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Case on DPs

- English pronoun system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>them</td>
<td>their</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case on DPs (cont.)

- English full DPs don’t have case morphology. But in languages with rich morphological system, like German, Russian, Japanese, Korean, full DPs are case-marked.

(1) Korean
   a. Nay-ka chayk-ul ilkessta.
      I-Nom book-Acc read
      ‘I read a/the book.’
   b. Chayk-i pang-ey issta.
      book-Nom room-in is
      ‘The book is in the room.’

(2) German
   a. Der Mann sieht den Hund.
      the-Nom man sees the.Acc dog
      ‘The man sees the dog.’
   b. Der Hund sieht den Mann.
      the-Nom dog sees the.Acc man
      ‘The dog sees the man.’

(3) Modern Greek
   a. O andr-as vlepi to skil-o.
      the-Nom man-Nom sees the.Acc dog-Acc
      ‘The man sees the dog.’
   b. O skil-os vlepi ton andr-a.
      the-Nom dog-Nom sees the.Acc man-Acc
      ‘The dog sees the man.’
Case on DPs (cont.)

• Under the assumption that languages are very similar from an abstract point of view, it is reasonable to conclude that DPs in all languages have Case. The cross-linguistic variation is that while some languages have overt morphological manifestation of Case, others do not.

• A Case on a DP is legal only if certain structural conditions are met. That is, Case is licensed only in a certain structural configuration.
Structural Conditions on Case Licensing on a Subject DP

● Trial 1:

(4)  a. [That John should die so suddenly] is a tragedy.
   b. * [John to die so suddenly] is a tragedy.
   c. [To die so suddenly] is a tragedy.
   d. [For John to die so suddenly] is a tragedy.

● Trial 2:

(5)  a. [That he should die so suddenly] is a tragedy.
   b. * [That him should die so suddenly] is a tragedy.
   c. [For him to die so suddenly] is a tragedy.
   d. * [For he to die so suddenly] is a tragedy.
Structural Conditions on Case Licensing on a Subject DP (cont.)

- Structural conditions for nominative Case licensing on a subject DP

Spec-head: Nominative Case in [Spec,TP] is licensed by finite $T^0$ in Spec-head configuration.

```
he [Nom] should $t_i$ die so suddenly
```

```
TP
     /\     /
DP_i [Nom] T'
     |     /
     |  VP

TP
```
Structural Conditions on Case Licensing on a Subject DP (cont.)

- Structural conditions for accusative Case licensing on a subject DP

  Head-spec: Accusative Case in [Spec,TP] is licensed by $C^0$ hosting $for$.

```
CP
 |   |
 |   C'
 |   /
 |   C
 |   /
|   /
|   for

DP_i

[Acc]

him

T

t_i die so suddenly

VP

T'

to
```
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Structural Conditions on Case Licensing on an Object DP

- Structural conditions for accusative case licensing on an object DP

  (6)  
  a. John hugged him.  
  b. * John hugged he.

Head-complement: Accusative Case on the object DP is licensed by the head $V^0$ in head-complement configuration.
Structural Conditions on Case Licensing on a DP in a PP

- Structural conditions for accusative case licensing on a DP in a PP

  (7)  
  a. Mary left with him.
  b. * Mary left with he.

Head-complement: Accusative Case in complement of PP is licensed by the head $P^0$ in head-complement configuration.

![Diagram of PP structure with case licensing]

[Diagram shows a PP structure with a head P', and a DP with a [Acc] marker, connected by a dashed arrow labeled with 'with' and 'him'.]
Case Theory

- DP has a **case feature**. It must be **checked/licensed** by a corresponding feature on another head, subject to certain structural constraints.

```
TP
  DP_i
  he [Nom]
  should [Nom]

T' [Nom]

TP
  C
  for [Acc]
  DP_i [Nom]
  him [Nom]

C'

CP
  T
  t_i die

V'

VP
  V
  huged [Acc]
  him [Acc]

PP
  P
  with [Acc]
  him [Acc]
```

- Case Filter:
  All DPs must have its Case checked. If the Case of a DP is not checked, the derivation will crash.

- If a DP is in a position from which its Case cannot be checked, then it must go to a position so that its Case can be checked. \(\implies\) DP movement!

E.g., Subject DP movement from [Spec,VP] to [Spec,TP].
Predicates that Do Not Assign Theta-role to Subject

- Predicates like *seem, appear, likely* can have expletive *it* as a subject and a complement clause.

  (8) a. It seems [that he understands her].
  b. It appears [that they are lying].
  c. It is likely [that Mary was right].

- These predicates can have as a subject regular DP whose theta-role comes from the complement clause.

