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Rodica says ‘Hi!’
**PUZZLE**

Context: Bad Parenting

Imagine we all have children. Also imagine that the speaker (Zahra) is of the opinion that she is the world's greatest parent and that no one else is a good parent. According to the speaker, no one in the group takes care of their own children except for her.
Context: Bad Parenting
Puzzle

Context: Bad Parenting

*Imagine we all have children. Also imagine that the speaker (Zahra) is of the opinion that she is the world’s greatest parent and that no one else is a good parent. According to the speaker, no one in the group takes care of their own children except for her.*
**Puzzle**

(1) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
I only person-RM be-1SG
‘I am the only one...’
Puzzle

(1) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
   I only person-RM be-1SG
   ‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
   ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
   1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable
   ‘... who am taking care of my child.’
**Puzzle**

(1) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
    I only person-RM be-1SG
    ‘I am the only one…’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
    ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
    1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable
    ‘... who am taking care of my child.’

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æš negæhdari mi-kon-æd]
    ... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
    3rd Agr 3rd Pro ✓ Bound Variable
    ‘... who is taking care of their child.’
Puzzle
✓ BVar reading when embedded T agreement and pronoun match

(1) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
    I only person-RM be-1SG
    ‘I am the only one...’

a. ...
   [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
   ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
   1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable
   ‘... who am taking care of my child.’

b. ...
   [ke æz bačč-æš negæhdari mi-kon-æd]
   ... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
   3rd Agr 3rd Pro ✓ Bound Variable
   ‘... who is taking care of their child.’
**Puzzle**

(2) mæn tænha kæs-ı hæst-æm ...  
I only person-RM be-1SG  
*I am the only one...’
**Puzzle**

(2) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
I only person-RM be-1SG
‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æš negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
1st Agr 3rd Pro * Bound Variable
‘... who am taking care of her Rodica child.’
Puzzle

(2) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
I only person-RM be-1SG
'I am the only one…'

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æš negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
   1st Agr 3rd Pro * Bound Variable
   ‘... who am taking care of her$_{Rodica}$ child.’

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æd]
... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
   3rd Agr 1st Pro * Bound Variable
   ‘... who is taking care of my$_{Zahra}$ child.’
**PUZZLE**

* BVar reading when embedded T agreement and pronoun mismatch

(2) \[ \text{mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...} \]
I only person-RM be-1SG
‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æš negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
\[ 1\text{st Agr} \quad 3\text{rd Pro} \quad * \text{Bound Variable} \]
‘... who am taking care of her_{Rodica} child.’

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æd]
... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
\[ 3\text{rd Agr} \quad 1\text{st Pro} \quad * \text{Bound Variable} \]
‘... who is taking care of my_{Zahra} child.’
Puzzle

The availability of **bound variable** readings is sensitive to whether the \( \phi \)-**features** on the embedded \( T \) and the embedded **pronoun match**.
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$\rightarrow$ **Feature identification** between the matrix subject, predicate and relative pronoun takes place only with **predicative** matrix clauses
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→ Sharing **person** features through **feature identification under predication** is **optional** and can happen in **syntax** or **post-syntactically**.
**Puzzle**

The availability of **bound variable** readings is sensitive to whether the \( \phi \)-**features** on the embedded \( T \) and the embedded **pronoun match**.

---

**Spiel in a Nutshell**

→ Farsi provides an argument in favor of **syntactic** accounts

→ **Feature identification** between the matrix subject, predicate and relative pronoun takes place only with **predicative** matrix clauses

→ Sharing **person** features through **feature identification under predication** is **optional** and can happen in **syntax** or post-syntactically.

→ non-predicative matrix clauses teach us that a **direct dependency** between the matrix subject and the indexical is possible in Farsi
**PUZZLE**

The availability of **bound variable** readings is sensitive to whether the $\phi$-features on the embedded T and the embedded **pronoun match**.

**SPIEL IN A NUTSHELL**

→ Farsi provides an argument in favor of **syntactic** accounts

→ **Feature identification** between the matrix subject, predicate and relative pronoun takes place only with **predicative** matrix clauses

→ Sharing **person** features through **feature identification under predication** is **optional** and can happen in **syntax** or post-syntactically.

→ non-predicative matrix clauses teach us that a **direct dependency** between the matrix subject and the indexical is possible in Farsi

→ this direct dependency is modulated by **Rule H (Fox, 1998)**
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Setting the Stage
RIGID DESIGNATORS

\(i, \text{you} = \text{context-dependent, intensionally rigid designators.}\)

Kaplan (1989)
**RIGID DESIGNATORS**

*I, you = context-dependent, intensionally rigid designators.*  
Kaplan (1989)

**THE FIXITY THESIS**

The semantic value of an indexical is fixed solely by the context of the speech act, and cannot be affected by any logical operators.  
Schlenker (2005)
Rigid Designators

\( I, \ you = \) context-dependent, intensionally rigid designators. Kaplan (1989)

The Fixity Thesis

The semantic value of an indexical is fixed solely by the context of the speech act, and cannot be affected by any logical operators. Schlenker (2005)

\[
\rightarrow [I]^{g,c} = \text{the speaker in } C \\
\rightarrow [you]^{g,c} = \text{the addressee in } C
\]
RIGID DESIGNATORS & FAKE INDEXICALS

