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1. INTRODUCTION

The exists a growing body of research (Béjar and Massam 1999, Merchant 2006, Caha 2007, Richards 2007, Matushansky 2008, 2010, 2012, Pesetsky 2013) showing that more than one case can be assigned to (as well as realized on) the same NP

Which case wins?


This presentation: a number of test cases:

- genitive of negation
- numeral NPs
- directional PPs
- Russian complex prepositions
- Albanian pseudo-partitives

Tentative conclusion: morphological resolution throughout or language-specific algorithms including morphological resolution

2. GENITIVE OF NEGATION

The phenomenon: the accusative case assigned by the verb and the nominative case changes under negation to genitive (Babby 1980, Pesetsky 1982, etc., etc.):

   frost-NOM.M.SG NEG be.felt-M.SG
   The frost was not felt.

   b. Moroza ne čuvstvalos'.
   frost-GEN.M.SG NEG be.felt-N.SG
   No frost was felt (there was no frost).

It is generally believed that genitive of negation happens only to underlying objects; there are some exceptions to this generalization

Quirky objects retain their case

Extension: accusative-marked duration NPs:

(2) a. My rabotali dva časa.
   we worked two.ACC hour.PAUC
   We worked for two hours.

   b. My ne rabotali i dvux časov.
   we NEG worked EMPH two.GEN hour.PL.GEN
   We didn't work even for two hours.

(3) a. My myli posudu dva časa.
   we washed dishes.ACC two.ACC hour.PAUC
   We washed dishes for two hours.
b. My ne myli posudu i dvux časov.
we NEG washed dishes.ACC EMPH two.Gen hour.pl.Gen

We didn’t wash the dishes even for two hours.

The same effects can be observed in Estonian (Miljan and Cann 2013)

Problems for the standard theory of case:

➢ How does genitive of negation interact with structural case? (Activity Condition)
➢ Why does it not override inherent case?
➢ What’s with the adverbial NPs?

Answers have been proposed to these questions, but they are, to my mind, unsatisfactory

3. Russian Numeral NPs

Two case-marking patterns in numeral NPs: the homogenous one and the heterogeneous one (Babby 1987):

(4) a. pjat’ knig
five.NOM=ACC book.PL.GEN
five books

b. s pjat’ju knigami/*knig
with five.INS book.PL.INS/PL.GEN
with five books

c. k pjati knigam/*knig
to five.DAT book.PL.DAT/PL.GEN
to five books

The same effect is observed in Finnish (Brattico 2008) and Estonian (Miljan and Cann 2013):

(5) a. Minä nään [kaksi sukka-a.]ACC
    i saw two sock-PRT
    I saw two socks.

b. Minä asuin [kahde-ssa talo-ssa.]INE
    I lived two-INE house-INE
    I lived in two houses.


Problem: non-structural accusative case:

(6) a. pro pjat’ knig
about five.NOM=ACC book.PL.GEN
about/on five books

b. za četyre dnja
for four.NOM=ACC day.PAUC=SG.GEN
before/in four days

Possible (highly stipulative) solution: accusative is always a structural case

Issue: the directional accusative
4. THE DIRECTIONAL ACCUSATIVE CASE IN INDO-EUROPEAN

Bierwisch 1988, den Dikken 2003, 2010, Zwarts 2005, 2006, Caha 2010: with prepositions that allow both directional and locative interpretation, the two can be distinguished by case

German: locative interpretation → dative on the NP, directional interpretation → accusative:

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

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

Latin: locative = ablative, directional = accusative

(8) a. Sub imperium Romanum Gallia cecidit.  
    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.

Russian: locative = instrumental or locative (prepositional), directional = accusative

(9) a. Marina sprjatala knigu pod stol.  
    Marina hid book under table.ACC  
    Marina hid the book under the (surface of the) table.

b. Marina sprjatala knigu pod stolom.  
    Marina hid book under table.INS  
    Marina hid the book (somewhere) under the table.

(10) 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.

Crucial: the directional accusative wins over more than one locative case

The compositional semantics of directionality requires accusative assignment by a constituent that is external to a structure that already contains the assignment of a locative case

Koopman 2000: a locative PP must be contained in the functional projection PathP

Zwarts 2005: directional PPs contain a Path function, in addition to the location

So it makes sense to assume that the two cases are assigned:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{PathP} \\
\text{Path}_0 \xrightarrow{\text{to}} \text{PP} \\
\text{Path}_0 \xrightarrow{\text{in/under}} \text{Moscow} \\
\end{array}
\]

The use of accusative for the directional interpretation (extent and goal) originated in Proto-Indo-European and was independently augmented with prepositions later (Zwarts 2005)
Latin: accusative as directional for a subset of toponyms and some common nouns:

(12) Romam venit.
    Rome.ACC go.3SG
    S/he comes to Rome.

If the source of this accusative is a higher head with the semantics of Jackendoff’s (1983) GO (cf. Zwarts 2005, 2006), it can clearly override the case assigned by a preposition.

That means it is not a structural case (Zwarts 2005, 2006).

Caha 2010: a peeling account: the oblique inner case corresponds to a larger KP (licensed by a locative P0), whose sub-constituent (accusative) NP raises to the specifier of a higher PathP, where it is licensed.

