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1. Introduction

Collins and Postal (2012), building on work originating in Collins et al. (2008), study DPs that they refer to as "person imposters," or simply "imposters," which are defined as in (1):

(1) An imposter is a notionally X person DP that is grammatically Y person, X ≠ Y.

This is illustrated with the Icelandic example in which a father is talking to his son or daughter and refers to himself as pabbi "Daddy."

(2) Svona svona, elskan, pabbi er hér.

"There there, dear, Daddy is here."

This is an example of a first person imposter. The DP pabbi "Daddy" is notionally first person (referring to the speaker), but grammatically third person.

(3) Hvað segir kallinn?

"How are you?"

As we will show below, kallinn "the guy" can also be a first person imposter. In this chapter, we will mostly focus on first person imposters.

Collins and Postal (2012) show that the syntactic behavior of imposters presents some interesting puzzles for our understanding of personhood and pronoun-antecedent relations. As discussed further below, phenomena involving imposters suggest that there is a syntactic relation between a pronoun and its antecedent, rather than a relation governed by reference (or even intended reference). In this chapter, we will address a number of issues relating to Icelandic imposters, with a focus on the effect of finite verb agreement on pronoun-antecedent relations.

Before continuing, some terminological discussion is in order. Collins and Postal (2012) argue that imposter DPs are structurally complex, and contain a null pronoun corresponding to the intended referent. For example, a first person imposter would have a null first person pronoun. The visible DP is referred to as the "secondary DP," and the null pronoun is referred to as the "notional core." These two DPs are argued to be embedded within a third DP, which is called the "shell DP." This is illustrated below.
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D
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The idea of the shell DP is that imposters are similar in structure to appositives, which involve two DPs, in a predicative relation, that distribute like one DP. We will assume in what follows that imposters do have complex structure, but will remain uncommitted as to the exact nature of that structure; see Vázquez Rojas (this volume) for further discussion of the internal structure of imposter DPs.

1 The following abbreviations are used in this chapter: ACC = "accusative," DAT = "dative," F = "feminine," GEN = "genitive," IND = "indicative," INF = "infinitive," M = "masculine," NUM = "number," PL = "plural," PN = "person," REF = "reflexive," SBJ = "subjective," SG = "singular," 1 = "first person," 2 = "second person," 3 = "third person." When a verb form is syncretic for person, we reflect this with a slash, so that 1/3sG in a verb's gloss means "syncretic for first and third person singular."

2 For some imposters, we simply use the personal pronoun in the English translation line, for lack of a clear equivalent imposter in English.

3 The impersonal pronoun maður "man, one" can also be used to refer to the speaker, and raises similar issues as imposters do, but is also different in a number of ways that go beyond the scope of this chapter (such as being formally indefinite); see Jónsson (1992) for some discussion of the antecedence properties of maður across clauses; see also H. A. Sigurðsson and Egerland (2009) and E. F. Sigurðsson (2012: 94ff.) for further discussion of maður, and Collins and Postal (2012: 52-53) and Vázquez Rojas (this volume) for discussion of formally indefinite imposters.
2. Some Imposters in Icelandic

There are numerous examples of and types of imposters in modern Icelandic. In this study, we will for the most part limit ourselves to only a few. However, before turning to a more detailed look at agreement and pronominal/reflexive antecedence, we first give a cursory overview of a variety of imposters in the language.

One type of first person imposter involves a proper name or kinship relation, such as mamma "Mommy," pabbi "Daddy," Jón "John," or Jón frendi "Uncle John." 4

(5) En pabbi er longu búinn að segja þér það.  
but Daddy is.1/3sg long finished to tell you that  
"But Daddy already told you that a long time ago."

In this chapter, we will discuss the imposter pabbi "Daddy" in some detail, since its equivalent across languages has been studied in the past few years possibly more than any other type of imposter; this makes it useful for cross-linguistic comparison.

Another type of imposter, which we will also focus on here, is undirritadur "(the) undersigned (sg)." 5

(6) Undirritadur hafði ætlað að hætta í stjórnmalum.  
undersigned.m.sg had.1/3sg intended to stop in politics  
"The undersigned had planned to quit politics."

An analogous expression has been described in a number of languages, such as English, Bellinzonese, Italian, Romanian, and Albanian, and often exhibits properties which distinguish it from other imposters (see references in section 3 below). In Icelandic, this turns out to be the case as well. First, it has the form of an adjectival participle. Second, unlike English, Romance, and Albanian, it is morphologically indefinite. Third, it can also be marked for number, and some differences between the behavior of undirritadur "undersigned (sg)" and undirritadur "undersigned (pl)" will be discussed below.

4 For imposter interpretations of pabbi "Daddy," Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.) prefers an extra pronoun, known as a 'propriant article', as in (i). See Wood (2009) for further discussion.

(i) En hann pabbi er longu búinn að segja þér það.  
but he Daddy is.1/3sg long finished to tell you that  
"But Daddy already told you that a long time ago."

5 As discussed below, this imposter inflects for gender and number depending on the person it refers to. When discussing the form in general, we will use the masculine singular form and in general, we will write "(sg)" or "(pl)" depending on whether it is singular or plural. All citations in conjoined phrases (e.g., undirritadur og Jón) are singular.

Another type of imposter is compositional and complex, and turns out to be rather common in parliament speeches. Icelandic has a kind of demonstrative, sá "the one," which does not necessarily require a head noun, but does require either a relative clause or some other kind of modifier. In the present case, we find a relative clause which refers to the speaker, such as sá sem hér stendur "the one who is talking here" or sá sem hér stendur "the one who is standing here." The following is an attested example from a parliament discussion. 6

(7) Þir þingmenn úr þingflokki Vinstri hreyfingarinnar – græns framboðs,  
three MPs from party Left Movement – green candidate,  
hv. pm. Kolbrún Hallaðsdóttir, hv. þurður Backman og (sá sem hér  
Kolbrún Halldórsdóttir, hv. Þuríður Backman and the one who here  
sstands.3sg  
höfum lagt fram þáttill. sem hljómar a þessa lund, með leyfi  
have.1pl. laid forth resolution which sounds like this—with permission  
forseta.  
president  
"Three MPs from the Left-Green Movement, the honorable MP Kolbrún Halldórs-  
dóttir, the honorable MP Þuríður Backman, and the one who stands here, have  
submitted a parliamentary resolution which sounds like this—with the permis-  
sion of the president."

This example is an imposter par excellence. Notice that the verb inside the relative  
clause is third person singular, showing that the relative head has the features or properties of a third person DP. However, the overall DP refers to the speaker, and despite being third singular, it is conjointed with another third person DP and controls first person agreement on the main clause verb.

Some imposters appear to have arisen rather recently, and are common in very  
informal speech among certain speakers, especially younger ones. The first is  
kallinn, sometimes spelled kjellinn (reflecting pronunciation; IPA = [kʰatǐn] and  
[kʰetǐn], respectively). It is formally a noun with a definite suffix. 8 The second  
is gambi "old," also spelled gjemli. It is formally a "weak" adjective, marked as  

6 English examples similar to this are also discussed by Collins and Postal (2012: 178). The  
brackets in (7) are intended to help the reader parse sá sem hér stendur "the one who stands here"  
as a constituent.

7 http://www.althingi.is/altext/125/12/r15213123.sgml

8 The standard way of writing this is karlinn, though this is not how it is usually written. Karlinn  
means "the man / the old man," which is pronounced either [kʰartǐn], or the same way as kallinn  
(IPA = [kʰatǐn]). To our knowledge, karlinn, when written this way or pronounced [kʰartǐn], never  
has the imposter reading.
though it were modifying a definite noun. The examples below come from Google searches and Icelandic television.9

(8) a. en kjellinn aetrar samt að passa sig
    but guy.the intends.2/3sg still to look.after refl
    að vera ekkert of mikið í þessu
    to be not too much in this
    "But I am still going to be careful not to be too involved in this."10
b. Fullt af monni á leðinni. Og allir í vasann hjá kjellinnum.
    full of money on way.the and all in pocket.the by guy.the.dat
    "Lots of money on the way. And all of it into my pocket."(Næturvaktin, Ep. 10, 1: 03)
c. Nög að gera hjá gjemla.
    enough to do by old.dat
    "I've got plenty to do."11

Yet another type of imposter, yðar einlagur, is analogous to English yours truly, in form and meaning. It is similar in that like yours truly, it can be used to end a letter, or as an argument. The following example of it being used as an argument comes from a Google search.

(9) Yðar einlagur hefur undanfarnar vikur verið að velta fyrrir sér...
    yours truly has.2/3sg past.few weeks been to roll before refl.3
    "Yours truly has for the past few weeks been wondering..."12

It is different from English in that the form of the possessive pronoun, yðar, is an archaic honorific form (similar to German Sie "you") and not normally used in colloquial speech except in certain fixed expressions. Note that this form also occurs in certain fixed camouflage forms, such as yðar hágofski "your majesty" and yðar hátiðg "your highness."13 Another camouflage construction, þinn (lata) rass "your (lazy) ass," uses the modern pronoun þinn "your."

(10) Mættu klukkan 9, ef þú getur dregið þinn lata rass fram úr rúminu.
    meet clock 9, if you can drag your lazy ass out of bed.the
    "Meet at 9 o'clock, if you can drag your lazy ass out of bed." (Wood 2009: 28)

Certain relational expressions such as þinn auðumjúkri þönn "your humble servant" also have (first person, non-camouflage) imposter uses.

