

These remarks discuss certain properties of the Person Case Constraint (PCC) in relationship to other person-hierarchic argument interactions, and to other person-sensitive gaps in clitics and agreement. They address recent proposals of considerable theoretical interest: multiple Agree in lieu of rather than combined with interpretable person licensing, with consequences for conditions on matching by nontrivial phi-probes (section 1, drawing on cyclic agreement and indirective-secundative alignments); agreement conflicts versus person-licensing failures, and ways to escape them (section 2, on nonagreeing clauses and on portmanteaus); clitic clusters as constitutive of the PCC (section 3, on extensions of the PCC in systems with chiefly the clitic-cluster PCC); and variants of the PCC as parametrisations of Agree versus invariant Agree plus mechanisms specific to pronouns or their clusters (section 4, on distribution, systematicity, and repairability of the strong versus weak PCC). The discussion aims to bring out domains that motivate or challenge particular proposals, ways of meeting the challenges, and their commitments. The remarks are framed in part as a commentary on Coon and Keine (2019) [C&K], beginning with its development of and departures from Béjar and Rezac (2009) [B&R], and avail themselves of C&K's synthesis to address elements of recent syntactic analyses of the PCC, including Stegovec (2019); Preminger (2011, 2014, 2019); Anagnostopoulou (2005, 2017); Nevins (2007, 2011); Baker (2008, 2011); Béjar (2011); Rezac (2011); Sheehan (2019).

1 Multiple Agree and person licensing

B&R develops an approach to person-hierarchic argument interactions that "displace" agreement control from O/S to A, or *cyclic agreement*:

- (1) *Cyclic agreement*: the controller of a person agreement is O/S generally, but A if $A > O$ on a person hierarchy, such as $1/2 > 3$.¹

* Article submitted in 2020; I am very grateful to two helpful reviewers and the editor's encouragement, but other constraints have not permitted revision. The chief substantive comments of the reviews are suggestion to use superarticulated probes for secundative systems, or analysing secundative agreement as clitic. Neither seems compatible with systems cited but buried in footnotes of section 1, where the secundative R controls not only person but also number morphology, and neither morphology is dedicated to it, but controllable also by the most local of S, O, A (a.o. Georgian, Basque, Algonquian). Thank you to D. Georgi, A. Himmelreich, and A. Nevins for discussion of phi-hierarchic interactions, P. Albizu, M. Duguine and R. Etxepare of the Basque data, and M. Joutteau of the French data.

¹ The abbreviations A, O, and S are used for nonoblique "core" arguments: the external argument of active transitives, the internal argument of active transitives and its subject counterpart, and the internal argument of unaccusatives and passives of transitives. O, S are modified to O', S' when R is added, where R c-commands O'/S' and affects its agreement, cliticisation, or case. → indicates structural relationships, as in $3.A \rightarrow R \rightarrow 2PL.O$ for a transitive with a 3rd person A, any R, and 2PL O, while > indicates orderings, e.g. phi-hierarchy $1/2 > 3$, locality $R > O'$, cyclicity $O > A$.

The approach relies on the following elements (clarified below):

Articulated person: person phi-specifications are subtrees of a UG tree inclusive of its root $[\pi]$, with subtreehood mapping to hierarchy, e.g. $3^{\text{rd}} [\pi] < 1^{\text{st}}/2^{\text{nd}} [[[\pi] \text{ part}] \dots]$.

Incremental, cyclic Agree: upon $\text{Merge}(\alpha, \beta)$, giving a syntactic object SO, an unvalued (active) occurrence f_i of a feature f in a feature-structure F_i in the head/label H of SO matches the closest distinct f_k in SO, f_i is valued (deactivated), and F_k is copied to H .

Person Licensing Condition (PLC): a person structure on an argument must Agree.

The person specification of a probe codes the person hierarchy, e.g. $[[[\pi] \text{ part}]]$ for $1/2 > 3$. The incrementality of Agree gives person-hierarchic argument interactions by letting a probe match successively higher-valued goals. The cyclicity of Agree orders $A \rightarrow O$ as $O/S > A$ for matching by a probe between them. Thus Agree by $[[[\pi] \text{ part}]]$ on v partitions $A \rightarrow O$ combinations into two sets: *multiple-Agree* or *direct* combinations, $1/2.A \rightarrow 3.O$, and *single-Agree* or *inverse* combinations, $A \rightarrow 1/2.O$ and $3.A \rightarrow 3.O$. In direct $1/2.A \rightarrow 3.O$, $[[[\pi] \text{ part}]]$ matches $3.O$ for $[\pi]$ upon $\text{Merge}(v, VP)$, and $1/2.A$ for $[\text{part}]$ after $\text{Merge}(A, vP)$. Both values can surface in agreement and both arguments are licensed for the PLC. In inverse $1/2/3.A \rightarrow 1/2.O$ and $3.A \rightarrow 3.O$, O maximally matches the probe, and thus controls agreement and is licensed for the PLC. The PLC can still be met by A if there is a higher person probe, or through repair by an "added probe", which appears as inverse-specific agreement or case. Finally, unmarked 3^{rd} person internal arguments can have no (\emptyset) person specification, so $A \rightarrow \emptyset.O$ has single Agree with A which licenses it for the PLC. These mechanics are summarised in the left-hand column of Table 1.

Table 1: Cyclic agreement and PCC in B&R and C&K

Match order	B&R: cyclic agreement	C&K: PCC	B&R: PCC
$A \rightarrow O$	$A \rightarrow O$	$R \rightarrow O/S'$	$R \rightarrow O/S'$
$1/2.O_R > 1/2/3.O/S'$	s-Agree _{1/2} (inv) ! _{PLC}	s-Agree _{1/2}	s-Agree _{1/2} ! _{PLC}
$3.O_R > 3.O/S'$	s-Agree ₃ (inv) ! _{PLC}	s-Agree ₃	s-Agree ₃ ! _{PLC}
$3.O_R > 1/2.O/S'$	m-Agree _{3,1/2} (dir)	m-Agree _{3,1/2} ! _{confl}	s-Agree ₃ ! _{PLC}
$3.O_R > \emptyset.O/S'$	s-Agree ₃ (inv) ! _{PLC}	s-Agree ₃	s-Agree ₃
$\emptyset.O_R > 3.O/S'$	s-Agree ₃ (dir)	s-Agree ₃	s-Agree ₃

Cyclic agreement $[A [v \dots O]]$, $O >_{\text{cyclicity}} A$, PCC: $[v [R [\dots O/S']]]$, $R >_{\text{locality}} O/S'$
 $1/2: [[[\pi] \text{ part}]]$, $3: [\pi]$, \emptyset : unspecified (greyed out when unavailable)

C&K extends incremental Agree to the *Person-Case Constraint*:²

(2) *Person-Case Constraint (PCC)*: weak $*3.R \rightarrow 1/2.O/S'$, strong $*R \rightarrow 1/2.O/S'$.

