SOME CASES OF RUSSIAN
FDSL 7.5, Moscow, December 6-8, 2008

Evidence for multiple Case-assignment in Russian:
- predicate case
- genitive of negation
- accusative syncretism
- case-assignment with cardinals
- locative and directional prepositions
- circumstantial cases

Morphological evidence points at the complex nature of case (Jakobson 1936/1971, etc., etc.)

How is this reflected in syntax?

Proposal: a rearrangement of pieces:
(i) There are no special Case features. Instead, Case corresponds to uninterpretable counterparts of interpretable features (Pesetsky and Torrego 2001, 2004, in print, Bailyn 2004, Pesetsky 2008)
(ii) Structural Case is assigned by a head to its sister and percolates down (cf. Stowell 1981). An xNP can thus have more than one Case (cf. Merchant 2006, Caha 2007 and Richards 2007)
(iii) The resulting bundles of uninterpretable features are spelled out by Vocabulary Insertion rules and thus characterized by such standard effects as impoverishment and underspecification (cf. Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994)

1. PREDICATE CASE

At least the following patterns of Case-marking on non-verbal predicates are observed:
- Default or undetectable case (putative lack of case), as in (1)
- Case-agreement (the predicate is marked with the same case as the subject), as in (2)
- Dedicated predicative case(s), as in (3) and (4)
- A combination of the above

(1) hommish-níi barána gáarii. Harar Oromo (Owens 1985 via Comrie 1997)
harvest-NOM this.year good.CIT
The harvest is good this year.

NB: The citation case in Harar Oromo is also used for direct objects; nominative case is morphologically marked

(2) a. Ciceronem clarum habent. Latin: Case-agreement
    Cicero-ACC famous-ACC consider/hold
    They consider Cicero famous.

   b. Cicero clarus habetur.
    Cicero-NOM famous-NOM consider/hold-PASS
    Cicero is considered famous.

(3) a. Ja sègtaju ee lingvistkoj. Russian: predicative case
    I consider her-ACC linguist-INSTR
    I consider her a linguist.
b. Ona vernulas’ krasavicej.
she came back beauty-INSTR
*She came back a beauty.*

(4) a. Toini on sairaa-na. Finnish: multiple predicative cases
Toini.NOM be.3SG ill-ESS
*Toini is ill.*
b. Toini tul-i sairaa-ksi.
Toini.NOM become-PAST.3SG ill-TRA
*Toini became ill.*

The standard Case Theory has little to say about Case on predicates.

**Issues:**

- How is Case-agreement achieved? What happens in languages that only manifest Case-agreement in part of the predicates (Georgian)?
- How is predicate case assigned? What is the probe and what is the goal? Can $\phi$-feature agreement realistically be involved, given that the predicate does not have a full set of $\phi$-features?
- What happens in those languages where different cases are assigned to predicates in different syntactic or semantic environments (Russian, Finnish)?

**Answer:** multiple Case-assignment in syntax.

Further evidence that Case can be assigned to constituents larger than xNPs: Case-marking in Kayardild (Merchant 2006, based on Evans 2005) and Lardil (Richards 2007):

(5) Ngada mungurru, [ maku-ntha yalawu-jarra-ntsa yakuri-naa-ntsa Kayardild
I know woman-C.OBL catch-PAST-C.OBL fish-M.ABL-
thabuju-karra-nguni-naa-ntsa mijil-nguni-naa-nth].
brother-GEN-INS-M.ABL-C.OBL net-INS-M.ABL-C.OBL
*I know that the woman caught the fish with brother’s net.*

(6) Ngada kangka niween were-thuru-Ø wangalk-uru-Ø. Lardil
I tell him.ACC throw-FUT-ACC boomerang-FUT-ACC
*I told him to throw the boomerang.*

**Case-agreement in control infinitives:**

(7) a. Ego iubeo te esse bonum
I order you-ACC be-INF good-ACC
*I order you to be good.*
b. Quieto tibi licet esse.
quiet-DAT you-DAT licit-is be-INF
*You are allowed to stay quiet.*

This looks like concord, except it isn’t inside an xNP. Since verbs can also be Case-marked, it seems the simplest hypothesis to assume that Case here is assigned to a constituent larger than a DP and percolates down

### 1.1. Case agreement

In a number of languages, the predicate shows the same case as the subject (Latin, Icelandic, Modern Greek, Albanian, Serbo-Croatian…):
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    he is teacher-NOM/ACC
    He is a teacher.

b. Ég taldi hana/*hun vera kennara/*kennari.
    I believed her-ACC/NOM to-be teacher-ACC/NOM
    I believe her to be a teacher.