(11) Þinn auðumjúkri þönn biður tilskipanar þinnar.
    your humble servant awaits.2/3sg command your
    "Your humble servant awaits your command." (Wood 2009: 27)

Imposters can also be formed with demonstratives such as þessi "this" plus a noun naming some kind of role or job title, as in þessi fréttamæður "this reporter." The following is an example taken from Google of an imposter use of þessi bloggari "this blogger."14

(12) Hann fer tvismælaust á lista yfir bestu tónleika
    it.3g goes undoubtedly on list over best concerts
    sem þessi bloggari hefur farið á.
    that this blogger has.2/3sg gone to
    "It undoubtedly goes on the list of the best concerts that this blogger has ever gone to."15

It is unclear whether plural imposters with demonstratives of this sort can be formed. Speakers seem to vary in whether they accept imposter uses of þessir fréttamen "these reporters," in English as well as in Icelandic. A further, similar case involves nouns like "author." Translations for "the present authors" (númerandi/vístaddir höfundar) do not have imposter readings in Icelandic. Imposters of the sort höfundar þessarar greinar ("the authors of this article") (with genitive case on "this article") are possible. An example from the web is presented in (13).

(13) Í rúmi tvó ár hafa höfundar þessarar greinar
    for around two years have.3pl authors this.gn article.gen
    verið í höpi þeirra sjónmorgu sem nota samskiptavefinn Facebook.
    been in group those many who use networking.site.the Facebook
    "For a little more than two years, the authors of this article have been among the many who use the networking site Facebook."16
Unfortunately, we are not able to address plural definite imposters in Icelandic in this chapter. Such a study would be an important next step in understanding plural imposters such as undirritaðir "undersigned (pl)," but at a first pass, the relevant judgments are unclear, so it must unfortunately be set aside.

Before concluding this section, it seems appropriate to mention the existence of a construction which seems to be a type of camouflage construction, characteristic of children's speech. This form is illustrated below in (14) with an example from an online discussion of it.

(14) Pinns má vera Barbie ef minns má vera Action Man.

"You can be Barbie if I can be Action Man."^17

Here, we have the expressions minns and pinns, apparently constructed from masculine, singular, nominative possessive pronouns in the first and second person (minn/pinn) respectively, and an -s that resembles the genitive -s. Outside this usage, however, minns and pinns are not well-formed expressions in Icelandic.\(^18\) This seems to be related to imposters and/or camouflage constructions in the sense that it is equally possible to use the ordinary first and second person pronouns in these cases.\(^19\) This expression has the flavor of child language which is used in informal speech. It is not used exclusively by children, but when a speaker uses it, s/he relies on the other speaker knowing that it comes from child language.

Pinns and minns often control third person agreement and apparently only occur in the first and second person. However, when conjoined with another third person DP, they can control first person agreement, as in the following example found on Google:

(15) Minns og lögfræðingurinn tilvoni undirjeið undirritahr

MINNS and lawyer. the future are.1PL finished. M.PL

að vera húkkut á á [sic] þessum geggaða leik.

to be hooked on on this crazy game

"Me and the future lawyer have been hooked on this awesome game.”^20

Note, moreover, that minns can control number and gender agreement on verbal participles, as shown in (15) with bætur "finished" and (16) with komnar "come." This happens even in the singular, where finite verb agreement is third person. We have also found an example of second person pinns anteceding what appears to be a third person reflexive possessive pronoun with the same -s, as shown in (18).

(16) Minns og Bübbó erum komnar í hop sorgegra bloggara,

MINNS and Bübbó are.1PL come. M.PL in group sad bloggers.Gen

höngum her heima, rifnum st í druslum og bloggum um þa

hang.1PL here at home fight.1PL in sluts and blog.1PL about them

"Me and Bübbó have joined the group of sad bloggers, hanging around here at home, picking on sluts and blogging about them."^21

There also seem to exist first and second person plural forms, okka(r)s and ykka(r) s, respectively, apparently built on the stem of the genitive/possessive forms of the pronouns okka(r)-ykka(r) plus -s. (The -r - appears variably.) These forms are less common, however, and not all speakers have heard of them. Examples of okka(r)s "we" can be found with third person agreement in the singular and plural, as well as first person plural agreement. We have not conducted a full study of the agreement possibilities with these forms, but such a study would seem to be a worthwhile topic for future research.

In the following section, we discuss previous work on imposters, in Icelandic and other languages. Then, we focus on the agreement and pronominal/reflexive antecedent properties of the following imposters: undirritaður "undersigned (sg)," undirritaður "undersigned (pl)," undirritaður og X "the undersigned and X," pabbi "Daddy," and mamma og pabbi "Mommy and Daddy." We will discuss some other imposters along the way, and then turn to a closer look at some specific properties of undirritaður "undersigned (sg)."

3. Previous Work

Previous work on imposters has addressed a number of issues cross-linguistically, including some preliminary work on verbal agreement. Wood (2009)
studies the interaction of Icelandic imposters with an optional pronoun (known as the "proprial article") that occurs with certain DPs in the language (see H. Á. Sigurðsson 2006). That study also includes a first probe into Icelandic verbal agreement with imposters, which is pursued in more detail here. Das (2011) discusses imposters in Bengali, a language which is apparently quite strict in that first and second person pronouns generally cannot take imposter antecedents. She proposes that this is related to the rich verbal agreement exhibited by Bengali, and provides some preliminary comparison with English, Italian, and Albanian. While we will show that the strictest form of Das's proposal cannot be maintained, we think that her intuition is on the right track and is worth refining. We will show that verbal agreement does indeed play a surprisingly important role in pronoun-antecedent relations in Icelandic. However, we will also show that the relevant facts are more complicated than Das's proposal would suggest. First, different imposters behave differently with respect to verbal agreement in Icelandic. Second, agreement effects can be shown, on the basis of syncretism and ECM contexts, to be only partially morphological. Third, in addition to agreement, a number of other properties are involved, including whether the pronoun is subject or object and whether the mood of the clause is imperative or indicative. For reflexives, the type of reflexive (inherent, natural, or disjoint) is apparently relevant in some cases as well. Fourth, and most importantly certain mismatches between agreement and antecedence are possible: an imposter that triggers third person agreement may antecede a first person pronoun, but an imposter that triggers first person agreement may not antecede a third person pronoun.

Our primary goal in this chapter is to refine our understanding of the role of verbal agreement in pronoun/reflexive-antecedent relations. Icelandic verbal agreement is quite "rich." Many verbal paradigms have a distinct form for each person/number slot. Others have syncretism in the singular between second and third person or first and third person.24

(19) sjá "see" (present ind.) hafa "have" (present ind.) vera "be" (present ind.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>sé</td>
<td>sjáum</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>hef</td>
<td>höfum</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>erum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>sérd</td>
<td>sjáð</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>hefur</td>
<td>hafað</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ert</td>
<td>eru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>sér</td>
<td>sjá</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>hefur</td>
<td>hafa</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>eru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite having rich agreement morphology, Icelandic is not a referential pro-drop language (see H. Á. Sigurðsson and Egerland 2009 and H. Á. Sigurðsson 2010 for recent discussion). The combination of rich agreement morphology and the absence of referential pro constrains the space of plausible analyses for the effects seen in this chapter.25

However, in order to study the effect of imposters on verbal agreement, a number of other issues must be addressed along the way. Work on imposters in the past few years has revealed several cross-linguistic tendencies, despite (often very fine-grained) differences among individual languages, dialects, and idiolects. Many of these tendencies are also evident in Icelandic. First, an imposter coordinated with a third person DP is more likely to show first person effects than a non-coordinate plural imposter, which in turn is more likely to show first person effects than a singular imposter. By "more likely" here, we are referring both to intraspeaker comparative judgments across constructions, as well as to variation across languages. Second, imposters corresponding to participial forms such as "the undersigned" tend to be more likely to show first person effects than imposters like "Daddy." This has been shown most clearly in Cattaneo (2007, 2009) for Bellinzonese (al sottuscrit), a northern Italian dialect, and similar facts have been presented in Servidio (this volume) for Italian (il sottoscritto), in Soare (2010) for Romanian (subsemnatul), and will be evident below in the Icelandic data on undirritaður as well.26

4. Verbal Agreement

In general, we will see that verbal agreement with imposters in Icelandic exhibits the following tendency: plural and coordinate imposters are more likely to control first person agreement than singular imposters, and among singular imposters, "the undersigned" is more likely to control first person agreement than "Daddy" or "this reporter." To illustrate these points, consider first that singular imposters basically do not control first person agreement, as shown in (20a–b). By comparison, first person agreement on the plural undirritaður "the undersigned (pl)," while not perfect, is much better than on the singular undirritaður "the undersigned (sg)," as shown in (20c).

(20) a. (Hann) pabbi [hefur / *hef} sagt þér það.
   (he) Daddy [has.3sG / *lsG} told you that
   "Daddy has told you that."

b. Undirritaður [hefur / *hef} akvéðið æðtta.
   undersigned,M,SG [has.3sG / *lsG} decided to quit
   "The undersigned (sg) has decided to quit."

25 Rögnvaldsson (1993) proposes that referential pro is possible in Icelandic sentence coordination structures, but that pro cannot be identified by verbal inflection in Icelandic, essentially because Icelandic has oblique subjects, which do not agree with the finite verb. The important point for the present analysis is that rich agreement cannot identify, and in effect cannot license pro in Icelandic. See also Dudley (this volume) for independent arguments against a pro analysis of imposter agreement in Spanish; it is noted there that a pro analysis cannot easily account for the fact that plural imposters trigger first person agreement much more easily than singular imposters.

