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0. Introduction

In current research on the internal structure of DPs there are basically two accounts of ‘adjectival modifiers’. In the ‘standard’ account, adjectival modifiers are treated as APs adjoined to one of the levels of the nominal projection, usually N'. The same idea is recast in recent analyses, like Valois’ (1990), where the AP may also be adjoined to any of the ‘extended’ functional projections of the noun. On the other hand, Abney (1987) suggested that English prenominal adjectives are not adjuncts, but nominal ‘auxiliaries’, projecting a phrase intervening between the noun projection and the determiner projection (see also Barbiers 1992).

Bernstein (1991) was the first one to argue that both the adjunction-type and the ‘aux’-type of adjective should be allowed within DP (but see fn.1). Her crucial argument comes from the properties of pronominal determiners in Spanish and Italian. Such determiners are distinguished from the usual determiners by getting the suffix -o in the masculine form, as in (1) below. The forms in (1b) preclude the occurrence of an overt noun, as we see from the contrast between (1a) and (2):

(1) a Sp.: un hombre simple ‘a man simple-minded’
        It.: quell’alto monte laggiù ‘that high mountain over there’
b Sp.: uno simple ‘a simple-minded (one)’
        It.: quello alto laggiù ‘the high (one) over there’

(2) Sp.: *uno hombre simple
        It.: *quello alto monte laggiù

On the other hand, the existence of pre and postnominal positions for Romance adjectives was independently argued to result from movement of the noun across postnominal adjectives to a position lower than the position of the prenominal adjectives (see Cinque 1993 and references cited there):

(3) la [brutale invasione, [italiana t, dell’Albania]]
    the brutal invasion Italian of+the Albania

---

1 I am grateful to Hans Bennis, Frits Beukema and the LIN reviewer for repairs and fruitful comments. Any remaining errors are mine.
Crucially, adjectives which are in prenominal position block the occurrence of a pronominal determiner. We see this in (4) with an adjective which occurs only in prenominal position. (5) shows that some adjectives have different interpretations depending on their position, and that the only interpretation available with pronominal determiners is the one they have in postnominal position:

(4)  
\begin{align*}
\text{un} & \ mero \ \text{accidente} \quad \text{‘a mere accident’} \\
\text{*un} & \ \text{accidente} \ \text{mero} \\
\text{*un} & \ \text{mero} \ \text{accidente} \\
\end{align*}

(5)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \ \text{un} \ \text{simple} \ \text{hombre} \quad \text{‘a mere man’} \\
\text{un} & \ \text{hombre} \ \text{simple} \\
\text{uno} & \ \text{simple} \quad \text{‘a simple-minded/*mere one’} \\
\text{b} & \ \text{un} \ \text{grande} \ \text{autor} \quad \text{‘a great author’} \\
\text{un} & \ \text{autor} \ \text{grande} \\
\text{uno} & \ \text{grande} \quad \text{‘a big/*great one’} \\
\text{c} & \ \text{un} \ \text{cierto} \ \text{dato} \quad \text{‘a particular fact’} \\
\text{un} & \ \text{dato} \ \text{cierto} \\
\text{uno} & \ \text{cierto} \quad \text{‘a right, true/*particular one’} \\
\end{align*}

The basic generalizations about pronominal determiners in Spanish and Italian therefore appear to be: (i) they can neither occur together with an overt noun nor with prenominal adjectives, (ii) but they can occur with postnominal adjectives. Bernstein’s insight was that these generalizations could be made to follow from (3) if DPs with pronominal determiners in Spanish and Italian are derived as in (6):

The fundamental hypotheses represented in (6) are: (i) pronominal determiners involve movement of the noun to the determiner; (ii) prenominal adjectives are intervening heads located higher than the noun position in (3) above (as $A_1$ in 6), and
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postnominal adjectives are dominated by the noun projection (as $A_2$ in 6). Pronominal determiners cannot occur with overt nouns because the noun position is independently filled in (6). However, they can occur with postnominal adjectives because, being dominated by the noun projection, these adjectives do not block the first step of the movement in (6). But prenominal adjectives, if present, would block the second step of the movement in (6), since they are intervening heads: hence, pronominal determiners do not occur with prenominal adjectives.

