

2016

# Delayed valuation: a reanalysis of goal features, “upwards” complementizer agreement, and the mechanics of Case

Vicki Carstens  
carstensv@siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ling\\_articles](http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/ling_articles)

*This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Carstens, V. (2016), Delayed Valuation: A Reanalysis of Goal Features, “Upward” Complementizer Agreement, and the Mechanics of Case. Syntax, 19: 1–42. doi:10.1111/synt.12116, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/synt.12116>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.*

---

## Recommended Citation

Carstens, Vicki. "Delayed valuation: a reanalysis of goal features, “upwards” complementizer agreement, and the mechanics of Case." *Syntax* 19, No. 1 (Jan 2016): 1-42. doi:10.1111/synt.12116.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Linguistics at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact [opensiuc@lib.siu.edu](mailto:opensiuc@lib.siu.edu).

## **Delayed Valuation\***

*A reanalysis of goal features, “upwards” complementizer agreement,  
and the mechanics of Case*

Vicki Carstens

Southern Illinois University

Abstract: There are at least four opposing views on the directionality and configuration of Agree relations. In mainstream Minimalism, Agree is strictly downward “probing” (Chomsky 2000, 2001, Boskovic 2007, Epstein & Seely 2006), but some recent works argue instead that Agree always looks upwards (Zeijlstra 2012; Wurmbrand 2012). A third perspective takes agreement to follow from the Spec, head configuration (Koopman 2006), and under a fourth proposal, the directionality of Agree varies parametrically (Baker 2008). While each of these approaches has some empirical support, none achieves the strict conceptual necessity that is a central goal of Minimalist theory. In this paper I argue, following Epstein’s 1999 approach to c-command, that a downward directionality

---

\* This paper could not have existed without Michael Diercks’s insightful work on complementizer agreement in Lubukusu (see Diercks 2010 and 2013). I thank Lillian Waswa, Aggrey Wasike, Aggrey Wanyonyi, and Justine Sikuku for Lubukusu data in this paper that are not taken from Diercks 2013. Thanks also to the Afranaph project for support of the Lubukusu research, to Klaus Abels and two anonymous *Syntax* reviewers for helpful comments; and to Mark Baker, Jonathan Bobaljik, Zelko Bošković, Sam Epstein, Martha McGinnis, Juvenal Ndayiragije, Ken Safir, and Susi Wurmbrand for discussions in relation to aspects of the material. Special thanks to Daniel Seely for very helpful feedback on an early draft. This research was partially funded by University of Missouri Research Council grant #4992.

for Agree follows automatically and necessarily from the bottom-to-top construction of syntactic objects. But if a uF does not find any source of valuation in its c-command domain at first Merge, directionality-free matching and DELAYED VALUATION are possible up to the point of cyclic Transfer. The approach eliminates several stipulations from agreement theory, deducing that the uFs making goals “active” in Agree relations are simply those that find no match in their c-command domains at Merge.

## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Approaching goal features**

Minimalist theory posits a class of morpho-syntactic features that are unvalued and uninterpretable (uFs). uFs are analyzed as *probes* which must acquire values from matching features of a suitably local expression. The search space of a probe  $\alpha$  is generally taken to be its c-command domain, comprised of the contents of  $\alpha$ 's sister  $\beta$ . This approach to valuation was initially motivated by empirical phenomena like (1) (see Chomsky 2000).

- (1) a. There *is* [a man] in the room.  
b. There *are* [two men] in the room.

Epstein 1999 argues that the central role of c-command in syntactic relations has a derivational basis, and his proposals yield a simple, organic account of the downward directionality of probing: at the point of Merge,  $\alpha$  has no place to look other than  $\beta$ . It follows automatically that  $\beta$  is where  $\alpha$  must seek the valuation that it needs. Thus (2):<sup>1,2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I abstract away from proposals that T inherits its features from C (Chomsky 2007, 2008; Richards 2007).

(2) MERGE ( $T_{u\phi} [_{VP} DP_{3S}\dots]$ ) necessarily  $\rightarrow$  [ $T_{u\phi 3S} [_{VP} DP_{3S}\dots]$ ].

Its explanatory power and elegant design make this idea highly appealing. Many locality properties of the Agree relation are derivable under two additional assumptions similarly rooted in the derivation. The first of these is cyclic Spell-Out, which by purging accumulated content at regular intervals accounts for common depth limits on valuation relations (see the Phase Impenetrability Constraint of Chomsky 2000, 2001). The second factor is the assumption alluded to above that valuation occurs whenever possible. The default, Minimalist approach is that the probe  $\alpha$  cannot delay, arbitrarily ignoring relevant material with which it was merged and instead awaiting the arrival of content added at a later point, higher in the tree (see the Earliness Principle of Pesetsky 1989).

Familiar syntactic processes attributable to unvalued features show downwards sensitivity (among them (1)a,b, and see discussion of West Germanic complementizer agreement to follow below). So in addition to the virtue of simplicity, the derivational approach has ample motivation in empirical patterns. But questions arise in connection with the features identifying “active” goals in Agree relations, such as a DP’s uCase. As uFs that need values, they meet the definition of probes. If probing cannot be delayed, the very existence of goal features is puzzling. Why is it

---

<sup>2</sup> In glosses, <X> means that X moved;  $\times$  indicates valuation of X. CA= complementizer agreement; SA=subject agreement; PST = past. Cardinal numbers (1-3) denote person features when accompanied by a number specification (s= singular and pl= plural). Arabic numbers 1-17 are noun classes, hence 2SA=subject agreement for noun class 2, but 2sSA is 2<sup>nd</sup> singular SA.

Other abbreviations should be transparent.


licit for them to lack valuation until a probe finds them? Why do they not probe their own c-command domains and, if a match is absent there, cause the derivation to fail?<sup>3</sup>

I propose that there is no separate species of goal features: every uF must seek valuation in its sister upon Merge. If a uF  $\gamma$  fails to be valued before phasal Transfer, the result is a PF crash due to unclarity as to how  $\gamma$  should be pronounced (see Epstein, Kitahara & Seely 2010 and Carstens 2010 on this conception of uF-induced crashes). But prior to the fatal point of Transfer, DELAYED VALUATION is possible (see (3)).<sup>4</sup> Thus the defining property of goal features is that their valuation does not happen right away (see (4), and the approach to Case sketched in (5)).<sup>5</sup>

(3) **DELAYED VALUATION:** Valuation that is not obtained in a uF's original c-command domain.

(4) **Goal features:** uFs that find no match at the point of first Merge.

(5) Why Case is a goal feature: upon Merge, D's uCase cannot be valued.




---

<sup>3</sup> Bošković 2007, 2011; Epstein et al 1998, and Epstein & Seely 2006 argue that goals must raise to probe; see discussion below.

<sup>4</sup> See Bejar & Rezac 2009 for a similar analysis of *agreement displacement*, discussed in §4.

<sup>5</sup> I use DP as a cover term for a set of projections, as Rizzi 1997 argued for CPs. I assume the licensing of genitive Case in constructions like *John's mother* is accomplished lower in DP than Merge of D bearing the overall DP's uCase so there is no potential interaction among these Case features. Thanks to Mark Baker for pointing out this issue. Relatedly, an anonymous reviewer asks why, in a case like *His attempt to win*, the pronoun cannot obtain accusative by downward-probing the verb. A genitive Case-valuer is closer.

Understanding this much about goal features yields some new insights into atypical valuation relations including apparent upwards agreement phenomena (see Baker 2008, Diercks 2011, 2013, Zeijlstra 2012) and downwards Case-checking (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005; Wurmbrand 2004/2006). And exploration of such instances of DELAYED VALUATION gives us important information regarding how it comes about.

## **1.2 Mechanics of DELAYED VALUATION**

As noted above, a model of syntax that assumes cyclic Transfer to the interfaces predicts that uF and its valuer necessarily occupy the same phase. I will provide several kinds of evidence that this is correct. On the other hand, there is no convincing conceptual basis for expecting any particular directionality to hold in DELAYED VALUATION. Taking as a point of departure Epstein 1999, I argued in §1.1 that the downward orientation of Agree relations like (1)a,b follows from the bottom-up construction of syntactic objects by Merge. This rationale does not extend to relations that might value a uF which finds no match in its sister. I accordingly propose that DELAYED VALUATION is directionality-neutral:

- (6) **Directionality-Free Mechanics of Delayed Valuation**  
uF with no match in its c-command domain can be valued:  
(i) Ex situ, by raising into locality with a matching feature, *OR*  
(ii) In situ, by the closest matching feature within the same phase.

I argue that valuation after the point of first Merge often exhibits a misleading upward or Spec, head bias due to the frequent involvement of edge features, raising expressions with uFs to locations c-commanding their valuers (see (7)). (7) is a version of “imperfection driven” movement which I assume underlies cases that I will analyze as XP-probing, inspired by (but adapting) Boskovic 2007, 2011 (see also the Survive Principle of Stroik 1999, Heck & Muller 2000 on Phase Balancing, and Koopman & Sportiche 1991, Carstens 1991 for much earlier attempts to unify upward and downward-looking Case and agreement processes).

(7) **Why there is movement:** the edge feature of a head H removes uF from within the complement of H.

We will also see, however, that absent an edge feature c-commanding the valuer, valuation of a uF by an expression merged higher in the tree is possible, with the bearer of uF either remaining in situ or raising to be the valuer's closest c-commandee.

Thus while the analysis is not compatible with “upwards” or Spec, head agreement as parametric choices (Baker 2008, Diercks 2011) or as universals (Zeijlstra 2012; Wurmbrand 2012, Koopman 2006) it allows such valuation processes in all languages, in circumstances where first Merge provides no results. Any intrinsic directionality to valuation relations is thus illusory, and so perhaps is any actual process of “probing” on this view (thanks to Daniel Seely for suggesting this to me; and see Preminger 2011 for a different perspective).<sup>6</sup>

### **1.3 Preview of empirical evidence for DELAYED VALUATION**

My proposals for DELAYED VALUATION explain the well-documented existence of alternations in the directionality of agreement and Case valuation both across languages and across phenomena within a single language (reflecting the presence or absence of edge features, and whether or not a match exists for a uF when it is first merged). Evidence comes from English and German Case, from contrasts between West Germanic and Lubukusu complementizer agreement

---

<sup>6</sup> Preminger 2011 proposes that while agreement must always be attempted, u $\phi$  can licitly go unvalued if a source of valuation is lacking. On this view, the Lubukusu CA facts to be discussed in this paper seem to suggest that expectations for those attempts can be quite demanding, as a lazier grammar might be content to settle for default CA when a match is unavailable in the c-command domain (see §3.3 on CA in expletive constructions). I leave exploration of this intriguing issue and its implications to future research.

(CA), and from a comparison of the latter with Lubukusu agreeing ‘how’ (Carstens & Diercks 2013a). I summarize briefly a few of the crucial facts.

Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005 argue persuasively from scopal contrasts like (8) versus (9) that a German internal argument can be valued nominative in situ if it is sufficiently local to T. If its base position is more distant (separated by two lexical VPs, which I will argue constitute a phase), the nominative object must raise to Spec TP for valuation (see (10)a-c). Hence the directionality of nominative valuation varies in a single language.

(8) weil mindestens einem Kind jede Übung gelungen ist  
 since at.least one.DAT child every.NOM exercise managed AUX  
 ‘Since at least one child managed to do every exercise’  $\exists \gg \forall / ? \forall \gg \exists$

(9) weil alle Fenster zu schließen vergessen wurden  
 since all windows(NOM) to close forgotten were  
 ‘Since they forgot to close all the windows’  $\forall \gg \text{forget}; * \text{forget} \gg \forall$

- (10) a.  $\checkmark [_{TP} T [_{VP} [_{VP} \dots \text{OB}_{\mu\text{Case}} ]]]$   
 b.  $* [_{TP} T [_{VP} [_{VP1} \dots [_{VP2} \dots \text{OB}_{\mu\text{Case}} ]]]]$   
 c.  $\checkmark [_{TP} \text{OB}_{\mu\text{Case}} T [_{VP} [_{VP1} \dots [_{VP2} \dots \langle \text{OB}_{\mu\text{Case}} \rangle ]]]]$

Turning to complementizer agreement (CA), West Germanic (WG) and Lubukusu differ in that  $u\phi$  on a WG complementizer (C) is valued by the embedded subject (see (11)a). In contrast, the agreeing Lubukusu C can only agree with the subject of the immediately higher clause (see (12)a). I argue that WG agreeing C is a low C, Fin(ite) in the cartography of Rizzi 1997, whereas Lubukusu C is the high C Force, merged after Transfer of the embedded subject ((11)b versus (12)b; transferred material here and subsequently shaded). A successful derivation for Lubukusu C therefore relies on DELAYED VALUATION. Simplifying slightly, I propose in §3.6 that an edge feature of  $v^*$  raises ForceP to a matrix Spec, vP where it c-commands the subject (see (12)c).



(11) a. Kvinden **dan** die boeken te diere zyn [West Flemish; Haegeman 1992]  
 I-find that-PL the books too expensive are  
 ‘I find those books too expensive.’

b. *Mechanics of West Germanic complementizer agreement: at Merge, uφ of Fin successfully probes the embedded subject*

Fin<sub>uφ</sub> [TP SU T [VP <SU> v [VP ...]]]

