

Case as/vs. DP-licensing (Marantz 1991)

MIT, 24.951, We 15 Oct 2003

The “Big Picture”

How are DPs licensed? Semantic roles plus ...

(1) In LFG:

- a. LEXICAL MAPPING THEORY: The mapping between semantic/ θ roles (“a-structure”) and Grammatical Relations (“f-structure”) is *complex*, allowing for various sorts of partial specification.
- b. (Non-)Correspondences between f-structure and surface structure aka constituent structure (“c-structure”) are explicitly stated in functional-description equations, but these (non-)correspondences are rather *un-constrained* and *arbitrary*.

(2) In P&P/RG:

- a. Mapping between semantic/ θ roles and “Deep Structure”/“Initial Stratum” is *trivial*; cf. Uniformity of θ -Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) in P&P and Universal Alignment Hypothesis (UAH) in RG.

In P&P, “Deep Structure” is a direct representation of θ -roles. Equivalently, DPs are “first merged” in θ -positions. The Deep-Structure representation of θ -roles is modulated by universal X'-theoretic principles.

- b. “Surface Structure”/“Final Stratum” is derived by a *complex* combination of movements / advancements/demotions/etc., which are constrained by general principles.

In P&P, such combination may include A-movement, \bar{A} -movement and head-movement, all of which introduce mis-alignments (apparent mismatches) between thematic structure and PF.

- (3) a. How can we constrain misalignments between initial and final structures?
- b. In particular, how can we constrain mismatches between the initial direct representation of θ -roles and the network of Grammatical Relations in the structure that is sent to PF (at “SpellOut”)?

Predicting the (surface) distribution of DPs: What drives DP-movement?

- (4) a. Formal properties: (R)UTAH, EPP, Case, Φ -features, ... (in need of “checking”)
- b. Discourse properties: Focus, Topic, ...
- c. Quantificational properties: Specificity, Indefiniteness, Genericity, ...

Some familiar examples of A-movements:

- (5) a. [*The metal*]_i was pounded *t_i* flat
 b. [*The river*]_i froze *t_i* solid
 c. *Mary_i* is certain *t_i* to have won

Case as licensing

Case/case as filters (Rouveret & Vergnaud 1980)

Latin case declensions on (e.g.) *femin-* ‘ $\sqrt{\text{WOMAN}}$ ’

- (6) a. **Nominative: *femina***—subject of a finite clause
 b. *Femina* *virem amat*
 woman+NOM man loves
 ‘The woman loves the man’
- (7) a. **Accusative: *feminam***—direct object of verb
 b. *vir* *feminam* *amat*
 man woman loves
 ‘The man loves the woman’
- (8) a. **Dative: *feminae***—indirect object of certain verbs and object of certain prepositions
 b. *vir* *feminae* *librum dedit*
 man woman book gave
 ‘The man gave the book the woman’
- (9) a. **Genitive: *feminae***—in possession construction
 b. *vir* *librum feminae* *capit*
 man book woman take
 ‘The man takes the woman’s book’
- (10) a. **Ablative: *feminaa***—object of certain prepositions
 b. *vir* *cum feminaa* *advenit*
 man with woman arrives
 ‘The man arrives with the woman’
- (11) **“case filter”, with a small c:** A parameterized morphological requirement on nouns in languages with morphologically-rich case systems (e.g., Latin, Russian): every nominal stem must be provided with a case suffix.

A morphological case filter: [_N stem*(-aff)]

Morphological properties of this sort are “historical accidents”.

(12) “Case Filter”, with a big *C* (A principle of UG):

*DP if DP has a phonetic matrix but no (abstract) Case.

[In Minimalist parlance: DPs, even in Chinese which show no overt case morphology, carry abstract Case features that need to be appropriately “checked”.]

(13) Case assignment rules (Chomsky 1981:170):

- a. NP is nominative if governed by AGR
- b. NP is objective if governed by transitive V
- c. NP oblique if governed by P
- d. NP is genitive in $[_{NP} - \bar{X}]$
- e. NP is inherently Case-marked as determined by properties of its $[-N]$ governor

Problems for Case filter:

Japanese quirky subjects (Ura 2000:345ff):

- (14) a. *Taroo-ni hebi-ga kowa-i*
 Taroo-DAT snake-NOM fearful-PRES
 ‘Taroo is fearful of snakes’
- b. *Taroo-ni eigo-ga dekir-u*
 Taroo-DAT English-NOM understand-Pres
 ‘Taroo understands English’

(15) Dative DPs in (14) do behave as subjects:

- a. they can bind subject-oriented anaphors;
- b. they can take subject-honorification marker

Split ergativity patterns (agreement vs. case) in Georgian aorist (Marantz 1991):

- (16) “Although the case marking changes from NOM-DAT to ERG-NOM in [1a,c]-[1b,d], the agreement morphology sticks to the NOM-DAT pattern. In particular, the suffixal agreement that normally agrees with a nominative subject will agree with the ergative subject in the aorist” (Marantz 1991 [2000:13]).

Icelandic quirky-ness:

- (17) *Mér var hjálpað*
 me-DAT was helped
 ‘I was helped’
- (18) a. *Ólafur leiddist*
 Olaf-DAT bored
 ‘Olaf was bored’

- b. *Ólafur virtist hafa leiddist*
Olaf-DAT seemed to-have bored
'Olaf seemed to have been bored'
- c. *Við töldum [Ólafur hafa leiddist]*
We believe Olaf-DAT to-have bored
'We believed Olaf to have been bored'
- (19) Icelandic 'quirky' subjects do behave like subjects on a battery of (16!) tests—reflexivization, subject position in ECM infinitives, Raising, Control, Conjunction Reduction, etc. (Sigurdsson 2002).
- (20) These Japanese, Georgian and Icelandic data show a dissociation between Abstract Case and case and/or agreement morphology: case morphology is *not* a systematic reflex of Abstract Case (pace Rouveret & Vergnaud 1980).