(3)  I am the only one who can take care of my children.

adapted from Partee (1989)
RIGID DESIGNATORS & FAKE INDEXICALS

(3) I am the only one who can take care of my children.

adapted from Partee (1989)

a. REFERENTIAL:
   No one else can take care of my children.
RIGID DESIGNATORS & FAKE INDEXICALS

(3)  *I am the only one who can take care of my children.*

adapted from Partee (1989)

a. REFERENTIAL:

*No one else can take care of my children.*

b. BOUND VARIABLE:

*No one else can take care of their children.*
**Rigid Designators & Fake Indexicals**

(3)  *I am the only one who can take care of my children.*

adapted from Partee (1989)

a. **Referential:**

   *No one else can take care of my children.*

b. **Bound Variable:**

   *No one else can take care of their children.*

1st and 2nd person pronouns can have bound variable readings.
(Main) Accounts

- **Semantic**: bound variable readings via **focus-alternatives**

- **Syntactic**: syntactically bound **minimal pronouns**
SEMANTIC ACCOUNTS: CORE IDEA
**Semantic Accounts: Core Idea**

- 1st and 2nd person pronouns are **real indexicals** with semantically contentful φ-features.
SEMANTIC ACCOUNTS: CORE IDEA

- 1st and 2nd person pronouns are real indexicals with semantically contentful φ-features.
- The φ-features get deleted in Focus Alternatives.
**Syntactic Accounts: Core Idea**
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- 1st and 2nd person pronouns in these cases are **fake indexicals**.
**Syntactic Accounts: Core Idea**

- 1st and 2nd person pronouns in these cases are *fake indexicals*.
- **Minimal pronouns**, $\emptyset_i$, are syntactically bound (somehow).
**Syntactic Accounts: Core Idea**

- 1st and 2nd person pronouns in these cases are **fake indexicals**.
- **Minimal pronouns**, $\emptyset_i$, are syntactically bound (somehow).
- Language specific **spell-out restrictions**.

The rest is up to debate ...

(4) **Kratzer (2009) vs. Wurmbrand (2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGREE type</strong></td>
<td>bottom-up, phase-based AGREE</td>
<td>top-down, Reverse AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$\pi$ features</strong></td>
<td>embedded $\nu$ with $\pi$ features</td>
<td>matrix subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>irrelevant</strong></td>
<td>features in matrix clause</td>
<td>AGREE for embedded $\nu / T$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Farsi Data
Context: Bad Parenting

Imagine we all have children. Also imagine that the speaker (Zahra) is of the opinion that she is the world’s greatest parent and that no one else is a good parent. According to the speaker, no one in the group takes care of their own children except for her.
✓ BVar reading when embedded T agreement and pronoun match

\[(5) \quad \text{mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...} \]
\[\text{I only person-RM be-1SG} \]

‘I am the only one...’
✓ **BVar reading when embedded T agreement and pronoun match**

(5) **mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...**
    I only person-RM be-1SG
    ‘I am the only one...’

a. **... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æm]**
    ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
    **1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable**
    ‘... who am taking care of my child.’
✓ BVar reading when embedded T agreement and pronoun match

(5) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
   I only person-RM be-1SG
   ‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
   ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
   1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable
   ‘... who am taking care of my child.’

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æʃ negæhdari mi-kon-æd ]
   ... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
   3rd Agr 3rd Pro ✓ Bound Variable
   ‘... who is taking care of their child.’
**Puzzle**

(6) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
I only person-RM be-1SG

‘I am the only one...’
**Puzzle**

(6) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
I only person-RM be-1SG
'I am the only one...'

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æš negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
1st Agr 3rd Pro * Bound Variable

'... who am taking care of her Rodica child.'
Puzzle

(6) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm...
   I only person-RM be-1SG
   ‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æš negæhhdari mi-kon-æm]
   ... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
   1st Agr 3rd Pro * Bound Variable
   ‘... who am taking care of herRodica child.’

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhhdari mi-kon-æd]
   ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
   3rd Agr 1st Pro * Bound Variable
   ‘... who is taking care of myZahra child.’
**Puzzle**

* BVar reading when embedded T agreement and pronoun mismatch

(6) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
  I only person-RM be-1SG
  ‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æʃ negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
  ... [that from kid-3SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
  * Bound Variable
  ‘... who am taking care of her_{Rodica} child.’

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æd]
  ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
  * Bound Variable
  ‘... who is taking care of my_{Zahra} child.’
In Farsi, the embedded verb of the relative clause containing a fake indexical can show either 3rd or 1st person agreement. The bound variable reading is only available when the embedded T and the relative pronoun match in $\phi$-features.
In Farsi, the **embedded verb** of the relative clause containing a fake indexical can show either 3rd or 1st person agreement.
GENERALIZATION

- In Farsi, the **embedded verb** of the relative clause containing a fake indexical can show either **3rd** or **1st** person agreement.