(12) a. N-enya **n-di** Barack Obama a-khil-e [Lubukusu; Diercks 2013]  
 1sSA-want 1s-that 1Barack.Obama 1S-win-SBJ  
 ‘I want Barack Obama to succeed.’

b. *uφ of Lubukusu Force cannot probe the transferred subject of an embedded clause.*

[ForceP Force<sub>uφ</sub> ... [FinP Fin [TP SU ...]]]

c. *Valuation of Lubukusu CA: ForceP inherits uφ of Force, which probes the matrix subject after an edge feature of v\* raises ForceP.*

[VP ForceP<sub>uφ</sub> [VP SU [v' v [VP... V <ForceP>]]]

*ForceP raises to probe*

The facts of German Case and West Germanic versus Lubukusu CA can thus be accounted for by assuming uF is either valued in situ or raises to c-command a source of valuation. English [for...to] infinitives provide evidence that raising to be closest c-commandee also suffices for DELAYED VALUATION (see (13), and additional evidence from Arabic in §2.3).

(13) a. For him to be arrested would surprise me.

b. [CP For<sub>uAgree</sub> [TP 3S<sub>uCaseAgree</sub> to be [VP v [VP arrested <3S<sub>uCase</sub>>]]]]...

Summing up, valuation relations are not intrinsically directional at all. Bottom-to-top construction of syntactic objects often creates configurations in which uF has a match in its sister, giving rise to the appearance that Agree must probe downwards. Similarly the operation of edge features, which raise any uF from the complement of a head to its Spec (see (7)), makes downward probing or the Spec, head relation seem to have privileged status. But a careful

exploration of DELAYED VALUATION phenomena reveals that only locality between uF and its valuer determines whether valuation can apply.

#### 1.4 uF of X become uF of XP

The approach to goal features and upwards agreement phenomena that I advocate here leads inevitably to rejection of the view that unvalued features on X abort XP or make it impossible for XP to Merge with Y (Chomsky 2000; Adger 2003). Chomsky 2000:132 writes, “Properties of the probe [...] must be exhausted before new elements of the lexical sub-array are accessed to drive further operations.” But a DP bearing unvalued uCase is licit in syntactic relations with other expressions, including Merge with a selecting head (Merge (H, DP<sub>uCase</sub>)), and Agree with a higher probe that can value its uCase. As an unvalued uF, uCase meets the definition of a probe, rendering untenable the hypothesis in Chomsky’s quote. Bošković 2007, 2011, Epstein et al 1998, and Epstein & Seely 2006 argue convincingly that DPs probe for Case values when they raise to c-command T or v. Assuming with these authors that Case “assigners” have valued uCase features, (14) is cross-linguistically well-motivated:

(14) *Match and delayed valuation where DP’s uCase is the “probe”*

$$[_{TP} \text{DP}_{uCase} [_{T'} \text{T}_{uNom} \dots ]]$$

Similarly, under the traditional view of adjectives as heading AP adjuncts to NP or nP,<sup>7</sup> concord on adjectives also entails that XPs can probe (see (15)-(17)). Building on Carstens 2000, 2008,

---

<sup>7</sup> There is controversy on this issue. See Cinque 2005 and Shlonsky 2004 for an alternative view, and Carstens 2011b for a rejoinder, analyzing adnominal modifiers as XPs. Note also the absence of “deactivation” since agreement here does not involve Case features; see §3.6.4 and Carstens 2010, 2011a.

2010, 2011 I propose that concord is a subcase of agreement and that a unified theory is possible and desirable. Assuming this and the ability of XPs to probe, (17) accounts for adjectival concord (raising of N(P) derives surface word orders). As noted in §1.3, the same mechanics underlie valuation of Lubukusu’s agreeing C. See also §3.2 and Carstens & Diercks 2013a for an XP-probing analysis of Lubukusu agreeing ‘how.’


(15) a kitabu [AP kizuri sana] [Swahili]  
 7book 7good very  
 ‘a very good book’

b. mzigo [AP mzito mno]  
 3load 3heavy too  
 ‘too heavy a load’


(16) a. la muchacha [AP muy bonita] [Spanish]  
 the.fem girl.fem very pretty.fem  
 ‘the very pretty girl’

b. une voiture [AP plus vite] [French]  
 a.fem car.fem more fast.fem  
 ‘a faster car’

(17) a. *AP contains no source of valuation for A’s  $u\phi$*



b.  *$u\phi$  of A become features of AP and probe N*



Throughout this paper I accordingly assume that XP bears the features of X as is consistent with the fact that X determines XP’s label. Any unvalued features of X become properties of XP and can probe the c-command domain of XP.

## 1.5 Structure of the paper

This paper consists of five sections. In §2 I lay the groundwork for DELAYED VALUATION in an exploration of Case, focusing on Bobaljik & Wurmbrand’s treatment of German nominative in restructuring contexts and English [*for...to*] infinitives. §3 considers in detail the phenomenon of

complementizer agreement in Lubukusu, arguing for the DELAYED VALUATION analysis of why it takes its features from an expression in the matrix clause. The general conclusion is that agreement parallels uCase in its syntactic behavior, acquiring a value in its Merge location if a match is available in its sister, or raising into locality with a more distant source of valuation. §4 sketches extensions of the approach to agreement displacement phenomena from Bejar & Rezac 2009 and to uTense on V. §5 concludes.

## 2. Mechanisms of delayed Case valuation

### 2.1 Introduction

The workings of DELAYED VALUATION are readily observable in Case-relations of familiar languages. This section presents evidence from Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005 that an internal argument in German can be valued nominative *in situ* if it is close enough to T. If its distance from T is too great for this, however, the internal argument raises to Spec, TP. I argue that the latter strategy for nominative valuation is a subcase of XP “raising to probe” a source of valuation from a derived, c-commanding position (see Boskovic 2007, 2011, Epstein et al, and Epstein & Seely 2006). Then I argue from English [*for...to*] infinitives that raising to be closest c-commandee also feeds Case valuation.

### 2.2 German nominative in Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005

Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005 (Henceforth B&W) demonstrate that in German restructuring contexts, the Case of an internal argument is determined by the matrix verb. If the matrix verb is active, the internal argument is accusative (18). If the matrix verb is passive (19) the object of the restructuring verb is nominative although this verb bears no passive morphology itself.

- (18) a. weil er den /\*der Traktor versucht hat [ t<sub>OBJ</sub> zu reparieren]  
 since he the.ACC/\*the.NOM tractor tried has t<sub>OBJ</sub> to repair  
 ‘Since he tried to repair the tractor’ *active*

b. weil er jeden /\*jeder Brief vergessen hat [ t<sub>OBJ</sub> zu öffnen]  
 since he every.ACC/ \*every.NOM letter forgotten has t<sub>OBJ</sub> to open  
 ‘Since he forgot to open every letter’ *active*

(19) weil der Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde  
 since the.NOM tractor to repair tried was.SG  
 ‘Since they tried to repair the tractor’ *passive*

B&W argue that T does not always have a specifier in German. Their evidence comes from scope asymmetries indicating that nominative DPs in restructuring contexts are not uniform in location. In (9) (repeated below) the nominative must be interpreted as having wide scope over the verb ‘forget’. Thus the interpretation cannot be one where the implicit agent remembered to close some but not all windows; rather, (9) means that no windows were remembered to be closed. In contrast, in a simple passive like (8) (repeated below) and in (20) where the restructuring verb is a modal, a narrow scope reading is preferred for the nominative. B&W account for this difference with a proposal that the internal argument obligatorily raises to Spec, TP when it originates in the complement of a lexical restructuring verb like ‘forget’. In the remaining cases the internal argument can (and therefore perhaps must) remain in situ: there is no motivation for it to raise because it is close enough to T to acquire its nominative Case value from T without moving.

(9) weil alle Fenster zu schließen vergessen wurden  
 since all windows(NOM) to close forgotten were  $\forall \gg \text{forget}; * \text{forget} \gg \forall$   
 ‘Since they forgot to close all the windows’

(8) weil mindestens einem Kind jede Übung gelungen ist  
 since at.least one.DAT child every.NOM exercise managed AUX  $\exists \gg A/?A \gg \exists$   
 ‘Since at least one child managed to do every exercise’

(20) weil mindestens einem Kritiker jeder Film gefallen sollte  
 since at.least one.DAT critic every.NOM film please should  $\exists \gg A/?A \gg \exists$   
 ‘Since at least one critic should like every movie’


B&W argue for the generalizations in (21) and (22). I reproduce their analysis of (8) and

(20) in (23) and their analysis of (9) in (24).<sup>8</sup>


(21) A DP may not be interpreted (for scope and binding) in a position lower than the domain in which it undergoes Case/agreement-checking = its *agreement domain*.

(22) Case/agreement-checking may occur without DP-movement but only within a single agreement domain.

(23) Representation of (8) and (20): in situ valuation for DP<sub>NOM</sub>



(24) Representation of (9): Case driven movement and ex situ valuation of DP<sub>NOM</sub>



B&W thus provide a strong and persuasive argument that successful valuation of a DP's uCase as nominative does not require raising to c-command T in all cases, contra Bošković 2007, 2011, Epstein et al 1998, and Epstein & Seely 2006. But in situ valuation of uCase can happen only

---

<sup>8</sup> German datives cannot be agreed with or raised to Spec, TP even in passives (see among others McFadden 2006). I assume they do not count in the calculation of *closeness* for the relation (Agree (T, DP<sub>uCase</sub>)) in (23).

when T and the relevant DP are within the same *agreement domain*. It follows from the theory of cyclic Transfer that the full inventory of *agreement domains* must include the phases v\*P and CP. Phasal Transfer also has the potential to explain why a DP within VP2 cannot be valued nominative by the matrix T in (24). Given this, and in the interests of forging a general account under one rubric, I suggest that the VP complement to a lexical restructuring verb in German be viewed as a phase in the sense of a Spell Out unit.<sup>9</sup>

### 2.3 [*For...to*] infinitives and Arabic Case from C: raising to closest c-commandee

Consider next the slightly different hypothetical case in (25) where an edge feature of a head Y is available in a position closest c-commanded by X, a potential valuer for uF on an expression Z. B&W's account of in situ nominatives in simple restructuring clauses argues that valuation is really a matter of two uFs establishing a matching relation under locality. Given this, a natural question arises as to whether (25) is a legitimate valuation configuration as well.

$$(25) \quad [_{XP} X_{uF1} [_{YP} \underbrace{Z_{uF2}}_{\text{c-commanded by } X} [Y, Y [_{WP} \langle Z_{uF2} \rangle \dots]]]]$$

I suggest that (25) is precisely the situation under which a subject's uCase is valued in English [*for...to*] infinitives such as (26) and (27). It is well known that the presence of *for* on the left

---

<sup>9</sup> Bobaljik & Wurmbrand argue that VP2 does not include an edge feature in part to account for the absence of reconstructed readings for the raised DP (see discussion in B&W:30, their (41)). Hence it arguably has some but not all features of a strong phase. They also claim that VP1 cannot have an edge feature either, for movement theoretic reasons, though I see no reason in principle to rule out the option that the nominative may surface in a Spec of VP1 if German T happens to have no EPP feature in a given sentence, and VP1 does. Scope phenomena motivating their analysis would still seem to be captured.

edge of an infinitival clause correlates positively with the possibility of an accusative subject appearing in an infinitive. This led Chomsky 1981 to propose that *for* is a prepositional complementizer, assigning accusative to the subject of its complement.<sup>10</sup> (26) demonstrates with a pronominal theme argument of a passive verb. (27) illustrates the analysis for a transitive verb with an agent subject.

- (26) a. For him to be arrested would surprise me.  
 b. [TP 3S<sub>uCase</sub> to be [vP v [VP arrested <3S<sub>uCase</sub>>]]]...  
 c. [CP For<sub>uAcc</sub> [TP 3S<sub>uCase</sub> to be [vP v [VP arrested <3S<sub>uCase</sub>>]]]]...  
 d. [CP For<sub>uAee</sub> [TP 3S<sub>uCaseAee</sub> to be [vP v [VP arrested <3S<sub>uCase</sub>>]]]]...  
 (27) a. For Mary to invite John is typical.  
 b. [TP Mary<sub>uCase</sub> to [vP <Mary<sub>uCase</sub>> v [VP invite John]]]...  
 c. [CP For<sub>uAcc</sub> [TP Mary<sub>uCase</sub> to [vP <Mary<sub>uCase</sub>> v [VP invite John]]]]...  
 d. [CP For<sub>uAee</sub> [TP Mary<sub>uCaseAee</sub> to [vP <Mary<sub>uCase</sub>> v [VP invite John]]]]

(26) and (27) argue that raising to be closest c-commandee as in (25) is licit; hence the directionality-neutral approach to valuation is supported. We need only suppose that a lexical DP cannot occupy [Spec, *for*] to complete the account of this pattern of facts (perhaps because that DP is a non-operator).<sup>11</sup> With respect to the Activity Condition of Chomsky 2001, it seems in

---

<sup>10</sup> In more recent literature attention has turned away from the correlation of *for* with accusative, focusing on its incompatibility with subject extraction *\*Who do you want for \_\_ to visit?* See Pesetsky 1991, Bošković & Lasnik 2003, Kim 2008 for proposals that English null C is an affix; its overt counterparts show up when affixation is impossible. I leave aside the relationship of this question to the issue of *for* and Case.

