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The “Big Picture”

How are DPs licensed? Semantic roles plus . . .

(1) In LFG:

a. LEXICAL MAPPING THEORY: The mapping between semantic/θ roles (“astructure”) 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.


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, A̅-movement and headmovement, 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] is pounded [the metal] flat
    b. [The river] froze [the river] solid
    c. Mary [Mary] is certain [Mary] 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: feminae—subject of a finite clause
    b. Feminae 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: feminaea—object of certain prepositions
    b. vir cum feminae 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: \( [N \text{ stem}^*(-\text{aff})] \)

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 $[\text{NP} - \overline{X}]$
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 vërtist 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], froze tₖ 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 óskadh (Ólafí) alls godðs
Mary-NOM wished Olaf-DAT everything-GEN good-GEN

   b. þess vas óskad
this-GEN was wished

   c. Hanni vas óskad þess
her-DAT was wished this-GEN

(27) a. Ég fylli bátinn
I filled the-boat-ACC

   b. Bátinn fylli
The-boat-ACC filled

(ACC?) Case by −θext 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. Elmeri struck her as [ti being too stubborn for the job]

Japanese passives with “possessor raising”

(29) Hanako-ga (dorobo-ni) | ti 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. [IP − [VP arrived the man ]] + EPP ⇒ [IP [the man]i [VP arrived ti]]

   b. [IP − [VP was pounded the metal flat ]] + EPP ⇒ [IP [the metal]i [VP was pounded ti] . . .

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., $\theta_{ext} \Rightarrow \neg \text{ACC}$) 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:

   $$[IP \ (SUBJ) \ [v \ [INFL \ V_i + I] \ [VP \ t_i \ (OBJ)] \ ]]$$

   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? …