The aim of this paper is to provide further evidence for Bernstein’s conclusion as to the presence of positions like $A_1$ and $A_2$ in (6). The basic claim is that non-uniform systems of agreement within DP are sensitive to the distinction between $A_1$ and $A_2$. In uniform systems a feature is shared by all agreeing heads (nouns, determiners, adjectives and other adjective-like elements), that is, they all inflect for this feature uniformly. Standard Portuguese (StP), for instance, is uniform for $[\pm F(eminine)] \text{ and } [\pm P(ural)]$ (see Harris 1991 for the morphological system of nominal inflection in Spanish: StP has the same basic properties):

\begin{align*}
(7)\ a\ [-F,-P]: & \quad o-\emptyset\ nov-o-\emptyset\ alun-o-\emptyset \quad \text{‘the new pupil’ (masc.)} \\
& \quad [-F,-P]: & a-\emptyset\ nov-a-\emptyset\ alun-a-\emptyset \quad \text{‘the new pupil’ (fem.)} \\
& \quad [-F,-P]: & o-s\ nov-o-s\ alun-o-s \quad \text{‘the new pupils’ (masc.)} \\
& \quad [-F,-P]: & a-s\ nov-a-s\ alun-a-s \quad \text{‘the new pupils’ (fem.)}
\end{align*}

In non-uniform systems of feature agreement, on the other hand, the agreeing heads do not inflect uniformly for some feature. These are exemplified by Spoken Brazilian Portuguese (BP) in section 1 and Dutch in section 2. I will show that in these systems different patterns of adjectival agreement arise depending on the feature specification of either the determiner or the noun. Moreover, such patterns will be shown to follow from standard configurational notions given (6).

1. Adjectival Agreement in Brazilian Portuguese DPs

BP has the same feature system as StP, that is, agreeing heads may inflect for $[\pm F]$ and $[\pm P]$. But, unlike StP, $[+P]$ agreement is not uniform in BP: nouns do not inflect for $[+P]$ if a determiner is present, as in (8a), although they do inflect in the absence of the determiner, as in (8b).

---

2 Bernstein assumes that postnominal adjectives are specifiers of NP, but the argument I am reviewing here is neutral in this respect: the only thing it shows is that they are not intervening heads. That is why the only claim of (6) about $A_2$ is that they are dominated by NP. See also the discussion in section 3.

3 $[\pm F]$ agreement is uniform in BP, just like in StP. I will ignore uniform agreement for lack of space, but my assumption is that non-uniform and uniform agreement are based on different mechanisms: non-uniform agreement arises from a head-to-head relation (see sections 2 and 3); uniform agreement arises from Spec-Head agreement with pro (see Barbiers 1992 and Menuzzi in progress).
(8) a [A-s garota-Ø] são graciosas ‘The girls are gracious’
    the-Pl girl-Ø are gracious
b [Garota-*s) são sempre graciosas ‘Girls are always gracious’

Of course, a uniform system of feature agreement like StP is not sensitive to
different positions of adjectives. Whether novo is in prenominal or postnominal
position is immaterial for its agreement properties in StP: compare (7) with (9).

(9) o-s alun-o-s nov-o-s ‘the new/young pupils’, masc.
a-s alun-a-s nov-a-s ‘the new/young pupils’, fem.

But BP is sensitive to the different positions of adjectives. Prenominal adjectives
agree with the determiner, inflecting for [+P1], cf. (10a), but postnominal adjectives
agree with the noun, not inflecting for [+P1] if the noun does not, cf. (10b):

(10) a o-s nov-o-s alun-o-Ø
    *o-s nov-o-Ø alun-o-Ø
b o-s alun-o-Ø nov-o-Ø
    *o-s alun-o-Ø nov-o-s

That postnominal adjectives agree with nouns with respect to [+P1] is further
illustrated by the fact that, if the noun inflects for it (in the absence of a determiner,
as in 8b), postnominal adjectives must do so too:

(11) a [Alun-o-s nov-o-s] começam as aula amanhã
    ‘New students start with the classes tomorrow’
b *[Alun-o-s nov-o-Ø] começam as aula amanhã

Finally, if the determiner is not present, but a prenominal adjective is, then this
adjective still inflects for [+P1], while the noun does not:

(12) a [Nov-o-s alun-o-Ø] chegam todos os dia na nossa escola
    ‘New students arrive everyday at our school’
b *[Nov-o-Ø alun-o-Ø] chegam todos os dia na nossa escola

In (13) I summarize the descriptive generalizations about BP exemplified above.\(^4\)