² Here and below, the term PCC is used for the clitic and agreement restrictions modelled in B&R and C&K through Agree + conflict/PLC, until section 3 turns to theories that confine the PCC to clitic clusters.

Agree by a $[[\pi]$ part] probe on v gives multiple Agree in $3.R \rightarrow 1/2.O/S'$, with closer $3.R$ for $[\pi]$ and farther $1/2.O/S'$ for [part], but simple Agree with R elsewhere, $1/2.R \rightarrow O/S'$ and $3.R \rightarrow 3.O/S'$. There is no PLC, so single Agree is unproblematic. However, multiple Agree creates two types of conflict that lead to ineffability or require repairs. One, if the probe requires cliticisation, the requirement is argued to hold for all matches but be unsatisfiable by more than one. Two, if there is overt agreement, distinct copied persons usually cannot be realised. These conflicts give rise to the "weak" PCC, barring $3.R \rightarrow 1/2.O/S'$. However, it is typical of oblique $1/2.R$ to behave as $3.R$, giving the "strong" PCC. This is schematised in the middle column of Table 1.

The extension of incremental Agree to $R \rightarrow O/S'$ is natural, and found though effable in Béjar (2003: 2.9).³ Its use for the PCC faces two challenges in the systems discussed in B&R. One is readily resolved by combining B&R and C&K. One is difficult, and at the heart of the different approach to the PCC through the PLC in B&R.

The resolvable challenge is that cyclic agreement and the PCC cooccur, so multiple-Agree by $[[\pi]$ part] on v is fine for agreement and displacement in $1/2.A \rightarrow v \rightarrow 3.O$ (match order $3.O > 1/2.A$), but gives rise to conflicts in $v \rightarrow R \rightarrow 1/2.O/S'$ (match order $3.R > 1/2.O/S'$). These two configurations have distinct mechanics under incremental, cyclic Agree. In the PCC (3)a, multiple-Agree occurs between a probe on v and two goals in the same syntactic object, closer $3.R$ and farther $1/2.O/S'$. In cyclic agreement (3)b, multiple-Agree occurs between a probe on v and the closest goal across two distinct syntactic objects, $[v \dots \underline{3.O} \dots]$ before A is Merged and $[1/2.A [v \dots]]$ after A Merged. Adopting one proposal about the interaction of Agree and Merge from B&R: 48-9, the PCC context (3)a has one occurrence of the probe for both matches, and multiple values or displacees give rise to conflicts; the cyclic agreement context (3)b has one occurrence of the probe per match and so no conflicts. The distinction would be absent if cyclic agreement systems were analysed with Agree in configurations like (3)c-(3)d. Instead, in multiple Agree combinations, (3)c $A \rightarrow O$ is expected to give rise to PCC-like conflict, while (3)b $A \rightarrow O$ to cyclic agreement. These expectations have some support (cf. C&K: 5.2, Rezac 2011: 5.9, and section 4 here, cf. inversely for a probe between R and O' , Walkow 2014).

- (3) a. $[v_{p=3,1/2} \dots R_3 \dots O/S'_{1/2}]$
 b. $[v_{p=1/2} (\dots) [A_{1/2} [v_{p=3} [v \dots O_3]]]]$
 c. $[T_{p=3,1/2} \dots [A_3 [v \dots O_{1/2}]]]$
 d. $[T_{p=3,1/2} \dots [O_3 [A_{1/2} [v \dots t_O]]]]$

The difficult challenge is that cyclic agreement systems and others frequently have the "strong" PCC even if R is *secundative* rather than *indirective* for person agreement. Indirective R does not transparently control the person agreement controlled by O/S , and its interaction with Agree must be inferred from its effects on O/S' , including the PCC.

³ Incremental multiple Agree between a person probe with two lower goals in Béjar (2003: 2.9, 3.8-3.10) involves $R \rightarrow S'$ in Georgian, with no PCC unlike $R \rightarrow O'$ despite parallel morphology, but the exception may be only apparent, Rezac (2019: note 56) (cf. also Béjar 2011: 984n2).

Secundative R does agree like O/S. Thus 1/2.R just like 1/2.O/S should exhaust a $[[\pi]$ part] probe on v in single-Agree and not permit multiple-Agree with O'/S'. Yet secundative just like indirective R commonly bars 1/2.O'/S' for any person of R, giving the strong PCC $*1/2/3.R \rightarrow 1/2.O'/S'$. This has been a central motivation of the PLC (most systems in B&R are of this type) and similar conditions (cf. esp. Ormazabal and Romero 2007: 2.1-2, Baker 2008: 3.3, 2011, both building on Baker 1996: ch. 2). Important studies include Lochbihler (2012: ch. 4) on Ojibwa^{*†s}, cf. Albizu (1997b: 2.2.1.2); Baker (op.cit.) on Mohawk^{*†s}, Classical Nahuatl^{‡s}, and certain Bantu^s systems; Shklovsky (2011) on Tsetsal^{*} and Albizu (1997a: 4n8) on Tzotzil; Fernández (2004), Rezac (2008ab) on Basque^{*†‡}; plus Georgian^{*†‡μ}, Bonet (1990: ch. 4), under the analysis of agreement in Béjar (2003) (adopted in B&R) (see below on the superscript flags).

On the face of it, secundative systems are an ideal test to discriminate between incremental multiple-Agree and the PLC as source of the PCC. Since R transparently values a probe like O and S do, 1/2.R should halt the probe of a $1/2 > 3$ hierarchy, especially in cyclic agreement systems where we see it halt at 1/2.O rather than continue to A. Any ban on 1/2.O' and S' should be due to their independent licensing requirements like the PLC. Otherwise, secundative systems would behave like assumed-identity copula constructions $I_S am you_X$ in C&K, which do contrast $*3 \rightarrow 1/2$ with $\sqrt{1/2} \rightarrow 2/1$.