  (9) a. He seems [to understand her].
  b. They appear [to be lying].
  c. Mary is likely [to be right].

- Theta-role assignment is a local operation. A predicate assigns theta-roles to its specifier and complement.

- Puzzle:

  In (9), how can a predicate in a lower clause assign a theta-role to the subject in the higher clause?
Subject-to-Subject Raising: an Instance of DP Movement

Predicates like *seem*, *appear*, *likely* are called RAISING PREDICATES.
Arguments for DP Movement

• Locality in selectional restrictions on the subject

(10)  a. There is a problem.
    b. * There continued the same problem.
    c. There seems [t to be a problem].
    d. * There seems [t to continue the same problem].

(11)  a. It is raining.
    b. * The weather is raining.
    c. It seems [t to be raining].
    d. * [The weather] seems [t to be raining].

(12)  a. A week has elapsed.
    b. # A desk has elapsed.
    c. [A week] seems [t to have elapsed].
    d. # [A desk] seems [t to have elapsed].
Arguments for DP Movement (cont.)

• Locality in agreement

(13) a. Jessica thinks [that Luis is a great linguist].
   b. * Dan thinks [that the students are a great linguist].
   c. Jessica\textsubscript{i} seems [t\textsubscript{i} to be a great linguist].
   d. [The students]\textsubscript{i} seem [t\textsubscript{i} to be great linguists].

• Subject idiom chunks

(14) a. The cat is out of the bag.
   b. The cat is safe with her.
      (Can’t mean: ‘The secret is safe with her.’
   c. [The cat]\textsubscript{i} seems [t\textsubscript{i} to be out of the bag].

• Binding

(15) a. Mary thinks [that John\textsubscript{i} hurt himself\textsubscript{i}].
   b. * Mary\textsubscript{i} thinks [that John hurt herself\textsubscript{i}].
   c. John\textsubscript{i} seems to Mary [t\textsubscript{i} to have hurt himself\textsubscript{i}].
   d. * John\textsubscript{j} seems to Mary\textsubscript{i} [t\textsubscript{j} to have hurt herself\textsubscript{i}].
Why Must the DP Subject Move?

(16)  a. * Seems [Mary to understand the situation].
   b. Mary\textsubscript{i} seems [t\textsubscript{i} to understand the situation].

- To satisfy EPP?

(17)  a. It seems [that Mary understands the situation].
   b. * It seems [Mary to understand the situation].
   c. * [The situation]\textsubscript{i} seems [Mary to understand t\textsubscript{i}].

- To check the nominative Case feature on the DP subject.

   If the DP doesn’t move, its Case cannot be checked and so Case filter would be violated.

   Recall: Nominative Case on subject DP can only be checked by finite T\textsuperscript{0}. 

Constraints on DP Movement

• DPs move from positions that don’t have Case to positions where they get Case.

  (18)  a. It seems [that John$_i$ will appear [t$_i$ to be ill]].
  b. * John$_i$ seems [that t$_i$ will appear [t$_i$ to be ill]].

• DP can only move into an empty position.

• Movement must be local and cyclic.

  A DP does not move to its final destination in one fell swoop. It goes through intermediate landing sites.

  (19)  a. John$_i$ seems [t$_i$ to appear [t$_i$ to be ill]].
  b. * John$_i$ seems [that it will appear [t$_i$ to be ill]].
Subject-to-Object Movement: an Instance of DP Movement

- The theta-role on the lower subject is coming from the lower predicate. But the accusative case is coming from the higher verb.

(20) a. Sue believes [Bill to be intelligent].
    b. Sue believes [him to be intelligent].
    c. * Sue believes [he to be intelligent].

- There is a group of special verbs that can check accusative case on a DP, without assigning a theta-role to it.

(21) a. Cindy expects [Anna to be on time].
    b. Cindy wants [her to leave now].
    c. Cindy believes [him to be nice].

- How can a DP get a theta-role from the lower clause predicate, and get accusative case from the higher clause verb?
Subject-to-Object Movement: an Instance of DP Movement (cont.)

TP
  ────
  │    DP_i
  │   ───
  │   │   T'
  │   │   ────
  │   │   │   T
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   VP
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   DP
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   ti
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   V
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   DP_j
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   believes
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   him
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   [Acc]
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   CP
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   C'
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   C
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   ∅
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   TP
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   tj
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   T
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   to
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   V
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   AdjP
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   be
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   t_j
  │   │   │   Adj
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   Adj'
  │   │   │   ───
  │   │   │   intelligent

Sue [Nom]

[Pres] [Nom]

believes [Acc]

[Acc]
Characteristic of the Passive

- Theta roles and grammatical functions

  (22) a. Active: The committee approved the plan.
       b. Passive: The plan was approved (by the committee).