---

\(^4\) The generalizations in (13) are true of strings of adjectives too, cf. alguns novo*(s) bon*(s) aluno ‘some new good students’, alguns livro romântico(*s) americano(*s) ‘some American romantic books’. Although (13) holds for most, usually core adjectives (with the thematic vowels -o and -a, cf. Harris 1991), there are restrictions, in particular with non-core ones. For example, I find *os competente(s) professor de matemática ‘the competent teachers of mathematics’ unacceptable, but os novos professor de matemática fully acceptable. This contrast is unexpected, but I have nothing to say about it here.
If a determiner and/or a prenominal adjective are present, the noun does not inflect for [+P1];

b If only the noun is present, then it must inflect for [+P1];

c Prenominal adjectives agree with the determiner with respect to [+P1];

d Postnominal adjectives agree with the noun with respect to [+P1];

How can these facts be accommodated? Let us start assuming that BP DPs essentially have the structure in (6). Notice that nouns do not inflect for [+P1] in the presence of a determiner and/or a prenominal adjective (13a). Other diagnostics, however, are still found for the first step of N movement in (6). For example, postnominal adjectives still intervene between the N and its arguments (see Cinque 1993 again):

(14) a algun-s amigo-Ø americano-Ø do Joâo
    some-Pi friend-Ø American-Ø of Joâo
    ‘Some American friends of Joâo’

b *alguns amigo do Joâo americano

Absence of Number inflection on the N in (14) indicates that Num is not the landing site of the first step of N movement in (6). Hence, this first step must be to some other functional head. Assume this head to be Gender, and [+P1] to be generated somewhere higher than A1; the configuration for DPs in BP would look like (15):

Consider how (15) codifies (13a,b). If the DP is specified for [+P1] and D is present, no other head needs to bear [+P1]. If there is no lexical D to bear [+P1], then some other lexical head must bear it; if the only head available is N, then it must move

---

Gender is presumably the head where N checks [+F] in BP. I ignore gender agreement here, since it is uniform, cf. fn.3. For the postulation of G in Romance DPs, see Picallo (1991). For concreteness, I take Number to be a specification of D in (15), although it might also be an independent head (Bernstein 1991, Picallo 1991). I am not aware, however, of any conclusive evidence for this in BP.
from G to D to bear [+P1]. But if a prenominal adjective and the noun are present, then the adjective, not the noun, inflects for [+P1]. This is also captured by (15), since prenominal adjectives are in A₁, the nearest head to bear [+P1] in (15) in the absence of a D with lexical content. Hence, A₁ blocks a movement of N to D which is otherwise required, cf. (13b). Postnominal adjectives, on the other hand, do not block N-to-D, as we see in (11) above: they are in A₂, which is not an intervening head in (15). (13a,b), then, reproduce the heart of Bernstein’s argument: A₁’s count as intervening heads with respect to N movement, but A₂’s do not.

Consider (13c,d): if both D and N are present in a [+P1] DP, A₁ agrees with D, both inflecting for [+P1]; A₂ agrees with the N, neither inflecting for [+P1]. (15) captures this if adjectives (inside DPs) must agree in features with a head independently specified for such features, and if they may access features of a c-commanding head, subject to a minimality constraint (see next section for more explicit statements). Now, (13c,d) follow from (16):

(16)

\[
\text{DP} \quad \text{AP} \quad \text{GP} \\
\quad \text{D} \quad \text{A₁} \quad \text{N,+G} \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{A₂} \quad \text{t₁}
\]

A₁ agrees with D, not with N in (16), because D is the only head which c-commands A₁; N does not. On the other hand, both D and N c-command A₂, but N is the first c-commanding head, hence A₂ is bound by the minimality constraint on feature accessibility to agree with N, and not with D.

Any analysis which does not recognize the asymmetry between A₁ and A₂ in (16) would have problems in explaining facts like these. Consider the traditional approach: all adjectives are adjuncts to the noun projection, as in (17a). The configurations in (17) try to mould Romance word order to the requirements of the alternative theories under consideration. Obviously those configurations face other problems as well. Valois’ approach, which is a variant of the traditional one, is not subject to the objection I raise against (17a): adjunction to functional heads allows richer structures. But it has other problems, cf. Barbiers (1992).
I conclude, therefore, that the non-uniform system of number agreement in BP provides further evidence for Bernstein's distinction between $A_1$s and $A_2$s in (6). In the next section I turn to another system of non-uniform feature agreement, Dutch. I will show that, although the system of inflectional features in Dutch differs from the BP system, it also is sensitive to the geometry in (6).