The problem would vanish if secundative systems – at least those with the strong PCC – were rather indirective systems in camouflage: the person probe sees R as 3rd even though apparently valued to 1st/2nd. Such reanalyses must account for or dispel certain properties tentatively flagged for the secundative systems listed above:

- ^s: Secundativity goes beyond agreement to e.g. case, promotion, reflexivity.
- [†]: The relevant R-O-S morphology is for person and participates in cyclic displacement; number also groups R-O-S but dissociates from person if on a different locus.
- [‡]: O'/S' is not without agreement after R takes up that of O/S, but agrees for number, by morphology additional to R/O/S and sometimes unique to O'/S'.
- ^{*}: The PCC bars not only agreeing forms but also silent or overt pronouns with no or default agreement, including pronouns available for O'/S' independently of agreement (e.g. in nonagreeing clauses, q.v. section 2).
- ^μ: Geographical or temporal microvariation in indirective-secundative R without effect on the PCC or other properties such as pronoun licensing.

These properties complicate several straightforward ways of reducing secundative to indirective systems: to wit, that the relevant morphology reflects not probe valuation, but feature displacement in morphology (^{s,‡}) or features of displaced pronouns (^{†,μ}); or that the illegitimacy of 1/2.O'/S' reflects some independent limitation on agreeing forms plus some requirement that pronouns control agreement (^{*,‡,μ}).⁴ They do leave open other

⁴ For a morphological analysis of secundativity, see Arregi and Nevins (2012) on Oñati Basque (inapplicable to varieties that lack its zero-past or have distinctive O'/S' number, Rezac 2009). For a clitic analysis of secundative systems with the *weak* PCC, see Anagnostopoulou (2017) (reanalysing Riedel 2009, the secundative pattern discussed in C&K). For pronouns and agreement, C&K set aside for future work Tsotsil and Tsetsal not as secundative but as systems where the PCC occurs without clitic clusters.

possibilities. One is to relate the desired behavior of secundative R, match as 3rd though valuing as 1st/2nd, with the familiar anomaly of indirective R, match and value as 3rd though concurring for 1st/2nd (often attributed to inherent Case absent on secundative R: cf. Taraldsen 1995, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Rezac 2008a, Atlamaz and Baker 2017).

In B&R, the evidence of secundative systems is taken at face value, and with the evidence of cyclic agreement, it leads to elements absent in C&K (B&R: 46-7). One is the PLC. It is grounded in the ineffability or repairs of $v_{p.} \rightarrow 1/2.R_{sec.} \rightarrow \pi^+.O/S'$ (PCC in secundative systems) and extended the repairs of $\pi^+.A \rightarrow v_{p.} \rightarrow 1/2.O$ (inverses in cyclic agreement), both involving the $1/2 > \pi^+$ order of matching (π^+ = any person from $[\pi]$ up). The other is relativisation of locality to feature structures rather than features, barring match past an entailed feature. It prevents a match for $[\text{part}]$ between a $[[\pi]$ part] probe and a $[[\pi]$ part] goal past intervening $[\pi]$. This makes any $\pi^+.R$ halt any π^+ probe, and so models $\pi^+.R_{indir./sec.} \rightarrow \pi^+.O/S'$ on $1/2.R_{sec.} \rightarrow \pi^+.O/S'$. This completes Table 1.⁵

This proposal has its own interesting challenges in recent work on selective and complex probes. By relativisation of locality to entailed features, only arguments without person or number fail to match and halt person or number probes, and underspecification of person seems limited to the internal argument (perhaps because of the selectional properties of v and Appl, Adger and Harbour 2007). This fits well with the findings in Nevins (2011): $A \rightarrow O$ often shows $A > O$ "omnivory" or incremental Agree for dual/plural, but not for 1st/2nd person (see Béjar 2003, 2011, Preminger 2014: ch. 4 for number, and Béjar 2011: sec. 3, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: sec. 4 for both person and number past 3SG S). *Selective* person probes that only see arguments of a given person, e.g. 2nd, are available to the extent that the theory of person allows probes like bare $[\text{addr}]$ rather than $[[\pi]$ part] $[\text{addr}]$. Evidence exists for such probes especially in the C-system, though there it might be reconstruable in terms of speaker and addressee licensing rather than selective probes (see Myler 2017, and for licensing, a.o. Bianchi 2005, Baker 2008: ch. 4).⁶

Secundativity beyond agreement includes repairs by promotion to ergative of the $R \rightarrow S'$ PCC, targeting R in secundative-R Chinook but S' in indirective-R Basque and Choctaw (Rezac 2011: ch. 5, Tyler 2018; whether R or S' is promoted in secundative system varies independently, Baker and Bobaljik 2017: 5.3 for a survey, and for one theory of S' promotion past robustly secundative R, Deal 2019).

⁵ The proposal retains the distinctions discussed above for (3)b-(3)c. The treatment of $3 \rightarrow 3$ in Table 1 derives from these differences between B&R and C&K. Unmarked 3rd on O/S is fine in PCC contexts, marked (e.g. animate) 3rd is barred like 1st/2nd. For C&K, the PCC derives from multiple Agree, which would not occur in $3.R \rightarrow 3.O/S'$, so both can be 3, and marked 3rd is more specified (cf. their note 4). For B&R, the PCC derives from single-Agree + PLC, so unmarked 3rd lacks person, marked 3rd is minimal person $[\pi]$, and R is always at least $[\pi]$ to halt the person probe, as may be A. (See Adger and Harbour 2007 on O/S vs. R/A, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: sec. 4 on S vs. R, Ormazabal and Romero 2007 on marked-O/R vs. unmarked O in the PCC, contrasts frequently borne out by no vs. overt morphology, e.g. Rezac 2008a, Harbour 2016: 5.4.2).

⁶ The theory of person in B&R adapts Harley and Ritter (2002) following Béjar (2003): person specifications are subtrees of a UG rooted directed tree with vertices labelled from a UG inventory and contain its root, labelled π . This approach can be modulated in various ways, including by omitting the root-inclusion requirement as in the text, or inversely by omitting labels, in which case persons are distinguished only by feature structures, e.g. $\{\{\pi\}, \pi\}$ for $[[\pi]$ part]. See Harbour (2016, esp. 5.4.2) on reconstructing the $1/2 > 3$ and 3 vs. unspecified in a different theory.