26 Note that while not always explicitly discussed as special, "undersigned" imposters play a role in most of the other contributions to this volume as well.
c. Undirritaair (hafa / ?höfum) haldíð þessu fram. 
undersigned.M.PL (have.3PL / 1PL) held this forth
"The undersigned (pl) have claimed this."

While the second author and several other speakers we have consulted find a difference between undirritaaur "undersigned (sg)" and undirritaair "undersigned (pl)," as indicated in (20) above, we should note that we do find attested examples of undirritaaur "undersigned (sg)" with first person agreement on the web, such as the following:27

(21) a. Undirritaður hef kynnt mér 
undersigned.M.sg have.1sg familiarized myself
skilmála fyrr Dælulykil Atlantsoliu.
conditions for discount.key Atlantsolía
"The undersigned (sg) has familiarized myself with the conditions for the Atlantsolía discount key."

b. Undirritaður hef verið ræðjarið fjölda fyrirtækja og 
undersigned.M.sg have.1sg been consultant many.gen companies and
fjarðesta.
investors
"The undersigned (sg) has been a consultant of many companies and investors."

In (22), we provide some attested examples of undirritaður/undirritaðar "undersigned (pl.m/f)" taking first person plural agreement.28

(22) a. Undirritaður erum að vinna að lokaritgerð 
undersigned.M.PL are.1PL to work to final.thesis
til B.S gráðu í fjörrafræðum.
for B.S. degree in athletic.studies
"The undersigned (pl) are working on their final thesis for a B.S. degree in athletic studies."

b. Undirritaðar ætlum að taka það að okkur að 
undersigned.F.PL intend.1PL to take it to ourselves to
versla í sameiginlega
shop in joint
málst í fyrir laugardagaskvöðli og kaupa små snakk og nammi.
meal for Saturday.evening and buy little snack and candy
"The undersigned (pl) plan on taking it upon ourselves to shop together for Saturday evening’s meal and buy some snacks and candy."

Not all speakers would agree with these judgments exactly. However, in each case—for speakers who get a contrast at all—first person is clearly better in the coordinated case than in the singular case, which is completely out. As far as we know, no speakers have the opposite judgment, preferring agreement in the singular case over the coordinated case.

Agreement with CoPs containing a second person pronoun varies cross-linguistically. In Icelandic, as originally discussed in Wood (2009), such agreement is always either third person (for the majority of speakers) or first person (for fewer speakers), but never second person, as far as we know.29

you and Daddy intend.2PL to go together to work today
b. % Dú og pabbi ætlu að fara saman í vinnuna í dag. 
you and Daddy intend.3PL to go together to work today
"You and Daddy are going to work together today." (Wood 2009: 19)
(24b) is of particular interest because it threatens the Illegal Coordinate Person Value Assignment Condition (ICPVAC) of Collins and Postal (2012: 117). The ICPVAC says, “If C is a conjunctive coordinate DP, then no conjunct of C outranks C.” “Outrank” refers to a hierarchy of person features where first person outranks second person, and second person outranks third person (as also discussed by Friðjónsson 1990–1991). Thus, you and I is a first person DP, and you and John is a second person DP. In example (24b), however, the verb agreement is third person, but one of the conjuncts is second person. This seems to be more general than imposters. Friðjónsson (1990–1991) reports that a coordinated subject containing a second person pronoun is not always completely ungrammatical with third person agreement.

(25) a. Þú og konan förú á bió.
   you and woman.the went.3PL to movie
   “You and the woman went to a movie.”
b. Þú og konan förúð á bió.
   you and woman.the went.2PL to movie
   “You and the woman went to a movie.” (Friðjónsson 1990–1991: 81)

Relatedly, with a second person genitive partitive, third person agreement is actually preferable, though second person agreement is possible. This is dependent on the person features of the partitive, as shown in (26c).

(26) a. Mörg ykkar vitið
   many.NOM you.PL-GEN know.3PL ...
   “Many of you know...”
b. (?) Mörg ykkar vitið
   many.NOM you.PL-GEN know.2PL ...
   “Many of you know...” (Friðjónsson 1990–1991: 81)
c. Mörg okkar vitið
   many.NOM us.PL-GEN know.2PL ...

Partitives play an important role in uncovering conditions on pronominal antecedence in Collins and Postal (2012) (see especially pp. 169–176), and the data in (26) show that they might play an important role in developing a better understanding of the triggers of verbal agreement (see also den Dikken 2001 on “pluringulars”). For now, we point this out because it is another example of a complex DP containing second person features which may or may not result in third person agreement. The main point is that given that verbal agreement is a syntactic process, the ungrammaticality of (24a) shows that the interpretation of a third person DP as first person has its roots in a syntactic process.

5. Reflexive Antecedence

As has long been known, Icelandic has a rather complicated reflexive system (Sigrún Jónsdóttir 1992). In the typology of Reuland’s (2011) monograph, Icelandic is described as having the most complex system (a “four-way” system), and is arguably even more complex than Reuland (2011) indicates. We will see below that reflexive/antecedence forms are sometimes sensitive to the type of reflexive construction. We are not in a position to offer an account as to why this is, but include it for now as a control on the data. More research would be required to understand exactly what the facts are with respect to a more sophisticated set of properties of reflexive predicates. For now, we will focus our preliminary discussion on three types of reflexives: inherent reflexives, natural reflexives, and naturally disjoint reflexives (cf. Schäfer 2012 and references therein). Inherent reflexives include skemmta sér “enjoy oneself/have fun” and skammast sín “be/feel ashamed of oneself.” They have the property that they can only take a reflexive object (not a non-reflexive object), and a simplex reflexive at that (i.e., without “self”). The simplex reflexive can be accusative (sig), dative (sér), or genitive (sín). Natural reflexives include auglysa “advertise” and raka “shave”; these verbs ordinarily take a simplex reflexive, but can take a non-reflexive DP object, and do allow a complex “self” reflexive, if used with contrastive focus. Naturally disjoint reflexives such as elsa “love” do not normally allow a simplex reflexive, but rather require a complex “self” reflexive. This is summarized in (27) below.

(27) | Simplex “Self” | Disjoint obj. | Examples |
--- | --- | --- | --- |
Naturally disjoint | No | Yes | Yes | elsa “love” |
Natural reflexives | Yes | Focus | Yes | auglysa “advertise” |
Inherent reflexives | Yes | No | No | skemmta “enjoy” |

This does not do full justice to the complexity of the reflexive system in Icelandic and the areas of grammar where it is relevant, but it is sufficient for present purposes. See Reuland (2011) for recent theoretical discussion and Árnadóttir et al. (2011) for a number of further subtypes of reflexive constructions.

As discussed in Collins and Postal (2012: 125–128) with respect to French, verbal agreement plays a role in the acceptability of reflexive antecedence. We will show that the same holds for Icelandic. This is perhaps a welcome and unsurprising result, given that a number of theories in recent years have proposed that the dependency between a reflexive and its antecedent is mediated by an

20 As discussed by Árnadóttir et al., (2011), skemmta also has a non-reflexive use meaning “entertain,” but the readings are distinct enough for present purposes.
agreement (or Agree) relation involving the verb, directly or indirectly (Reuland 2006, 2011; Heim 2008; Hicks 2009; Kratzer 2009). To illustrate with a clear case, when undirritaður "undersigned (sg)" is conjoined and takes first person agreement, only a first person reflexive is possible. When the same CoP takes third person agreement, only a third person reflexive is possible. \[1] \[2]

(28) a. Undirritaður og Jón, skammast (*okkar, / sin, ) fyrir undersigned.m.sg and John shame.3pl (*ourselves / themselves) for ummælin.

comments.the

"The undersigned and John feel ashamed for their comments."

b. Undirritaður, og Jón, skömmumst (*okkar, / *sin, ) fyrir undersigned.m.sg and John shame.1pl (*ourselves / *themselves) for ummælin.

comments.the

"The undersigned and John feel ashamed for their comments."

When the coordinate imposter is in an ECM subject position, and thus triggers no agreement, either, though the first person reflexive is a bit odd in some cases.

(29) a. Þeir toldu undirritaðan, og Jón, they believed undersigned.m.sg.acc and John skammast (*okkar, / sin, ) fyrir undersigned.m.sg and John shame.3pl (*ourselves / themselves) for ummælin.

shame.inf (*ourselves / themselves) for comments.the

"They believed the undersigned and John to feel ashamed for our comments."

b. Þeir sáu undirritaðan, og Jón, they saw undersigned.m.sg.acc and John auglýsa (*okkar, / sig, ) í sjónvarpinu.

advertise.inf (*ourselves / themselves) in television.the

"They saw the undersigned and John advertise themselves on TV."

c. Þeir tóldu undirritaðan, og Jón, they believed undersigned.m.sg.acc and John elska sjálfa (*okkar, / sig, ) meira en allt annað.

love.inf self (*ourselves / their) more than anything else

"They believed the undersigned and John to love themselves more than anything else."

Since singular imposters do not easily take first person agreement, it might be expected independently of anything else that first person anaphors are not possible in finite contexts. This is so, even when the verb in question is morphologically syncretic for first and third person, as in the examples below. \[3] \[4]

(30) a. Undirritaður skammast (*min, / sin, ) fyrir ummælin.

undersigned.m.sg shame.1/2/3sg (*myself / himself *) for comments.the

"The undersigned (sg) feels ashamed due to his comments."

b. Pabbi, skemmti (*mér, / sér, ) vel í gær.