3. Another Non-Uniform System of Agreement: Dutch

Dutch adjectives get the suffix -e depending on three feature oppositions: $[\pm$Neuter (Nt)], $[\pm$Plural] and $[\pm$Definite] (cf. Odijk 1992 and Barbiers 1992). The $[\pm$Nt] opposition is an idiosyncratic property of nouns, although it is not inflectionally marked on nouns. Dutch has two forms for the definite article, *de* and *het*, each noun selecting one of these forms. In dictionaries, nouns selecting *de* are classified as either masculine or feminine, and nouns selecting *het* as neuter. Since both masculine and feminine nouns select *de*, they must have some property in common, which is represented by their [-Nt] specification, as opposed to [+Nt] of *het* nouns. This feature distinction is further justified on the basis of adjectival inflection: [-Nt], but not [+Nt], nouns trigger the suffix -e on adjectives:

(18) a  

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[-Nt]}: \quad \text{de kaas} \quad \text{‘the cheese’ (masc)} \rightarrow \text{lekker*(e) kaas} \quad \text{‘tasty cheese’} \\
&\text{de zee} \quad \text{‘the sea’ (fem)} \rightarrow \text{vol*(le) zee} \quad \text{‘high sea’}
\end{align*}
\]

b  

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[+Nt]}: \quad \text{het brood} \quad \text{‘the bread’} \rightarrow \text{lekker*(e) brood} \quad \text{‘tasty bread’}
\end{align*}
\]

The [+Pl] opposition is morphologically marked in both nouns and determiners. [+Pl] shows up as one of the suffixes -en or -s on nouns. Most determiners have a suppletive form in the plural, and some get the suffix -e. As we see in (19), [+Pl] DPs require adjectives inflected with -e, but not [-Pl] DPs (the noun is neuter, so [+Nt] is not involved):

(19) a  

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[+Pl]}: \quad \text{(twee) klein*(e) broden} \quad \text{‘(two) small loaves’}
\end{align*}
\]

b  

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[-Pl]}: \quad \text{een klein(e) brood} \quad \text{‘one small loaf’}
\end{align*}
\]
Finally, definite articles and demonstrative determiners may alone trigger adjectival inflection, as in (20a) (the DP is singular and the noun is neuter, so [+P1] and [-Nt] are not involved). Other determiners do not possess this property, as exemplified in (20b). This fact can be captured if a [±Def] opposition distinguishes definite articles and demonstratives from other determiners: [+Def], but not [-Def], determiners trigger -e on adjectives (of course, the [-Def] determiner must not be inflected for [-Nt] nor for [+P1], since these features trigger adjectival inflection):

(20) a [+Def]: het/dat klein*(e) brood 'the/that small bread'
    b [-Def]: welk/een klein*(e) brood 'which/a small bread'

Summarizing, Dutch ‘regular’ adjectival occurrences get the suffix -e if at least one of the relevant feature specifications is available: [-Nt] on nouns (cf. 18), [+P1] on noun or determiners (cf. 19), or [+Def] on determiners (cf. 20).

Three types of adjectives, however, do not fit this system (Odijk 1992). Two of them are interesting in the present context.7 The first one does not inflect if the only feature available is [-Nt], that is, if the noun is [-Nt], but the DP is [-P1] and the determiner [-Def], as in (21a) below. If the DP is [+P1], or if the determiner is [+Def], then these adjectives show inflection, as in (21b):

(21) a een groot man ‘a great man’; een bekwaam veldheer ‘a competent general’; een knap timmerman ‘a skilful carpenter’; een goed pianiste ‘a good piano-player (female)’
    b grot*(e) mannen ‘great men’, deze grot*(e) man ‘this great man’

The second type does not inflect if only [+Def] is available, that is, if the determiner is [+Def], but the DP is [-P1] and the noun is [+Nt], as in (22a). If the noun is [-Nt], or if the DP is [+P1], these adjectives show inflection, as in (22b):

The third type never inflects, as toeziend in de toeziend voogd ‘the co-guardian’ (Odijk 1992: 199). This case is not interesting here, for it shows no inflectional sensitivity to the syntactic context, and has all properties of a compound (except for its phrasal stress): see Odijk (1992: 204-207).