Selective probes have been posited in *complex* probes, whose person and number components interact in Agree. Here key questions include: do the components share a feature (1+PL, Despić et al. 2018) or merely a terminal (1+PL, Coon and Bale 2014); do they see only goals matching both components ("Maximise Matching", Chomsky 2001: 15-19; Coon and Bale 2014, Despić et al. 2018), or do the components match independently but feed each other ("Free Riders", Chomsky 1995: 246, Bruening 2001: 5.7, Rezac 2013: cf. $\phi+2^{\text{nd}}$, Deal 2015); can one component void intervention for the other (by displacement or Agree, Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2018). Further understanding may come from more extensive person-number interactions chiefly explored in other frameworks (Trommer 2006, Georgi 2019). Throughout, it is not always obvious when argument phi-interactions reflect syntax (clearest for $1/2>3$, reviewed in Rezac 2011: ch. 3) or morphology (Bobaljik and Branigan 2006: sec. 7, Nevins 2011: 3.1, Nevins and Sandalo 2011, with literature) (cf. Woolford 2016).⁷

In incremental Agree approaches to person-hierarchic argument interactions, multiple arguments participate in a person dependency only if their ordering by locality and cyclicity corresponds to increasing person specification on the scale parametrised by the probe (Béjar 2003, B&R, C&K). Beside them stand harmonic Agree approaches, where a person dependency with multiple arguments is restricted by relations of harmony between their person specification, likewise relative to the probe (Anagnostopoulou 2005, 2017) or independent parameters (Nevins 2007, 2011). These harmonic Agree proposals have not distinguished indirective and secundative systems (in part because targeting only cliticisation, Anagnostopoulou 2017: 5.1, Nevins 2011: sec. 4).

2 Person licensing and agreement conflicts

In B&R, the PLC is motivated by convergence of evidence from ungrammaticality or agreement/case-based repairs in cyclic agreement $A \rightarrow O$ (inverse combinations, where O values the probe), the PCC in secundative $R \rightarrow O/S'$ (inverse combinations, where R values the probe), and the PCC in indirective systems (same, by hypothesis). One or more of these domains and others have figured in similar proposals (illustrative are: extending Case-licensing, Baker 1996, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Ormazabal and Romero 2007, B&R, Kalin 2018; specific to person, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Baker 2008, Coon and

⁷ Not discussed here is any challenge assumed-identity copula constructions like *I_S was you_X* pose to person licensing, since it is not clear there is one. In B&R, $3.S \rightarrow 1/2.X$ should skip underspecified 3.S to yield $1^{\text{st}}/2^{\text{nd}}$ person agreement and no violation of the PLC, or halt at specified 3.S and group it with $1/2.S$, (modulo any mechanism for the weak PCC, section 4). X should be immune to the PLC to the extent it has its own Case (see B&R: 47 on PLC by Case; on case of X, see Heycock 2012, Sigurðsson 2006, cf. Maling and Sprouse 1995, and esp. C&K: 4.1.4 on nominative on X that "shields" it from Agree). The predictions are met in some systems (Béjar 2011: 985-6, Béjar and Kahnemouyipour 2017; also Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: sec. 4 on a different copular construction and contrast with the PCC). The systems in C&K show $*3 \rightarrow 1/2 + *SG \rightarrow PL$ in contrast to all other combinations, precisely as predicted by agreement conflicts in C&K, which are compatible with the PLC (cf. also Bondaruk 2012).

Preminger 2012, Preminger 2014, Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2017, Stegovec 2019, Compton 2019; specific to applicativity, Adger and Harbour 2007).

Many theories that require licensing of interpretable person features face a challenge in systems where the PCC is restricted to clauses with agreement or clitics for the affected arguments, while other clauses are immune to it, despite not obviously differing in case or A-movement. Basque shows this contrast for both weak, silent and strong, overt pronouns (see further Bonet 1990: 4.2.1, Laka 1993: 1.5).⁸

(4) a. *...governuak zu/pro niri besoetatik kenduko [no finite form]
 the.gov.ERG 2SG.ABS 1SG.DAT from.the.arms take.FUT

[Do you think that the government] will take you from my arms?

b. √...[governuak zu/pro niri besoetatik kentzea]
 the.gov.ERG 2SG.ABS 1SG.DAT from.the/arms take.away.INF

[Do it seem bad to you] for the government to take you from my arms?

(Basque)

C&K elegantly derives this split because there is no licensing needed for interpretable person, there are only person probes and their conflicts, and these are absent when the probes are absent (see Rezac 2011: 259 for other proposals of this type, earliest Albizu 1997ab). However, if licensing of interpretable person is needed in domains like secundative systems above, and indeed nonagreeing clauses below, the split raises difficulties for most ideas about its nature (unless relatable to reasons why certain clauses lack agreement, cf. person and tense in Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2017, Kalin 2018: sec. 6). It may prove fruitful to start with a direct recognition of the split in a given theory of person licensing. Preminger (2019, cf. 2011) does this for the PLC: only person-bearers clausemate to ϕ -probes need licensing by ϕ -Agree, and acquisition of ϕ -probes is guided by agreement and clitic cues. If clausematehood is further relativised to at least T vs. v-domains, the proposal also encompasses variation in the PCC within clauses that, notably the PCC for agreeing nominatives but not nonagreeing, nonclitic accusatives illustrated by Icelandic (like C&K and other probe-centered approaches to the PCC).⁹

The suspension of the PCC for nonagreeing clauses is key evidence about its mechanisms, but so are exceptions to it. They may be illustrated by Icelandic. The PCC

⁸ The examples control for datives capable of nonagreement (not high datives like possessors, barring finite *zaitu* 2pA.3sE) and absolutes with 3SG/default agreement (not usually available, least so for unemphatic pronouns and *pro*, barring finite *dit/dizkit* 3sA/3pA.1sD.3sE). The relevant infinitives have the same case, pronouns, and word orders, as finite ones. The crosslinguistic robustness of PCC suspension merits study to control for these factors and to ensure that the evaded constraint is the PCC (cf. Perlmutter 1971: 91-3).

