests us here.

- the primary semantic feature is PERSON
- PERSON modeled as [±PARTICIPANT] (Nevins, 2007) allows for a direct CI association with an index
- the association is obligatory for [+PERSON]/[+PARTICIPANT]
- semantic coordination is based on indices associated with individual conjuncts:

(25) *The algorithm for calculating semantic plurality:*
  a. matching indices ⇒ SG
  b. non-matching indices ⇒ PL

(26) a. his best friend$_i$ and editor$_i$ **is** by his bedside $i + i \rightarrow$ SG
  b. his best friend$_i$ and editor$_j$ **are** by his bedside $i + j \rightarrow$ PL

The crucial insight:

- indices are tracked only for [+PARTICIPANT], that is, for [+PERSON]
- the logic: if there is no participant, there is nothing to track[15]
- ⇒ semantic plurality can be computed only if at least one of the conjuncts is [+PERSON]
- compare Heim's rule for calculating person features on split-antecedent pronouns:[16]

(27) Heim (2008, (53))
  (i) If i or j is unspecified for person, then leave $i + j$ unspecified.
  (ii) Otherwise, if i or j is 1st person, then specify $i + j$ as 1st person.
  (iii) Otherwise, if i or j is 2nd person, then specify $i + j$ as 2nd person.
  (iv) Otherwise, specify $i + j$ as 3rd person.

- note that this implementation is faithful to the original insight of Farkaş and Zec (1995)

Prediction I:

- 5&UPs lack a PERSON feature but if they combine with [+PERSON], agreement should still be PL

[15]Under this view, tracking definite and indefinite DPs with respect to some sort of a file-card system must be done differently, for example, by indices being part of definite articles, as proposed for instance in Schwarz (2009).

[16]The same formal insight can be rephrased in terms of sum-formation and inclusion:

(i) Let s_c and h_c be atoms. Then:
  If x or y includes s_c, x ⊕ y includes s_c.
  If neither x nor y includes s_c, but x or y includes h_c, then x ⊕ y doesn't include s_c but includes h_c.
  If neither x nor y includes s_c or h_c, x ⊕ y doesn't include either s_c or h_c.

(Heim, 2008, (55))

The formulation in (27) is slightly more transparent for our morpho-syntactic purposes.

- reason: the [+PERSON] conjunct provides an index, and there is no matching index on the 5&UP conjunct (by (25-b))

(28) Já/ty a pět chlapců jsme/jste šli/ *šlo do ZOO.
I.NOM/you.NOM and five boys.GEN.PL AUX.1/2.PL gone.M.PL/ gone.N.SG to ZOO
'I/you and five boys went to the ZOO.' *SG/ ✓PL

Prediction II:

- if the coordination consists solely of 5&UPs, there is no PERSON feature to compute semantic agreement
- in addition, since 5&UPs are numberless, the system cannot calculate the number from morpho-syntactic features either
- ⇒ failed agree: N.SG

(29) Pět chlapců a pět dívek se sešlo/ *sešli v klubu.
five boys.GEN and five girls.GEN REFL get-together.N.SG/ *M.PL in club
'Five boys and five girls got together in the club.' ✓SG/ *PL

Prediction III:

- if one conjunct is [−PERSON], we expect agreement optionality
- either (a) the system tracks the PERSON feature ⇒ PL,
- or (b) the system tracks morpho-syntactic features ⇒ two options:
  - if the closer conjunct is 5&UP ⇒ failed agree; (30-a)
  - if the closer conjunct labeled for ϕ-features ⇒ closest conjunct agreement; (30-b) (cf. Marušič et al. (2015))

(30) a. Děvčata a **pět chlapců** šli/ šlo/ *šla do ZOO.
girls.N.PL and five boys gone.M.PL/ N.SG/ N.PL to ZOO
'Girls and five boys went to the ZOO.' PL/ FAILED AGREE

b. Pět chlapců a **děvčata** šli/ *šlo/ šla do ZOO.
five boys and girls.N.PL gone.M.PL/ N.SG/ N.PL to ZOO
'Five boys and girls went to the ZOO.' PL/ CCA

Interim summary:

- the key property is that 5&UP numerals are not labeled for PERSON

4 Why is Russian different? The case for index raising

- I argue that in both language groups, NUM raises to D (Pesetsky, 2013) ⇒ criterial freezing (Rizzi, 2006, 2007, and subsequent work)
- criterial freezing makes D and its features invisible for labeling
- Russian is special in that in the Russian-type languages D (or at least its PERSON/index feature) raises farther ⇒ D becomes accessible for minimal search/labeling

Evidence from binding:

- in the Czech-type languages binding only arises under c-command
- in Russian possessive pronouns in spec,DP bind outside of their c-command domain

(31) a. *Eë$_i$ učitel'nica poxvalila Mašu$_i$.
her teacher.NOM praised Maša.ACC
'Her$_i$ teacher praised Maša$_i$.' RUSSIAN

b. Její$_i$ učitelka pochválila Mášu$_i$.
her teacher.NOM praised Maša.ACC
'Her$_i$ teacher praised Maša$_i$.' CZECH

- Nikolaeva (2014): Russian allows for index raising , i.e., an index can raise out of a criterial freezing domain and in turn may label the immediately dominating projection
- here modeled as PERSON (Sudo, 2012; Longobardi, 2008; Landau, 2010) ∼ an (referential?) index formally corresponds to CI licensing of [+PERSON] feature
- the correlation between binding and NOM licensing further supports the hypothesis that PERSON is the feature that provides a formal connection to a referential index at the CI interface, and it is in the very core of being NOM

5 Conclusions

- Czech 5&UP constructions thus truly nominative-less because there is no PERSON feature associated with such a DP ⇒ NOM corresponds to a DP being labeled by a PERSON feature
- only DP labeled by PERSON can become a goal for Agree, license secondary predicates etc.
- new empirical evidence for a formal connection between Case and PERSON, and PERSON and referential index (Schütze 1997; Martin 1999; Chomsky 2000; Béjar and Rezac 2003; Rezac 2004; Richards 2008, among others)
- open question: does labeling by PERSON arise via Agree (∼ necessity of a licensing component), or is it a prerequisite of Agree?

A Abstract vs oblique case?

- as in Russian, if the numeral DP is assigned an oblique case, for example, dative, then the case pattern becomes homogeneous (as expected under Feature Assignment of Pesetsky 2013)

(32) těm pěti hodným chlapcům
those.DAT.PL nice.DAT.PL boys.DAT.PL
'to those nice five boys'

- but if the 5&UP receives ACC, the structure retains the heterogeneous case pattern

(33) Petr napsal pět dlouhých románů.
Petr.NOM wrote.PERF five.ACC long.GEN.PL novels.GEN.PL
'Petr wrote five long novels.'

- numeral ⇒ ACC, everything else ⇒ GEN

Syncretism?

- I gloss the numeral in (33) as ACC but the form is identical to NOM
- unusual syncretism of 5&UP numerals: NOM/ACC vs OBLIQUE
- the heterogeneous pattern holds for all ACC, including ACC assigned to temporal adjuncts and ACC assigned by a preposition:

(34) Petr psal román pět dlouhých let.
Petr.NOM wrote.IMPERF novel.ACC five.ACC long.GEN.PL years.GEN.PL
'Petr wrote a/the novel for five long years.'

(35) Petr napsal román za pět dlouhých let.
Petr.NOM wrote.PERF novel.ACC in five.ACC long.GEN.PL years.GEN.PL
'Petr wrote a/the novel in five long years.'

- van Riemsdijk (1990); Maling and Kim (2001): certain classes of temporal adjuncts can receive a structural case and certain prepositions can assign a structural case

Case generalization:

- abstract case = heterogeneous case pattern
- oblique case = homogeneous case pattern
- alternatively: [±CASE]

⇒

- what does the proposed theory of NOM mean for ACC?

References

Bartošová, Jitka, and Ivona Kučerová. 2015. Multiple-agree conspiracy: On person, animacy and copular agreement. A poster presented at NELS, November 2015.

Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series* 4:49–62.

Bhatt, Rajesh, and Martin Walkow. 2013. Locating agreement in grammar: An argument from agreement in conjunctions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 31:951–1013.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2008. Where's Phi? Agreement as a post-syntactic operation. In *Phi-theory: Phi features across interfaces and modules*, ed. Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar, 295–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by Step*, ed. R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Urigereka, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130:33–49.