The LIN reviewer noticed that the patterns of adjectival agreement here described must be stated in terms of occurrences of adjectives, since the same lexical forms may occur in different patterns (the same is true of BP, cf. 10). For example, the adjective centraal may follow the regular pattern, as in het centrale probleem ‘the central/crucial problem’, or the pattern in (22), as in het Centraal Station ‘the Central Station’ (that is, the main station of a city). Crucially, such occurrences show different syntactic and semantic properties, suggesting different syntactic environments. In the case of centraal, for instance, just one of the above interpretations is compatible with the predicative position:

(i) Dit station is centraal ‘This station is central/in a central region’
    (not ‘this station is a Central Station/the main station of the city’)
(ii) Dit problem is centraal ‘This problem is central/crucial’

For convenience, I will keep referring to occurrences of adjectives just as adjectives.

7 The third type never inflects, as toeziend in de toeziend voogd ‘the co-guardian’ (Odijk 1992: 199). This case is not interesting here, for it shows no inflectional sensitivity to the syntactic context, and has all properties of a compound (except for its phrasal stress): see Odijk (1992: 204-207).
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(22) a het zelfstandig naamwoord, lit. 'the substantive name-word'; het medisch/psychologisch dossier 'the medical/psychological file'; het openbaar ministerie 'the Prosecution Counsel'; het Utrechts Nieuwsblad 'the Utrecht News'; het Burgerlijk Wetboek 'the Civil Code'; het akademisch ziekenhuis, lit. 'the academic hospital'; het stoffelijk overschot 'the mortal remains'

b een medisch*(e) raad 'a medical counsel' (masc), psychologisch*(e) dossiers 'psychological files'

Notice that the distinction between the 'exceptional' adjectives in (21) and (22) has to do with accessibility of features which are marked either only on the determiner (the case of [+Def] in 22), or only on the noun ([-Nt] in 21). This situation is already familiar to us, for [+P1] agreement in BP shows the same conditioning. Assume that Dutch DPs have the same geometry as BP DPs, hence the structure in (23), where the adjectives in (21) above are in A₁, and the ones in (22) are in A₂.⁸

(23)

The patterns of adjectival agreement in (21) and (22) might be stated in the same terms as the pattern of [+P1] agreement in BP, that is, adjectives agree with a c-commanding head under a minimality constraint. This, however, cannot be the whole story for Dutch, since most Dutch adjectives do not follow the patterns in (21) and (22), but the 'regular pattern' exemplified in (18)-(20). What is remarkable about these 'regular' adjectives is that they are sensitive to both [+Def] and [-Nt], that is, to features of both D and N, cf. (20) and (18), respectively. The question, then, is whether the approach developed so far captures this pattern of agreement in Dutch

---

⁸ Dutch would differ from BP in that its Gender features are weak, hence they do not trigger N-to-G. [+P1] agreement is not characterized in (23) because it is uniform, cf. fn.3. Notice that uniformity of [+P1] agreement is expected, since [+P1] is marked both on nouns and determiners.
together with the previous generalizations about \(A_1\)'s and \(A_2\)'s in Dutch and BP. The answer depends on how regular Dutch adjectives fit the configuration (23).

Notice that regular adjectives in Dutch must be in a higher position than \(A_2\)'s in (23), since they precede these adjectives when they co-occur, as in *het boeiend*(e) bijvoeglijk naamwoord 'the exciting adjective' (Odijk 1992: 203). On the other hand, consider the fact that restrictive adjectives in Romance (including BP) occur just in postnominal position. This means that restrictive adjectives in BP are lower than \(G\) — the position occupied by the noun (cf. (16) above). Now, most regular adjectives in Dutch are restrictive modifiers. If restrictive/non-restrictive modifiers in Dutch correlate with the structure in (23) in the same way they do with (16) in BP, then most regular adjectives in Dutch must be lower than \(G\) in (23).\(^9\)

Dutch 'regular' adjectives, then, must be lower than \(G\) and higher than \(A_2\) in (23). This can be accommodated as follows: take Dutch \(A_2\)'s to be dominated by all segments of NP, and regular adjectives to be adjoined to the NP, as \(A_3\) in (24):

(24)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{[±Def]} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{[±Def]} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{A_1} \\
\text{G} \\
\text{[±Nt]} \\
\text{GP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{A_3} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{[±Nt]} \\
\text{N'} \\
\text{...}
\end{array}
\]

Now, let me be more precise about the mechanisms which trigger and constrain non-uniform adjectival agreement inside DPs: adjectives are subject to the licensing condition in (25), and accessible head in (25) is defined recursively, as in (26):\(^{10}\)

\(^9\) This is partially motivated by the fact that Dutch \(A_1\)'s are not restrictive, just like BP \(A_1\)'s: they cannot pick up a subset of the domain defined by the noun, hence their unacceptability in contexts like:

(i) *Ik heb twee timmerlieden in dienst: een luie en een -eke/*knap timmerman.*

'I employ three carpenters: a lazy one and a sick/*skillful carpenter'

A more precise characterization of the notion (non-)restrictive is clearly called for.