⁹ Preminger (2011, 2014, 2019) achieves this result independently by further restricting the PLC to person-bearers whose case makes them visible to ϕ -Agree. An alternative is offered here to highlight compatibility of the probe-mate restriction with other theories of case-Agree relations, e.g. attribution parametric opacity and person licensing to the supranominal architecture of nonstructural cases (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Rezac 2008a). Important for further understanding case-person interactions seem to be person licensing repairs by extra supranominal material (B&R: 4.3, Rezac 2011: ch. 5.7-8), and variation in clausal licensing for person bearers whose case renders them opaque to clausal agreement (PCC in Slovenian ACC > DAT, Stegovec 2019, vs. no PCC in Icelandic NOM > DAT, Sigurðsson 1996).

bars R.DAT→1st/2nd.S.NOM in agreeing finite clauses. The corresponding nonagreeing infinitives vary. In one type of grammar, "A", the PCC remains severe (Bobaljik 2008: 319n27; this variety is also documented in Thráinsson 2007: 4.2.4-5, Schütze 1997: ch. 4, Taraldsen 1995). In another, "B", it is weak but present, unless due to the influence of "A" (Sigurðsson 2004: 155 note 14, Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008: 271 and 261-2).¹⁰

- (5) a. Henni leiddust/?*leiddist þeir.
 3SGF.DAT bore.3PL/*3SG 3PLM.NOM
 They bore her.
- b. *Henni leiðumst / leiðast / leiðist við.
 3SGF.DAT bore.1PL/3PL/3SG 1PL.NOM
 We bore her.
- c. Við vonumst til [að ___ leiðast hún/*þið ekki]
 we hope to PRO.DAT bore.INF 3SGF/*2SG.NOM not
 We hope not to be bored with her/*you.
 (Icelandic "A"; Taraldsen 1995: 307-9, citing H. Thráinsson; Taraldsen 1995: 308-9 = Thráinsson 2008: 236; Bobaljik 2008: 319n27 citing H. Thráinsson)

For Preminger's (2019) relativisation of the PLC, the Icelandic variation may simply indicate that overt agreement and clitics are not the sole cues to the acquisition of person probes. Their absence might favour absence of probes, but not inexorably (it may be significant that Icelandic "A" but not "B" requires number agreement with nominatives across datives), and be overruled by other evidence of the PCC (in Icelandic-like systems but with repair of PCC-barred nominatives by accusatives, Rezac 2019).¹¹

It is not clear what to say about the Icelandic variation on theories that construe its PCC solely as a problem in the realisation of multiple agreement (Schütze 2003, Ackema and Neeleman 2019; these proposals also invoke amelioration of the PCC through 1st/2nd-3rd syncretisms, yet this is considerable not only in "B" but also "A", Thráinsson 2007: 4.2.4-5). C&K need not be in the same bind, because multiple-Agree leads not only to an agreement-realisation but also a clitic-displacement conflict. The latter conflict is argued to reflect the impossibility of meeting a clitic-displacement requirement if there is more than one match, and the logic should generalise to phrasal displacement. It would then suffice that "A" but not "B" have phrasal movement driven by the probe underlying the PCC (cf. Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008 which also, for other reasons, posits different probe-position configurations across "A" and "B").

¹⁰ In both "A" and "B", nominative-subject infinitives under a dative-experiencer *seem*-type verb can fail to agree as 3PL and can be nonagreeing 1st/2nd person unlike in otherwise parallel monoclausal configurations. This has been interpreted as suspension of the PCC in nonagreeing clauses (Preminger 2011: 932-4). However, the configuration is not a parallel to the PCC in a finite clause. Schütze (1997) and Bobaljik (2008) argue that infinitives opaque to agreement differ from transparent ones, and that the absence of a person restriction may be attributed to this difference, for example to phi-Agree of the T of an infinitive with the nominative (Schütze 1997: ch. 4; cf. 2003: 297n2).

¹¹ The limited evidence for person-hierarchy interactions of A→O in nonagreeing clauses seems compatible with this: in Mapudungun they affect subjecthood, but there is overt inverse marking to cue their presence, although no agreement (Arnold 1997, see Rezac 2011: 3.2).

Nonagreeing clauses are the clearest environment where agreement-realisation conflicts should be absent. C&K brings out other ways to evade problems in realising $\langle 3, 1/2 \rangle$ value pairs created by multiple Agree: 3-1/2 syncretisms, 3-1/2 portmanteaus, fission splitting 3 and 1/2, or absence of a morpheme for 3 and 1/2. Only syncretism has been studied for the PCC, in Sigurðsson (1996) for $R \rightarrow S'$ in Icelandic, and its interpretation is unclear. It affords variable amelioration, typically considerable but incomplete, compatible with the paragrammatical analysis in Sigurðsson (1996) or the grammatical analysis in C&K (given a linking theory to yield remaining deviance).

Of the other ways to defuse agreement conflicts in C&K, portmanteaus are of particular interest, because some have been analysed precisely as realisation of multiple Agree, and their grammaticality appears to be categorical. The expectations are clear. If the PCC reflects agreement conflicts due to incremental multiple Agree, we expect systems where the relevant argument combinations like $3 \rightarrow 1/2$ are illegitimate, save those realised by portmanteaus that reflect a multiply-valued probe (though not other types of portmanteaus, e.g. contextual allomorphy, Trommer 2007, Woolford 2016, Zubizarreta and Pancheva 2017). If the PCC reflects failure of interpretable person licensing, multiply-valued-probe portmanteaus should have no effect (though other types might, notably those realising clitic clusters, section 4). As far as is known at present, portmanteaus do not seem to carve out a grammatical subset among incremental multiple-Agree combinations of $A \rightarrow O$ (either when analysed as (3)b above, B&R, Gluckman 2016, or (3)c-(3)d, Georgi 2013, Woolford 2016, Oxford 2018, and esp. Bobaljik and Branigan 2006: esp. sec. 4.2, 7, and note 20 thereto, where there is a set of gaps, but not one that corresponds to incremental multiple Agree). The same goes for the canonical PCC $R \rightarrow O/S'$. However, the line of research identified in C&K is novel and still to be explored; whatever its outcome, it holds promise of new insight into the PCC.

3 Clitic conflicts

Bonet (1990: ch. 4) formulates the PCC as a constraint on combinations of bound phi-morphology controlled by the direct and indirect object. Among recent syntactic theories of the mechanisms underlying the PCC, some rely on properties unique to combinations of clitic pronouns (e.g. Arregi and Nevins 2012: 2.3, Tyler 2018; Stegovec 2019), others extend beyond any bound-phi combinations (e.g. $R \rightarrow S'_{agr}$ in Icelandic, Anagnostopoulou 2003; $R_{agr} \rightarrow O/S'$ in Ojibwa, Mohawk, Baker 2008: 3.3-4). This split is independent of configurations where person restrictions occur, which may be shared by both types of theory, esp. *person-dependency target* > *intervener* > *argument with restricted person*.