Endriss, Cornelia. 2009. *Quantificational topics: A scopal treatment of exceptional wide scope phenomena*. New York: Springer.

Farkaş, Donka, and Draga Zec. 1995. Agreement and pronominal reference. In *Advances in Roumanian linguistics*, ed. Guglielmo Cinque and Guiliana Giusti, 83–102. John Benjamins Publishing.

Heim, Irene. 2008. Features on bound pronouns. In *Phi-theory: Phi features across interfaces and modules*, ed. Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar, 35–56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heycock, Caroline, and Roberto Zamparelli. 2005. Friends and colleagues: Plurality, coordination, and the structure of DP. *Natural language semantics* 13:201–270.

Jiranová, Pavlína. 2008. Morfologická a syntaktická charakteristika českých číslovek vyjadřujících počet entit, jejich souborŕu a druhů [Morphological and syntactical description of Czech numerals expressing number, sets and types of entities]. Master's thesis, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic.

King, Tracy Holloway, and Mary Dalrymple. 2004. Determiner agreement and noun conjunction. *Journal of Linguistics* 40:69–104.

Kučerová, Ivona. 2016. Long-distance agreement in icelandic: locality restored. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 19:49–74. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10828-016-9077-6`.

Landau, Idan. 2010. The explicit syntax of implicit arguments. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:357–388.

Lasersohn, Peter. 2013. *Plurality, conjunction and events*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. Morphological and abstract case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:55–101. URL `http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/ling.2008.39.1.55`.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2008. Reference to individuals, person, and the variety of mapping parameters. In *Essays on nominal determination: From morphology to discourse management*, ed. Henrik Høeg Müller and Alex Klinge, 189–211. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Maling, Jong Sup Jun, Joan, and Soowon Kim. 2001. Case-marking on duration adverbials revisited. In *Selected papers from the twelfth international conference on Korean linguistics*, ed. Hee-Don Ahn and Namkil Kim, 323–335. Kyungjin Munhwasa.

Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. In *Proceedings of ESCOL '91*, 175–195. Cornell Linguistic Club.

Marantz, Alec. 2007. Phases and words. In *Phases in the theory of grammar*, ed. Sook-Hee Choe, Dong-Wee Yang, Yang-Soon Kim, Sung-Hun Kim, and Alec Marantz, 191–222. Seoul: Dong-In Publishing Co.

Martin, Roger. 1999. Case, the Extended Projection Principle, and minimalism. In *Working minimalism*, ed. Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 1–25. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Marušič, Franc, Andrew Ira Nevins, and William Badecker. 2015. The grammars of conjunction agreement in Slovenian. *Syntax* 18:39–77.

Munn, Alan Boag. 1993. Topics in the syntax and semantics of coordinate structures. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for Person-Case effects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25:273–313.

Nikolaeva, Liudmila. 2014. The secret life of pronouns. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Pesetsky, David. 2013. *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rezac, Milan. 2004. Elements of cyclic syntax: Agree and merge. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Rezac, Milan. 2008. The syntax of eccentric agreement: The Person Case Constraint and absolutive displacement in Basque. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26:61–106.

Richards, Marc. 2008. Quirky expletives. In *Agreement restrictions*, ed. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 181–213. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

van Riemsdijk, Henk C. 1990. Functional prepositions. In *Unity and diversity: Papers presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th birthday*, ed. H. Pinkster and I. Geneé, 229–241. Foris: Dordrecht.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2006. On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In *Wh-movement: Moving on*, ed. Lisa Cheng and Norbert Corver, 97–134. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2007. On some properties of criterial freezing. *Studies in linguistics* 1:145–158.

Rothstein, Susan. 2012. Reconsidering the construct state in Modern Hebrew. *Rivista di Linguistica* 24:227–266.

Schäfer, Florian. 2012. The passive of reflexive verbs and its implications for theories of binding and case. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 15:213–268.

Schütze, Carson T. 1997. INFL in child and adult language: Agreement, case and licensing. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Schwarz, Florian. 2009. The types of definites in natural language. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2012. Minimalist C/case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:191–227.

Sudo, Yasutada. 2012. On the semantics of phi features on pronouns. Doctoral Dissertation,

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Winter, Yoad. 2001. *Flexibility principles in boolean semantics: coordination, plurality and scope in natural language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.