- The **bound variable** reading is only available when the embedded T and the relative pronoun **match** in φ-features.
**How Farsi is Problematic:**

(7) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
I only person-RM be-1SG
‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]

1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æd]
... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]

3rd Agr 1st Pro * Bound Variable

Focus-alternative accounts cannot distinguish between (7a) & (7b).
Wurmbrand (2017) assumes T (and v) agreement in the embedded clause is irrelevant. (7b) should have a bound variable reading.
**How Farsi is Problematic:**

(7) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
    I only person-RM be-1SG
    ‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon-æm]
    ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
    1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari mi-kon æd]
    ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
    3rd Agr 1st Pro * Bound Variable

▶ Focus-alternative accounts cannot distinguish between (7a) & (7b).
**HOW FARSI IS PROBLEMATIC:**

(7) mæn tænha kæs-i hæst-æm ...
    I only person-RM be-1SG
    ‘I am the only one...’

a. ... [ke æz bačč-æem negæhdari mi-kon-æem]
    ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-1SG]
    1st Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable

b. ... [ke æz bačč-æem negæhdari mi-kon-æed]
    ... [that from kid-1SG care IMPERF-do-3SG]
    3rd Agr 1st Pro * Bound Variable

▶ Focus-alternative accounts cannot distinguish between (7a) & (7b).

▶ Wurmbrand (2017) assumes T (and v) agreement in the embedded clause is irrelevant. (7b) should have a bound variable reading.
TAKEAWAY

Embedded T agreement does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017). A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement matters.
**Takeaway**

- *embedded T agreement* does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017).
**TAKEAWAY**

- **embedded T agreement** does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017).
- A **purely semantic account** of fake indexicals is **not sufficient** for Farsi: syntactic agreement matters.
HOW ENGLISH (!) IS PROBLEMATIC:

Kratzer (2009) argues that bound variable readings are generated within the relative clause and assumes that matrix clause features are irrelevant. → there should be no difference between (8a) and (8b).

(8) a. I am the only one who takes care of my children. ✓

b. I met the only one who takes care of my children. *
**How English (!) is problematic:**

- Kratzer (2009) argues that bound variable readings are generated within the relative clause and assumes that matrix clause features are irrelevant.
  → there should be no difference between (8a) and (8b) .

(8) a. I am the only one who takes care of my children. ✓

b. I met the only one who takes care of my children. *
**HOW ENGLISH (!) IS PROBLEMATIC:**

- Kratzer (2009) argues that bound variable readings are generated within the relative clause and assumes that matrix clause features are irrelevant. → there should be no difference between (8a) and (8b).

(8) a. I am the only one who takes care of my children.  
    ✓ BVar PREDICATIVE
**HOW ENGLISH (!) IS PROBLEMATIC:**

- Kratzer (2009) argues that bound variable readings are generated within the relative clause and assumes that matrix clause features are irrelevant. → there should be no difference between (8a) and (8b).

(8)  

a. I **am** the only one who takes care of my children.  
✓ **BVar** PREDICATIVE

b. I **met** the only one who takes care of my children.  
* **BVar** NON- PREDICATIVE

(Cable, 2005)
**HOW ENGLISH (!) IS PROBLEMATIC:**

- Kratzer (2009) argues that bound variable readings are generated within the relative clause and assumes that matrix clause features are irrelevant. → there should be no difference between (8a) and (8b).

(8)  

a. I am the only one who takes care of my children. ✓ BVar PREDICATIVE

b. I met the only one who takes care of my children. *BVar NON-PREDICATIVE

(Cable, 2005)

**TAKEAWAY**

- the features in the matrix clause are relevant
How English (!) is problematic:

Kratzer (2009) argues that bound variable readings are generated within the relative clause and assumes that matrix clause features are irrelevant. → there should be no difference between (8a) and (8b).

(8)  

a. I am the only one who takes care of my children.  
✓ BVar PREDICATIVE

b. I met the only one who takes care of my children.
* BVar NON-PREDICATIVE
(Cable, 2005)

Takeaway

- the features in the matrix clause are relevant
- the matrix subject should be involved in a top-down feature transmission of π features. (in favor of Wurmbrand, 2017)
AGREEMENT PATTERNS
**Agreement Patterns**

(9) **Predicative Matrix Pattern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agr.</th>
<th>Pro.</th>
<th>Bound Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

1. In the relative clause when the matrix is predicative:
   - Only 1st Agr and 1st Pro patterns yield bound variable readings.