A central argument for extensions of the PCC is their emergence in systems that are archetypes of the bound-phi PCC. French is a well-studied example. By and large, the PCC is restricted to DAT-ACC clitic clusters. However, this is independently expected in many syntactic theories: in French, accusatives and datives must control clitics when pronominal, and most types of clearly "high" datives can only be clitics. There is one clear exception, causee datives. Restructuring causatives code A of the causativised verb as dative, O as accusative, and have the structure A.DAT > O.ACC, save for a few

experiencer-A verbs that also allow O.ACC > A.DAT. In the structure A.DAT > O.ACC, O is restricted to 3rd person, as in the clitic PCC, but independent of the cliticness of A:¹²

- (6) a. Cela les/*vous lui fera {choisir, connaître}.
 that 3PL/*2PL.ACC=3SG.DAT=will.make choose know
 That will make her {choose, get to know} them/*you.
- b. Cela les/*vous fera choisir à Hervé.
 that 3PL/*2PL.ACC=will.make choose to Hervé
 That will make Herve chose them/*you.
- c. Cela vous fera connaître à Hervé; (*sans ___i le regretter).
 that 2PL.ACC=will.make know to Hervé
 That will make Herve get to know you (*without regretting it).
- (French, Postal 1989)

This paradigm is established for French in Postal (1989), and has been extended to other Romance systems (Catalan, Bonet 1990: 4.3; Italian and Spanish, Sheehan 2019). It converges with similar extensions of the PCC across related systems rather than across configurations within a system (Riedel 2009: 5.4 on Bantu). The evidence has been interpreted to show that even where the PCC chiefly restricts clitic clusters, it emerges outside them precisely when expected (Rezac 2011: 4.5.3, Sheehan 2019). It is not incompatible with theories that limit the PCC to clitic combinations, but the expectations are clear, and remain to be explored: either the restrictions outside clitic combinations reflect a different mechanism, or the nonclitic arguments that participate in them but not others are clitic-like in the relevant way, e.g. covertly clitic-doubled or person-deficient.¹³

In C&K, bound-phi and other PCC are both modelled through multiple Agree in 3.R→1/2.O/S'. Clitic PCC arises because a probe with a cliticisation requirement cannot satisfy it if matching multiple goals. The logic should extend to other displacements. However, no displacement is in evidence for dative causees in French. Other PCC is due to unrealisability of agreement reflecting the person feature pair <3, 1st/2nd> copied from R and O/S'. There is no overt agreement with objects in French, but French object clitics may depend on it (Preminger 2019), and indeed realise it similarly to the joint realisation of agreement and weak pronoun in classical pro-drop (cf. Roberts 2010). If so, realisation of the accusative clitic in 3.R→1/2.O' in French would fall prey to the same problem as that of nominative agreement in 3.R→1/2.S' in Icelandic for C&K. So the agreement conflict generalises to clitics of this type, and may suffice for them.

¹² The PCC with nonclitic causees is robust; variation exists on *connaître*-type verbs and adjunct control.

¹³ Other evidence groups clitic and extended PCC across a much wider range of configurations and systems. Consider two phenomena recently discussed for the clitic-PCC in Stegovec (2019). One, obviation of the clitic PCC in Slovenian by reversing DAT-ACC to ACC-DAT clitic order, analysed as O' raising past R, corresponds strikingly to suspension of the nonclitic PCC in Icelandic by raising nominative S' past dative R in Sigurðsson and Holmberg (2008: sec. 6). Two, sometime absence of the clitic PCC in French for 1st/2nd persons accusatives that are inanimate in Rezac (2011: 307) or non-de-se in Charnavel and Mateu (2015), may have a decent match in absence of the nonclitic PCC in French for similar 1st/2nd person nominatives in mediopassives in Postal (1989) (Rezac op.cit.).

4 Variants of the Person Case Constraint

Bonet (1990: ch. 4) introduces the PCC in two variants, "strong" $*R \rightarrow 1/2.O'$ and "weak" $*3.R \rightarrow 1/2.O'$. Recent syntactic theories have often put variation at the centre and derive it through parametric specification of probes (Anagnostopoulou 2005), of goals (C&K), or conditions on matching (Nevins 2007). Other syntactic theories have targeted only the strong version (Albizu 1997a, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Ormazabal and Romero 2007, Adger and Harbour 2007, Baker 2008, 2011, B&R).¹⁴

It is far from clear that variants of the PCC reflect parametrisation of the mechanism that yields the strong PCC. Studies of the weak PCC have highlighted its limitation to clusters of pronouns against the greater generality of the strong PCC (Bonet 1994, Baker 2011, Anagnostopoulou 2017). This suggests that the licensing of $1/2.R \rightarrow 1/2.O'/S'$ relies on something specific to pronouns or their clusters. Possibilities include richer pronominal structure that permits additional person licensing dependencies (Stegovec 2019: 4.1.3), or sharing and shared licensing of participant features of 1st/2nd person in a cluster (taking cue from Chatzikyriakidis and Kempson 2011: 3.2; cf. Grewendorf 2001 for clusters in syntax and Pescarini 2014 for opaque phi-content of opaque clitic clusters and its syntactic effects, in part recalling portmanteaus in section 3).¹⁵

There is an important deficit in our understanding at present: certain systems attributed the weak PCC appear not to have it as a variant of the strong PCC at all, including the western Romance systems emblematic of it. Ormazabal and Romero (2007) on Spanish, and Chatzikyriakidis and Kempson (2011) on Italian, find that whereas the strong PCC is systematic, the 1-2 combinations allowed by the weak PCC are limited to particular clitics in particular orders, to certain tenses, moods, and constructions, and to certain verbs. Their findings converge with other less systematic evidence across these languages as well as Catalan (Bonet 1990: 179-182) and French (references in Rezac 2011: 4.6.8). In these systems then, there may be only the strong PCC, obscured by something else (Ormazabal and Romero 2007), or else the 1-2 licensing mechanisms of the weak PCC can be nonsystematic in this fashion (e.g. phi-opaque clitic clusters).

There may be tools that let us probe the syntax of the PCC independently of the legitimacy of bound-phi morphology: syntactic "repairs". They may be illustrated through French. French clitic clusters have gaps for the PCC $*3.DAT=1/2.ACC=$, other gaps that generalise over phi-features like $*3.DAT=DAT=$ and ${}^{\%}1/2.DAT=DAT=$, and parochial gaps like ${}^{\%}3SG.DAT=LOC=$. The PCC gap alone is "repaired" by a syntactic structure not available otherwise: the dative clitic is replaced by *à* 'to' + unfocused independent pronoun, provided that *à* + nominal can express the relevant grammatical

¹⁴ It is often possible to integrate the weak PCC in the latter class of approaches by wholly or partly independent devices. To illustrate with B&R: (i) a person probe on Appl present only if Appl introduces a 1st/2nd person R (cf. Adger and Harbour 2007 for probe-selection interactions on Appl; Comrie 2003 for Appl-sensitivity to person of R); or (ii) parametrically allow the "added probe" on v only if the core probe is valued to 1st/2nd (with intervention of R for it voided by Agree with the core probe).