<sup>11</sup> Alternatively *for* has no edge feature (hence the *\*[for t]* effect might reduce to the impossibility of [*<wh> for*]). It is unexpected, however, for *Who do you want for John to visit?* to be licit under this approach.



principle possible that *for* has  $\text{u}\phi$  agreeing abstractly with the infinitival subject, the same as English *v* agrees abstractly with the DP that it Case-licenses.

Melebari & Seely 2011 provide similar evidence from Standard Arabic that Case-valuation is possible under raising of a DP to be closest c-commandee of a head with a Case-“assigning” feature. They demonstrate that the Arabic complementizer *ʔanna* licenses accusative Case on a DP that follows it; hence the contrast between the nominative subject in (28)a and the accusative subject in (28)b. Melebari & Seely analyze this as re-valuation of the subject’s uCase (see Bejar & Massam 1999 on this phenomenon), so it does not disprove the narrow claim that *unvalued* features must (raise to) probe their valuers as in Bošković 2007, 2011, Epstein et al 1998, and Epstein & Seely 2006. It does however strongly suggest that valuation is not contingent upon the valuee’s c-commanding the valuer, weakening the motivation to reject (25).<sup>12</sup>

- (28) a. ʔal-ʔawlad-u qaraʔ-u d-dars-a *Main clause SU is NOM*  
the-boys-NOM read-3PL.MASC the-lesson-ACC  
‘The boys read the lesson.’
- b. ʔanna al-ʔawlad-a ʔakal-u T-Taʕaam-a yusʕidu-ni *ʔanna values SU as ACC*  
that the-boys-ACC ate-3PL.MASC the-food-ACC pleases 3PL.MASC-me  
‘That the boys ate the food pleases me.’

#### 2.4 Arguments against valuation in a *cyclic Spec*: Boskovic 2007

Bošković 2007 discusses two apparent counter-examples to the hypothesis of valuation in (25) which he calls raising to a *cyclic Spec*. He first argues that sentences involving the English verbs

---

<sup>12</sup> It is well known that when a lexical subject is post-verbal in Standard Arabic, agreement on V is invariantly singular. Melebari & Seely 2011 among others argue that a null singular expletive is probed by T and raises to Spec TP in VS. This refutes Zeijlstra’s (2012) claim that the pattern motivates universal “Reverse Agree”.

*conjecture* and *remark* do not license accusative, and that this causes the unacceptability of (29)a. He next concludes from the ill-formedness of (29)b that raising the object of *conjecture* or *remark* to Spec of a CP embedded under an accusative Case-licenser does not remedy the problem (see (29)c).

(29) a. \*John conjectured/remarked something.

b. \*I know what John remarked/conjectured.

c. \*I [<sub>VP</sub> Y [<sub>VP</sub> know [<sub>CP</sub> what [<sub>TP</sub> John remarked <what>]]]]

*Case-valuation fails*

Bošković also argues that the unacceptability of (30)a is due to the fact that ECM-type Case-licensing is unavailable with such verbs as *wager*. *Wh*-movement of the embedded subject yields an improved result (see (30)b), and Bošković proposes that this is because Case-valuation can only be obtained if a DP raises to c-command the Case-licenser. Hence *who* obtains Case through A'-movement to the higher Spec, vP en route to Spec, CP (see (30)c).

(30) a. \*John wagered Mary to be smart.

b. Who did John wager to be smart?

c. [<sub>VP</sub> <who<sub>uCase</sub>> v<sub>uNom</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> wager [<sub>CP</sub> <who> [<sub>TP</sub> \_\_\_ to be smart]]]]

*No Case-valuation from 1st move  
2nd move yields success: (Agree (who<sub>uCase</sub>, v))*

These are challenging problems, but I think insufficient basis to conclude that the relationship for ex situ valuation is narrowly directional rather than purely local. While a full treatment lies outside this paper's scope, I will sketch out alternative approaches.

First, a different interpretation of (29) might be that *remark* and *conjecture* simply do not c-select DP complements. No strategy for Case-valuation of a DP complement can overcome this problem, and (29) is therefore irrelevant to the issues at hand.

Second, Postal 1974, Pesetsky 1992, Ura 1993, and Bošković 1997 show that *wager*-class verbs have a set of curious properties beyond the simple contrast in (30)a,b. Unexpectedly, they pattern with ECM verbs in allowing passivization and pronominalization of the subject of their

infinitival complement (see (31)a,b). A full DP subject is mysteriously more felicitous if it bears some thematic relation to the higher *wager*-class verb (31)c. I add to these prior observations my judgment that an *in situ wh*-subject is better than a name (compare (31)d with (30)a).

- (31) a. ?Mary was wagered to be smart.  
b. ?We wagered him to be the winner.  
c. We wagered Mary's weight to be 120 pounds.  
d. Who wagered who to be smart?

The approach to (30)b sketched in (30)c has nothing to say about these quirks of licensing for subjects embedded under *wager*-class verbs. I leave a full account for future research, concluding merely that the additional facts seem to weaken Bošković's case against Case-valuation for a closest c-commandee. Their complexity suggests other factors are at play.

## 2.5 Summary

The facts I have examined in connection with Case converge on an important general conclusion: the distinction between unvalued probe and goal features is illusory. The two function identically; all that is necessary for valuation is establishing a local match between relevant features. When valuation is not available to a uF at the point of first Merge, DELAYED VALUATION can take place if uF moves to a location where it closest c-commands a potential valuer or is its closest c-commandee. On this basis I have proposed (6), which seems the strongest and hence the most interesting hypothesis for valuation:

- (6) **Directionality-Free Mechanics of Delayed Valuation**  
uF with no match in its c-command domain can be valued:  
(i) Ex situ, by raising into locality with a matching feature *OR*  
(ii) In situ, by the closest matching feature within the same phase.

Since at least George & Kornfilt 1981 agreement and Case have generally been viewed as tightly related phenomena -- two sides of a single coin. In the next section I will present evidence strongly confirming this view. I will show that agreement on a head can be valued by material in

that head's sister at Merge or, failing that, through one of the same DELAYED VALUATION mechanisms motivated by German and English Case.

### 3. Evidence from “upward” complementizer agreement.

#### 3.1 Introduction

Complementizer agreement (CA) exhibits a kind of cross-linguistic variation that has fueled recent controversy over the directionality of Agree. While West Germanic complementizers can agree only with the subject of the embedded clause they introduce (see (11)a, repeated below), complementizers in some African languages must agree with the subject of the immediately higher clause. I illustrate this in (32) with Lubukusu data from Diercks 2013.

(11) a. Kvinden [<sub>CP</sub> **dan** die boeken te diere zyn] [West Flemish; Haegeman 1992]  
 I-find that-PL the books too expensive are  
 ‘I find those books too expensive.’

(32) Khw-aulile [<sub>CP</sub> **khu-li**/\***ba-li** ba-limi ba-funa ka- ma-indi.] [Lubukusu]  
 1plSA-heard 1pl-that/2-that 2-farmers 2S-harvested 6-6-maize  
 ‘We heard that the farmers harvested the maize.’

Both kinds of CA are demonstrably independent of subject agreement on the verb. Haegeman & van Koppen 2012 argue that WG C has  $\varphi$  distinct from T's  $\varphi$ , and each is valued separately.

Among their evidence is the fact that Limburgian C can agree with the left member of a conjoined subject, while T must agree with the whole:<sup>13</sup>

(33) Ich dink [<sub>CP</sub> de-s [ toow en Marie] kump]. [Lumburgian]  
 I think that-2s you(s) and Marie come.pl  
 ‘I think that you and Marie will come’

Diercks 2013 provides two arguments that Lubukusu CA is independent agreement on C and not simply a copy of T's subject agreement. When subjects are extracted, T agrees only in number and gender (Diercks's “Alternative Agreement Effect,” = AAE below). In contrast, agreeing C

---

<sup>13</sup> Some conjoined DPs in Lubukusu allow mismatches between SA and CA, depending on noun class and (apparently also) person hierarchies. I leave these issues to future research.

exhibits full features of gender, number, and person (see (34)). Second, imperative verbs do not bear SA; but 2<sup>nd</sup> person CA is possible on agreeing C selected by an imperative verb as shown in (35)a,b (I assume with Diercks that imperatives contain a silent 2<sup>nd</sup> person subject with which C can agree).<sup>14</sup>

(34) Naanu **o**-manyile     **a**-li     (\***o**-li)     Alfred     a-l-ola?  
 who     AAE-knows     1-that (\*AAE-that) 1Alfred     1SA-FUT-arrive  
 ‘Who knows that Alfred will arrive?’

(35) a. Suubisye **o**-li     o-kh-eche     muchuli.  
 promise     2s-that     2sSA-FUT-come tomorrow  
 ‘Promise me that you (sg) will come tomorrow.’

b. Loma **mu**-li     orio     muno.  
 say     2pl-that     thank you very much (pl)  
 ‘Say thank you very much.’

### 3.2 Against a directionality parameter

Baker 2008 views this kind of variation in CA as at least partially explained by an upward/downward parameter (U/D) on Agree. But a fruitful approach to parameters attributes

---

<sup>14</sup> Ndayiragije (personal communication) suggests that Lubukusu agreeing C is not a C at all but a verb agreeing with a controlled *pro* subject. But a control analysis faces severe problems. §3.5 shows that a matrix IO/causee cannot value  $\varphi$  of Lubukusu C and explains this with the proposal that IOs/causees have Case-licensing in situ and hence are inactive for Agree. Unlike its probe-deactivating effect, Case-valuation does not typically disqualify an expression from serving as a licit controller, so the approach cannot be modified to suit a controlled *pro* account. We could stipulate that every Lubukusu matrix verb with a ForceP complement functions like *promise* so that IOs are irrelevant, but this lacks any principled basis. Lastly, it seems undesirable for the categorial realization of clauses to be CP in one language and VP in the next language (or the next construction within the same language) without strong independent motivation.

them to properties of lexical items (Borer 1984, Chomsky 1995). As Baker acknowledges, a U/D parameter is probably not implementable in these terms. U/D is also anomalous from a derivationalist standpoint (see discussion of (2) in §1.1).

In addition to these theoretical drawbacks, Carstens & Diercks 2013a show that upward probing is incompatible with the syntax of Lubukusu agreeing ‘how.’ In a transitive SVO clause, ‘how’ can only agree with the external argument (see (36)a). But in an A-movement type of locative inversion, a locative DP raises to Spec, TP and values subject agreement, while ‘how’ agrees with the thematic subject in its base position (see (36)b). Carstens & Diercks argue that this is compatible only with a downward probing approach to agreeing ‘how.’ Since only selected locatives can invert, Diercks 2011 proposes that inverting locatives originate as sisters to V. Adopting this independently motivated assumption permits Carstens & Diercks to give a unified analysis of ‘how’s agreement features. They argue that ‘how’ is a vP-adjunct, differing from English ‘how’ only in that it has  $u\phi$  valued under closest c-command by the highest argument in vP (see (36)b and (37)b, adapted from Carstens & Diercks 2013:(68) and (37) respectively. See Carstens & Diercks 221-224 for a proposal that the locative clitic on the verb in (37) is instrumental in the locative DP’s movement to Spec, TP across the logical subject).

- (36) a. **Ba**-ba-ana    ba-kha-kule    bi-tabu    **ba**-rie(na)/\*bi-rie(na)?  
 2-2-children    2SA-FUT-buy    8-books    2-how    /\*8-how  
 ‘How will the children buy books?’

b. [<sub>TP</sub> 2children T<sub>uPhi2</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> <2children> [<sub>v</sub> v [buy 8books]]] how<sub>uPhi2</sub>]]

- (37) a. **Mu**-mu-siiru    **mw**-a-kwa-**mo**    ku-mu-saala    ku-rie?  
 18-3-forest    18SA-PST-fall-18L    3-3-tree    3-how  
 ‘How did a tree fall in the forest?’ (Lit: In the forest fell a tree how?)

b. [<sub>TP</sub> 18forest T<sub>uPhi18</sub> ... [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> v [<sub>vP</sub> 3tree [<sub>v</sub> fall <18forest> ]]]] how<sub>uPhi3</sub>]]

The facts of agreeing ‘how’ show that Lubukusu  $u\phi$  probes its c-command domain at first Merge, as the derivationalist view of syntax predicts.<sup>15</sup> They are thus incompatible with analysis of Lubukusu as an upward-agreeing language.

### 3.3 The question of anaphoricity and point of view

Diercks 2013 proposes that Lubukusu CA is “indirect agreement,” mediated by an anaphoric null operator that raises from Spec, CP to T. The primary reason for this is a strict subject orientation that will be the topic of §3.6. But some patterns of usage and interpretation that he discusses are also suggestive of anaphora so I will review and comment on them briefly here.

Diercks reports that the speakers he interviewed preferred a non-agreeing C when the upstairs subject is inanimate. On this basis he proposes that the valuer of Lubukusu CA must have a point of view or a “mind to report,” a state of affairs that seems supportive of the anaphoric analysis (see also Diercks, Putnam & Van Koppen 2011/2012 where it is proposed that agreeing C is an anaphor with unvalued interpretable  $\phi$ -features).

But Diercks acknowledges an inconsistency in that Lubukusu CA can have expletive values, absent a thematic subject ((38)a,b= (73) and (74) in Diercks 2013). In such a case, only the embedded subject plausibly has a mind to report or a point of view. While raising it covertly might seem a way to address Diercks’s point of view requirement, the embedded subject’s  $\phi$ -features don’t match CA, and covert raising, if it happens in such contexts, does not license anaphora. This is clear from the inability of a subject under a raising verb to antecede a matrix reflexive in a case like (39).