Daddy enjoyed.1/3sg (*myself / himself *) well yesterday

"Daddy enjoyed himself yesterday."

However, the asymmetry between singular and plural imposters goes further than this. Recall that when agreement is controlled for with an ECM predicate, the plural cases allow both first and third person reflexives, though the latter are preferable. Even when agreement is controlled for with an ECM predicate, where there is never any overt agreement, there is a clear contrast between the plural cases in (29) and the singular ones shown in (31) and (32) below.

(31) a. Þeir toldu undirritaðan, they believed undersigned.m.sg.acc skammast (*min, / sin, ) fyrir ummælin.

shame.inf (*myself / himself ) for comments.the

"They believed the undersigned (sg) to feel ashamed for his comments."

b. Þeir sáu undirritaðan,

they saw undersigned.m.sg.acc auglýsa (*mig, / sig, ) í sjónvarpinu.

advertise.inf (*myself / himself ) in television.the

"They saw the undersigned (sg) advertise himself on TV."

c. Þeir tóldu undirritaðan,

they believed undersigned.m.sg.acc elska sjálfa (*mig, / sig, ) meira en allt annað.

love.inf self (*my / his *) more than everything else

"They believed the undersigned (sg) to love himself more than anything else."

(32) a. Þeir sáu pabba, skemmti (*mér, / sér, ) vel í gær.

they saw Daddy enjoyed.1/3sg (*myself / himself *) well yesterday

"They saw Daddy enjoying himself yesterday."

b. Þeir sáu pabba, raka (*mig, / sig, ) í gær.

they saw Daddy shave.inf (*myself / himself ) yesterday

"They saw Daddy shaving himself yesterday."

\[3] As indicated, skemmt "shame" is in fact syncretic for all persons in the singular, though it does make person distinctions in the plural.
c. Tveir toldu pabba,
  they believed Daddy
  elska sjálfan (*mig / sig, ) meira en allt annað.
  love.INF self (*my / his ) more than everything else
  "They believed Daddy to love himself more than anything else."

Just as morphological syncretism on the finite verb does not help singular imposters antecede first person reflexives, putting a singular imposter in a non-agreeing ECM subject position does not help either. This singular/plural asymmetry cannot, then, be attributed directly to the independent asymmetry with morphological agreement. When imposter pabbi "Daddy" is coordinated, the effect is somewhere in between these two cases—while inherent reflexives exclude a first person anaphor, for natural reflexives and naturally disjoint predicates, first person is not as bad as the singular case, but worse than coordinated undirritaður "undersigned (sg)."

(33) a. Tveir sau mömmu og pabba,
    they saw Mommy and Daddy
    skemmta (*okkur, / sér, ) vel í gær.
    enjoy.INF *ourselves / themselves well yesterday
    "They saw Mommy and Daddy enjoy themselves yesterday."

b. Logreglan sá mömmu, og pabba,
  police.the saw Mommy and Daddy
  raka (*okkur, / sig, ) á ströndinni í gær.
  shave.INF *ourselves/ themselves on beach.the yesterday
  "The police saw Mommy and Daddy shaving themselves on the beach yesterday."

c. Tveir toldu mömmu, og pabba,
  they believed Mommy and Daddy
  elska sjálf (*okkur, / sig, ) meira en allt annað.
  love.INF self (*our / their ) more than everything else
  "They believed Mommy and Daddy to love themselves more than anything else."

Again, the difference between (32b-c) on the one hand and (33b-c) on the other cannot be attributed to morphological subject-verb agreement.

Undirritaður "the undersigned (pl)" is slightly worse with a first person reflexive than undirritaður og Jón "the undersigned and John," but not as bad as mamma og pabbi "Mommy and Daddy."

(34) a. Tveir tóldu undirritaða,ú
    they believed undersigned.M.PL.ACC
    skammtast (*okkar, / sín, ) fyrir ummælin.
    shame.INF *ourselves/ themselves for comments.the
    "They believed the undersigned (pl) to feel ashamed of ourselves for our comments."

Table 9.1 Reflexive Predicates in ECM Contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Inherent</th>
<th>1st Natural</th>
<th>1st Disjoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daddy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mommy and Daddy</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned (plural)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned and John</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Tveir sau undirritaða,ú
  they saw undersigned.M.PL.ACC
  auglýsa (*okkur, / sig, ) í sjónvarpinu.
  advertise.INF *ourselves/ themselves in television.the
  "They saw the undersigned (pl) advertise ourselves on TV."

c. Tveir tóldu undirritaða,ú
  they believed undersigned.M.PL.ACC
  elska sjálf (*okkur, / sig, ) meira en allt annað.
  love.INF self (*our / their ) more than everything else
  "They believed the undersigned (pl) to love ourselves more than anything else."

The data discussed so far are summarized in Table 9.1.

Here, we see that plurals with first person reflexives are generally better than singulars with first person reflexives. We also see some effects of the type of reflexives. Natural reflexives are slightly better than the others in the first person, and inherent reflexives are slightly better in the first person than disjoint reflexives are.

Given the above, it doesn't seem obvious that mamma og pabbi "Mommy and Daddy" behaves differently from singular pabbi "Daddy" and undirritaður "the undersigned (sg)," since the reported difference between them is so slight ("??" versus "*"). However, turning to more complex constructions reveals a much stronger difference between singular pabbi "Daddy" and coordinated mamma og pabbi "Mommy and Daddy." Like in English, a preposed purpose clause improves the first person reflexive in the plural even more, to the point where third person is actually quite odd, as illustrated in (35a). 34

(i) Tveir letu mömmu, og pabbi, byggja sérstakt herbergi til að
    they made Mommy and Daddy build.INF special room for to
    raka (*okkur, / sig, ) i.
    shave (*ourselves / themselves ) in
    "They made Mommy and Daddy build a special room to shave in."

(ii) Tveir telja mömmu, og pabbi, vonast til að raka
    they believe Mommy and Daddy hope.INF for to shave
    (*okkur, / sig, ) einhvern tímann.
    *ourselves / themselves some time
    "They believe Mommy and Daddy to hope to shave someday."

34 Control into purpose clauses can in general improve the first person reflexive with a plural imposter, and is better than control into a complement clause.
Note, however, that first person singular is still quite bad here, as illustrated in (35b).

(35) a. Til þess að læra að raka {okkur, */sig} betur, for it to learn to shave {ourselves / themselves} better, sagði Jón frændi mömmu og papba, að fara á námkeið. told John Uncle Mommy and Daddy to go to class "In order to learn to shave better, Uncle John told Mommy and Daddy to take a class."
b. Til þess að læra að raka {?myself / himself} betur, for it to learn to shave {ourselves / themselves} better, sagði mamma papba, að fara á námkeið. told Mommy Daddy to go to class "In order to learn to shave better, Mommy told Daddy to take a class."

Thus, even with the imposter use of pabbi "Daddy," an imposter which doesn't seem to trigger first person agreement on its own, we can find a strong difference in coordinated cases such as mamma og pabbi "Mommy and Daddy."

What we have shown in this section is that different imposters react differently to different reflexive types—even when overt morphology is controlled for by using non-finite contexts. We also saw a number of other constraints that cannot be attributed directly to verbal agreement, such as the difference between singulars and plurals in terms of the availability of an imposter anteceding a first person reflexive (as illustrated by the contrast between (31) and (32), on the one hand, versus (33) and (34), on the other). Still, overt agreement morphology does make a difference in constraining reflexive-antecedent relations. When agreement is unambiguously first person, the reflexive must be first person. When agreement is third person, the reflexive must be third person.

35 Note that we find homogeneity (mismatch) effects as well, so that there can be a first person reflexive in the preposed clause and a third person reflexive in the lower clause.

(i) Til þess að læra að raka {okkur, */sig} betur, sagði Jón for it to learn to shave {ourselves / themselves} better told John frændi mömmu og papba, að hvila sig aður en Uncle Mommy and Daddy to relax themselves before námkeið byjar, class the begins "In order to learn to shave better, Uncle John told Mommy and Daddy to relax before the class begins."

36 The effect is weaker when agreement is third person, however.
The same effect obtains when plural "undersigned" takes first person agreement and antecedes a pronoun in the complement clause; the pronoun must be first person, and third person is unacceptable. The mood of the complement clause makes no difference here either.

(38) a. Undirritaður, hófum áður sagt
undersigned.M.PL have.1PL before said
að yfirvold vilji bara móðga (okkur, / / ’pá, ).
that authorities want.SBJV just insult (us / ’them )
"The undersigned (pl) have said before that the authorities just want to insult us."

b. Undirritaður, uppgötuðum í fyrра
undersigned.M.PL discovered.1PL last year
að stjórnin vill reka (okkur, / ’pá, ).
that management wants.IND fire (us / ’them )
"The undersigned and John discovered last year that management wants to fire us."

When plural "undersigned" takes third person agreement and antecedes a pronoun in a complement clause, the first person pronoun is generally preferred and the third person pronoun is at least dispreferred, in some cases odd. The contrast is a bit stronger in the indicative than in the subjunctive.48

(39) a. Undirritaðir, hafa áður sagt
undersigned.M.PL have.3PL before said
að yfirvold vilji bara móðga (okkur, / / ’pá, ).
that authorities want.SBJV just insult (us / ’them )
"The undersigned (sg) has said before that they just want to insult me."

b. Pabbi, hefur áður sagt
Daddy has.2/3sG never said
að þú megir trufla (mig, / / ’hann, ).
that you may.SBJV disturb (me / / ’him )
"Daddy never said that you were allowed to disturb him."