¹⁵ Riedel (2009) identifies the weak PCC in an agreement system, but the agreement status is clear only for 3rd person, cf. Baker (2018), allowing 1-2 combinations to be analysed as clitics, Anagnostopoulou (2017).

evidence for syntactic status to 1/2↔3 interactions to the exclusion of various 1↔2 interactions (Nevins 2011: 3.1, Rezac 2011: 3.2-5, cf. Oxford 2018: 3.1).

5 Some conclusions

The main conclusions may be resumed as follows:

- The extension of *incremental Agree* from A→O cyclic agreement to R→O/S' PCC is compatible with attribution of the PCC to either *person licensing* in *single Agree* or *conflicts* in *multiple Agree*. The latter approach is challenged by systems with secundative rather than indirective R and these remain a chief motivation of person licensing. The two approaches and their differences highlight questions about incremental Agree with *partial matches* and with *selective* and *composite probes*.
- The resort solely to *agreement conflicts* for the PCC seems inapplicable to its presence in nonagreeing clauses. Conversely, its absence in nonagreeing clauses is problematic for most derivations of *person licensing*. Tools like portmanteaus promise to help in differentiating the approaches.
- Even where the PCC chiefly affects *clitic clusters*, it still arises outside them when a nonclitic is trapped in the expected syntactic configuration. Either mechanisms underlying the PCC are independent of cliticness, or there is more relevantly clitic-like behaviour than it seems.
- Distribution of the *weak PCC*, its modulation, and its interaction with repairs, all suggest that it does not reflect parametrisation of the mechanics underlying the strong PCC, but rather them plus something inherent to pronouns or their clusters.

6 References

- Ackema, Peter, and Ad Neeleman. 2019. Default person versus default number in agreement. In *Agreement, case and locality in the nominal and verbal domains*, edited by Ludovico Franco, Mihaela Marchis Moreno, and Matthew Reeve, 21–54. Berlin: Language Sciences Press.
- Adger, David, and Daniel Harbour. 2007. Syntax and syncretisms of the Person Case Constraint. *Syntax* 10: 2–37.
- Albizu, Pablo. 1997a. Generalized Person-Case Constraint. In *Theoretical issues on the morphology-syntax interface*, edited by Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Amaya Mendikoetxea, 1–33. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia.
- Albizu, Pablo. 1997b. Syntax of person agreement. Doctoral dissertation draft, Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: evidence from clitics*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions. In *Clitic and affix combinations*, edited by Lorie Heggie and Francisco Ordóñez, 199–235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2017. The Person Case Constraint. In *The Companion to Syntax*, edited by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 1–47. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2018. Defective intervention effects in two Greek varieties and their implications for ϕ -incorporation as agree. In *Order and structure in syntax*, edited by Michelle Sheehan and Laura R Bailey, 153–78. Berlin: Language Sciences Press.
- Arnold, Jennifer. 1997. The inverse system in Mapudungun and other languages. *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 34: 9–48.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2012. *Morphotactics*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Atlamaz, Ümit, and Mark Baker. 2018. On partial agreement and oblique case. *Syntax* 21: 195–237.
- Baker, Mark C. 1996. *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Mark C. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mark C. 2011. When agreement is for number and gender but not person. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29: 875–915.
- Baker, Mark C. 2018. On the status of object markers in Bantu languages. In *Data-rich linguistics*, edited by Oluseye Adesola, Akinbiyi Akinlabi, and Olanike Ola Orié, 2–40. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Baker, Mark C., and Jonathan Bobaljik. 2017. On inherent and dependent theories of ergative case. In *The Oxford handbook of ergativity*, edited by Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa Demena Travis, 111–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Béjar, Susana. 2003. Phi-syntax: a theory of agreement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Béjar, Susana. 2011. Remarks on omnivory and complementarity. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29: 973–97.
- Béjar, Susana, and Arsalan Kahnemuyipour. 2017. Non-canonical agreement in copular clauses. *Journal of Linguistics* 53: 463–99.
- Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In *Romance linguistics: Theory and acquisition*, edited by Ana Teresa Pérez-Leroux and Yves Roberge, 49–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40: 35–73.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2006. On the syntax of personal arguments. *Lingua* 116: 2023–67.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2008. Where's phi? Agreement as a post-syntactic operation. In *Phi theory*, edited by Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar, 295–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Phil Branigan. 2006. Eccentric agreement and multiple case checking. In *Ergativity*, edited by Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije, 47–77. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bondaruk, Anna. 2012. Person Case Constraint effects in Polish copular clauses. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 59: 49–84.
- Bonet, M. Eulàlia. 1992. Morphology after syntax: pronominal clitics in Romance. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

- Bonet, M. Eulàlia. 1994. The Person-Case Constraint: a morphological approach. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 22: 33–52.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, and Victoria Mateu. 2015. The clitic binding restriction revisited: evidence for antilogophoricity. *The Linguistic Review* 32: 671–701.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2003. Recipient person suppletion in the verb “give.” In *Language and life*, edited by Mary Ruth Wise, Thomas N. Headland, and Brend Ruth, 265–81. Dallas: SIL.
- Coon, Jessica, and Alan Bale. 2014. The interaction of person and number in Mi’gmaq. *Nordlyd* 40: 85–101.
- Coon, Jessica, and Stefan Keine. 2020. Feature gluttony. Ms.: ling.auf.net.
- Coon, Jessica, and Omer Preminger. 2012. Taking ‘ergativity’ out of split ergativity. Ms.: ling.auf.net.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2015. Interaction and satisfaction in ϕ -agreement. *NELS* 45: 179–92.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2019. Raising to ergative: remarks on applicatives of unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50: 388–415.
- Despić, Miloje, Michael David Hamilton, and Sarah E. Murray. 2019. A Cyclic and Multiple Agree account: person/number marking in Cheyenne. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37: 51–89.
- Fernandez, Beatriz. 2004. Gustatzen nau gustatzen dizu. In *Euskal gramatika XXI. mendearren atarian*, edited by Pablo Albizu and Beatriz Fernández, 89–112. Gasteiz: Arabako Foru Aldundia.
- Foley, Steven, Nick Kalivoda, and Maziar Toosarvandani. 2017. Gender-Case Constraint in Zapotec. ling.auf.net.
- Georgi, Doreen. 2012. A relativized probing approach to person encoding in local scenarios. *Linguistic Variation* 12: 153–210.
- Georgi, Doreen. 2019. On prominence scale interactions in Hayu. *Nordlyd* 43: 1–13.
- Gluckman, John. 2016. Decomposing morphological number in local contexts. *WCCFL* 33: 146–56.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2016. *Impossible persons*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi, and Elizabeth Ritter. 2002. Person and number in pronouns: a feature-geometric analysis. *Language* 78: 482–526.
- Heycock, Caroline. 2012. Specification, equation, and agreement in copular sentences. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 57: 209–40.
- Kalin, Laura. 2018. Licensing and differential object marking: the view from Neo-Aramaic. *Syntax* 21: 112–59.
- Kalin, Laura. 2019. Nominal licensing is driven by valued (ϕ -)features. *Nordlyd* 43: 1–14.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French syntax: the transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Laka, Itziar. 1993. The structure of inflection: a case study in X0 syntax. In *Generative studies in Basque linguistics*, edited by José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz Urbina, 21–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Legate, Julie. 1999. The morphosyntax of Irish agreement. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 33: 219–40.