CONCLUSIONS:

- Sharing person features is possible under the predication relation between I and the only one.
- Sharing person features between I and the only one under the predication relation is optional.
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WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

- 1st Agr in the relative clause when the matrix is predicative

CONCLUSIONS:

- Sharing person features is possible under the predication relation between I and the only one
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- **1st Agr** in the relative clause when the matrix is **predicative**
- **predicative** matrix: only **1st Agr 1st Pro** and **3rd Agr 3rd Pro** patterns yield bound variable readings

CONCLUSIONS:

- Sharing person features is possible under the **predication** relation between *I* and *the only one*
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

- 1st Agr in the relative clause when the matrix is **predicative**
- **predicative** matrix: only 1st Agr 1st Pro and 3rd Agr 3rd Pro patterns yield bound variable readings

CONCLUSIONS:

- Sharing person features is possible under the **predication** relation between *I* and *the only one*
- Sharing person features between *I* and *the only one* under the **predication** relation is **optional**
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

► **1st Agr** in the relative clause when the matrix is **predicative**

► **predicative** matrix: only **1st Agr 1st Pro** and **3rd Agr 3rd Pro** patterns yield bound variable readings

CONCLUSIONS:

► Sharing person features is possible under the **predication** relation between *I* and *the only one*

► Sharing person features between *I* and *the only one* under the **predication** relation is **optional**
OUR ASSUMPTIONS:

Feature Identification under Relativization (Cable, 2005): the relative operator and the modified NP share features.

Feature Identification under Predication (Cable, 2005): the subject and the predicate DP share features.

Sharing Person Features under Predication is optional.
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  the relative operator and the modified NP share features.
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Our Assumptions:

- **Feature Identification under Relativization** (Cable, 2005): the relative operator and the modified NP share features.

- **Feature Identification under Predication** (Cable, 2005): the subject and the predicate DP share features.

- **Sharing Person Features under Predication** is optional.
**Our Assumptions:**
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Our Assumptions:

- **T Agreement** happens in syntax.

- The features of the minimal pronoun are determined post-syntactically.

- Sharing Person Features can happen in syntax.
  - feeding both **T Agreement** and the minimal pronoun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Agr</th>
<th>1st Pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Our Assumptions:**

- **T Agreement** happens **in syntax**.

- **The features of the minimal pronoun** are determined **post-syntactically**.

- **Sharing Person Features** can happen **in syntax**.
  - feeding both **T Agreement** and the **minimal pronoun**.
    - **1st Agr 1st Pro**

- **Sharing Person Features** can happen **post-syntactically**.
**OUR ASSUMPTIONS:**

- **T Agreement** happens in syntax.

- **The features of the minimal pronoun** are determined post-syntactically.

- **Sharing Person Features** can happen in syntax.
  - feeding both **T Agreement** and the **minimal pronoun**.
  - 1st Agr 1st Pro

- **Sharing Person Features** can happen post-syntactically.
  - feeding only the **minimal pronoun**.
**OUR ASSUMPTIONS:**

- **T Agreement** happens in syntax.

- The features of the minimal pronoun are determined post-syntactically.

- **Sharing Person Features** can happen in syntax.
  - feeding both **T Agreement** and the minimal pronoun.
    - 1st Agr 1st Pro

- **Sharing Person Features** can happen post-syntactically.
  - feeding only the minimal pronoun.
    - 3rd Agr 1st Pro
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

(All Languages)
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

(All Languages)

STEP 1: The embedded T probe and the minimal pronoun enter an AGREE relation with who.

man tanha kasi hastam [ ke az bačče-Ø₁ negahdari mikon-Ø₁. ]
I only person am that from child-Ø₁ care do-Ø₁

[1st] [3rd] [3rd] [3rd] [3rd]
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

(All Languages)

**STEP 1:** The embedded T probe and the minimal pronoun enter an AGREE relation with *who*.

```
man tanha kasi hastam [ ke az bačće-Ø₁ negahdari mikon-Ø₁. ]
I only person am that from child-Ø₁ care do-Ø₁
[1st] [3rd] [3rd] [3rd]
```
Derivation for Predicative Matrix 3rd Agr 3rd Pro

*(All Languages)*

**STEP 1:** The **embedded T probe** and the **minimal pronoun** enter an AGREE relation with *who*.

`man tanha kasi hastam [ ke az bačče-∅₁ negahdari mikon-∅₁. ]`

[I only person am that from child-∅₁ care do-∅₁]

[1st] [3rd] [3rd] [3rd] [3rd] [3rd]
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

3rd Agr

3rd Pro
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

**3rd Agr  3rd Pro**

**STEP 2:** The matrix DP, the predicate DP and the relative head share **semantic** features through **Identification** under **Predication**.
**Derivation for Predicative Matrix**

**Step 2**: The matrix DP, the predicate DP and the relative head share **semantic** features through **Identification** under **Predication**.

```plaintext
man\(^1\) tanha [3rd] kasi\(^i\) hastam [3rd] ke\(^i\) az bačče-\(\varnothing\) negahdari mikon-\(\varnothing\). [3rd]
I only person am that from child-\(\varnothing\) care do-\(\varnothing\).
```

**Derivation for Predicative Matrix 3rd Agr 3rd Pro**
**Derivation for Predicative Matrix**  

**Step 2:** The matrix DP, the predicate DP and the relative head share **semantic** features through **Identification** under **Predication**.