My alternative: Case-agreement is just like concord: it results from Case assignment to the constituent that contains both “agreeing” items (cf. Stowell 1981)

(9) Case Theory, Mark II

(i) Case features are assigned by a head to its complement

(ii) → More than one Case feature can be assigned to a given term.

Nominative is assigned by T⁰ to vP (or AspP, or ModP…) and accusative is assigned by v⁰ to VP. All constituents that can bear Case (and are not separated from the assigner by a Case-barrier, an issue to be clarified) are Case-marked by percolation (unlike in Stowell’s story).

Case is viewed as a property of a domain rather than of an xNP, which therefore entails a purely structural view of Case.

Small clause Case-agreement:

(10) a. T⁰ [NOM]
    T′
    vP
    DP Alice v
    [ACC]
    V⁰ believe DP PredP
    Mary a genius

b. T⁰ [NOM]
    T′
    vP
    DP v
    [ACC]
    V⁰ seem DP PredP
    Mary a genius

NB: It’s a standard assumption that raising and passive v⁰ does not assign Case.

Lardil and Kayardild phenomena are treated straightforwardly.

NB: Note the appearance of the FUT marker on the adverb, suggesting that it behaves like a Case-marker. This could be a way of treating Affix Hopping for verbs.

Important: Case Theory has traditionally been drafted to account also for the distribution of PRO. As shown by Landau 2006, Landau 2007, PRO receives Case just like other xNPs and therefore cannot be argued to be constrained to appear in Caseless or Null-Case positions.

Case Theory has also been used to deal with the choice of expletives (there vs. it in English). However, it seems enough to just talk about agreement there.

1.2. Predicate case assignment

Russian predicate Case-marking depends on the presence of the verb:

➤ Russian xNP and xAP predicates are marked with instrumental case
➤ except in the present tense primary predication, where they must be nominative

In Arabic, predicates are marked accusative, except in the present tense, where nominative is obligatory (Maling and Sprouse 1995, fn.4)
Empirical generalization: **Russian predicates are case-marked in the presence of an overt verb; otherwise they receive the default case** (nominative)

NB: With an overt be, the post-copular xNP or xAP can be either nominative or instrumental. Only instrumental marking corresponds to semantic predication (Rothstein 1986, Bailyn and Rubin 1991, Bailyn and Citko 1999, Pereltsvaig 2001, among others).

NB: It is usually claimed that Russian has not only instrumental depictives, but also Case-agreeing ones. It can be argued (Peshkovskij 1956, Pereltsvaig 2001) that agreeing “depictives” are really split xNPs

So Russian xNP and xAP predicates receive Case. How?


\[
\begin{align*}
\text{consider} & \\
\text{Mary} & \rightarrow \text{xNP} \\
\text{a genius} & \rightarrow \text{Pred}^0 \\
\text{VP} & \rightarrow \text{small clause}
\end{align*}
\]

The head of the small clause, Pred^0, is the source of the instrumental case. Since Pred^0 is the head that converts its complement into a predicate, its presence in a small clause is obligatory

However, in the present tense in Russian the copula is null and post-copular xNPs and xAPs cannot be marked instrumental:

No theory asserting that Pred^0 is the source of instrumental marking on the predicate predicts that it should depend either on the tense or on the overtness of the copula

**The present tense copular sentences can be shown to possess a predicative reading**, as the non-predicative reading can be excluded pragmatically:

(12) a. Context: And how did they earn their living?
   - Jesus was a carpenter and Mohammed was a merchant.
   - Jesus was carpenter-NOM/INSTR and Mohammed was merchant-NOM/INSTR

b. Context: And how do they earn their living?
   - Magdalen is a prostitute and Jesus is a carpenter.

Since a predicative reading is available, PredP must be present even in absence of the copula – but instrumental may not be assigned. Why not?

Thus **it is not Pred^0 that assigns predicative Case**. Then what does?