  (23) a. Active: John hid the letter.
       b. Passive: The letter was hidden (by John).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>subject position</td>
<td>optional by-phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>object position (Accusative)</td>
<td>subject position (Nominative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The verbal form of the passive in English is *be* + participle.

- The verb in the participle form in passive cannot assign accusative case, unlike the one in the active.

  (24) a. The committee has approved them.
       b. * There_{expl} was approved them.
          ‘They were approved.’
       c. * It_{expl} was approved them.
          ‘They were approved.’
Towards an Analysis of the Passive

- Object idiom chunks

Object idiom chunks are licensed by verbs.

(25)  
a. Luis payed some heed to Jack’s proposal. (‘heed’ means ‘attention’)

b. # Luis attracted some heed. (‘heed’ doesn’t mean ‘attention’)

c. # Some heed facilitates learning. (‘heed’ doesn’t mean ‘attention’)

(26)  
a. Dan is making some headway with the homework.

b. # Dan showed some headway with the homework.

c. # Headway comes with effort.

Only in passives, such object idiom chunks can occur in a subject position when the passive verb is the licensing verb.

(27)  
a. Some heed was payed to Jack’s proposal by Luis.

b. Some headway was made by Dan with the homework.
Towards an Analysis of the Passive (cont.)

- Uniformity of theta-role assignment

For a given verb, we would like to assume that theta-role assignment to an argument DP is done under a uniform configurational condition.

For instance, we would like to maintain that theme argument of the verb *hide* is assigned to the complement position regardless of whether the verb is in active or passive form.
Passivization: Another Instance of DP Movement

- The passive morpheme -en

  i. absorbs a verb’s agent theta role;

  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c|c}
  \text{hide} & \\
  \hline
  \text{agent} & \text{theme} & \text{DP} \\
  i & j & \text{DP} \\
  \end{array}
  \qquad
  \begin{array}{c|c|c}
  \text{hide}+\text{en} (=\text{hidden}) & \\
  \hline
  \text{agent} & \text{theme} & \text{DP} \\
  i & j & \text{DP} \\
  \end{array}
  \]

  ii. absorbs a verb’s ability to check accusative Case.

  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c|c}
  \text{VP} & \\
  \hline
  \text{V} & \text{DP} \\
  \text{hide} & \text{the letter} \\
  \text{[Acc]} & \text{[Acc]} \\
  \end{array}
  \quad
  \begin{array}{c|c|c}
  \text{VP} & \\
  \hline
  \text{V} & \text{DP} \\
  \text{hide} & \text{en} & \text{the letter} \\
  \text{[Acc]} & \text{[Acc]} & \text{[Case]} \\
  \end{array}
  \]
Passivization: Another Instance of DP Movement (cont.)

- Syntactically
  
  i. The agent argument gets **DEMOTED** and can be realized as an adjunct PP.

  ii. The theme argument in the complement position moves to [Spec,TP] for Case checking and EPP.

(28)  

a. John hid the letter.

b. [The letter]$_i$ was hidden t$_i$ by John.
Passivization: Another Instance of DP Movement (cont.)

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
    [Past] [Nom]
    /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
  [Past] [Nom]
   /  /
  V  V'
  /  /
 [Past] [Nom]
  /  /
V  V'
 /  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
/  /
V  V'
/  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
/  /
V  V'
/  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
```

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
   [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was [Past]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
/  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
```

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
   [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
by John
```

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
   [Past]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was_j [Past]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
t_j [Acc]
```

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
   [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was_j [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
t_j [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
/  /
by John
```

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
   [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was_j [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
/  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
```

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
   [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was_j [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
/  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
```

```
TP
  \  /
T'  \ /
  \ /
  T  \ /
   \ /
   [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
was_j [Nom]
   /  /
   V  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
   V'  V'
   /  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
/  /
hide [Acc]
/  /
[Acc]
```
Correlation between Case Checking and Argument Structure

- Burzio’s Generalization (1986)
  
  A predicate that assigns no external theta role (theta role to the subject in the specifier position) cannot assign accusative case.

- Similarities between passivization and subject-to-subject raising:
  
  Both the passive verb and raising verb do not assign theta role to the specifier position, and lacks the ability to assign accusative case. So, Burzio’s generalization holds for both passive and raising constructions.

  In both cases, a DP originates in a position from which case can’t be checked. The requirement that DPs receive case then forces the relevant DP to move to the closest position to which case is checked.