---

**Feature Identification**

**Under Predication**

- I only
- person am
- that from
- child care
doi

**Under Relativization**

- that
- from
- child care
doi

**No Sharing of Person Features under Predication.**

- **3rd Agr**
- **3rd Pro**
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

\[(\text{Farsi})\]
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

Step 1: The matrix DP, the predicate DP and the relative head share person features through Identification under Predication.
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

(Farsi)
**Derivation for Predicative Matrix (Farsi)**

**STEP 2:** The **embedded T probe** and the **minimal pronoun** enter an AGREE relation with *who*.

```
Sharing Person Features
Under Predication

man\textsuperscript{i} tanha
I only
[1\textsuperscript{st}]

kasi\textsuperscript{i} hastam
person am
[1\textsuperscript{st}]

Feature Identification
Under Relativization

ke\textsuperscript{i} az ba\textsuperscript{c\textcdo}\textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{e}-\textsuperscript{0}\textsubscript{i} negahdari mikon-\textsuperscript{0}\textsubscript{i}.
that from child-\textsuperscript{0}\textsubscript{i} care do-\textsuperscript{0}\textsubscript{i}
[1\textsuperscript{st}]
```
**Derivation for Predicative Matrix**

**(Farsi)**

**STEP 2:** The **embedded T probe** and the **minimal pronoun** enter an **AGREE** relation with *who*.

```
Sharing Person Features
 Under Predication

I only person am
[1st] [1st]

Feature Identification
 Under Relativization

that from child-Ø₁ care do-Ø₁
[1st] [1st] [1st] [1st]
```

```
manᵢ tanha
I only
[1st]

kasiᵢ hastam [keᵢ az bačče-Ø₁ negahdari mikon-Ø₁. ]
person am [that from child-Ø₁ care do-Ø₁]
[1st] [1st] [1st] [1st]
```
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

*(English)*
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

(English)

**STEP 1:** The **embedded T probe** and the **minimal pronoun** enter an AGREE relation with *who*.

I am the only one [who take- Ø₁ care of Ø₁ child.]

[3rd] [3rd] [3rd]
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

*English*
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

*(English)*

**Step 2:** The matrix DP, the predicate DP and the relative head share person features through **Identification** under **Predication** post-syntactically.
**Derivation for Predicative Matrix**

**STEP 2:** The matrix DP, the predicate DP and the relative head share **person** features through **Identification** under **Predication** post-syntactically.

- **I am the only one [1st] [1st]**
- **who take- ∅₁ care of ∅₁ child. [1st] [3rd]**

▶ **T Agreement happens in syntax.** ➞ **3rd Agr**
Derivation for Predicative Matrix

(English)

**STEP 2:** The matrix DP, the predicate DP and the relative head share person features through **Identification** under **Predication** post-syntactically.

---

Sharing Person Features
Under Predication

| I am the only one            | who take- $\emptyset_i$ care of $\emptyset_i$ child. |
| 1st                        | 1st                              | 3rd                       |

Feature Identification
Under Relativization

---

- T Agreement happens **in syntax.**  → 3rd Agr
- 3rd is the absence of person features.
- The features of $\emptyset_i$ are determined **post-syntactically.**  → 1st Pro
**Predicative Matrix Patterns**

(10) *The data so far...* (embedded T & Øi Agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>German (SG.)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English, Dutch</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farsi, German (pl.)</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romanian, French</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Predicative Matrix Patterns

(10) *The data so far...* (embedded T & 0i Agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German (sg.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Dutch</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi, German (pl.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian, French</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

▶ Typological gap?
**CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES**

**FARSI**

Sharing Person Features under predication is optional. If sharing of Person Features under predication happens, it happens in syntax and feeds both T-Agreement and the minimal pronoun. 1st Agr 1st Pro

Icelandic (Wurmbrand, 2017) & Greek (Itai Bassi, p.c.) also pattern with Farsi
**CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES**

**FARSI**

- **Sharing Person Features under predication** is optional.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

**Farsi**

- **Sharing Person Features under predication** is optional.
- If **Sharing of Person Features under predication** happens, it happens in **syntax** and feeds both **T-Agreement** and the **minimal pronoun**.

---

Icelandic (Wurmbrand, 2017) & Greek (Itai Bassi, p.c.) also pattern with Farsi.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

**Farsi**

- **Sharing Person Features under predication** is optional.
- **If Sharing of Person Features under predication** happens, it happens in *syntax* and feeds both **T-Agreement** and the **minimal pronoun**.
- Icelandic (Wurmbrand, 2017) & Greek (Itai Bassi, p.c.) also pattern with Farsi
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

ENGLISH & DUTCH
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

ENGLISH & DUTCH

Sharing Person Features under predication is optional.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

ENGLISH & DUTCH

- Sharing Person Features under predication is optional.
- If Sharing of Person Features under predication happens, it happens post-syntactically and only feeds the minimal pronoun. $3^{rd}$ Agr $1^{st}$ Pro
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

ROMANIAN & FRENCH

Sharing Person Features under predication is optional. Sharing of Person Features under predication can happen in syntax or post-syntactically. When Sharing of Person Features under predication happens in the syntax, we get 1st Agr 1st Pro. When Sharing of Person Features under predication happens post-syntactically, we get 3rd Agr 1st Pro. Hebrew (Itai Bassi, p.c.) patterns with Romanian...
**CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES**

**ROMANIAN & FRENCH**

- **Sharing Person Features under predication** is optional.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

ROMANIAN & FRENCH

- Sharing Person Features under predication is optional.
- Sharing of Person Features under predication can happen in syntax or post-syntactically.