Solution: different **wider syntactic environment** for present tense copulas vs. elsewhere

Bailyn and Rubin 1991, etc.: in the absence of an overt copula the small clause merges as the complement of T:
The small clause subject is in the domain of T only, while the small clause predicate is in the domain of both T⁰ and Pred⁰. As a result, in the present tense copular sentence the predicate receives two Case features: [nominative] (from T⁰) and [predicative] (from Pred⁰).

With a verb, the Case-featural bundle becomes more complex. The Case feature assigned by the v⁰ introducing the eventuality argument of the verb will be dubbed [eventive].

(14) vP
v⁰ vP
EVENT DP v
Alice
vP V 0 PredP
believe DP Pred
Mary
xNP
a genius

How does a complex Case-feature bundle receive a morphonological realization?

(15) The Morphology of Case


b. The PF realization of each particular bundle of Case features (the surface case) is resolved by language-specific vocabulary insertion rules, whose key properties are impoverishment and underspecification (see Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994).

NB: Maling and Sprouse 1995 also suggest that (15a) applies in syntax, but the details of their proposal are completely different. The hypothesis that Case corresponds to an uninterpretable counterpart of an interpretable feature is also found in Pesetsky and Torrego 2001, 2004, in print, Pesetsky 2008 and Bailyn 2004.

The predicate case pattern in Russian can be resolved by the following vocabulary insertion rules:

(16) Vocabulary insertion rules (a fragment):
[nominative] → NOM
[accusative] → ACC
[predicative, eventive] → INSTR

NB: The labels ACC, NOM, etc., should be taken as referring to the actual lexical entries – as vocabulary insertion rules for those are considerably more complex due to the interaction with gender and number, and also subject to impoverishment, I use simplified representations here.

NB: If reduced relatives are really relatives and involve a PredP, the story incorrectly predicts that they should surface with instrumental, unless the relative C⁰ has particular blocking properties. But they could be attributive

The standard Case Theory has little to say on the subject:
- if Case can be assigned to the complement and instrumental is assigned by Pred⁰, present tense predication must involve a different Pred⁰ or none at all
- if Case cannot be assigned to the complement, locality issues arise: the subject of a small clause, being structurally higher than its predicate, necessarily intervenes. If instrumental is assigned to the entire small clause, it would interfere with Case-assignment to the subject. And I shouldn’t even mention φ-features...

2. Genitive of negation

The phenomenon: roughly, for non-specific direct objects and some subjects (the standard assumption is that the subject must be unaccusative) the accusative/nominaive case changes to genitive under negation (Babby 1980, Pesetsky 1982, etc., etc.):

(17) a. Moroz ne čuvstvoval'sja.
   frost-M.SG NEG be.felt-M.SG
   The frost was not felt.

b. Moroza ne čuvstvovalos'.
   frost-GEN.M.SG NEG be.felt-N.SG
   No frost was felt (there was no frost). (Babby 1980:59)

If structural case is assigned in a certain configuration, how is this assignment overridden in the standard Case Theory? The stacking approach advocated here offers a natural algorithm:

(18)  TP
    Dina vP
    vP
    NegP
    v′
    V′

    V 0 [NegP Neg 0 VP ne V′ 0 DP v 0 NegP Neg 0 VP ne V′ 0 DP bought bread] (This tree structure corresponds to the standard assumption that genitive of negation happens only to underlying objects; there are some exceptions to this generalization)

On the assumption that genitive corresponds to the feature \([Q]\) (Jakobson 1958/1984, Bailyn 2004), the system is rather straightforward:

(19) \([Q] \rightarrow ø / [specific][V]
[accusative] \rightarrow ACC
[Case] \rightarrow NOM\]

However, accusative realization is not as simple as the syntax would lead us to assume.

3. Accusative syncretism

Empirically: in two of the three Russian declension classes the accusative case coincides with nominative if the noun is inanimate and with genitive if it is animate.

Inanimate forms are easy to handle if nominative is the default case in Russian (cf. Jakobson 1936/1971, 1958/1984, Bobaljik 2002):

(20) \([\text{accusative}] \rightarrow ø / [-animate][\text{II, III}]
[\text{Case}] \rightarrow \text{NOM}\]
NB: Once again, these rules are a simplification.

Jakobson 1958/1984: The six main Russian cases can be viewed as involving three features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Directionality</th>
<th>Quantification</th>
<th>Marginality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both nominative and accusative are **direct** cases ([-Q, -M]).

Genitive and accusative are both **definite**.