---

<sup>15</sup> This is partly obscured by frequent pairing of  $u\phi$  and edge features; see Carstens 2005; Collins 2004.

(38) a. Ka-lolekana ka-li Tegani ka-a-kwa  
 6SA-seems 6-that 1SA-PST-fall  
 ‘It seems that Tegan fell’

b. Li-lolekana li-li Sammy a-likho a-lwala  
 5SA-seems 5-that 1SA-PROG 1SA-be.sick  
 ‘It seems that Sammy is sick’

(39) \*It seems to himself [that John is sick]

The speakers I consulted differed from those of Diercks’s study in accepting CA with inanimate subjects as in (40), and in lacking a preference that Diercks reported for a different C, *bali*, to report hearsay (see (41)). If the subject orientation of Lubukusu CA were related to the usage restrictions, we might expect it to be absent for speakers who lack the restrictions, but this is not the case; these speakers also have subject-oriented CA. Diercks (personal communication) informs me that the division of labor among Cs varies considerably across small geographic areas. In contrast, the subject orientation is consistent.

(40) a. E-barua y-ø-eke-sy-a e-li Nelson o-mu-sangafu  
 9-letter 9SA-PST-see-CAUS-FV 9-that 1Nelson 1-1-happy  
 ‘The letter showed that Nelson was happy’

b. E-barua y-a-suubi-sy-a e-li ba-keni ba-cha  
 9-letter 9SA-PST-believe-CAUS-FV 9-that 2-guests 2SA-leave  
 ‘The letter promised that the guests would leave’

c. E-barua y-a-sindu-sy-a ba-ba-na e-li ba-keni khe-beecha  
 9-letter 9SA-PST-surprise-CAUS-FV 2-children 9-that 2-guests 2SA-come-FV  
 ‘The letter made the children surprised that the guests were coming’

(41) *Diercks’s speakers’ division of labor for agreeing C and bali (not found in my sample)*

Mosesi a-ul-ile a-li/bali Sammy k-eba chi-rupia  
 1Moses 1SA -hear-PST 1-C/BALI 1Sammy 1SA-stole 10-money  
 ‘Moses heard that Sammy stole the money.’  
 [*a-li*: Moses and the speaker believe it.]  
 [*bali*: Moses doesn’t believe it or the speaker doubts it.]

I conclude that Lubukusu CA and its controller are not connected by anaphora or point of view.

For speakers who have the restrictions Diercks reported, they can easily be accounted for in terms of selection (see (42)).



(42) *Hypothesis for (overt) complementizer selection, Diercks's speakers:*

<i>Bali:</i>	Hearsay
Agreeing C:	Animate subjects
<i>Mbo:</i>	Elsewhere

### 3.4 Summary

I have shown that agreeing ‘how’ is inconsistent with analysis of Lubukusu as an upward-agreeing language. CA with expletive subjects as in (38) is incompatible with the claim that the controller of CA must have a mind to report. A few usage restrictions on Lubukusu CA can be attributed to selection, for the speakers who have them. The way is clear to pursue the strongest and most interesting hypothesis about CA phenomena, namely a unitary theoretical approach.

### 3.5 The DELAYED VALUATION approach

I propose that, like the difference between probe and goal features discussed in §1.1, the contrasting properties of CA in the two languages are due to whether valuation is available for the relevant uFs in their Merge locations. The analysis rests on interaction among independently motivated factors: (i) the Phase Impenetrability Condition of Chomsky 2000; (ii) an articulated left edge as in Rizzi 1997, 1999 allowing differences in the heights of the 2 agreeing Cs;<sup>16</sup> and (iii) one of the DELAYED VALUATION mechanisms sketched out in relation to goal features in §2. Rizzi’s approach to the left periphery is illustrated in (43) (INT = interrogative; FOC = focus). The version of the PIC that I adopt is shown in (44).

---

<sup>16</sup> Putnam & van Koppen (2010) also argue that Cs at different heights in the articulated left periphery have contrasting agreement properties. In their analysis however, the Force-level C of the English *alls* construction and the low C of West Germanic CA both agree with the embedded subject.

(43) *The articulated left periphery: Rizzi 1997, 1999*

...<sub>[ForceP FORCE [FocP FOC [IntP INT [FinP FIN [TP SU T...]]]]]]</sub>

(44) In a phase  $\alpha$  with head H, the domain of H is inaccessible to operations outside  $\alpha$ , only H and its edge are.<sup>17</sup>

Since WG C clearly has access to the contents of the embedded TP, I propose that it is the lowest C, Rizzi's Fin. When  $u\phi$  of Fin is merged, the subject is accessible (see (45)). Hence Fin's  $u\phi$  finds a match immediately, in its c-command domain:

(45) *West Germanic complementizer agreement:  $u\phi$  of Fin successfully probes the subject*

Fin <sub>$u\phi$</sub>  [TP SU T [<sub>vP</sub> <SU> v VP]]

In contrast, Lubukusu's agreeing C is closer to the matrix clause – I will assume it is Rizzi's Force. Suppose Fin is a phase head; then by the time Force Merges, Transfer has taken place and the subject is already gone (see (46)). Thus like a goal feature in (4) and (5),  $u\phi$  of agreeing C cannot be valued unless Merge of additional material expands the possibilities.

(46) *Lubukusu complementizer agreement: Force <sub>$u\phi$</sub>  cannot probe Transferred SU*

[<sub>ForceP</sub> Force <sub>$u\phi$</sub> ... [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin [TP SU ...]]]

Fine-tuning a bit, there is reason to think the phase head of the CP-domain is intermediate between ForceP and FinP. Carstens & Diercks 2013b argue from cases like (47)a,b that there is HYPER-RAISING out of Lubukusu tensed clauses. (47)a shows that HYPER-RAISING is compatible with reconstructed readings where the matrix subject is construed in the embedded clause. (47)b

<sup>17</sup> The version of the PIC in Chomsky 2001 (see below) can capture the delay in Lubukusu CA valuation if both ForceP and FinP are strong phases, so Force cannot reach across Fin into TP, and if the analysis of hyper-raising constructions in (47) is slightly modified. I leave this aside.

(i) Given phases ZP and HP, the domain of H is inaccessible to operations at ZP, only H and its edge are.

shows that HYPER-RAISING can feed matrix passive. These examples also illustrate that HYPER-RAISING can cross the non-agreeing C *mbo* but not the agreeing C.

- (47) a. E-fula e-lolekhana (mbo/\*e-li) e-kha-kw-e muchiri  
 9-rain 9SA-appear (that /\*9-that) 9SA-FUT-fall-FUT tomorrow  
 ‘It seems like it will rain tomorrow’ [Lit: rain seems (that) will fall tomorrow]  
*OK to say upon reading the forecast in the paper*
- b. O-mu-keni ka-suubil-wa mbo (\*a-li) k-ola  
 1-1-guest 1SA-believe-PASS that (\*1-that) 1SA-arrive  
 ‘The guest was believed to have arrived.’

Following Carstens & Diercks 2013b I identify *mbo* as Lubukusu’s low C Fin. The simplest approach to the permeability of *mbo* clauses is to assume with Carstens & Diercks that *mbo* is not a phase head.<sup>18</sup> Hence cyclic Transfer must be triggered by a null head located between *mbo* and agreeing C.<sup>19</sup> Rizzi 1999 posits a C intermediate between Fin and Force, where overt


---

<sup>18</sup> Bošković 2007 reviews evidence from Chuckchee and Blackfoot from Stepanovic & Takahashi 2001 and Legate 2005 suggesting that Agree can reach into an embedded clause. He concludes from it that only Move is subject to the PIC. To accommodate the fact that Lubukusu cross-clausal agreement fails, I suggest instead that the relevant C in Chuckchee and Blackfoot is the low non-phasal C Fin, so that long-distance Agree in these languages relies on the same embedded clause permeability as Lubukusu hyper-raising across *mbo*. See also Bhatt 2005, Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005 for analyses of some long-distance agreement in terms of restructuring, and Polinsky & Potsdam 2001 for arguments that long-distance agreement in Tsez is mediated by a null topic in Spec of the embedded CP.

<sup>19</sup>A reviewer asks about embedded topicalization. It can only target a position to the right of agreeing C, which cannot agree with the topic (see (i)). These factors suggest (ii) where TopP is

interrogative (Int) Cs appear in some languages. I will assume that there are positive and negative values for Int and that the CP it heads (IntP) is selected by Force (see (48)). A raising verb selects a bare FinP headed by *mbo*, out of which A-movement is possible (and see note 18 on long-distance agreement); other verbs usually select ForceP complements<sup>20</sup> containing phasal IntP. Thus *mbo* clauses are permeable, and  $u\phi$  of the agreeing C cannot be valued by an embedded subject – all the desired results are obtained.

(48) *An intermediate C (Int) triggers phasal Transfer, blocking CA with embedded SU*



The situation for  $u\phi$  of Force in (48) is parallel to that of D's uCase in (5). There are two general routes by which DELAYED VALUATION might in principle proceed here. Force might raise into locality with an expression bearing  $i\phi$  (with or without pied-piping surrounding material). Alternatively, Force might obtain valuation in situ when an expression is merged higher bearing matching  $i\phi$ . Teasing out the best among these options is the next task.

below both Force and phasal Int. Since *mbo* cannot surface, its location relative to TopP is unclear.

- (i) John a-loma a-/\*li-li /\*mbo litunda, Nolu ka-kula  
 John 1SA-say 1/\*5-that/ \*MBO 5fruit 1SA-bought  
 'John said that the fruit, Nolu bought'

(ii) [\_{ForceP} C\_{u\phi} [\_{IntP} Int [\_{TopP} fruit...]]]

<sup>20</sup> Both Fin and Force appear to have null variants that I will not consider here. See Diercks 2013 for discussion of C choices and their selecting verbs; and see my brief discussion in §3.3.

### 3.6 The subject orientation and its implications

#### 3.6.1 The empirical problem

The evidence that ForceP must be able to raise lies in the identity of the expression that ultimately values its  $u\phi$ . Diercks 2013 demonstrates that only the subject of the immediately higher clause can value  $u\phi$  of Lubukusu agreeing C. C cannot agree with a more remote subject (see (49)); nor with an indirect object (IO) or causee in a double object construction (henceforth DOC). See (50); (49) and (50)a from Diercks 2013; thanks to Lillian Waswa for (50)b). The subject orientation of CA is Diercks's primary reason for proposing an anaphoric approach.

(49) Alfredi ka-a-loma a-li ba-ba-andu ba-mwekesia \*a- /ba-li o-mu-keni k-ola  
1Alfred 1SA -PST-say 1-that 2-2-people 2SA-revealed \*1-/2-that 1-1-guest 1SA-arrived  
'Alfred said people revealed that the guest arrived.'

(50) a. Ewe w-abol-el-a Nelsoni \*a-/o-li ba-keni ba-rekukha.  
you 2sSA-say-APPL-FV 1Nelson 1/2s-that 2-guests 2SA-left  
'You told Nelson that the guests left.'

b. N-ok-esy-a Wekesa ndi /(\*ali) ba-keni ba-rekhukha.  
1sSA-see-CAUS-FV 1Wekesa 1s-that (\*1-that) 2-guests 2SA-left  
'I showed Wekesa that the guests had left.'


(49) shows that the relation valuing Lubukusu CA is local, as Diercks 2013 points out. Given this, (50) present a puzzle. Following Marantz 1993 and McGinnis 2001 I assume that IOs in Bantu languages Merge in Spec of a 'high' Appl(icative)P located between vP and VP. The schematic structure of (50)a is therefore (51). Following Baker & Safir 2012 I assume Lubukusu causees and applied objects have similar syntax; hence there is a Caus head counterpart to Appl, though for reasons of length I focus on applicatives here.<sup>21</sup> Evidence that IO asymmetrically c-

---

<sup>21</sup> See Baker & Safir 2012 on some differences related to first and second person objects that will not be relevant here, and for a proposal that the category responsible for raising DO over IO is head of LinkP.

commands DO is given in (52) (see Barss & Lasnik 1986; Marantz 1993).<sup>22</sup> The Merge positions of the subject and agreeing C are thus clearly non-local.

(51) Merge locations of EA, IO, and agreeing C



- (52) a. Na-a-rer-er-a                      buli mayi<sub>i</sub>    omwana    wewe<sub>i</sub>  
 1sSA-PAST-bring-APPL-FV    every 1mother 1child    1POSS1  
 ‘I brought each mother<sub>i</sub> her<sub>i</sub> child’ (OK with bound variable reading)
- b. \*Na-a-rer-er-a                      mayi        w-ewe<sub>i</sub> buli    omusoleli<sub>i</sub>  
 1sSA-PAST-bring-APPL-FV    1mother    1-POSS-1 every 1boy  
 \*‘I brought his<sub>i</sub> mother each boy<sub>i</sub>’ (OK only without bound reading)

Whether Force(P) is hypothesized to raise or to be valued by a feature of the subject interacting with it downwards, the IO (or causee) would seem to be in the way. Diercks’s proposed subject-oriented anaphoric null operator addresses this. But as previously noted (see (38)), CA can have expletive values, and only a subset of speakers have usage restrictions that support Diercks’s claim of an anaphoric relation. His approach also has to stipulate that  $u\phi$  of C cannot instead probe downwards like Lubukusu ‘how’ does (see §3.2). The DELAYED VALUATION approach

---

<sup>22</sup> Binding relations in Lubukusu double object constructions (DOCs) are more complex than this, as will be detailed §3.7. I assume that the more rigid word order and binding pattern when both objects are human reveal the underlying hierarchical relations, based in part upon prior works on DOCs cited in this section.

avoids both of these problems, reducing the directionality of Lubukusu CA to a general theory of agreement and Case. It remains only to flesh out the derivation and explain the basis for non-intervention by an IO or causee.