Hebrew (Itai Bassi, p.c.) patterns with Romanian
**CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES**

**ROMANIAN & FRENCH**

- **Sharing Person Features under predication** is optional.
- **Sharing of Person Features under predication** can happen in **syntax** or **post-syntactically**.
- **When Sharing of Person Features under predication** happens in the **syntax**, we get **1st Agr 1st Pro**

Hebrew (Itai Bassi, p.c.) patterns with Romanian
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

ROMANIAN & FRENCH

- Sharing Person Features under predication is optional.
- Sharing of Person Features under predication can happen in syntax or post-syntactically.
  - When Sharing of Person Features under predication happens in the syntax, we get 1st Agr 1st Pro
  - When Sharing of Person Features under predication happens post-syntactically, we get 3rd Agr 1st Pro
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

ROMANIAN & FRENCH

- Sharing Person Features under predication is optional.
- Sharing of Person Features under predication can happen in syntax or post-syntactically.
- When Sharing of Person Features under predication happens in the syntax, we get 1st Agr 1st Pro.
- When Sharing of Person Features under predication happens post-syntactically, we get 3rd Agr 1st Pro.
- Hebrew (Itai Bassi, p.c.) patterns with Romanian.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

**TYPOLOGICAL GAP**

a language in which 1st Agr 3rd Pro is allowed. 1st Agr can only be attested when sharing of person features under predication has happened in the syntax. 3rd Pro can only be attested when there is no sharing of person features under predication. Our account predicts that this language should not exist. However, Itai Bassi (p.c.) has data from French which also allows this pattern (unlike our French informants).
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

TYPOLOGICAL GAP

- a language in which 1st Agr 3rd Pro is allowed.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

Typological Gap

- a language in which **1st Agr 3rd Pro** is allowed.
- **1st Agr** can only be attested when sharing of person features under predication has happened in the **syntax**.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

TyPOLOGICAL GAP

- a language in which 1st Agr 3rd Pro is allowed.
- 1st Agr can only be attested when sharing of person features under predication has happened in the syntax.
- 3rd Pro can only be attested when there is no sharing of person features under predication.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

**TYPOLOGICAL GAP**

- a language in which 1st Agr 3rd Pro is allowed.
- 1st Agr can only be attested when sharing of person features under predication has happened in the syntax.
- 3rd Pro can only be attested when there is no sharing of person features under predication
- Our account predicts that this language should not exist.
CROSS-LINGUISTIC QUICK FIXES

**Typological Gap**

- a language in which **1st Agr 3rd Pro** is allowed.
- **1st Agr** can only be attested when sharing of person features under predication has happened in the **syntax**.
- **3rd Pro** can only be attested when there is no sharing of person features under predication.
- Our account predicts that this language should not exist.
- However, Itai Bassi (p.c.) has data from French which also allows **this pattern** (unlike our French informants)
Interim Summary
**SUMMARY:**

A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement and bound variable readings are correlated. Embedded T agreement does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017). Sharing of Person Features under predication is optional. Languages differ in timing of sharing of Person Features under predication.
SUMMARY:

- A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement and bound variable readings are correlated.
SUMMARY:

- A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement and bound variable readings are correlated.

- **embedded T agreement** does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017).
**Summary:**

- A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement and bound variable readings are correlated.
- Embedded T agreement does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017).
- Sharing of Person Features under predication is optional.
- Languages differ in Timing of Sharing of Person Features under predication.
Non-predicative Matrix Clauses
Puzzle

Context: Bad Parenting Continues...

Imagine we all have children. Also imagine that we all have babysitters to take care of our children. We are all supposed to have monthly meetings with our babysitters. No one in the group met their babysitter this month except for the speaker (Zahra).

Imagine we all have children. Also imagine that the speaker (Zahra) is of the opinion that she is the world's greatest parent and that no one else is a good parent. According to the speaker, no one in the group takes care of their own children except for her.
Puzzle

Context: Bad Parenting Continues...
Puzzle

Context: Bad Parenting Continues...

Imagine we all have children. Also imagine that we all have babysitters to take care of our children. We are all supposed to have monthly meetings with our babysitters. No one in the group met their babysitter this month except for the speaker (Zahra).
Puzzle

(Only) I met the/a person who takes care of my children.

3rd Agr 1st Pro  ✓
Bound Variable
Puzzle

(11) Non-Predicative Matrix

(tænha) man kæs-i ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari
(only) I person-RM that from kid-1SG care
mi-kon-æd ra did-æm
IMPERF-do-3SG RA saw-1SG

‘(Only) I met the/a person who takes care of my children.’
**Puzzle**

(11) **Non-Predicative Matrix**

(tænha) man kæs-i ke æz bačč-æm negæhdari
(only) I person-RM that from kid-1SG care
mi-kon-æd ra did-æm
IMPERF-do-3SG RA saw-1SG

‘(Only) I met the/a person who takes care of my children.’