5. **RUSSIAN COMPLEX PREPOSITIONS**

Not to be considered: complex collocations with a nominal core, even if it is synchronically undetectable, as in (13c), where *radi* ‘for the sake of’ is an independent preposition in modern literary Russian:

(13) a. v tečenie
    in flow
    *in the course of, during*

b. v.mesto
    in place
    *instead*

c. za-/dlja- radi
    behind/for sake
    *for the sake of*

Modern Russian has six complex prepositions, of which only the first two are widespread:

(14) case determined by the outer preposition (outer preposition assigns genitive)

a. iz-za
    out-behind
    genitive+accusative/instrumental ⇒ genitive

b. iz-pod
    out-under
    genitive+accusative/instrumental ⇒ genitive

c. s-pod
    from-under
    genitive+accusative/instrumental ⇒ genitive

(15) case determined by the inner preposition (outer preposition assigns dative)

a. po-pod
    along-under
    dative +accusative/instrumental ⇒ instrumental

b. po-za
    along-behind
    dative +accusative/instrumental ⇒ accusative/instrumental

c. po-nad
    along-above
    dative +accusative/instrumental ⇒ instrumental

(16) Po-pod snegom ruč’i pobežali.
    along-under snow-INS brooks ran
    *Brooks ran under the snow.* (Ožegov dictionary)

(17) samosval, mirno stojavšij na prigorke po-nad očered’ju…
    dump-truck peacefully standing on hillock along-above queue-INS
    *a dump-truck standing peacefully on hillock above the queue* (Strugackie, Xromaja sud’ba)
(18) a. Ja, konečno, otošel v storonu, sprjatalsja pod-korčmu i stoju. I of course moved in side hid along behind tavern.ACC and stand
I moved aside of course, hid behind the tavern and stood waiting. (Kuprin, Konokrady)

b. Po-za uvalami začerneli vsadniki beloj boevoj razvedki. Behind the hills White Army horsed scouts appeared darkly. (Pervencev, Kočubej)

Empirically:

- the same inner prepositions (pod 'under' and za 'behind') appear in both lists
- the outer genitive wins, the outer dative loses
- the directional/locative alternation is preserved (15)

It’s exactly the same semantic structure in both cases: path + location

It is always a combination of two non-structural cases

The hypothesis that the outermost case overrides inner cases does not explain the facts. In the peeling approach, however, it can be claimed that some prepositions do not trigger movement to a higher Spec (po 'along' wouldn’t, though somehow only as part of a complex preposition)

6. ALBANIAN PSEUDO-PARTITIVES

Albanian direct pseudo-partitives (Giusti and Turano 2004)

(19) Direct cases: no marking (or matching)

a. një shishe verë është mbi bankë a bottle.NOM=ACC wine.NOM=ACC is on table
A bottle of wine is on the table.

b. piva një shishe verë drank.1SG a bottle.ACC= NOM wine.ACC=NOM
I drank a bottle of wine.

(20) Oblique cases: matching and no marking?

a. shija e një shisheje verë/vere flavor of a bottle.GEN wine.DAT=GEN/ABL/NOM=ACC
the flavor of a bottle of wine

b. vë çdo gotë pranë një shisheje verë/verë put every glass near a bottle.DAT wine.DAT=GEN/ABL/NOM=ACC
I put every glass near a bottle of wine.

Ablative and genitive/dative are distinguished in the plural:

(21) a. *shija e një shisheje bizeleve flavor.DEF a.GEN bottle.GEN peas.DAT=GEN

b. shija e një shisheje bizelesh flavor.DEF a.GEN bottle.GEN peas.ABL
the flavor of a bottle of peas

Confusing factor: ablative pseudo-partitives:

(22) a. Mblodha një tuñë lulesh picked a bunch.ACC= NOM flowers.ABL
I picked a bunch of flowers.
b. I shtie ujë një tufe lułesh.
   CL.DAT put water a bunch.DAT flowers.ABL
   I watered a bunch of flowers.

This is the case pattern of nominal modifiers:

(23) a. një sallatë domatesh
    a salad tomatoes.ABL
    a tomato salad

b. një triko leshi
    a sweater wool.ABL
    a woolen sweater

Giusti and Turano 2004: there are no direct pseudo-partitives in oblique cases; only ablative pseudo-partitives are allowed there (the reasons given are stipulative)

Alternative: what is seen in oblique cases is the combination of the case features assigned by the head of the pseudo-partitive and the case features assigned to the NP as a whole.

The ablative surfaces because it realizes a bundle of case features that is more complex than what is realized by the dative/genitive case marker. In direct cases this extra case feature does not affect the realization of the bundle

7. Conclusion

For a number of cases the outer case is clearly more complex/marked then the inner case and both approaches make the same prediction

Divergence:

- Indo-European directional PPs: the outer accusative case is less morphologically marked than the oblique inner cases
- Russian complex prepositions: the outer genitive wins over the inner (locative or) instrumental, the outer dative loses
- Albanian pseudo-partitives: the combination of case features may give rise to the surface case that cannot be attributed to either of the outer or is the inner assigner

However, the hypothesis that the most marked case wins makes wrong predictions for Niuean raising (Béjar and Massam 1999):

(24) a. Manako a Sione ke kai [he tau tama] [e tau apala].
    want ABS Sione SBJNCT eat ERG PL child ABS PL apple
    Sione wants for the children to eat the apples.

b. Manako a Sione [he tau tama], ke kai ti [e tau apala].
    want ABS Sione MID PL child SUBJNCT eat ABS PL apple
    Sione wants the children to eat the apples.

(25) a. Teitei ke fakatau e sione taha fale.
    nearly SUBJNCT buy ERG Sione one house
    It nearly happened that Sione bought a house.

b. Teitei [a Sione], ke fakatau ti, taha fale.
    nearly ABS Sione SUBJNCT buy one house
    Sione nearly bought a house.

In Icelandic raising, on the other hand, it is the downstairs quirky case that wins.
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