### 3.6.2 Datives and intervention

I propose that IOs in Lubukusu are Case-licensed in situ by Appl so they are not active to Agree with C; similarly, causees can be assumed to be Case-valued by the causative affix Caus (since the affixes incorporate and raise to the middle field with the verb, the directionality of these relations is an open question). A reasonable first hypothesis is that their dative Case value makes IOs/causees wholly irrelevant for valuation of CA. Once the subject is Merged in Spec, vP, it can Agree with  $\varphi$  of C across the intervening IO or causee because SU is not Case-valued until it raises to Spec, TP (see §3.6.4 for details).

There is some initial support for such an approach in the behavior of datives in German. As I noted in the introduction, Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005 argue that German T can value a VP-internal nominative if the domain is small enough (see (20) and (23), repeated below); and this valuation relation ignores an intervening dative argument.

(20) weil mindestens einem Kritiker jeder Film gefallen sollte  
 since at.least one.DAT critic every.NOM film please should  
 ‘Since at least one critic should like every movie’ E»A/?A»E



German datives differ from Lubukusu IOs and causees in significant respects, however. It is well-established that as an inherent Case, German dative retains its identity even when it is borne

by the object of a passive verb. And unlike an accusative, the German dative object in a passive cannot interact with T to value T's  $u\phi$  (see (53), adapted from McFadden 2006).

(53) a. *Under passivization, Accusative OB becomes Nominative and values  $u\phi$  of T*

Meine Brüder sind /\*ist geschoben worden  
 my brothers(NOM) be.PL/\*be.SING pushed become  
 'My brothers were pushed'

b. *Under passivization, Dative OB retains its Case value and cannot value  $u\phi$  of T*

Meine Brüdern \*sind/ist geholfen worden  
 my brothers(DAT) \*be.PL/be.SING pushed become  
 'My brothers were helped'

c. *Nominative cannot replace dative on a passivized IO, and SA is impossible*

\* [Die Wissenschaftler] sind /Den Wissenschaftlern ist  
 [the scientists](NOM) \*be.PL/[the scientists](DAT) be.SING

[ein großer Auftrag] gegeben worden  
 [a big assignment]NOM given become  
 'The scientists were given a big assignment'

In contrast, passivized Lubukusu IOs value SA. Compare the Lubukusu (54) with German (53)b,c. The contrast suggests that the Case of Lubukusu IOs is structural, and that they are therefore not systematically inert for Agree.

(54) Sammy ka-bol-el-wa a-li ba-keni b-ola.  
 1Sammy 1SA-say-APPL-PASS 1-that 2-guests 2SA-arrived  
 'Sammy was told that the guests arrived.'

The final and greatest reason for caution about positing that Lubukusu IOs do not count in the calculus of closeness is that even inherent datives, which cannot value SA themselves and do not block Case valuation in circumstances like (20)/(23), nonetheless function as *defective interveners* in  $\phi$ -relations. I demonstrate in (55) with an Icelandic example from Holmberg & Hróarsdóttir 2003.<sup>23</sup> As in German, T appears able to value nominative on a VP-internal DP

---

<sup>23</sup> See also Preminger 2011 for helpful discussion.



across an intervening dative. But SA of T with DP<sub>Nom</sub> is impossible in this configuration. If the dative raises out of the way, however, the Agree relation can proceed.

- (55) a. það finnst/\*finnast [ einhverjum stúdent]<sub>DAT</sub> [SC tölvurnar ljótar]  
 there find.SG/\*find.PL some student.SG.DAT the.computers.PL.NOM ugly  
 ‘Some student finds the computers ugly’
- b. [Einhverjum stúdent]<sub>i</sub> finnast t<sub>i</sub>[SC tölvurnar ljótar]  
 some student.SG.DAT find.PL the.computers.PL.NOM ugly  
 ‘Some student finds the computers ugly’

Thus a number of factors would lead one to expect IOs might block a valuation relationship between SU and in situ uφ of Lubukusu Force. In the next section I present evidence that DOCs are “symmetrical” in Lubukusu, and discuss a proposal of McGinnis 2001 that in such languages Appl is a phase head. Like the defective intervention possibility discussed above, this analysis suggests that if ForceP remained in situ its features could not interact with the subject and it would Transfer to Spell Out with uφ of Force unvalued. On the other hand, the approach also provides an independently motivated mechanism for raising ForceP into locality with the subject, overcoming the potential phase-theoretic and defective intervention problems at the same time.

### 3.6.3 A move-and-Agree account

Lubukusu has what are called “symmetrical” double object constructions: either DO or IO can generally be realized as an object pronoun, or move to Spec, TP in a passive (see also Baker & Safir 2012). McGinnis 2001 argues that in such languages, Appl is a phase head with an edge (= EPP) feature<sup>24</sup> permitting DO raising across IOs to feed passive and pronominalization. The


---

<sup>24</sup>Chomsky 2008 defines an A’ position as one created by an edge feature of a phase head, raising questions about the A/A’-status of pronominalization and passivization under this analysis. I discuss this in §3.7.

examples in (56) demonstrate this symmetry (thanks to Aggrey Wasike for (56)). I illustrate McGinnis’s approach in (57).

- (56) a. *Khu-rer-er-e*                      *o-mu-soleli*    *bi-tabu*  
           1plSA-bring-APPL-PAST    1-1-boy        8-book  
           ‘We brought the boy books’
- b. *Khu-mu-rer-er-e*                      *bi-tabu*  
           1plSA-1OM-bring-APPL-PAST    8book  
           ‘We brought him books’
- c. *Khu-vi-rer-er-e*                      *o-mu-soleli*  
           1plSA-8OM-bring-APPL-PAST    1-1-boy  
           ‘We brought them (to) the boy’
- d. *Omusoleli*    *a-rer-er-w-e*                      *bi-tabu*  
           1boy            1SA-bring-APPL-PASS-PAST    8-book  
           ‘The boy was brought books’
- e. *Bi-tabu*    *bi-rer-er-w-e*                      *o-mu-soleli*  
           8-book    8SA-bring-APPL-PASS-PAST    1-1-boy  
           ‘The books were brought (to) the boy’

(57) *Raising DO in a “symmetrical” language – Appl is a phase-head head with an edge feature (cf. McGinnis 2001).*




In contrast, only the IO can passivize or pronominalize in an “asymmetrical” DOC like (58).

McGinnis argues that when DOCs are asymmetrical, Appl is not a phase head. It hence has no edge feature, so the DO is trapped below the IO (leaving aside A’-movement).

- (58) a. \*A book was given the children  
       b. \*We gave it the children (out with DO reading for the pronoun)

c. In an “asymmetrical” language, *Appl* is not a phase head so *DO* cannot raise (cf. McGinnis 2001).



McGinnis’s successful analysis of the two varieties of applicatives extends nicely to the symmetrical DOCs of Lubukusu. Interestingly for our purposes, it is incompatible with an approach to Lubukusu CA in terms of in situ valuation of  $\text{Force}_{u\phi}$ . This is because by the time the subject is merged, the complement to the *Appl* phase head including *ForceP* will have been spelled out.<sup>25 26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> This phase-theoretic problem arises also for approach in Diercks 2013 where it is argued that a null anaphoric operator raises from Spec, CP to T. Unless the operator raises to T via Spec, *ApplP* it cannot escape the transferred VP. Unlike raising of *ForceP* argued for above, this movement does not fall out as a subcase of raising DO across IO. For Diercks, Putnam, and Van Koppen 2011/2012, the problem looks slightly different: it would seem that agreeing C must undergo long head-movement across *Appl* to v (also not a subcase of DO over IO movement).

<sup>26</sup> Abels 2012 proposes that feature-sharing between goals and phase heads (which can iterate) provides an alternative to movement for circumventing the PIC. The framework involves assumptions that my paper has not considered so I leave this possibility for future research.

(59) *If Lubukusu Appl is a phase head, an in situ approach to valuing CA must fail*




On the other hand, McGinnis’s proposal that an edge feature of phasal Appl can raise the DO yields a straightforward movement analysis for valuing  $\text{Force}_{u\phi}$ . Since ForceP is the direct object, the possibility of raising it is automatically available under McGinnis’s approach.



As noted above, I propose that the IO or causee receives dative from Appl and hence is “inactive” for Agree relations with other probes. Hence it cannot value  $u\phi$  of Force:

(61) *ForceP raises to outer Spec, Appl but Agree does not occur*



As the derivation continues, Merge introduces  $v$  and the thematic SU in Spec,  $vP$ . Subjects seem never to become comparably “inactive” in Lubukusu, interacting with multiple probes and valuing agreement many times. §3.6.4 addresses the question of why this is so. For present purposes, let us take it as a given. In line with the imperfection-driven approach to movement in (7), if  $v^*$  has an edge feature then it will raise ForceP to outer Spec,  $vP$  where  $u\phi$  of ForceP is successfully valued by downward probing.

(62) *An edge feature of  $v^*$  can raise ForceP again, feeding downwards Agree (ForceP<sub>uφ</sub>, SU)*



The fact that ForceP *can* raise to Spec,  $v^*$  does not entail that it always must do so, however; recall the two possibilities for valuation of German nominative objects discussed in §2.2. If the edge feature of  $v^*$  is optional like the EPP feature of German T, valuation of ForceP’s  $u\phi$  might happen in Spec, AppIP of (62) without further raising. Similarly, in situ valuation of ForceP’s  $u\phi$

might be possible upon Merge of the subject where Appl is absent, if  $v^*$ 's edge feature is optional (see (63)).<sup>27</sup>

(63)  $[_{VP} \text{SU } [_{v'} v [_{VP} V [\text{ForceP}_{u\phi}]]]]$

*Downwards valuation for  $u\phi$  of Force in situ?*

CPs have a well-documented propensity to extrapose, gravitating to the peripheries of clauses.

Assuming that this might happen late, it potentially eliminates word order evidence on the derivational history (see Stowell 1981 and references therein on contrasts like (64)a-c).

Lubukusu ForceP complements are uniformly right-peripheral like their English counterparts (see (65)), suggesting that they extrapose.<sup>28</sup> I accordingly leave open the question of whether an edge feature of  $v^*$  always raises ForceP.

---

<sup>27</sup> Example (54) demonstrated that C agrees with the derived IO SU in a passive containing a double object verb with a ForceP complement. This result follows from assuming that Appl itself can be passivized (see (i)). It does not then dative-mark the IO, which is therefore “active.” ForceP can stop in outer Spec, ApplP and probe IO before the IO raises to Spec, TP. This solution is simple and consistent with the approach to movement in (7).

(i)  $[_{TP} \text{IO } [_{VP} v [_{PassP} \text{Pass } [_{AppIP} \text{ForceP}_{u\phi} [_{AppIP} \langle \text{IO} \rangle [_{AppI'} \text{Appl } [_{VP} \dots] ]]]]]]]$

<sup>28</sup> Depending on its landing site, extraposition might be hypothesized to suffice to make ForceP sufficiently local to the subject for agreement to take place. But see Takano 2003 for evidence that “right-adjointing” a heavy NP object does not change c-command relations (in his view, because it really consists of moving it leftwards and then raising a remnant across it). Given uncertainties about its derivation and consequences I do not rely on extraposition of ForceP for the crucial results here.

(64) a. John said [<sub>DP</sub> his name] loudly.

b. \*John said [<sub>CP</sub> that he was leaving] loudly.

c. John said loudly [<sub>CP</sub> that he was leaving].

(65) *A Lubukusu CP complement cannot precede an indirect object or an adverb:*

a. \*Ewe w-abol-el-a [<sub>CP</sub> o-li ba-keniba-rekukha] [<sub>IO</sub> Nelsoni]  
you 2sSA-say-APPL-FV 2sSA-that 2-guests 2SA-left 1Nelson  
Intended: 'You told Nelson that the guests left.'

b. \*Juma a-∅-lom-a [<sub>CP</sub> a-li/ mbo ba-keni ba-ba b-oola] lukali  
1Juma 1SA-PST-say-FV 1-that/that 2-guests 2SA-PERF 2SA-arrive loudly

c. Juma a-∅-lom-a lukali [<sub>CP</sub> a-li/ mbo ba-keni ba-ba b-oola]  
1Juma 1SA-PST-say-FV loudly 1-that/that 2-guests 2SA-PERF 2SA-arrive  
'Juma said loudly that the guests had left'

Summing up, in a DOC the base position of a ForceP complement to V is too distant from the subject for valuation to be possible since a phase head ApplP intervenes. Since Appl has a phasal edge feature that routinely raises DOs to the height of IOs, a move-and-Agree account is readily available.  $U\phi$  of ForceP might be licensed as closest c-commander of the subject, or a phasal edge feature of  $v^*$  might raise ForceP to outer Spec, vP where it c-commands the subject before subject raising and CP extraposition. What is important for our purposes is that DELAYED VALUATION makes both possibilities available, and provides the necessary ingredients for a unified account of Lubukusu and WG CA, and of CA and Case.