Burzio's generalization

Recall Baker, Johnson & Roberts' (1989) passive argument:

- (21) a. *It is widely anticipated that Mary will win*
b. **It is widely anticipated Mary's victory*
- (22) a. Spec(IP) is de-thematized
b. [NP,V'] is de-Cased
c. Assuming θ -criterion and the Visibility Condition (which evokes the Case filter), BJR related these two properties via the properties of *-en*, an argumental clitic in INFL which gets the external θ -role from VP and ACC Case by incorporating into V.

Now what about

(23) [*The river*]_i froze *t_i solid*

- (24) a. *The man arrived*
b. **It arrived the man*

Burzio's Generalization

- (25) a. If a verb assigns no external θ -role, then the verb will not assign structural ACC Case (i.e., $\neg\theta_{ext} \Rightarrow \neg\text{ACC}$).
b. Other half of Burzio's generalization: $\neg\text{ACC} \Rightarrow \neg\theta_{ext}$

Problems for Burzio's Generalization

Icelandic quirky objects

- (26) a. *María óskaði (Ólafi) alls goðs*
 Mary-NOM wished Olaf-DAT everything-GEN good-GEN
- b. *Þess vas óskað*
 this-GEN was wished
- c. *Henni vas óskað þess*
 her-DAT was wished this-GEN
- (27) a. *Ég fyllti bátinn*
 I filled the-boat-ACC
- b. *Bátinn fyllti*
 The-boat-ACC filled

(ACC?) Case by $\neg\theta_{ext}$ verbs

- (28) a. *It struck me that I should have used "Elmer" in this sentence*
- b. *There struck me as begin too many examples in this paper*
- c. *Elmer_i struck her as [_{t_i} being too stubborn for the job]*

Japanese passives with "possessor raising"

- (29) *Hanako_i-ga (dorobo-ni) [_{t_i} yubiwa-o to-rare-ta]*
 Hanako-NOM (thief-by) ring-ACC steal-PASS-PAST
 'Hanako had a thief steal her ring on her'

Case is not licensing (or filtering); Case "interprets" syntax at PF (Marantz 1991)

Licensing = Projection of semantic roles + EPP + Economy (+ Caveats re PRO + ...)

- (30) a. $[\text{IP} - [\text{VP } \textit{arrived the man}]] + \text{EPP} \Rightarrow [\text{IP } [\textit{the man}]_i [\text{VP } \textit{arrived } t_i]]$
- b. $[\text{IP} - [\text{VP } \textit{was pounded the metal flat}]] + \text{EPP} \Rightarrow [\text{IP } [\textit{the metal}]_i [\text{VP } \textit{was pounded } t_i \dots]]$

What about (morphological) case? Marantz's observation [8]

- (31) a. **Ergative Generalization:** No ergative case on an argument moved into a non-thematic subject position.
- b. In other words, the true generalization about ergative languages is that the subjects of 'unaccusatives' never get ergative case.

Marantz's claim

- (32) Burzio's Generalization (i.e., $\neg\theta_{ext} \Rightarrow \neg\text{ACC}$) is actually about the realization of *morphological accusative case* in a way that is fundamentally similar to the realization of *morphological ergative case* in (31) (i.e., the subjects of unaccusatives in NOM-ACC languages do not get accusative case; cf. (31b)).

Algorithm for morphological case assignment in the PF branch—deriving the Ergative Generalization and the morphological side of Burzio's Generalization

- (33) a. **Case assignment under government of NP-chain:** CASE features are assigned/realized based on what governs the chain of the NP headed by N+CASE.
- b. After V-raising into INFL, V_i+I governs both the SUBJ and OBJ positions:

$$[\text{IP} (\text{SUBJ}) [I' [\text{INFL } V_i+I] [\text{VP } t_i (\text{OBJ})]]]$$
- c. **Case realization disjunctive hierarchy:**
1. lexically governed case (aka 'quirky' case)
 2. "dependent" case (accusative and ergative)
 3. unmarked case (environment-sensitive; e.g., NOM in Spec(IP), GEN in Spec(DP))
 4. default case –*Who won the prize?* –*Her*.
- (34) a. ACC and ERG are "dependent" in the sense that they "are assigned by V+I to one argument position in opposition to another argument position; hence ACC and ERG case on an NP is dependent on the properties not only of the NP itself but also of another NP position governed by V+I" (Marantz 1991 [2000:24]).
- b. ACC is the dependent case that is assigned downward to an NP position governed by V+I when the subject position governed by V+I has the properties in (35a,b).
- c. ERG is the dependent case that is assigned upward to the subject position when V+I governs downward an NP position with the properties in (35a,b).
- (35) Dependent case is assigned by V+I to a position governed by V+I when a distinct position governed by V+I is:
- a. not "marked" (i.e., not part of a chain governed by a lexical case determiner)
 - b. distinct from the chain being assigned dependent case
- [NB: links in a single chain are not mutually distinct vis-à-vis the assignment of (dependent) case]

Deriving the Ergative Generalization and the morphological side of Burzio's Generalization . . .

Remaining problems? . . .