

The Ez head bears unvalued ϕ - and case features. When Ez is merged with AP (5a), it probes downward into AP. Since adjectives have neither ϕ - nor case features, Ez must probe upward once EzP is merged in the noun phrase. It Agrees with N in ϕ -features and with D in case features, so that the form of *ezafe* covaries with the case of the entire DP (nominative or oblique). When, however, Ez merges with a possessor (5b), it can Agree downward with the oblique case feature on P, so that the form of *ezafe* is invariantly realized as the oblique. ϕ -agreement with the possessor is blocked, however, since obliques are inaccessible for agreement (cf. Rezac 2008, Bobaljik 2008, Preminger 2011), which can be shown independently in Zazaki (data not shown). Ez must then probe upward to Agree with N in ϕ -features. Since the valued case feature originates either below Ez (an oblique possessor) or above it (oblique case on the entire DP), Agree must be able to operate both downwards and upwards (Nichols 1985, Baker 2008).

Intervention effects. When there is more than one nominal dependent, they are each introduced by an *ezafe* that Agrees with the ϕ -features of N. Only the highest *ezafe*, however, can Agree in oblique case — regardless of whether it introduces an adjective (6a) or a possessor (6b). Subsequent occurrences of *ezafe* are realized in the nominative (=o).

- (6) a. Ez [_{DP} ê kutik [_{EzP} =ê girs] [_{EzP} =o rind]]=i vinen-a.
 I that dog =EZ.M.OBL big =EZ.M.NOM good=OBL.M see.PRS-1SG
 ‘I see that big, good dog (m. obl.)’
- b. Ez [_{DP} kutik [_{EzP} =ê Alik=i] [_{EzP} =o girs]]=i vinen-a.
 I dog =EZ.M.OBL Alik=OBL.M =EZ.M.NOM big=OBL.M see.PRS-1SG
 ‘I see Alik’s big dog (m. obl.)’

We argue that this pattern arises from the defective intervention condition on Agree (Chomsky 2000). Regardless of whether the highest EzP values its case feature as oblique through upward or downward Agree, it acts as an intervener for all EzPs below it, which must probe upward to get case from D. Since they cannot be valued as oblique, they get default case, which in Zazaki is nominative. No intervention effect arises for ϕ -agreement, however, because valued ϕ -features originate lower than case. If N raises to its surface position through all intermediate functional projections (Travis 1984), there is a stage in the derivation for each Ez head where nothing intervenes between it and N.

Theoretical consequences. We have argued that concord in the Zazaki noun phrase is sensitive both to directionality and locality. These are properties of Agree, and so we conclude that the featural covariation found in nominal concord arises from this syntactic relation. If our account is on the right track, this suggests that Agree cannot be inherently directional — it is possible if the probe c-commands the goal or if it is c-commanded by it. Note, however, that Agree is triggered as soon as a licit goal is available. In a bottom-up derivation, this means that downward Agree is *preferred* when a choice arises, because this is the configuration is established first. As such, downward Agree takes precedence over upward Agree (cf. Béjar & Rezac 2009).

Selected references. Baker, M. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge University Press. □ Béjar, S. & M. Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35–73. □ Kramer, R. 2009. *Definite markers, phi-features, and agreement: A morphosyntactic investigation of the Amharic DP*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz. □ Nichols, J. 1985. The directionality of agreement. *Proceedings of BLS 11*, 273–286. □ Samiiian, V. 1983. *Structure of phrasal categories in Persian: An X-bar analysis*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.