### 3.6.4 Multiple probe-goal relations with subjects

In this subsection I consider the phenomenon of multiple agreement and argue that subjects in Lubukusu differ from other arguments in being able to engage in relations with multiple probes.

For this reason once ForceP raises across the IO its  $u\phi$  can be valued by the subject.

In Minimalist theory, "activity" in A-relations is generally related to Case (Chomsky 2000; 2001). The role of Case in Bantu languages is a topic of some controversy due to widespread Case-theoretic anomalies including full-featured multiple agreement phenomena and

a variety of inversion constructions (see among others Baker 2003, Carstens 2001, 2005, 2010, 2011a; Carstens & Diercks 2013b; Diercks 2012; Halpert 2012; Harford-Perez 1986; Henderson 2007; Ndayiragije 1999; Zeller 2012). But Carstens & Mletshe, to appear, argue that the anomalies coexist with abstract Case in Xhosa and are therefore red herrings of a sort. I adopt this conclusion without elaboration for reasons of length. In what follows I describe multiple SA and suggest that it always tracks the nominative argument because nominative is valued *ex situ*, in Spec, TP. In contrast, I have argued that IOs and causees have a 1:1 relationship with their local licenser, Appl/Caus.<sup>29</sup>

Lubukusu has multiple SA in full  $\phi$ -features in compound tense constructions and ‘how’ questions (see (66)a,b), motivating the generalization in (67).

(66) a. **a**-kha-be ne-**a**-khola siina?  
 1SA-FUT-be ne-1SA -do 7what  
 ‘What will s/he be doing?’

b. Ba-ba-ana **ba**-kha-kule bi-tabu **ba**-rie(ena)?  
 2-2-children 2SA-FUT-buy 8-book 2-how  
 ‘How will the children buy books?’

(67) Full  $\phi$ -feature agreement with a subject does not “deactivate” it in Lubukusu; subjects can have relations with multiple  $u\phi$  probes.

In theory-neutral terms, the fact that  $u\phi$  of Lubukusu ForceP agrees only with a subject may be viewed as just one among many indicators that structural subjects in Bantu languages have an

---

<sup>29</sup> Halpert 2012 argues from the distribution of polarity items that in Zulu applied constructions, Appl Case-licenses the argument to its right, usually the DO, while a higher licenser Case-values IO. See Carstens & Mletshe 2013 for arguments against this. I assume that Lubukusu Appl values Case on its own argument (since APPL+V always raises across the IO, the directionality of this relationship is an open question).

unusual capacity to license agreement multiple times. This phenomenon, dubbed “hyper-agreement” in Carstens 2011a, is impossible in English (see (68)).

- (68) a. \*John has is sleepings.  
 b. \*He seems \_\_ has left.


Chomsky (2000, 2001) addresses (68)b, attributing it in part to a strict agreement/Case connection. He argues that Agree with a “ $\phi$ -complete” probe (in (68)b/(69)a,b, the lower T) values a DP’s uCase (see (69)b). This prohibits the embedded subject from Agreeing with the matrix T (see (69)c). Chomsky (2001:6) writes, “Once the Case value is determined, N no longer enters into agreement relations and is ‘frozen in place.’”

(69) *In (68)b, agreement/movement of 3S is blocked after Case-valuation in the lower clause*

- a.  $[_{TP1} T1_{u\phi} 3S_{uCase} \text{ have left}] \rightarrow$   
 b.  $[_{TP1} T1_{u\phi} 3S_{uNom} \text{ have left}]$   
 c. \*  $[_{TP2} T2_{u\phi} \text{ seems...} [_{TP1} 3S_{uNom} T1 \dots]]$   
 (Note: A bracket under the  $3S_{uNom}$  in (c) is crossed out with an X, indicating that agreement is blocked.)

I pointed out in Carstens 2001 that subjects in Bantu languages typically do not exhibit the “frozen in place” property, analyzing cases like (66)a as in (70), consistent with (67).

(70) *Asp agrees with and raises SU; then T agrees with and raises SU*



I argued in Carstens 2010, 2011a that the grammatical gender component of noun class (uGen) functions as an “activity” feature: uGen is uninterpretable so, like uCase, it makes a nominal expression “active.” But unlike uCase, uGen comes from the lexicon with a value that is not affected by its participation in Agree relations. I proposed that “deactivation” accompanies Case valuation in a language like English because successive Agree relations can tamper with a Case value, leading to unclarity as to how uCase should be pronounced (see also Nevins 2005,



Epstein, Kitahara & Seely 2010 on this conception of uF-induced crashes).<sup>30</sup> No such issue arises for uGen since it is never valued via Agree. It therefore does not “deactivate” and can serve as goal iteratively, in successive Agree relations until and unless the expression that bears it obtains a Case value. The reusability of uGen as an active goal feature is clearly demonstrated in the widespread phenomenon of DP-internal concord in languages with grammatical gender. Lastly, N-to-D adjunction makes uGen accessible to clause level probes in Bantu, so all agreement includes gender and can in principle iterate like concord.

Summarizing, I have argued that Bantu DPs can interact with multiple probes until and unless they obtain Case values. To account for why subjects but not IOs and causees can value  $u\phi$  of Force we need only assume that valuation of a subject’s uCase happens when it raises to Spec, TP as argued for English by Boskovic 2007, 2011 and Epstein et al 1998, Epstein & Seely 2006. I assume Lubukusu T always has an edge (EPP) feature that can and therefore must raise the subject, as the closest expression to it bearing a uF (see (7) on why there is movement). The evidence of multiple SA argues that aspectuals also have probe and edge features that interact with the subject before its Case-value is fixed. In contrast, Appl confers immediate Case-licensing on its IO argument in situ rendering it inactive for further Agree relations.

---

<sup>30</sup>I refer the reader to Carstens 2011a for fuller details on how multiple agreement is ruled out in English. Also relevant here is evidence in Epstein, Kitahara & Seely 2010, Bejar & Massam 1999, and Melebari & Seely 2011 that Case values can be altered in the course of the derivation, but this seems subject to variation across languages and Cases. I will not explore the issue here, though I note a potential relevance to the analysis of hyper-raising (see discussion of (47) in §3.5), which I leave for future research.

### 3.6.5 A note on CNPCs and Raising to Object

The restriction to subjects for valuation of Lubukusu CA also shows up in complex noun phrases (CNPs) and instances of raising to object (RtO). Neither the head of a CNP nor an RtO expression can value  $u\phi$  of C. I illustrate in (71) and (72) and discuss each case in turn.

(71) n-a-ulila      [<sub>DP</sub> li-khuwa [<sub>CP</sub> **nd**-/\*li-li    Sammy ka-a-kula    li-tunda ]]  
 1sSA-PST-hear    5-word            1s/ \*5-that    1Sammy 1sSA-PST-buy 5-fruit  
 ‘I heard the rumor that Sammy bought the fruit. §

(72) N-enya      Baraka Obama [<sub>CP</sub> **nd**-i      a-khil-e]  
 1sSA-want                                    1S-that    1SA-win-SUBJ  
 ‘I want Barak Obama to win’

In a model that assumes valuation can only happen when the probe c-commands the goal, the CNP pattern is not too surprising. Agreeing C, lacking access to the transferred embedded subject, would have to rely on an edge feature raising it to closest c-command the matrix subject along the lines that I have proposed already. But under my proposal that Agree is not intrinsically directional, failure of valuation by the head noun raises some questions (see (73)).

(73) *In a directionality-free system, why could N of a CNPC not value in situ  $u\phi$  of Force?*

[<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> V [<sub>DP</sub> D... [<sub>NP</sub> N [<sub>ForceP</sub> Force <sub>$u\phi$</sub>  . . . ]]]]]] *a potential match under locality*

I suggest that the CNP case reduces to the same factors that underlie the general pattern of multiple agreement, namely, it tracks the nominative argument because nominative is not valued until the subject reaches Spec, TP. A tentative mechanics follows.

Assume that when no match is present in the c-command domain of  $uF$  at first Merge, DELAYED VALUATION is not attempted until the next phase head is introduced. In the case at hand, this is  $v^*$ . Merge of  $v^*$  triggers valuation of the object DP’s  $uCase$  as accusative, and Merge of the matrix subject. Assuming a DP’s  $uCase$  originates with D, and that Bantu N and D morphologically amalgamate (see Carstens 2011a,b), I propose that Case-valuation of DP is shared with D and renders  $\phi$ -features of both D and N inactive. Returning to the question of CA,

the not-yet-Case-valued subject is hence the choice to value  $u\phi$  of Force even in this syntactic environment (see (74)).<sup>31</sup>

(74) *Nothing can happen until phasal  $v^*$  is merged; then Case-valuation of the containing DP is shared with its head, making it inactive. Hence CA must be valued by SU.*

- a.  $[_{VP} V_{ACC} [_{VP} V [_{DP} N+D_{uCase} [_{NP} N [_{ForceP} Force_{u\phi} ]]]]]]$
- b.  $[_{VP} SU_{uCase} \underbrace{V_{ACC} [_{VP} V [_{DP} N+D_{uCase} [_{NP} N [_{ForceP} Force_{u\phi} ]]]]}_{\text{inactive}} ]]$
- c.  $[_{VP} SU_{uCase} v \underbrace{[_{VP} V [_{DP} [D' N+D_{uCase} [_{NP} N [_{ForceP} Force_{u\phi} ]]]]}_{\text{inactive}} ]]$

As for RtO, significantly this is the only licit case of “NP-movement” across agreeing C: subject-to-subject raising across agreeing C is impossible (see (75) from Diercks 2013).

- (75) a. Michael a-lolekhana mbo (\*a-li) a-si-kona  
 Michael 1SA-appear that (\*1-that) 1SA-still-sleep  
 ‘Michael appears to be still sleeping’
- b. O-mu-keni ka-suubil-wa mbo (\*a-li) k-ola  
 1-1-guest 1SA-believe-PASS that (\*1-that) 1SA-arrive  
 ‘The guest was believed to have arrived.’

Bruening 2001 argues persuasively that such a restriction diagnoses an A’-variety of RtO, moving an expression from within the source clause to the CP phase edge. If RtO across agreeing C is A’-movement, the contrast between (72) and (75) has a simple account.


I proposed in §3.5 that the left-peripheral phase head is Int, a C intermediate between Force and Finite. Under Bruening’s approach, the Lubukusu RtO expression in (72) lands in outer Spec, IntP (see (76)a). Under the standard assumption that outer Spec, vP can serve as an A’-position, we predict the possibility of RtO from Spec, Int to matrix Spec, vP. But an expression undergoing RtO across agreeing C is correctly predicted to be unable to participate in A-relations, and this includes “improper movement” into Spec, TP and valuing  $u\phi$  of Force (see

---


<sup>31</sup> If D were a phase head in Lubukusu, a different approach would be required. I leave this aside.

Svenonius 2000 on the opacity of operators to A-probing).<sup>32</sup> In contrast, raising across the non-agreeing, non-phasal C *mbo* is true A-movement and hence can land in either Spec, vP or Spec, TP. (76)a illustrates (72), and (76)b shows why agreeing C is illicit in (75).


(76) a. *RtO across agreeing C is A'-movement to phasal Spec, IntP, thence to Spec, vP:*



b. *RtO across agreeing C to matrix Spec, TP is illicit "improper movement":*



c. *RtO across mbo is A-movement since it does not cross a phasal boundary:*



The precise configuration under which  $\mu\phi$  of ForceP agrees with the subject in an RtO construction depends upon whether  $v^*$  has and uses one or two phasal edge features. As I noted in §3.6.3, the common phenomenon of CP-extrapolation clouds aspects of the derivation (and see note 31). I illustrate the logical possibilities in (77), both of which are consistent with my system of DELAYED VALUATION. I leave the choice among them open.

---

<sup>32</sup> If the RtO expression remained in [Spec, Int] the result would resemble embedded topicalization, with the order [Agreeing C-Object-SU...]. This order is possible; see note 19. I assume that whether Spec, vP “counts” as A- or A’- depends on whether its occupant is an operator, that is, moving to or from an A’ position.

(77) *Regardless of whether remnant ForceP raises to a second outer Spec, vP it will ignore the A' RTO expression and agree with the "active" DP subject (SU).*

a. *Downwards Agree if v has two phasal edge features*

$[_{VP} [_{ForceP} Force_{u\phi} ] ] [_{VP} \text{Barak Obama } [_{VP} \text{SU } v [_{VP} \text{want } <[_{ForceP} Force_{u\phi}]>]]]] \text{ OR}$

b. *"Reverse Agree" if v has only one phasal edge feature*

$[_{VP} \text{Barak Obama } [_{VP} \text{SU } v [_{VP} \text{want } <[_{ForceP} Force_{u\phi}]>]]]]$

### 3.7 On binding and the edge feature of Appl

§3 has developed an analysis of how  $u\phi$  of Force is valued, based upon the approach to 'high' symmetrical applicatives in McGinnis 2001. Following McGinnis, I have argued that ApplP has an edge feature that raises the DO across the IO in a language with symmetrical DOCs.

McGinnis argues that this edge feature indicates that Appl is a phase head.