With the imposter мамma og pabbi "Mommy and Daddy," the same contrast is evident, but here in the subjunctive rather than the indicative. (Recall that first person subject-verb agreement is generally not acceptable with "Mommy and Daddy" as a subject.)

(40) a. Mamma, og pabbi, hafa aldrei sagt
Mommy and Daddy have.3PL never said
að þú megir trufla (okkur, / / ’pau, ).
that you may.SBJV disturb (us / / ’them )
"Mommy and Daddy never said that you were allowed to disturb us."

b. Mamma, og pabbi, uppgötvuðum í morgun
Mommy and Daddy discovered.3PL this morning
að skrímslið ætlar að borda (okkur, / / ’pau, ).
that monster the intends.IND to eat (us / / ’them )
"Mommy and Daddy discovered this morning that the monster is planning to eat us."

The mood of the complement clause seems to make a difference in the singular as well. When the embedded clause is subjunctive, "the undersigned" preferably antecedes a first person object pronoun, more so than "Daddy."

(41) a. Undirritaður, hefur áður sagt
undersigned.M.PL has.2/3SG has.3SG before said
að þeir vilji bara móðga (mig, / / ’hann, ).
that they want.SBJV just insult (me / / ’him )
"The undersigned (sg) has said before that they just want to insult me."

b. Pabbi, hefur aldrei sagt
Daddy has.2/3SG never said
að þú megir trufla (mig, / / ’hann, ),
that you may.SBJV disturb (me / / ’him )
"Daddy never said that you were allowed to disturb him."

When the embedded clause is indicative, third person is preferred for both.

(42) a. Undirritaður, uppgötvuði í fyrра
undersigned.M.PL discovered.1/3SG last year
að þeir vilja reka (?mig, / / ’hann, ),
that they want.IND fire (?me / / ’him )
"The undersigned discovered last year that they want to fire me."

b. Pabbi, uppgötvuði í morgun
Daddy discovered.1/3SG this morning
að skrímslið ætlar að borda (?mig, / / ’hann, )
that monster the intends.IND to eat (?me / / ’him )
"Daddy discovered this morning that the monster plans to eat me."

48 Like the classes of reflexives discussed in the previous section, we will not attempt in this chapter an explanation of the effect of mood on antecedence relations, but rather include this data to control for a potentially relevant grammatical property of the sentences we are looking at. Note that the morphological expression of mood makes a difference in the acceptability of long-distance reflexives for many (but not all) speakers (H. Á. Sigurđsson 1988).
Table 9.2  Subject-Verb Agreement and Object Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st obj</td>
<td>3rd obj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daddy (3rd agr)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Undersigned (3rd agr) |       ?      |             |   ✓     |          (?)
| Mommy and Daddy (3rd agr) | ✓     |             |   ✓     |          (?)
| Undersigned (plural) (3rd agr) | ✓      |             |   ?     |            |
| Undersigned and John (3rd agr) | ✓     |             |   ✓     |          (?)
| Undersigned (plural) (1st agr) | ✓      |             |   ✓     |            |
| Undersigned and John (1st agr) | ✓     |             |   ✓     |            |

These results are summarized in Table 9.2.

What we see in Table 9.2 is that whenever the agreement triggered in the superordinate clause is first person, the DP triggering that agreement cannot antecede a third person object pronoun. We also see a difference between singular and plural. For example, while undirritaður "undersigned (sg)" makes a slightly odd antecedent of a first person pronoun, third person being preferred, plural and coordinated "undersigned," even with third person agreement, preferably antecede a first person pronoun. Since the difference in mood is subtle, it should be tested with more speakers before any conclusions are drawn from it.

6.2 SUBJECTS

Subject pronouns show a paradigm similar to object pronouns in some respects, but distinct in others. If the verbal agreement is third person, either a first or third person subject pronoun is possible with coordinate structures.

(43) a. Undirritaður og Jón, hafa ãður sagt
undersigned.M.SG and John have.3PL before said
að [við, mnum / þeir, muni ] ekki styðja skattahækkanið.
that [we will.SBJV / they will.SBJV ] not support tax.hikes
"The undersigned and John have said before that we will not support tax hikes."

b. Undirritaður og Jón, uppgötvuðum i fyrra
undersigned.M.SG and John discovered.1PL last year
að [við, erum / þeir, eru ] með krabbamein.
that [we are.IND / they are.IND ] with cancer
"The undersigned and John discovered last year that we have cancer."

When undirritaðir "undersigned (pl)" occurs with first person agreement, the third person pronoun is unacceptable, and only a first person pronoun can take undirritaðir as an antecedent.

(46) a. Undirritaðir, og Jón, hofum ãður sagt
undersigned.M.PL have.3PL before said
að [við, mnum / þeir, muni ] ekki styðja skattahækkanið.
that [we will.SBJV / they will.SBJV ] not support tax.hikes
"The undersigned (pl) have said before that we will not support tax hikes."

b. Undirritaðir, og Jón, uppgötvuðum i fyrra
undersigned.M.PL discovered.3PL last year
að [við, erum / þeir, eru ] með krabbamein.
that [we are.IND / they are.IND ] with cancer
"The undersigned (pl) discovered last year that we have cancer."

Coordinated mamma og pabbi "Mommy and Daddy" behaves differently. To the extent that there is a contrast, it is the first person pronoun that is a bit marked.
The third person pronoun is preferred. Notice that this cannot be tied to verbal agreement in these cases, since undirritaðir “the undersigned (pl)” in the example above and mamma og pabbi “Mommy and Daddy” in the example below are controlling third person plural agreement.

(47) a. Mamma, og pabbi, hafa aldréi sagt
   Mommy and Daddy have.3Pl never said
   að [{??viði, ætil / þau, ætili }] að kaupa nammi handa þér.
   that [{??we intend.SBJV / they intend.SBJV} to buy candy for you
   “Mommy and Daddy never said that we planned on buying candy for you.”

b. Mamma, og pabbi, uppgöguðu i morgun
   Mommy and Daddy discovered.3Pl this morning
   að [{??viði, þurfum / þau, þurfa }] ekki að vinna í dag.
   that [{??we need.IND / they need.IND} not to work today
   “Mommy and Daddy discovered this morning that we don’t have to work today.”

Turning to singular imposters, there is again a contrast between “undersigned” and “Daddy.” For embedded subject pronouns, both prefer third person. However, the first person pronoun is considerably better for “the undersigned” than for “Daddy.”

(48) a. Undirritaður, hefur áður sagt
   undersigned.m.sg has.2/3sg before said
   að [{??eg, / hann } muni ekki styðja skattahjóknar.
   that [{??we } will.SBJV not support tax.hikes
   “The undersigned (sg) has said before that he will not support tax hikes.”

b. Pabbi, hefur aldréi sagt
   Daddy has.2/3sg never said
   að [{??eg, / hann } ætili að kaupa nammi handa þér.
   that [{??he / he } intends.SBJV to buy candy for you
   “Daddy never said that he was going to buy candy for you.”

There is no apparent difference depending on the mood of the embedded clause.

(49) a. Undirritaður, uppgöguði í fyrra
   undersigned.m.sg discovered.1/3sg last year
   að [{??eg, / hann } er med krabbamein.
   that [{??he / he } be.1/3sg.ind with cancer
   “The undersigned (sg) discovered last year that he has cancer.”

b. Pabbi, uppgöguði í morgun
   Daddy discovered.1/3sg this morning
   að [{??eg, / hann } þarf ekki að vinna í dag.
   that [{??he / he } need.1/3sg.ind not to work today
   “Daddy discovered this morning that he doesn’t need to work today.”

We summarize the results in Table 9.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st sub</td>
<td>3rd sub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daddy (3rd agr)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned (3rd agr)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mommy and Daddy (3rd agr)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned (plural) (3rd agr)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned and John (3rd agr)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned (plural) (1st agr)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undersigned and John (1st agr)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We omit first person singular verb agreement in these tables because, as discussed earlier, singular imposters are generally unacceptable with first person agreement, so its effect on antecedence cannot easily be tested.

7. Pronoun-Antecedent Relations and Agreement

In the early stages of the minimalist program, there was an attempt to relegate phenomena associated with Binding Theory (BT) to the LF interface. The idea was that there are interpretive restrictions on different kinds of DPs. The binding conditions proposed in Chomsky (1995: 211), for example, were the following:

(50) (For a DP α in local domain D . . .)
   A. If α is an anaphor, interpret it as coreferential with a c-commanding phrase in D.
Imposter phenomena pose very serious challenges to this kind of binding theory. For one thing, this Condition B will clearly not suffice to rule out a sentence such as (51).

(51) *Undirritaður og Jón höfum áður sagt undersigned.MSG and John have.1PL before said

\[ \{ \text{að þeir}_m \text{, muni ekki styðja skattahækkælarir} \} \]

that they will.SBJV not support tax.hikes

"The undersigned and John have said before that we will not support tax hikes."

Here the embedded third person pronoun þeir "they" could easily refer to the same individuals as those referred to by undirritaður og Jón "undersigned and John"; it need only be interpreted as disjoint from every c-commanding phrase in the local domain, which in this case is the embedded CP (bracketed above). Neither the interpretation of the matrix imposter nor the verbal agreement would be expected to have an effect.

