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Claims

- Case and Agree(ment) do not have to license NPs
- Case and Agree(ment) interact and determine each other
- Dependent case approaches need to see φ-features
Case and case
Abstract Case

- In GB, abstract Case plays an important role
- Case Filter determines the distribution of noun phrases:
  - Word order (raising, passivisation, adjacency, directionality)
  - Which noun phrases can get θ-roles (Visibility Condition)
  - Case licenses (overt) NPs and PRO
- Abstract Case does not equal morphological case
  - English has abstract Case, but mostly lacks morphological case
  - One-way implication: morphological case entails abstract case
Structural Case and inherent Case

- **Structural Case:**
  - Defined by the *position in the clause* (Chomsky 1981)
  - Related to T (NOM) and v (ACC) (Chomsky 2000, 2001)
  - **Dissociated from θ-roles** (passivisation, raising)

- **Inherent Case:**
  - Determined by properties of the assigner
  - Tied to a θ-role
  - Restricted passivisation?

- NB: these properties do not depend on a notion of Case
Abstract Case and morphological case (m-case)

- Marantz (1991), McFadden (2004) argue against a connection:
  - Abstract Case does not exist
  - Licensing through semantic roles
  - Word order through EPP
  - “Giving content to the theory of morphological case allows for the elimination of abstract Case theory from the theory of syntax.” (Marantz 1991: 3)
Dependent case


- For two DPs, $\text{DP}_1$ asymmetrically c-commanding $\text{DP}_2$:
  - **Acc** on lower DP:
  - **ERG** on higher DP:
  - Tri-partite systems?
Interim summary and questions

- If abstract Case does not license NPs,
- Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) Case/Agree is not tenable.
- Is there any relation?
Case and Agreement
Case and agreement

Bobaljik (2008)

- Follows Marantz (1991): morphological case is post-syntactic
- Morphological case determines $\phi$-agreement, so
- $\phi$-agreement is post-syntactic too!

(1) Unmarked Case > Dependent Case > Lexical/Oblique Case

(Bobaljik 2008: 303)
Marathi agreement based on m-case?

(2) a. mulii gaaNii mhaNtaat.
   girl.3PL.F.ABS song.3PL.N.ABS sing.PST.3PL.F
   ‘Girls sing songs.’

b. mulii-ne gaaNii mhaTlii.
   girl.3PL.F-ERG song.3PL.N.ABS sing.PST.3PL.N
   ‘The girls sang songs.’

(Legate 2008: 94, via Pandharipande 1997)
Case and agreement (cont.)

- Legate (2008): no, based on abstract Case

(3) a. mii / tuu    gaaNii    mhaTlii.
    1.ABS you.SG.ABS song.3PL.N.ABS sing.PST. 3PL.N
    ‘I/you sang songs.’

b. tyaa-ne / ti-ne    gaaNii    mhaTlii.
    he-ERG she-ERG song.3PL.N.ABS sing.PST. 3PL.N
    ‘S/he sang songs.’ (Keine 2010: 52, via Pandharipande 1997)

- Legate (2008): inherent ERG does not agree, abstract ABS does

- Keine (2010): Case features in syntax, interacting with Agree
Case and agreement (cont.)

Preminger (2014)

- Preminger (2014) dissociates Case/Agree:
  - **Agree can fail**, does not license DPs or determine their case…
  - dependent case does!

Baker (2015)

- Dependent case is one possibility, **Case/Agree another one**
Interim summary and questions

- Abstraction is necessary: “null” m-case in Marathi?
- Is there “abstract” dependent case?
- What can differential object marking tell us?
Case studies: differential object marking/agreement
Hungarian

(4)  

a. \textit{Lát-ok egy gyerek-\text{et}.}  
    see-1SG.SBJ a child-\text{ACC}  
    ‘I see a child.’

b. \textit{Lát-\text{om} a gyerek-\text{et}.}  
    see-1SG.OBJ the child-\text{ACC}  
    ‘I see the child.’

- Mismatch between case and agreement
- DO is marked ACC, object agreement is differential
Global phenomena suggest Case/Agree-connection?

Hungarian “inverse” agreement: É. Kiss (2013), Bárány (2015)

(5)  a. Én lát-lak téged.

    I see-1SG>2 you.SG.ACC

    ‘I see you.’

b. Ő lát téged.

    s/he see.3SG. SBJ you.SG.ACC

    ‘S/he sees you.’

2nd person triggers agreement when S is 1st person

“Hierarchical” effect: 1 > 2 > 3

v can Agree several times if SBJ > DO (Béjar and Rezac 2009)
Hungarian: (5a) ‘I see you.’

- SBJ’s [1] > DO’s [2], so v gets two sets of φ-features
- Bárány (2015, in progress): object agreement if $v[\phi_1, \phi_2]$
Hungarian: (5b) ‘S/he sees you.’

- SBJ’s [3] < DO’s [2], v has a single value; **no object agreement**!
- SBJ and DO’s φ determine different syntactic configurations
Global case splits

- Case comes into the picture in **global case splits**
- Close connection between \(\phi\)-agreement and (m-)case
- Dependent case not enough: SBJ’s and DO’s \(\phi\)-features matter
- Silverstein (1976), Aissen (1999), de Hoop and Malchukov (2008), Keine (2010), Georgi (2012), Bárány (in progress)
Kashmiri

(6) a. $b \underline{chu-s-ath} \underline{par-na:va:n}$

I.NOM be.M.SG-1.SG.SBJ-2.SG.OBJ you.NOM teaching

‘I am teaching you.’

b. $su \underline{chu-y} \underline{tse} \underline{par-na:va:n}$

he.NOM be.M.SG-2.SG.OBJ you.DAT teaching

‘He is teaching you.’

(Wali and Koul 1997: 155)

- DAT on the DO in inverse configurations
- DAT depends on properties of subject and object
- Simple solution: $v[\phi \prec \text{CASE}]$, $v$ can agree more than once
Kashmiri: (6a) ‘I am teaching you.’

- \( \nu \) assigns case after agreeing with SBJ and DO: \([\phi \prec \text{CASE}]\)
- NOM with \( \nu[\phi_1, \phi_2] \), DAT otherwise
Kashmiri: (6b) ‘He is teaching you.’

- single \( \phi \)-feature on \( \nu \) leads to \( \text{DAT} \)
Datives and DOM

- DOM can resemble dative: Kashmiri, Spanish, Hindi, Awtuw
- Are these DOs real datives? IOs?
  - Béjar and Rezac (2009), Bárány (in progress): not quite clear

(7) a. su kariy tse me havaːltfoot.  
   he.NOM do.FUT.2.SG.OBJ you.DAT I.DAT handover 
   ‘He will hand you over to me.’

b. tsī yikh me havaːltfoot karntfoot ţem’sţindī dēs’  
   you.NOM come.PASS I.DAT handover do.INF.ABL he.GEN by 
   ‘You will be handed over to me by him.’

(Wali and Koul 1997: 208)

- No IO-passives in Kashmiri and Spanish
- IO DAT not affected by φ-features
Conclusions
Conclusions

- **Abstraction necessary**: Marathi “null” ergative
- Case and Agree do not license NPs together, Agree can fail
- Case and agreement interact closely in **global case splits**
- Dependent case needs to be **sensitive to \(\phi\)-features**
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