Chomsky 2008 proposes that an A' position is one created by the edge feature of a phase head. As I noted in footnote 24, questions accordingly arise about the nature of DO raising across the IO, mediated by Appl. Should the status of Appl as a phase head be reassessed? Or is Chomsky's biconditional linkage between phasal edge features and A' positions too rigid?

There are several kinds of evidence that DO-raising across the IO is A-movement. We saw in §3.6.3 that DO and IO are symmetrical for pronominalization and passive. This is in itself extremely strong evidence. My investigation also uncovered some novel evidence from binding for this conclusion.

(78)a and (79)a illustrate the symmetrical ordering possibilities in DOCs. When the IO precedes the DO as in (78)a, a universal quantifier in the former can bind a pronoun in the latter as expected (see (78)b, and compare to the unacceptable (79)c). But just in case the DO precedes the IO as in (79)a, a universal quantifier in the DO can bind a pronoun in the IO (compare the licit (79)b with the illicit (78)c). McGinnis 2010 argues that binding relationships are irreversibly

established as each phase is completed. Under this assumption, and given that the ApplP phase is not complete until the DO raises to outer Spec, Appl, the change in binders is correctly predicted to be licit.

- (78) a. *Khu-rer-er-e*                      *o-mu-soleli bi-tabu*  
 1plSA-bring-APPL-PAST 1-1-boy 8book  
 ‘We brought the boy books’
- b. *Khu-rere-re*                      *buli mu-soleli si-tabu si-e-we*  
 1plSA -bring-APPL-PAST every 1-boy 7-book 7-POSS-1  
 ‘We brought every boy his (own) book’
- c. \**Khu-rere-re*                      *o-mwen-ene-syo buli si-tabu*  
 1plSA -bring-APPL-PAST 1-1-owner-7 every 7-book  
 \*‘We brought its owner every book’

- (79) a. *Khu-rer-er-e*                      *bi-tabu o-mu-soleli.*  
 1plSA -bring-APPL-PAST 8-book 1-1-boy  
 ‘We brought the boy books’ [Lit: We brought books the boy]
- b. *Khu-rere-re*                      *buli si-tabu o-mw-ene-syo*  
 1plSA -bring-APPL-PAST every 7book 1-1-owner-7  
 ‘We brought every book (to) its owner’
- c. \**Khu-rere-re*                      *si-tabu si-e-we buli mu-soleli*  
 1plSA -bring-APPL-PAST 7book 7-POSS-1 every 1-boy  
 ‘We brought every book (to) its owner’

- (80) a. ...<sub>[<sub>VP</sub> SU v+Appl+bring [<sub>AppIP</sub> every boy [<sub>Appl</sub> <Appl> [<sub>VP</sub> V his book]]]]]                      = (78)b  
 b. ...<sub>[<sub>VP</sub> SU v+Appl+bring [<sub>AppIP</sub> every book [<sub>AppIP</sub> its owner [<sub>Appl</sub> <Appl> [<sub>VP</sub> ...]]]]]                      = (79)b</sub></sub>

If raising of the DO across the IO were A’-movement, we would expect (79)b to be unacceptable like the bound reading in the English *\*Every paycheck, I gave its owner*.

Summing up, raising of the DO over the IO patterns as A-movement with respect to binding.<sup>33</sup> It also feeds passivization and pronominalization, both of which are typically part of A rather than A’ relations. Hence one of three things must be true:

---

<sup>33</sup> Klaus Abels (personal communication) points out that to complete the binding evidence for A-movement we need to know if a raised DO can bind an IO anaphor. Absent overt Case-marking in Lubukusu this cannot be differentiated from IO binding DO in situ. I leave it aside.

(81) *Hypotheses consistent with A-movement of DO over IO in high Appl constructions*

- a. Appl has an extra edge feature but it is not a phase head.
- b. A position created by the edge feature of a phase head is not always an A'-position, contra Chomsky 2008.
- c. 'High' applicative constructions are always surrounded by an invisible layer of structure including a Spec position into which the DO A-moves across the IO; hence A-movement is not to an outer Spec, Appl contra McGinnis 2001.

Among these options (81)b seems the most promising. Arguing against (81)a is the fact that multiple edge features are consistent properties of v and C, and not available in every kind of XP. The problem with (81)c is that the IO in Spec, ApplP should intervene to block single step A-movement of the DO from VP to any Spec external to ApplP, so the desired results are unobtainable. An OVS construction referred to as Subject-Object-Reversal (SOR) in the Bantu linguistics literature is also relevant to the question of edge features and A'-positions (see the Kilega (82)a from Kinyalolo 1991). It has been argued in Ndayiragije 1999, Kinyalolo 1991 that the inverted object in Kirundi and Kilega SOR constructions lands in the canonical subject position. To account for the fact that the thematic subject in Spec, vP does not block raising of the DO in the Kilega (82)a, Carstens (2005, 2011a) proposes that the DO first moves to an outer Spec, vP (see (82)b). If outer Spec, vP were always and only an A' position, A-movement through it to Spec, TP would be impossible.

- (82) a. Maku ta-ma-ku-sol-ag-a mutu weneene.  
 6beer NEG-6SA-PROG-drink-HAB-FV 1person 1alone  
 'No one usually drinks beer alone'  
 [Lit: Beer doesn't usually drink a person alone]

b. *SOR: Agree (T, OB) is possible after OB raises to outer Spec, vP*

$$\boxed{T \left[ {}_{VP} OB \left[ {}_{VP} SU \left[ {}_{v'} v \left[ {}_{VP} V \langle OB \rangle \right] \right] \right] \right]} \rightarrow \left[ {}_{TP} OB T \left[ {}_{VP} \langle OB \rangle \left[ {}_{VP} SU \left[ {}_{v'} v \left[ {}_{VP} V \langle OB \rangle \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]$$

I conclude that (81)b is correct.<sup>34</sup> The A/A' distinction must be otherwise derived, perhaps by defining an A' position as one to which an expression with an operator feature moves (see Carstens & Diercks 2013a for discussion of Lubukusu inversion constructions).

### 3.8 Interim conclusions

This section has proposed that CA in WG languages and in Lubukusu differ because Lubukusu agreeing C is merged higher than its counterparts in WG languages. For this reason, WG Cs can agree with an embedded subject, but Lubukusu C cannot. The result is that Lubukusu C has only the higher clause in which to find valuation. It patterns as a subcase of multiple subject agreement, as is common in Lubukusu and many other Bantu languages. I follow Carstens 2010, 2011a,b in attributing multiple SA to the operation of N-to-D, making the uGen feature of Bantu nouns accessible to clause-level probes. Because of uGen, until a DP has acquired a Case-value, it can participate in agreement many times.

An applied construction can potentially disrupt the relation (Agree (SU, C)) because inactive dative IOs intervene structurally between agreeing C and the higher subject. But since Lubukusu Appl is a phase head, its edge feature can raise ForceP into locality with the not-yet-Case-valued subject, overriding this difficulty.

I have left open the question of whether ForceP always raises to Spec, vP to c-command the subject because the common phenomenon of CP-extraposition eliminates word order evidence.

---

<sup>34</sup> In §3.5 I argued that Fin is non-phasal to account for raising from tensed clauses headed by *mbo*. Adoption of (81)b makes an alternative interpretation possible: we might instead suppose that *mbo* = Fin IS a phase head, but one whose Spec is not an A' position. I leave the decision among these options to future research.



An edge feature of phasal  $v^*$  is in principle available, making the movement derivation a possibility. On the other hand, if  $v^*$  sometimes lacks the edge feature then  $u\phi$  of Force might be valued in situ, like the Case of German nominative objects in simple clauses (see §2.2). So long as ForceP is not stranded in a Spell Out domain without a source of valuation, the derivation should be licit. In principle, either outcome suffices to permit DELAYED VALUATION of Lubukusu C.

#### **4. DELAYED VALUATION extensions**

##### **4.1 Agreement displacement and delayed valuation: Bejar & Rezac 2009**

Something very like the concept of DELAYED VALUATION was developed independently in the work of Bejar & Rezac 2009 based on the phenomenon of “agreement displacement” (see also Bejar 2003; Rezac 2003). Bejar & Rezac explore languages in which they argue that person feature hierarchies play a crucial role in determining whether agreement is valued by the internal or the external argument. If the internal argument is first or second person, the verb agrees with it (see (83)a-c; following their conventions the relevant agreement morpheme is underlined, as is its controller in the translation). But third person is low on the hierarchy (in fact underspecified) and therefore if the object of the verb is third person and the subject is first or second person, the verb’s  $u\phi$  agrees with the subject (83)d. For Bejar & Rezac, this indicates a second cycle of probing under *cyclic expansion* (see (84)). Simplifying somewhat the technical details, this is possible because the unvalued features of  $v$  are inherited by projections of  $v$ , and can initiate a continuation of the search.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> See Nevins 2011 for an approach in terms of simultaneous Multiple Agree. Absent clear constraints or a principled account of where Multiple Agree is possible, I prefer to avoid it (see

- (83) a. ikusi z-in-t-u-da-n      c. ikusi n-ind-u-zu-n      [Basque]  
seen 2-X-PL-have-1-PST      seen 1-X-have-2- PST  
'I saw you.'      'You saw me.'
- b. ikusi n-ind-u-en      d. ikusi n-u-en  
seen 1-X-have- PST      seen 1-have- PST  
'He saw me.'      'I saw him.'
- (84) a. [<sub>vP</sub> EA [<sub>v-Agr</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> V IA]]]      *Agree cycle 1*  
b. [<sub>vP</sub> EA [<sub>v-Agr</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> V IA]]]      *Agree cycle 2*

Bejar & Rezac's analysis provides important and compelling evidence that the absence of a match in the c-command domain of a uF is not fatal to the derivation. Given cross-linguistic evidence that an expression must have a uF to be "active" in Agree relations, the DPs that can value the u $\phi$  probe qualify as probes themselves as I have argued previously in this paper. Basque and other agreement displacement languages thus can be taken as supporting evidence that the positions of would-be probe and goal can be reversed; goals *are* probes. Thus agreement displacement converges with Bobaljik & Wurmbrand's treatment of in situ Nominative valuation, in which there is "downwards" valuation of DP's uCase without its undergoing raising. I suggest that it is preferable to analyze agreement displacement in this way than to suppose that vP can search material that it dominates. A model that dispenses with the probe-goal distinction has no need for this assumption.

#### **4.2 Tense features and "Reverse Agree"**

Following Pesetsky & Torreño 2007, Wurmbrand 2012 and Zeilstra 2012 argue that tense features on English verbs are uninterpretable, and must be valued by the interpretable features of

---


Haegeman & Londahl 2010 for a persuasive argument against its involvement in licensing of multiple negative concord items).

T. Partly on this basis Wurmbrand and Zeijlstra argue that the Minimalist “downwards’ probing approach to Agree should be rejected in favor of “Reverse Agree:”

(85) a.  $T \dots V_{uT} \rightarrow T \dots V_{uF}$


b. Reverse Agree: universally, valuation obtains when iF closest c-commands uF  
(adapted from Wurmbrand 2012, Zeijlstra 2012)

The general approach that I have proposed is quite compatible with “Reverse Agree” valuation for uT on a verb: lacking valued interpretable kT locally within its c-command domain, V’s uT must obtain DELAYED VALUATION for the derivation to converge. Assuming V always raises to v, it is in the same phase as T and hence can be valued downwards in situ.



My two-point mechanics for DELAYED VALUATION, coupled with the approach to motivating movement in (7), argue that if there is an available edge feature in some language, we might see vP/VP raise into locality with T as an alternative to in situ valuation of V’s uTense feature.

Assume that VP inherits unvalued features from its head as I proposed for all XPs in §1.4; and that v and hence vP also inherit these features, as a consequence of V-to-v adjunction. Then we predict that some languages might value V’s uTense as in (87):



In fact, a proposal rather like this is made in Travis 2006 for “snowballing” movement in Malagasy. Travis argues that Malagasy DPs check their features by incorporation of D into relevant heads, leaving Spec positions open. Travis proposes that predicate movement checks the same kinds of features in Malagasy that head-movement checks in a language like English. I suggest that valuation of uT is involved in motivating predicate movement. The fact that DPs remain in situ paves the way for edge features to raise vPs, since they bear the uF of unvalued tense. Hence like valuation of uCase on DP, valuation of uTense on V can be valued in situ or by raising of vP.

## **5. Conclusion**

In this paper I have argued that valuation is not directional. If a match for uF on head X is available in H’s sister at Merge, valuation will happen immediately and instantiate downward Agree. But if no match is available at this point, uF can obtain DELAYED VALUATION either in situ or by raising of XP. In situ DELAYED VALUATION occurs under closest c-command by an expression merged prior to any head with an edge feature, within the same phase. This is how DELAYED VALUATION of nominative Case works in passives of German simple clauses and simplex restructurings, and how agreement displacement works in a language like Basque. DELAYED VALUATION is also possible under movement of XP to c-command an expression with matching features, as when a German object in a complex restructuring construction requires nominative from T; or whenever an edge/EPP feature c-commands the source of Case valuation as it always does in English finite TP. English [*for...to*] infinitives provide evidence that raising to be closest c-commandee also suffices to permit DELAYED VALUATION.