NB: This feature is not in Jakobson’s list but he uses it nonetheless.

(21)  
[directional] → ø / [-animate][II, III]  
[definite] → ø / [+animate][II, III]  
[+D, +M] → LOC  
[+D] → DAT  
[+M] → INSTR  
[-M] → GEN  
[Case] → NOM

There cannot be anything deep here, because syncretism is not deep. In Georgian, accusative is merged with dative, so what?

Jakobson’s system is insufficient, since surface accusative may correspond to more than one combination of syntactic Case features, but it gives us the first glimpse of the complexity of the problem.

4. **CASE-ASSIGNMENT WITH CARDINALS**

Mel'čuk 1985, Babby 1987, Franks 1994, etc.: Case marking in a Russian **xNP containing a cardinal** depends on the case assigned to that xNP:

(22) a. tridcat' šagov  
    thirty NOM/ACC steps GEN  
    direct case: genitive under cardinal

b. tridcat'ju šagami  
    thirty INSTR steps INSTR  
    instrumental case: instrumental throughout

c. v tridcati šagax  
    in thirty LOC steps LOC  
    locative case: locative throughout

If the xNP is assigned nominative or accusative, the lexical NP is case-marked by the cardinal (usually genitive); if the xNP is assigned an oblique case, the lexical NP is marked with that case.

This pattern is predicted by (21):

(21)  
[directional] → ø / [-animate][II, III]  
[definite] → ø / [+animate][II, III]  
[+D, +M] → LOC  
[+D] → DAT  
[+M] → INSTR  
[-M] → GEN  
[Case] → NOM
As genitive is less specified than any of the other oblique cases, they take preference over it and successfully overwrite its featural specifications. Direct cases, on the other hand, do not affect the realization of the complex feature bundle involving oblique case features.

NB: This also accounts for the possibility of the approximative PP *około Num NP* ‘about N NPs’ in direct Case positions but not elsewhere (Corver and Zwarts 2004).

Unlike the genitive assigned by cardinals, genitive assigned by nouns cannot be overwritten externally. If Russian cardinals are deficient nouns (Ionin and Matushansky 2006) that do not block Case-assignment as do normal nouns, this fact can be derived.

Likewise, *paucal* is known to be very similar to genitive – if paucal numerals are even more deficient nouns (which they are, as they decline like adjectives and some of them even show agreement), the link is explained.

5. **Directional and Locative Prepositions**

The Case assigned by certain prepositions depends on whether the preposition is interpreted as directional or locative (Bierwisch 1988, Zwarts 2005, 2006, den Dikken 2006).

(23) a. Marina sprjatała knigu pod stol. Russian
    Marina hid book under table-ACC
    *Marina hid the book under the (surface of the) table.*

    b. Marina sprjatała knigu pod stolom.
    Marina hid book under table-INSTR
    *Marina hid the book (somewhere) under the table.*

(24) a. Marina bežit v gorod. Marina runs in city-ACC
    *Marina is running to the city.*

    b. Marina bežit v gorode.
    Marina runs in city-LOC
    *Marina is running in the city.*

**German**: locative = dative, directional = accusative

(25) a. Alex tanzte in das Zimmer. German (Zwarts 2006)
    Alex dance-PST in the-ACC room
    *Alex danced into the room.*

    b. Alex tanzte in dem Zimmer.
    Alex dance-PST in the-DAT room
    *Alex danced in the room.*

**Latin**: locative = locative, directional = accusative

NB: In general, the locative in Latin is realized as ablative, but for some words a dedicated form exists

(26) a. Sub imperium Romanum Gallia cecidit. Latin
    under rule-ACC Roman-ACC Gaul fall-PRET
    *Gaul fell under the Roman rule.*

    b. Multos annos Gallia sub imperio Romano fuit.
    many years Gaul under rule-LOC Roman-LOC be-PRET
    *For many years Gaul was under Roman rule.*

How are the different cases assigned?