\(^{10}\) Containment is defined in (i), and exclusion in (ii):

(i) \(\alpha\) contains \(\beta\) if all segments of \(\alpha\) dominate \(\beta\).

(ii) \(\alpha\) excludes \(\beta\) if no segment of \(\alpha\) dominates \(\beta\). (Chomsky 1986: 9)
(25) If a language has adjectival inflection, its adjectives must agree in features with an accessible head independently specified for these features inside DP.

(26) A head X is an accessible head to a head Y iff:
   a X has lexical content, and the maximal projection YP of Y is not excluded by the maximal projection of X, or
   b X is an accessible head to Y, and there is no maximal projection ZP such that ZP has its head Z accessible to Y, and ZP contains YP but not XP.

(25) states that adjectival modifiers in languages with adjectival inflection must agree with a head inflected for the relevant features (for discussion about 25, see Barbiers 1992 and Menuzzi in progress). (26) defines the configurational conditions on this relation. Consider the effects of (26) with respect to the configuration (24). First, (26a) specifies that an accessible head must have lexical content, excluding G in (24) from the set of accessible heads in Dutch. Further, (26a) requires that at least one segment of the maximal projection of an accessible head dominates the maximal projection of the adjective, that is, N in (24) is an accessible head to A₂ and A₃, but not to A₁, as we want.

The minimality effects on feature accessibility are codified in (26b). This says that maximal projections of accessible heads which contain the maximal projection of the adjective, but not the maximal projection of another head block access to this external head. The maximal projection of G in (24) does not block accessibility of A₃ or of A₂ to D, since G is not an accessible head (it has no lexical content). NP does not block the accessibility of A₃ to D either, since the maximal projection of A₃ is adjoined to NP, hence it is not contained by NP. On the other hand, NP does block accessibility of A₂ to D, since NP contains A₂, but not DP.

The results of (24) in conjunction with (25)-(26) are, then: (i) A₁s have just one accessible head in Dutch, D in (24), which explains why they inflect for [+Def] but not for [-Nt]; (ii) A₂s also have just one accessible head in Dutch, N in (24), which explains why they are the reverse of A₁s; (iii) A₃s have both D and N as accessible heads, hence they inflect whenever one of the features [+Def] or [-Nt] is available. This covers the basic patterns of non-uniform adjectival agreement in Dutch.

Is the BP system also captured? The answer is 'yes', under standard assumptions. The question to consider here is: why does BP not have adjectives which access features in both N and D, as A₃s do in Dutch? The basic difference between BP and Dutch is that N moves to G only in BP. Since N has lexical content, it makes G have lexical content too. Therefore, G counts as an accessible head in BP, and the
minimality effect encoded in (26b) excludes D from the set of accessible heads to all adjectives dominated by GP in (16).\footnote{11}

3. Concluding Remarks

In this paper I argued that non-uniform systems of feature agreement within DPs provide evidence for Bernstein's conclusion: there should be adjecitival positions with the structural properties of A₁ and A₂ in (6). In section 1 I showed that [+Pl] agreement in BP can be described by reference to A₁ and A₂ alone, cf. (15)-(16). But we have seen in section 2 that the Dutch system of non-uniform agreement requires a further distinction among the adjectives which correspond to A₂ in BP, A₃ and A₄ in (24). Crucially, both systems can be captured by the same structural conditions (25) and (26), what is possible just because of the hypothesis that DPs have the same geometry in both languages.
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\footnote{11} The LIN reviewer points a problem for the present analysis: unlike BP (cf. fn.4), the Dutch patterns of adjecitival agreement can be disturbed by the presence of another adjective. In particular, regular adjectives cannot be inflected if preceded by an A₁ (although the noun is [-Nt]):

(i) Guimarães Rosa is een groot Braziliaans(e) auteur ‘G.R. is a great Brazilian writer’

This problem requires further investigation.