The anomalous concept of “active” goal features receives a principled account under this analysis, yielding a simpler theory: goal features are simply uFs that find no match in their c-

command domains at first Merge, and obtain valuation when a matching feature is merged higher in the tree. The upward orientation of Lubukusu complementizer agreement falls out from the approach, coupled with independently motivated factors including cyclic Transfer and the articulated left-periphery.

I conclude that there is no upwards/downwards agreement parameter, contra Baker 2008 and Diercks 2011; and no basis for rejecting the downwards probing model of valuation, contra Zeijlstra 2012 and Wurmbrand 2012. Empirical phenomena robustly support the existence of Agree relations in which the uF c-commands its source of valuation, including SA with post-verbal subjects, West Germanic CA, and agreement of the Lubukusu vP-adjunct ‘how’ with an in situ subject. See also Preminger 2012 for additional arguments including the existence of agreement between material in an embedded clause with a head in a higher clause, touched on in my note 18 (based on Bošković 2007, Stepanovic & Takahashi 2001, Legate 2005 among others).

But some of the factors in the above-cited works do warrant a “Reverse Agree” analysis. I have argued that this is entirely due to match failures in the c-command domain of a uF at the point of first Merge, and the ensuing processes of DELAYED VALUATION.

## References

- Abels, K. 2012. *Phases: an essay on cyclicity in syntax*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Adger, D. 2003. *Core Syntax*. 2003. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, M. 2003. Agreement, Dislocation, and Partial Configurationality, in *Formal Approaches to Function in Grammar*, eds. A. Carnie, H. Harley, E. Jelinek, and M. Willie, 107-132.
- Baker, M. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Baker, M., K. Safir and J. Sikuku 2012. Sources of (a)symmetry in Bantu double object constructions. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 30*, eds. Nathan Arnett and Ryan Bennett, 54-64. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Barss, A. & H. Lasnik. 1986. A note on anaphora and double objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 347-354.
- Bejar, S. 2003.  $\phi$ -syntax: A theory of agreement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Ontario.
- Bejar, S. and D. Massam. 1999. Multiple Case-checking *Syntax* 2.2: 65-79.
- Bejar, S. & M. Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40.1: 35-73.
- Bhatt, R. 2005. Long-distance agreement in Hindi-Urdu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:757-807.
- Bobaljik, J. & S. Wurmbrand. 2005. The Domain of Agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:809-865.
- Borer, H. 1994. *Parametric Syntax: Case Studies in Semitic and Romance Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Bošković, Ž. 1997. *The Syntax of Non-Finite Complementation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Ž. 2002. A-movement and the EPP. *Syntax* 5: 167-218.
- Bošković, Ž. 2007. On the locality and motivation of Move and Agree: An even more minimal theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 589-644.
- Bošković, Ž. 2011. Last Resort with Move and Agree in derivations and representations. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Minimalism*, ed. C. Boeckx, 327-353. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bošković, Ž. and H. Lasnik. 2003. On the distribution of null complementizers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:527 – 541.
- Bruening, B. 2001. Raising to object and proper movement. Unpublished ms., University of Delaware.
- Carstens, V. 2011a. Hyperactivity and Hyperagreement in Bantu. *Lingua* 121.5:721-741.
- Carstens, V. 2011b. Head-movement in Bantu DPs. Paper presented at the 41<sup>st</sup> meeting of the North East Linguistics Society, Philadelphia, PA.
- Carstens, V. 2010. Grammatical gender and the theory of uninterpretable features. In *Exploring Crash Proof Grammars*, ed. M. Putnam, 31-57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carstens, V. 2008. DP in Bantu and Romance. In *The Bantu-Romance Connection; a comparative investigation of verbal agreement, DPs, and information structure*, eds De Cat, C. and K. Demuth, 131-166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carstens, V. 2005. Agree and EPP in Bantu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:219-279.
- Carstens, V. 2003. Rethinking complementizer agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.3:393-412.
- Carstens, V. 2001. Multiple agreement and Case deletion. *Syntax* 4.3:147-163.
- Carstens, V. 1991. The syntax and morphology of determiner phrases in Kiswahili. UCLA PhD dissertation.
- Carstens, V. & M. Diercks. 2013a. Agreeing How? *Linguistic Inquiry* 44.2:179-237.
- Carstens, V. & M. Diercks. 2013b. Parameterizing Case and Activity: Hyper-raising in Bantu. In *Proceedings of the 40<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, eds. S. Kan, C. Moore-Cantwell, R. Staubs, 99-118. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Graduate Linguistic Student Association.

- Carstens, V. & L. Mletshe. To appear. Radical Defectivity: Xhosa expletive constructions and flavors of T and v. Forthcoming in *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Carstens, V. & L. Mletshe. 2013. N-words in disguise: a negative concord approach to augmentless NPIs in Xhosa and Zulu. *Lingbuzz/001938*.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. R. Martin et al, 89-155. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Kan Hale: A life in language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2007. Approaching UG from below. In *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?*, eds. U. Sauerland and H.-M. Gartner, 1-29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky N. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. R. Freidin, C. P. Otero and M-L Zubizarreta, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2013. Problems of projection. In *Lingua* 130: 33-49.
- Cinque, G. 2005. On deriving Greenberg's Universal 20. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36.3: 315-332.
- Collins, C. 2004. The agreement parameter. In *Triggers*, eds. Anne Breitbarth and Henk van Riemsdijk, 115-136. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Diercks, M. 2010. *Agreement with Subjects in Lubukusu*. PhD dissertation, Georgetown U.
- Diercks, M. 2011. The morphosyntax of Lubukusu locative inversion and the parameterization of Agree. *Lingua* 121.5: 702-720.
- Diercks, M. 2012. Parameterizing Case: Evidence from Bantu. *Syntax* 15.3: 253-286.



- Diercks M. 2013. Lubukusu complementizer agreement as a logophoric relation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31.2: 257-407.
- Diercks, M., M. Putnam, & M. van Koppen. 2011/2012. The directionality of Agree: can a universal feature valuation operation be established? Paper delivered at *The Minimalist Program: Quo Vadis?* Potsdam, Germany, and at *The 30<sup>th</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*.
- Epstein, S. 1999. Unprincipled syntax and the derivation of syntactic relations. In *Working Minimalism*, eds. S. Epstein and N. Hornstein, 317-345. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Epstein, S. E.M. Groat, R. Kawashima, and H. Kitahara. 1998. *A Derivational Approach to Syntactic Relations*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Epstein, S., Kitahara, H., & T. D. Seely. 2010. Uninterpretable features: what are they, and what do they do? In *Exploring Crash-Proof Grammars*, ed. M Putnam, 125-142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Epstein, S. & T. D. Seely. 2006. *Derivations in Minimalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- George, L., and J. Kornfilt. 1981. Finiteness and boundedness in Turkish. In *Binding and filtering*, ed. F. Heny, 105-127. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Grohman, K., Drury, J. and Castillo, C. 2000. No more EPP. In *WCCFL 19 Proceedings*, ed. Billery and Lillehaugen, 153-166. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Halpert, C. 2012. Argument Licensing in Zulu. MIT PhD dissertation.
- Haegeman, L. 1992. Some speculations on argument shift, clitics and crossing in West Flemish. Ms., University of Geneva.
- Haegeman, L. and T. Lohndal. 2010. Negative concord and (multiple) Agree: a case study of

- West Flemish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41: 181-211.
- Haegeman, L. & M. van Koppen. 2010. Complementizer agreement and the relationship between T and C. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43.3:441-454.
- Harford Perez, C. 1986. Aspects of complementation in three Bantu languages. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin PhD dissertation.
- Heck, F. & G. Muller. 2000. Successive cyclicity, long distance superiority, and optimization. *WCCFL 19 Proceedings*, ed. R. Billerey and B.D. Lillehaugen 218-231. Summerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Henderson, B. 2007. Multiple agreement and inversion in Bantu. *Syntax* 9.3: 275-289.
- Holmberg, A. & B. Hróarsdóttir. 2003. Agreement and movement in Icelandic raising constructions. *Lingua* 113:997–1019.
- Julien, M. 2002. *Syntactic Heads and Word Formation*, Oxford University Press, NY.
- Kim, K. 2008. English C moves downward as well as upward: an extension of Bošković & Lasnik's (2003) approach. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39.2: 295-307.
- Kinyalolo, K.K.W. 1991. *Kilega and the Spec, head agreement hypothesis*. UCLA PhD thesis.
- Koopman, H. 2006. Agreement configurations: in defense of "Spec, head." In *Agreement Systems*, ed. Cedric Boeckx, 159-199. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koopman, H., and D. Sportiche. 1991. The position of subjects. *Lingua* 85.1:211-258.
- Legate, J.A. 2003. Some interface properties of the phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.3: 506-516.
- Legate, J. 2005. Phases and cyclic agreement. In *MITWPL 49: Perspectives on Phases*, ed. M. McGinnis & N. Richards: 147-156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Linguistics Department.
- Marantz, A. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*, ed. S. Mchombo, 113–150. Stanford: CSLI,

- McFadden, T. 2006. German inherent datives and argument structure. In *Datives and Other Cases*, eds. D. Hole, A. Meinunger, and W. Abraham. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- McGinnis, M. 2001. Variation in the phase structure of applicatives. In *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*: 105-146.
- McGinnis, M. 2005. UTAH at Merge: evidence from multiple applicatives. In *MITWPL 49: Perspectives on Phases*, ed. M. McGinnis and N. Richards, 183-200. Cambridge, MA: MIT Linguistics Department.
- McGinnis, M. 2010. Binding Preservation. Talk delivered at UBC Colloquium.
- Melebari, A. & T. D. Seely. 2011. Agreement without 'exception' in Standard Arabic? Paper presented at University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Nevins, A. 2011. Multiple Agree with clitics: person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. *Natural Language and Linguistic Inquiry* 29:939-971.
- Nevins, A. 2005. Derivations without the Activity Condition. *MITWPL 49*: 283-306.
- Ndayiragije, J. 1999. Checking Economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30.3: 399-444.
- Obata, M. and S. Epstein. 2011. Feature-Splitting Internal Merge: improper movement, intervention and the A/A'-distinction. *Syntax* 14.2: 122-147.
- Pesetsky, D. 1989. Language-particular rules and the Earliness Principle. Talk delivered at the *GLOW* colloquium, University of Utrecht.
- Pesetsky, D. 1991. *Zero Syntax, vol. 2: Infinitives*. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.  
<http://web.mit.edu/linguistics/www/pesetsky/infins.pdf>.

- Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation*, ed. S. Karimi, V. Samiian and W. Wilkins. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 262-294.
- Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2004. Tense, Case, and the nature of syntactic categories. In *The Syntax of Time*, ed. J. Guéron and J. Lecarme, 495-538. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Polinsky, M. and E. Potsdam. 2001. Long-Distance Agreement and Topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 583–646.
- Postal, P. 1974. *On raising: one rule of English grammar and its implications*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Preminger, O. 2012. Reversing agreement is untenable: a reply to Zeijlstra. *lingbuzz* 001442.
- Preminger, O. 2011. Agreement as a fallible operation. MIT PhD dissertation.
- Putnam, M. & M. Van Koppen. 2010. All there is to know about the *alls*-construction. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 14.1: 81-109.
- Pylkkänen, L. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Rackowski, A & N Richards. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: a Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36.4: 565-599.
- Rezac, M. 2003. The fine structure of cyclic Agree. *Syntax* 6.2: 156-182.
- Richards, M. 2007. On feature inheritance: an argument from the phase impenetrability condition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 563-572.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Rizzi, L. 1999. On the Position “Int(errogative)” in the Left Periphery of the Clause. Ms., University of Siena.
- Shlonsky, U. 2004. The form of Semitic nominals. *Lingua* 114 (12): 1465-1526.
- Stjepanović, S., and T. Shoichi . 2001. Eliminating the Phase Impenetrability Condition. Paper presented at the workshop *Motivating movement: Explaining the displacement property of natural language*, University of Ulster.
- Stowell, T. 1981. Origins of phrase structure. MIT PhD dissertation.
- Stroik, T. 1999. The Survive Principle. *Linguistic Analysis* 282-309.
- Svenonius, P.. 2000. Quantifier Movement in Icelandic. In *The Derivation of VO and OV*, ed. P. Svenonius, 255- 292. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Takano, Y. 2003. How antisymmetric is syntax? *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.3: 516-526.
- Travis, L. 2006. VP, D<sup>0</sup>-movement languages. In *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture*, eds. R. Zanuttini, H. Campos, E. Herburger, P. Portner, 127-150. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Ura, H. 1993. On feature-checking for *wh*-traces. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 19: Papers on Case and agreement II*, ed. C Phillips, 377-399. Cambridge, Mass: Department of Linguistics and Philosophy.
- Wurmbrand, S. 2004/2006. Licensing Case. Ms, UConn/publication in *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 18.3: 175-236.
- Wurmbrand, S. 2012. The syntax of valuation in auxiliary-participle constructions. In *Coyote Working Papers: procedigns of the 29<sup>th</sup> annual West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* ed. J. Choi et. al, 154-162. University of Arizona, Tuscon.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2012. Instrument inversion in Zulu. In *Proceedings of the 42<sup>nd</sup>*

*Meeting of the Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. M. Marlo, C. Green, M. Morrison, and T. Purvis, 134-148. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Zeijlstra, H. 2012. There is only one way to Agree. *lingBuzz*1435.

Vicki Carstens  
Professor & Chair  
Department of Linguistics  
3232 Faner Hall  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, Il 62901