3rd Agr 1st Pro ✓ Bound Variable
HOW FARSI IS EVEN MORE PROBLEMATIC:
**How Farsi is even more problematic:**

- Current accounts cannot predict the split between predicative and **non-predicative** matrix clauses for fake indexicals within relative clauses.
GENERALIZATION

When the main clause is not predicative:

1st T agreement in the relative clause is no longer possible.

bound variable readings are available with mismatching agreement on T and on the fake indexical. (only 3rd Agr 1st Pro)

Matrix predication affects the agreement patterns in the relative clause.
**GENERALIZATION**

When the main clause is **not predicative**: 

1. Agreement in the relative clause is no longer possible.
2. Bound variable readings are available with mismatching agreement on T and on the fake indexical. (Only 3rd Agr 1st Pro)

Matrix predication affects the agreement patterns in the relative clause.
GENERALIZATION

When the main clause is **not** predicative:

- 1st T agreement in the relative clause is no longer possible.
**GENERALIZATION**

When the main clause is **not predicative**:

- 1st T agreement in the relative clause is no longer possible.
- bound variable readings are available with **mismatching** agreement on T and on the fake indexical. (only 3rd Agr 1st Pro)
**GENERALIZATION**

When the main clause is **not predicative**:

- 1st T agreement in the relative clause is no longer possible.
- bound variable readings **are** available with **mismatching** agreement on T and on the fake indexical. (only 3rd Agr 1st Pro)

**TAKEAWAY**

Matrix predication affects the agreement patterns in the relative clause.
AGREEMENT PATTERNS
**AGREEMENT PATTERNS**

(12) **NON-PREDICATIVE MATRIX PATTERN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agr.</th>
<th>Pro.</th>
<th>Bound Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

non-predicative matrix: only the 3rd Agr 1st Pro pattern yields bound variable readings.

CONCLUSIONS:
The matrix subject can bind the pronoun directly for non-predicative matrix clauses. If this direct dependency were always available, then 3rd Agr 1st Pro wouldn't be starred for predicative matrix clauses.
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

- **non-predicative** matrix: only the 3rd Agr 1st Pro pattern yields bound variable readings
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED:

- non-predicative matrix: only the 3rd Agr 1st Pro pattern yields bound variable readings

CONCLUSIONS:

- the matrix subject can bind the pronoun directly for non-predicative matrix clauses
- if this direct dependency were always available, then 3rd Agr 1st Pro wouldn’t be starred for predicative matrix clauses
**OUR ASSUMPTIONS:**

A direct dependency between the matrix subject and the indexical is possible, but modulated by locality constraints (Wurmbrand, 2017).

Rule H*: when local binding and non-local binding yield the same interpretation, non-local binding is blocked.

* This is inspired by Wurmbrand (2017) who uses a morphological version of Rule H. We argue the regular Rule H can capture the data.
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- A **direct dependency** between the matrix subject and the indexical is possible, but modulated by locality constraints (Wurmbrand, 2017).
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- A **direct dependency** between the matrix subject and the indexical is possible, but modulated by locality constraints (Wurmbrand, 2017).

- **Rule H*** (Fox, 1998): when local binding and non-local binding yield the same interpretation, non-local binding is blocked.
**Our Assumptions:**

- A **direct dependency** between the matrix subject and the indexical is possible, but modulated by locality constraints (Wurmbrand, 2017).

- **Rule H** (Fox, 1998): when local binding and non-local binding yield the same interpretation, non-local binding is blocked.

* This is inspired by Wurmbrand (2017) who uses a morphological version of Rule H. We argue the regular Rule H can capture the data.
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix Clauses

There is no predication, so feature identification between the subject and the relative pronoun does not take place.
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**STEP 1:** There is no predication, so feature identification between the subject and the relative pronoun does not take place.
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**STEP 1:** There is no predication, so feature identification between the subject and the relative pronoun does not take place.

No Predication

\[
\text{tanha man kasi ra didam [ ke az bačče-Ø₁ negahdari mikon-Ø₁ ].}
\]

only I person RA saw-1SG that from kid-Ø₁ care do-Ø₁

\[
[1^{\text{st}}] [3^{\text{rd}}] [3^{\text{rd}}]
\]

- **who only** has 3rd person features
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix Clauses

When the features get valued, only 3rd person embedded T agreement is possible.
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**Step 2:** The **embedded T probe** enters an AGREE relation with *who*. 
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**STEP 2:** The **embedded T probe** enters an AGREE relation with *who*. When the features get valued, only [3rd] is available.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tanha man kasi ra didam [ ke az bačč-Øi negahdari mikon -ad ]}.
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{only I person RA saw-1SG that from kid-Øi care do 3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[1st] [3rd]} & \quad \text{[3rd]}
\end{align*}
\]
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**STEP 2:** The *embedded T probe* enters an AGREE relation with *who*. When the features get valued, only [3rd] is available.

```
tanha man kasi ra didam [ ke az bačč-Øₐ negahdari mikon -ad ].
only I person RA saw-1SG that from kid-Øₐ care do 3SG
[1st] [3rd]  [3rd]  [3rd]
```

► only 3rd person embedded T agreement is possible
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