There are many other problems with this kind of binding theory, as emphasized in Collins and Postal (2012). There have been, within the minimalist program, a number of other proposals attempting to derive BT phenomena from properties of the syntactic derivation (Kayne 2002; Zwart 2002; Reuland 2006, 2011; Boeckx et al., 2007; Hicks 2008, 2009). Among these (and other) theories, some assume a syntactic relation between a non-reflexive pronoun and its antecedent, and others do not. Collins and Postal (2012) argue that a primitive relation "antecede" encodes referential dependencies among linguistic objects, and that this relation will hold between a pronoun and its antecedent. Kayne (2002) has proposed that movement underlies this dependency, such that the antecedent will form a constituent with the pronoun and move subsequently out of the local domain, which in this case is the embedded CP (bracketed above). Neither the interpretation of the matrix imposter nor the verbal agreement would be expected to have an effect.

Concentrating on the third person pronoun, consider the contrast in (55), repeated from above.

(55) a. Imposter, . . , Agr-3 [pronoun-1/3]

Concentrating on the third person pronoun, consider the contrast in (55), repeated from above.

(55) a. Imposter, . . , Agr-3 [pronoun-1/3]

b. Imposter, . . , Agr-1 [pronoun-1/3]

The presence of an imposter antecedent, then, makes it possible for a third person pronoun to include the speaker. If pronouns were interpreted bascially freely, this dependency on an antecedent would be a mystery. For the sake of argument, we might constrain the denotation of pronouns by invoking "definite descriptions." We might say that a third person pronoun can include the speaker if it can independently refer to some description of an individual who happens to be the speaker. The appearance of undirritaður "undersigned (pl)" might then make such a description salient enough that the pronoun can pick out the referent of this description, which happens to be the speaker.

However, recall the effect of agreement on the embedded pronoun. Simplifying greatly, we have the following schema:41

(54) a. Imposter, . . , Agr-3 [pronoun-1/3]

b. Imposter, . . , Agr-1 [pronoun-1/3]

Concentrating on the third person pronoun, consider the contrast in (55), repeated from above.

40 This is related to and partly adapted from an argument in Collins and Postal (2012), but with verbal agreement specifically in mind.

41 See Kallulli (this volume) for the same generalization in Albanian.
According to the account under consideration, the pronoun in (55a) can include the speaker because the matrix clause makes available/salient a description of an entity that the pronoun can refer to, and that description happens to pick out the speaker. However, (55b) clearly makes such a description available as well. We would be forced to say that a third person pronoun can include the speaker if the linguistic element making the appropriate description available is third person, has third person \( \phi \)-features, shows third person behavior, and so on. But note that invoking person features is a linguistic notion, not a referential notion. That is, in saving the idea that pronouns have no linguistic relation with their antecedent, we are forced to invoke linguistic properties of that very antecedent. This moves away from the very intuition of the assumption that pronouns refer freely, modulo the presuppositions induced by the \( \phi \)-features that they are composed of. It asserts a relation between a linguistic element, the pronoun, and another linguistic element, the antecedent, and constrains the former with reference to linguistic properties of the latter. It would be far beyond the scope of this chapter to argue against every imaginable form of the assumption that pronouns do not have a syntactic relation with their antecedent. However, the basic form of the argument should be clear—the linguistic properties of pronouns seem to depend on the linguistic properties of their antecedents, and this is expected if there is a syntactic relation between the two.

8. Toward an Account

We adopt the overall approach in H. Á. Sigurðsson (2004, 2011), which is similar to Collins and Postal (2012) in many respects. H. Á. Sigurðsson (2004, 2011) argues that all pronouns must match left-peripheral context linkers. A typical first person pronoun will match a "logophoric agent," which roughly refers to the speaker (or the source of the clause). The logophoric agent is notated as \( \text{Λ}_{\text{A}} \). This is obviously quite similar to \text{AUTHOR} in Collins and Postal (2012), though it is not assumed to be a DP, but rather a left-peripheral head. A typical second person pronoun will match the "logophoric patient" (\( \text{Λ}_{\text{P}} \)), which corresponds roughly to ADDRESSEE in Collins and Postal (2012). Third person DPs, on the other hand, will match other context linkers; H. Á. Sigurðsson (2011), drawing on Frascarelli (2007), proposes several such linkers, relating in particular to various kinds of topics, such as aboutness-shift topics, familiar topics, contrastive topics, and so on. The discourse properties of the context linkers will not concern us here, so we will refer to any non-\( \text{Λ}_{\text{A}}/\text{Λ}_{\text{P}} \) context linker as CL.

Typically, the context linkers of embedded finite clauses will be controlled by the matrix context linkers. This can be illustrated by comparing an embedded that-clause with embedded direct speech. In (56), \text{John} and \text{Mary} are both linked to CLs, and the matrix CLs, including \( \text{Λ}_{\text{A}} \) and \( \text{Λ}_{\text{P}} \), all control their counterparts in the embedded clause. The "control" relation is indicated with dotted lines, while matching relations are indicated with solid lines. In the embedded clauses, the first and second person pronouns match their local \( \text{Λ}_{\text{A}} \) and \( \text{Λ}_{\text{P}} \) heads, respectively.

\begin{align*}
(56) & \quad \text{a. John told Mary that I love you.} \\
& \quad \text{b. John told Mary, "I love you."}
\end{align*}

Here, the first and second person pronouns of the embedded clause have no overt antecedents in the matrix clause, but are rather linked to local \( \text{Λ}_{\text{A}} \) and \( \text{Λ}_{\text{P}} \) heads, which are in turn controlled by the \( \text{Λ}_{\text{A}} \) and \( \text{Λ}_{\text{P}} \) head in the matrix clause. In (57), on the other hand, it is the matrix arguments that control the embedded \( \text{Λ}_{\text{A}} \) and \( \text{Λ}_{\text{P}} \) heads. Thus, the first and second person pronoun in the embedded clause do have overt antecedents in the matrix clause.

\begin{align*}
(57) & \quad \text{a. John told Mary, "I love you."} \\
& \quad \text{b. John told Mary that I love you.}
\end{align*}

In what follows, we will only be concerned with cases like (56), where, all else being equal, the superordinate context linkers control the subordinate context linkers.

The left-peripheral context linkers mediate the relation between a pronoun and its antecedent. This is outlined schematically in (58), where again, the dotted line indicates the control relation between the higher and lower CL.

\begin{align*}
(58) & \quad \text{a. John told Mary that I love you.} \\
& \quad \text{b. John told Mary, "I love you."}
\end{align*}
Consider now the effect of first person agreement on the pronoun-antecedent relation shown in (59), repeated from above.

\[(59)\]
\[
\text{a. Undirritaðir, hefur ádur sagt}
\]
\[
\text{undersigned.M.sg has.2/3sg before said}
\]
\[
ad \text{eg muni ekki styðja skattahækkkanir.}
\]
\[
\text{that I will.say not support tax.hikes}
\]
\[
\text{"The undersigned (sg) has said before that he will not support tax hikes."}
\]
\[
\text{b. Undirritaðir, hafa ádur sagt}
\]
\[
\text{undersigned.M.pl have.3pl before said}
\]
\[
ad \text{ðeir muni ekki styðja skattahækkkanir.}
\]
\[
\text{that they will.say not support tax.hikes}
\]
\[
\text{"The undersigned (pl) have said before that they will not support tax hikes."}
\]

In order for the pronoun \textit{ðeir} "they" to take the imposter as an antecedent, the imposter must match the CL that controls the CL matched by \textit{ðeir} "they." That is, for the imposter to antecede \textit{ðeir} "they," it would have to both trigger first person agreement and match a non-\(\Lambda_{\alpha}\) CL.\(^{42}\) We note the agreement relation with a solid bar above the structure, and matching relations with a solid bar below the structure.

\[(60)\]
\[
\text{CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots T^0_{1p1} \ldots \text{DP} \ldots \{\text{cp CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots \text{ðeir "they"}}
\]
\[
\text{This configuration is evidently ill-formed. We can rule it out by assuming a DP triggering first person agreement must match \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\) and no other CL. Given this much, we generate the following paradigm.}

\[(61)\]
\[
\text{a. \# CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots T^0_{1p1} \ldots \text{DP} \ldots \{\text{cp CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots \text{ðeir "they"}}
\]
\[
\text{b. CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots T^0_{1p1} \ldots \text{DP} \ldots \{\text{cp CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots \text{ðeir "they"}}
\]

Since first person agreement forces the imposter to match \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\), it cannot be the antecedent of \textit{ðeir} "they." The structure in (61a) is acceptable, but it is only acceptable on the reading where \textit{ðeir} "they" is distinct from the imposter.\(^{43}\) In (61b), the imposter triggers third person agreement, so nothing stops it from matching the CL that controls the CL matched by \textit{ðeir} "they."\(^{44}\)

Turning to \textit{við} "we," the question is how we allow \textit{við} "we" to take an imposter antecedent that triggers third person agreement.