- Lochbihler, Bethany. 2012. Aspects of argument licensing. Doctoral dissertation, Montréal: McGill University.
- Maling, Joan, and Rex A. Sprouse. 1995. Structural Case, specifier-head relations, and the case of predicate NPs. In *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, edited by Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner, 167–86. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- McCloskey, James, and Kenneth Hale. 1984. On the syntax of person-number inflection in modern Irish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 1: 487–533.
- Myler, Neil. 2017. Cliticization feeds agreement: a view from Quechua. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 35: 751–800.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25: 273–313.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2011. Multiple Agree with clitics: person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29: 939–71.
- Nevins, Andrew, and Filomena Sandalo. 2011. Markedness and morphotactics in Kadiwéu [+participant] agreement. *Morphology* 21: 351–78.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2007. The Object Agreement Constraint. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25: 315–47.
- Oxford, Will. 2019. Inverse marking and Multiple Agree in Algonquin: Complementarity and variability. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37: 955–96.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1971. *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Postal, Paul M. 1981. A failed analysis of the French cohesive infinitive construction. *Linguistic Analysis* 8: 281–324.
- Postal, Paul M. 1983. On characterizing French grammatical structure. *Linguistic Analysis* 11: 361–417.
- Postal, Paul M. 1984. French indirect object cliticisation and SSC/BT. *Linguistic Analysis* 14: 111–72.
- Postal, Paul M. 1989. *Masked inversion in French*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1990. French indirect object demotion. In *Studies in Relational Grammar* 3, edited by Paul M. Postal and Brian D. Joseph, 104–200. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Preminger, Omer. 2011. Asymmetries between person and number in syntax: a commentary on Baker’s SCOPA. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29: 917–37.
- Preminger, Omer. 2014. *Agreement and its failures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Preminger, Omer. 2019. What the PCC tells us about “abstract” agreement, head movement, and locality. *Glossa* 4: 1–42.
- Rezac, Milan. 2008a. Phi-Agree and theta-related Case. In *Phi theory: Phi-features across modules and interfaces*, edited by Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar, 83–129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rezac, Milan. 2008b. The syntax of eccentric agreement: the Person Case Constraint and absolutive displacement in Basque. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26: 61–106.

- Rezac, Milan. 2011. *Phi-features and the modular architecture of language*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rezac, Milan. 2013. Case and Licensing: Evidence from ECM+DOC. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44: 299–319.
- Rezac, Milan. 2019. The Person Case Constraint in Breton and its consequences. Ms.: www.iker.cnrs.fr/rezac-milan-cnrs.
- Riedel, Kristina. 2009. The syntax of object marking in Sambiaa. Doctoral dissertation, Leiden: University of Leiden.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and head movement: clitics, incorporation, and defective goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schütze, Carson. 1997. INFL in child and adult language: agreement, case and licensing. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Schütze, Carson. 2003. Syncretism and double agreement with Icelandic nominative objects. In *Grammar in focus*, edited by Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson, and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson, 295–303. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2018. The Romance Person Case Constraint is not about clitic clusters. ling.auf.net.
- Shklovsky, Kirill. 2012. Person-Case effects in Tselal. *The Linguistic Review* 29: 439–490.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1996. Icelandic finite verb agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57: 1–46.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2004. Icelandic non-nominative subjects. In *Non-nominative subjects, vol. 2*, edited by Peri Bhaskararao and Karumuri Venkata Subbarao, 137–60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2006. The Nom/Acc alternation in Germanic. In *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*, edited by Jutta M. Hartmann and László Molnárfi, 13–50. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, and Anders Holmberg. 2008. Icelandic dative intervention: person and number are separate probes. In *Agreement restrictions*, edited by Roberta D’Alessandro, Susann Fischer, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 251–80. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Stegovec, Adrian. 2019. Taking case out of the Person-Case Constraint. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*.
- Sturgeon, Anne, Boris Harizanov, Maria Polinsky, Ekaterina Kravtchenko, Carlos Gómez Gallo, Lucie Medová, and Václav Koula. 2012. Revisiting the Person Case Constraint in Czech. *FASL* 19: 116–30.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1995. On agreement and nominative objects in Icelandic. In *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, edited by Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner, 307–27. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trommer, Jochen. 2006. Person and number agreement in Dumi. *Linguistics* 44: 1011–57.

- Trommer, Jochen. 2007. On portmanteau agreement. presented at the Harvard-Leipzig Workshop on Morphology & Argument Encoding, Ont-line: home.uni-leipzig.de/jtrommer/Harvard/trommer.pdf, September 9.
- Tyler, Matthew. 2018. Absolutive promotion and the condition on clitic hosts in Choctaw. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*.
- Walkow, Martin. 2014. Cyclic AGREE derives restrictions on cliticization in Classical Arabic. In *Perspectives on Arabic linguistics 26*, edited by Reem Khamis-Dakwar and Karen Froud, 135–60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Woolford, Ellen. 2016. Two types of portmanteau agreement: Syntactic and morphological. In *Optimality-Theoretic Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics*, edited by Géraldine Legendre, Michael T. Putnam, Henriëtte de Swart, and Erin Zaroukian, 111–35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yokoyama, Tomohiro. 2019. Dissociating the Person Case Constraint from its “repair.” *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 64: 730–52.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa, and Roumyana Pancheva. 2017. A formal characterization of person-based alignment: The case of Paraguayan Guaraní. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 35: 1161–1204.