The standard story whereby Case is assigned by some head or another fares pretty badly with respect to these facts even if we assume (with Svenonius 2003) that it is not $P'$ that assigns Case, but the functional head taking PP as the complement (because verbs do this too)
5.1. Paths

Bierwisch 1988, Koopman 2000, Tungseth 2003, Zwarts 2005, among others: directional PPs are more complex (semantically and/or syntactically)
Bierwisch 1988: directional prepositions are specified [+ dir]
Koopman 2000: for directional interpretation, a locative PP must be contained in the functional projection PathP
Zwarts 2005: directional PPs contain a Path function, in addition to the location

Problems with these stories:

- Standard Case Theory: if P assigns Case, how can the directional accusative ever be assigned?
- New Case Theory: the more marked case appears in a less complex structure

Hypothesis: the surface accusative corresponds to a subset of the Case-features assigned by a directional prepositional complex:

(27) PathP
    Path0 PP
    to                   p0
    in
    Moscow

Is there any evidence for Case-stacking here?

5.2. Circumstantial cases of Russian

Can be seen with demonstratives and interrogatives (Garde 1998:265-269):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>distant (‘there’)</th>
<th>proximate (‘here’)</th>
<th>interrogative (‘where’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inessive</td>
<td>t-am</td>
<td>z-des’</td>
<td>g-de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illative</td>
<td>t-uda</td>
<td>s‘-uda</td>
<td>k-uda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>ot-t-Uda</td>
<td>on-s‘-Uda</td>
<td>ot-k-Uda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>t-ogdA</td>
<td>tepEr’</td>
<td>k-ogdA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting aside the suppletive form tepEr’ ‘now’ (Garde also puts in this cell the derived form sejčas ‘now’ (literally, ‘this (very) hour’)) and the irregular case endings in the inessive case (for the proximate, Garde also includes tut ‘right here’), we are left with at least three more cases to the paradigm

NB: The main six cases are also available for these demonstratives and correspond to to/tot ‘that’, ěto/ětot ‘this’ (or its archaic form sej) and kto ‘who’ and čto ‘what’ (and their archaic adjectival form koj ‘which’) respectively

The ablative form seems to contain the preposition ot ‘from’, which does not behave entirely like other prepositions with respect to stranding under negation. We set this “case” aside.

The noun dom ‘home’ also has an inessive form, dōma, and an illative form, domoj.

For all other nouns the inessive is realized as accusative after the prepositions v ‘in’, na ‘on’, pod ‘under’ and za ‘behind’. In Jakobson’s system they clearly share the feature [directional]; the impoverishment of additional features of illative leads to this surface realization.

NB: Illative pronouns do not appear after prepositions; the only exception is the somewhat marked v nikuda ‘in nowhere’, as in ‘a road to nowhere’

If inessive corresponds to a bundle of features, one of which is [directional], impoverishment of others will be sufficient to yield the surface accusative.
6. **LEXICAL (QUIRKY) CASES**

Woolford 2006: **non-structural Cases can be lexical** (idiosyncratic, assigned by a particular lexical item) or **inherent** (associated with a particular theta-role)

In our Case Theory, lexical cases are simply **uninterpretable equivalents of specific lexical heads** (plus, potentially, everything else in the structure above them)

**Example 1:** **Russian verbs of management** assign instrumental case to their objects:

(28) a. upravljet’ *fabriku/✓fabrikoj
    manage-INF factory-ACC/INSTR

b. rukovodit’ *zavod/✓zavodom
    direct-INF industrial plant-ACC/INSTR

c. pravit’ *stranu/✓stranoj
    rule-INF country-ACC/INSTR

(29) Vocabulary insertion redundancy rules:

\[
\text{[MANAGE, ACC] \rightarrow [INSTR]}
\]

NB: There has to be some semantic similarity that is exploited here. Perhaps, there is a connection between the notion of management and the notion of an agent of passives.

**Example 2:** the **Russian verb xvata‘ to suffice’** assigns genitive to its object (and dative to its subject, but this is irrelevant here):

(30) Name xvataet *rabota/*rabotu/
    us-DAT suffices work-NOM/ACC/GEN
    We have enough work.

(31) Vocabulary insertion redundancy rules:

\[
\text{[SUFFICE] \rightarrow [GEN]}
\]

NB: As genitive is the case of quantification and part-whole relations in Russian, presumably it is this part of the meaning of the verb *suffice* that is exploited here.

In other words, if Cases are simply uninterpretable equivalents of interpretable, i.e., semantic, features, then a given root can (and perhaps must) function as a Case assigner. Depending on what vocabulary insertion redundancy rules say, some of these roots may be reflected in the surface morphological cases.

NB: In the best of all possible worlds, lexical cases are always correlated with some semantic features.
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