\(^42\) If a plural pronoun matches \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\), it would be pronounced as \textit{við} "we."  
\(^43\) The "\#" notation indicates that the configuration is fine, but does not generate the intended reading.  
\(^44\) We still assume here that the notional core matches \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\); the issue is what the DP as a whole matches and how that interacts with agreement.

\[(62)\]
\[
\text{a. Undirritaðir, hafa ádur sagt}
\]
\[
\text{undersigned.M.pl have.3pl before said}
\]
\[
ad \text{við muni ekki styðja skattahækkkanir.}
\]
\[
\text{that we will.say not support tax.hikes}
\]
\[
\text{"The undersigned have said before that we/they will not support tax hikes."}
\]
\[
\text{b. Undirritaðir, hofum ádur sagt}
\]
\[
\text{undersigned.M.pl have.1pl before said}
\]
\[
ad \text{við muni ekki styðja skattahækkkanir.}
\]
\[
\text{that we will.say not support tax.hikes}
\]
\[
\text{"The undersigned (pl) have said before that we/they will not support tax hikes."}
\]

If \textit{við} "we" matched only \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\) and third person agreement matched only a non-\(\Lambda_{\alpha}\) CL, we would incorrectly generate the same "distinctness." However, notice that \textit{við} "we" should not simply refer to the speaker, or even a plural speaker. It refers to the speaker plus some other entity, which must be available in the discourse. Suppose John is alone in a room, and someone walks in and asks, "What were you doing?" If John were to answer, "We were reading," the response would sound as unusual as a third person pronoun with no referent. John's interlocuter would either think that John was talking about him/her, or else s/he would lack the appropriate referent for the other person John was talking about. Given this, suppose that \textit{við} "we" matches both \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\) and another CL.\(^{45}\)

\[(63)\]
\[
\text{a. CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots T^0_{1p1} \ldots \text{DP} \ldots \{\text{cp CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots \text{we}}
\]
\[
\text{b. CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots T^0_{1p1} \ldots \text{DP} \ldots \{\text{cp CL}_1 \ldots \Lambda_{\alpha} \ldots \text{we}}
\]

When verbal agreement is first person, the imposter DP matches only \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\), which is fine because \textit{við} "we" matches the lower \(\Lambda_{\alpha}\) (which is controlled by the higher one). When verbal agreement is third person, the DP matches the other CL, which is also fine as long as it matches the CL that controls the CL matched by \textit{við} "we."

Recall that a first person singular pronoun is less acceptable when anteceded by an imposter.\(^{46}\) The examples in (64a-b) are adapted from (48a) and (45a) above (respectively).

\[(64)\]
\[
\text{a. Undirritaðurni hefur ádur sagt}
\]
\[
\text{undersigned.M.sg has.2/3sg before said}
\]
\[
ad \text{eg muni ekki styðja skattahækkkanir.}
\]
\[
\text{that I will.say not support tax.hikes}
\]
\[
\text{"The undersigned (sg) has said before that he will not support tax hikes."}
\]

\(^{45}\) See H. Á. Sigurðsson (submitted) for a related and relevant discussion of "we" in a context-linking system.  
\(^{46}\) As mentioned earlier, this is stronger for subjects than objects. We have no explanation for this fact.
A singular first person pronoun would not have to match any CL other than \( \Lambda_A \).

\[
\text{CL} \ldots \Lambda_A \ldots \text{DP} \ldots \text{CP} \ldots \Lambda_A \ldots \text{I}
\]

This is probably stranger because the DP antecedent is matching a CL which is not controlling the \( \Lambda_A \) which the pronoun is matching. However, we do assume that the notional core of the matrix DP is matching \( \Lambda_A \) (not shown above), so it is not completely unacceptable. That is, singular \( I \) can be understood as linked to the imposter core, since the imposter core matches the \( \Lambda_A \) which controls the embedded \( \Lambda_A \). However, in the case of plurals, the antecedent and the pronoun may match parallel context linkers. Since the imposter core matching involves matching of a null element, we indicate this relation with a dashed line (with no theoretical importance attached to this notational choice).

\[
\text{CL} \ldots \Lambda_A \ldots \text{Pn3g} \ldots \text{[DP SHELL \ldots DP CORE \ldots]} \ldots \text{[CP CL} \ldots \Lambda_A \ldots \text{I}
\]

Note that this reasoning would not undermine our account of the cases we wanted to rule out above. In (61a), the imposter core and shell DP would both match \( \Lambda_A \). Thus, the case in (68) simply does not generate a coreferential interpretation between "they" and the antecedent.

\[
\text{CL} \ldots \Lambda_A \ldots \text{Pn3g} \ldots \text{[DP SHELL \ldots DP CORE \ldots]} \ldots \text{[CP CL} \ldots \Lambda_A \ldots \text{they}
\]

It is only with third person agreement that the imposter core and shell DP match different context linkers. The present account thus generates exactly the schematic paradigm in (58).

While we successfully generate cases where the antecedent of a first person pronoun triggers third person agreement, and we correctly do not generate cases where the antecedent of a third person pronoun triggers first person agreement, there is at least one potential problem with the proposed account, as Chris Collins (p.c.) points out to us. While "we" plausibly does link to two context linkers in many cases (\( \Lambda_A \) and CL), as outlined above, that does not seem to correspond to our intuitions regarding "we" when anteceded by imposters such as the "undersigned." The intuition is that the set denoted by "we" is co-extensive with the set denoted by the "the undersigned." This does not seem to raise a problem for the configuration in (67), with third person plural agreement, since the linkers matched by the pronoun are all controlled by the linkers matched by (subparts of) the antecedent. With first person plural agreement, however, as in (69), the embedded pronoun matches a context linker that is not controlled by anything matched by its antecedent. We can think of at least two solutions to this. The first is to allow "we" to optionally match only the \( \Lambda_A \) linker; this would still get the contrast between (66) and (67) as long as "I" is unable to match an additional context linker. The second option is to assume that "we" always matches an additional context linker, but the additional context linker need not always add anything to the reference set. That is, "we" still expresses the relation with a single \( \Lambda_A \) plus another entity, but the control relation with the matrix \( \Lambda_A \) allows for the understanding that this other entity is a part of the same reference set (i.e., "I+other" = "the undersigned"). This second option might be supported by the existence of seemingly singular uses of first person plural pronouns, such as the so-called "royal we" (though see Collins and Postal 2012) for a view compatible with the first option; see also H. A. Sigurðsson (submitted) on "context scanning".

In sum, the context linkers constrain pronoun-antecedent relations by enforcing certain syntactic conditions on the interpretation of pronouns. The link between a pronoun and its antecedent is syntactic, though indirect. The antecedent matches context linkers in the left periphery, and those context linkers control the context linkers of the embedded clause; the pronoun matches these context linkers. The effect of verbal agreement arises because in order for a DP to trigger first person agreement, it must match \( \Lambda_A \). While we have simply stated this condition brute force, it could actually be made to follow from independent properties of the system. H. A. Sigurðsson (2010) proposes that the matching of DPs to context linkers is mediated by a head Pn (person) in the inflectional complex. So for a first person pronoun, Pn first matches the DP, and then that DP and Pn together match \( \Lambda_A \). Since this is how first person agreement arises, it would be impossible to trigger first person agreement without matching \( \Lambda_A \).

9. Verbal Agreement with Different Imposters

While the analysis above is able to account for the effect of first person agreement on pronominal antecedence, it so far says nothing about why some imposters are able to trigger first person agreement while others are not. Recall the
Contrast between *undersigned (sg)* and *undersigned (pl)* with first person agreement, repeated in (70) from (20b—c) above.

\(70\) a. Undirritaaur (hefur / "hefur") ákveðið að hætt.
undersigned M.SG (has.3SG / "has") decided to quit
"The undersigned (sg) has decided to quit."

b. Undirritaaur (hafu / "hafu") haldið þessu fram.
undersigned M.PL (have.3PL / "have") held this forth
"The undersigned (pl) have claimed this."

Contrasts like these are not easy to derive on any simple approach to agreement. We can move closer toward an explanatory account of this data, however, with three further assumptions, all of which have been independently proposed (though not necessarily together). The first is to assume with Bejar (2008) and H. Á. Sigurðsson and Holmberg (2008) that individual φ-features can probe separately. The second is to assume that number agreement only involves an Agree relation in the plural; from this perspective, singular agreement is a kind of "default" agreement. In fact, there are a number of phenomena cross-linguistically that suggest that plural features control agreement in a much more aggressive way than singular features do (den Dikken 2001; Nevins 2011; Myler submitted). Nevins (2011) has recently proposed that "singular" is actually the absence of a privative [PLURAL] feature rather than the presence of a [SG] feature or a [-PLURAL] feature (though see Harbour (2011a, b) for a different theory based on other facts). What is important here is that regardless of the correct theory of number features themselves, number agreement seems to involve plurals only, or at least in a much more robust way. The third assumption is that when a probe enters into an Agree relation with a goal, the entire φ-bundle of the probe is replaced by that of the goal, not just the probing feature. This has been made in different forms by Bejar (2003), Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), Harbour (2007, 2011b), Kratzer (2009), Bejar and Rezac (2009), and Myler (submitted).

Now, suppose that in the complex DP leading to *undersigned (m.pl)*, the gender and number features are only active on the notional core, not on the secondary DP. This is independently plausible since the number and gender of *undersigned (m.pl)* are determined by the notional core, so that if it refers to a female, it would take the feminine form *undersigned*. It has been replaced with the goal’s φ-bundle, it will no longer be a probe because all of its features will be valued. If the person feature probes, it will Agree with the secondary DP, resulting in third person plural agreement.

\(71\) Number probes first
a. \(\psi^n_{(3p, m, n)} \cdots \{\phi \text{ undersigned}_{(3p, m, n)} \[ \text{vid} \{1, 3p, m, n\} \} \)

\(72\) Person probes first
a. \(\phi^n_{(3p, m, n)} \cdots \{\psi \text{ undersigned}_{(3p, m, n)} \[ \text{vid} \{1, 3p, m, n\} \} \)

Thus, in the plural cases, either person or number may probe first, and the result is that either first or third person agreement on the verb is possible. In the singular cases, if number probes first, it will not find any goal, assuming that singular number agreement is a lack of number agreement. Then, when person probes, it will agree with the secondary DP. If person probes first, it will agree with the secondary DP right away. In this way, the singular/plural asymmetry follows from assuming that person and number probe separately, and that only plural agreement reflects the syntactic operation Agree.