The direct dependency between the matrix subject and the indexical is no longer ruled out by Rule H. The indexical can be directly bound by the subject.
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**STEP 3:** The direct dependency between the matrix subject and the indexical is no longer ruled out by Rule H.
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**STEP 3:** The direct dependency between the matrix subject and the indexical is no longer ruled out by Rule H.

\[
\text{tanha man kasi ra didam [ ke az bačč -am negahdari mikon -ad ].}
\]

only I person RA saw-1SG that from kid 1SG care do 3SG

\([1^{st}] [3^{rd}] [3^{rd}] [1^{st}] [3^{rd}]\)
Derivation for Non-Predicative Matrix

**STEP 3:** The direct dependency between the matrix subject and the indexical is no longer ruled out by Rule H.

```
tanha man kasi ra didam [ ke az bačč -am negahdari mikon –ad ].
only I person RA saw-1SG that from kid 1SG care do 3SG
```

- the indexical can be directly bound by the subject
Summary
**SUMMARY:**

A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement and bound variable readings are correlated. Embedded T agreement does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017). Sharing of Person Features under predication is optional. Languages differ in the timing of Sharing of Person Features under predication. A direct dependency between the matrix subject and the minimal pronoun is regulated by Rule H (Fox, 1989) (like Wurmbrand, 2017; but no need for H PF).
SUMMARY:

- A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement and bound variable readings are correlated.
- **embedded T agreement** does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017).
- **Sharing of Person Features under predication** is *optional*.
- Languages differ in **Timing** of **Sharing of Person Features under predication**.
A purely semantic account of fake indexicals is not sufficient for Farsi: syntactic agreement and bound variable readings are correlated.

- *embedded T agreement* does play a role in the availability of bound variable readings (contra Wurmbrand, 2017).

- **Sharing of Person Features under predication** is *optional*.

- Languages differ in **Timing** of **Sharing of Person Features under predication**.

- A *direct dependency* between the matrix subject and the minimal pronoun is regulated by **Rule H (Fox, 1989)** (like Wurmbrand, 2017; but no need for $H_{PF}$).
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KRATZER (2009): Assumptions

→ minimal pronouns are born featureless $\emptyset_i$

→ they acquire their features via binding
  (from functional heads with $\lambda$-operators)

→ Important: $\nu$ and $C$ can be merged with valued $\phi$-features
  (to preserve local phase-based spellout)

→ $\nu$ and $C$ alter the spell-out form of $\emptyset_i$
  via FEATURE TRANSMISSION UNDER BINDING

→ binding relations determined in relative clause
  (phase-based agreement, bottom-up)

→ via unification rules, the relative pronoun, $T$, $\nu$ and the indexical
  end up specified for all features involved in the various feature
  dependencies.
Kratzer (2009): Ingredients

(13) **Feature Transmission under Binding**
The $\phi$-feature set of a **bound DP** unifies with the $\phi$-feature set of the **verbal** functional head that hosts its binder.

(14) **Specifier-Head Agreement under Binding**
When a DP occupies the **specifier** position of a head that carries a $\lambda$-operator, their $\phi$-feature sets **unify**.

(15) **Feature Compatibility**
Bound variable readings are only obtained when the possessive pronoun and the closest verb have **compatible $\phi$-features** (before-spell out).
**KRATZER (2009): Derivation**

(16) I am the only one who takes care of her children.

**Bottom-up!**

**STEP 0:** $v \& C$ enter derivation with relevant features

**STEP 1:** $v \&$ the possessive enter **FEATURE TRANSMISSION**

**STEP 2:** *predication* (spec-head agr.) between subject DP and $v$

**STEP 3:** subject DP AGREES with $T$

**STEP 4:** subject DP and $C$ enter **FEATURE TRANSMISSION**
**Wurmbbrand (2017): Observation**

Kratzer (2009) proposes that the embedded little ν comes with 1st person features. This wrongly predicts that there should be no difference between (10a) and (10b).

(17) a. I am the only one [who has done my/her best]. ✓ BVar
    b. The only one [who has done *my/her best] is me. *BVar

**Conclusion:**

→ ν does not come equipped with 1st person features
→ the derivation is not bottom-up.
**WURMBRAND (2017): Assumptions**

→ the AGREE relations with $T$ and $v$ are **irrelevant**.

→ A **direct dependency** between the antecedent and the overt indexical pronoun is needed.

→ A locality condition reminiscent of Rule H (Heim 1993, Fox 1998) favoring feature sharing with the closest relevant antecedent.

→ Certain (markedness inspired) morphological feature co-occurrence restrictions.
Wurmbrand (2017): **Ingredients**

→ The semantic dependencies in the targeted sentences are **predication, relativization, and binding**.

→ Any feature sharing relation triggered by these dependencies has to obey Rule $H_{PF}$, which requires sharing with the closest antecedent.

(18) **RULE $H_{PF}$**:
A variable $x$ cannot Agree with an antecedent $\alpha$, in cases where a **more local antecedent** $\beta$ could Agree with $x$ and share morphosyntactic features with $x$.

$\approx$ typical locality restriction
WURMBRAND (2017): Derivation

(19) I am the only one who takes care of my children.

Top-Down!