Paul Postal (p.c.) raises the question of whether there is any independent evidence that verbs can agree with a subpart of a DP (a secondary source, in the terms of Collins and Postal 2012). In fact, the idea that first and second person agreement may involve agreement with a subpart of a complex DP (specifically, a silent pronoun embedded within it) is supported by the partitive genitive data cited above in (26a—b) repeated here in (73).

\(73\) a. Mörk ykkar við...
Many NOM you.PL GEN know.3PL
"Many of you know..."
The quantifier mörg "many," like the participle undirritaður "undersigned," is not inherently specified for number, case or gender. Rather, it agrees with the head noun in number and gender, as illustrated in Table 9.5.

The derivation of the variation in (73) proceeds exactly as with plural "undersigned": if number probes first, it agrees with the partitive pronoun, like in (71), resulting in second person agreement; if person probes first, it agrees with the quantifier, like in (72), resulting in third person agreement.

### Table 9.5 Forms of margur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masc</td>
<td>Fem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>margur</td>
<td>mörg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>margan</td>
<td>marga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>morgum</td>
<td>margri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>margs</td>
<td>margrar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. (?) Mörg ykkar vitið ... Many.NOM you.PL.GEN know.2PL
"Many of you know..." (Friðjónsson 1990–1991: 81)

The quantifier mörg “many,” like the participle undirritaður “undersigned,” is not inherently specified for number, case or gender. Rather, it agrees with the head noun in number and gender, as illustrated in Table 9.5.

The derivation of the variation in (73) proceeds exactly as with plural “undersigned”: if number probes first, it agrees with the partitive pronoun, like in (71), resulting in second person agreement; if person probes first, it agrees with the quantifier, like in (72), resulting in third person agreement.

### 10. Why Is “Undersigned” Special?

Before closing this chapter, we would like to briefly ask whether our analysis offers a way to understand why “undersigned” behaves differently from other imposters. It is possible, but there are several other reasonable hypotheses, which we will outline presently. We suggested that for elements like undirritaður “undersigned (sg),” the feature valuation assigning gender and number to the secondary DP makes those features inactive, allowing outside probes to Agree with the notional core past the secondary DP. The analysis extended directly to partitives with quantifiers, such as in (73). The logic of this analysis leads us to offer the following tentative hypothesis:

(74) The more features of a secondary DP that are not inherently specified, the more likely the person features of the notional core are to be visible to outside probes.

If true, (74) would follow nicely from our approach; but whether it actually holds in general is a matter for future research.

We should point out, however, that there is another difference between undirritaður “undersigned (sg)" and imposters like pábbi "Daddy": undirritaður “undersigned (sg)" is formally indefinite. Icelandic has no indefinite article, but for undirritaður “undersigned (sg)," there are actually two morphological paradigms: a "strong" paradigm which is used in indefinite contexts, and a "weak" paradigm which is used in definite contexts. Thus, in a non-imposter context, there is a formal distinction between undirritaði höfundurinn "the undersigned author" and undirritaður höfundur "an undersigned author." The imposter form is the strong, or “indefinite,” form. Despite this, undirritaður "undersigned (sg)" (in its imposter use) can be shown to distribute like a definite DP. In Icelandic, indefinite participles are allowed in a low position in various expletive constructions, as exemplified in (75a). Undirritaður "undersigned (sg)" is not possible in this position with the imposter reading, as shown in (75b).

(75) a. Það hafði við verið vopnadar lögreglumáður í húsinn.
excl had apparently been armed.m.sg policeman in house.the
"There had apparently been an armed policeman in the house."
b. *Það hafði verið undirritaður í húsinn.
excl had been undersigned.m.sg in house.the

This is a clear case where the structural position of a DP is different depending on whether it is used as an imposter or not (see Kaufman (this volume) for another, particularly striking instance from Indonesian, where imposters distribute like clitic pronouns).

It is possible, however, that the indefinite form of undirritaður is misleading. It does strongly suggest that there is not an understood definite head noun such as maaurinn "the man.DEF," as was suggested for Italian by Servidio (this volume). If so, we would expect the weak form, undirritaði, rather than undirritaður, as in undirritaði maaurinn "the undersigned man." However, given the rarity of indefinite imposters cross-linguistically, and the definite behavior of undirritaður "undersigned (sg)," it would be odd to suppose that the head noun is indefinite, as in undirritaður maaur "an undersigned man," this would also be at odds with the fact that definite morphology shows up with "undersigned" in many other languages.

---

47 See Vázquez Rojas (this volume) for a similar demonstration with respect to a formally indefinite imposter in Mexican Spanish.

48 For example, this seems to be exactly what is going on with the imposter gamli/gjemli "the old (guy)" cited in (8c), which is an adjective in the weak form, as though it were definite or modifying a definite head noun. For gamli/gjemli, an analysis in terms of a null definite head noun is morphologically plausible (perhaps gamli kallinn "the old guy," since gamli/gjemli and kallinn/kjellinn seem to occupy the same register). The existence of gamli/gjemli shows that there is nothing about imposter DPs that intrinsically prevents them from taking the weak adjectival form or modifying a definite unrephrased noun—but that is not what is going on with undirritaður "undersigned (sg)."

49 It is also worth pointing out that overt maður "man," as in undirritaður maður "an undersigned man" or undirritaði maðurinn, is quite odd, perhaps unacceptable; undirritaður höfundur "an undersigned author" and undirritaður stafsmáður "an undersigned employee" are acceptable, though the definite forms, undirritaði höfundurinn/stafsmáðurinn "the undersigned author/employee" are not very natural.
But another possibility exists. In Icelandic, the strong form of participles shows up not only in the attributive position of indefinite nouns, but also in the predicative position, as illustrated for undirritaður “undersigned (sg)” in the following example:

(76) Afhverju hringiði ekki, eða sendið þar sem að why call.you.PL not, or send letter there as that þið allar eruð undirritaðar, til forlagssins og kvartið. you.PL all.F.PL are.2PL undersigned.F.PL to publishing.house and complain “Why don’t you call, or send a letter to the publishing house where you will all be undersigned, and complain?”

Thus, one possibility is that undirritaður “undersigned (sg)” in its imposter use is a reduced relative clause. Then, it can be collapsed with the complex imposters seen earlier in (7), partially repeated here.

(77) ...Puriður Backman og [sá sem hér stendur], höfum lagt fram... ...Puriður Backman and [the one who here stands.3SG] have.1PL put forth... “...Puriður Backman and the one who stands here have submitted...”

In Icelandic, unlike languages like German or Russian, predicate adjectives and participles must agree in number, gender, and case with their subject, so this possibility is compatible with (74).

In sum, the present approach has the potential to understand the different behavior of different imposters on the basis of their grammatical properties. We have several working hypotheses. One possibility is that imposters with gender, number, or other features controlled by the notional core rather than by inherent specification are more likely to show first person effects. Another possibility is that formally indefinite, or perhaps predicative, imposters are more likely to show first person effects. A third possibility is that imposters built on relative clauses are more likely to show first person effects than imposters built on other structures (such as appositives, as proposed in Collins and Postal 2012). The present approach would make sense of the first possibility more straightforwardly than the other two, but more cross-linguistic and analytical work needs to be done before it can be determined whether this is on the right track.

11. Conclusion

In this chapter, we have shown that verbal agreement can have a constraining effect on pronoun-antecedent relations. This is unexpected from the perspective of theories that take pronouns to be basically freely interpreted (modulo Condition B, however formulated), but is understandable if there is a syntactic relation between a pronoun and its antecedent. However, we have also shown, in at least two ways, that agreement is not the only constraining factor. First, while first person agreement controlled by a DP prevents that DP from anteceding a third person pronoun, third person agreement controlled by a DP does not necessarily prevent that DP from anteceding a first person pronoun. The ability to antecede a first person pronoun, then, cannot be contingent on agreement. Second, when agreement is controlled for with contexts where the antecedent DP is not in a position that controls agreement, such as in the embedded subject position of ECM constructions, there are still constraints on antecedence. So while agreement is a factor in pronoun-antecedent relations, it is not the only factor.

We have proposed that this can be understood if pronoun-antecedent relations are mediated by one or more silent functional heads, such as the context linkers of H. Á. Sigurðsson (2004, 2010, 2011). The relation between a pronoun and its antecedent is syntactic, but indirect. That is, it does not involve a direct Agree or movement dependency, but rather involves intermediate functional heads. Verbal agreement has an effect on pronoun-antecedent relations because verbal agreement in part reflects the relationship between a DP and the context linker it matches. We have also offered a tentative hypothesis as to why certain imposters trigger agreement more easily than others. The idea is that agreement with a subpart of a complex DP is more likely if that subpart controls features of a structurally higher subpart, such as the head of a partitive genitive construction or the secondary DP of an imposter. This provides a way of proceeding at least, so that in future work we can understand better how verbal agreement is triggered and what the effects of verbal agreement are. For now, we conclude that the fact that verbal agreement can have a constraining effect on pronoun-antecedent relations supports the claim that the relationship between a pronoun and its antecedent involves a syntactic relation.
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