CASE, AGREEMENT, PRO-DROP AND EXTRACTION: TOWARDS A UNIFICATION
Maia Duguine (EHU-U. Basque Country & U. Nantes-Naoned)

Overview. I discuss the crosslinguistic patterns of the licensing of *pro*-drop and extraction in the DP domain, where I show that the condition (A) holds. The proposed analysis leads to a view by which the functional structure, at least in the nominal domain, varies crosslinguistically.

(A)   Case condition on *pro*-drop and extraction of DPs: A DP can be dropped or extracted *if and only if* it bears (Structural) Case.

1. A generalization. I begin showing that in languages in which at the DP level, nouns agree with their possessor (I call them *Pattern A* languages; in this study: Boumaa Fijian, Chamorro, Abaza, Southern Quechua, Hungarian, Nahuatl, Jacaltec, Itzaj, Tzotzil, and Tzutujil), the possessor can be both dropped and extracted (cf. (1)-(2)). This leads me to formulate the generalization (B) (cf. also Szabolcsi (1994), Gavruseva (2000) for the idea that agreement is necessary for possessor-extraction).

(B)   *Generalization on possessor-extraction and -drop*: If in a language the noun agrees in φ-features with its possessor DP, the possessor can be extracted or dropped.

Furthermore, I also discuss the apparent problematic counterevidence raised by the data from Palauan and Mohawk, where nouns agree with their possessor but wh-possessors do not extract, and show that in fact these languages do not escape the generalization: they are Pattern A languages.

2. The proposal. I propose that the generalization (B) is the result of the condition (A). These are the assumptions that I adopt: (i) On the one hand, Structural Case assignment and agreement are reflexes of a single syntactic Agree relation (Chomsky (2000), (2001)). (ii) On the other hand, a probe with uninterpretable-φ can be present in the nominal domain (cf. Szabolcsi (1994), Chung (1998), Gavruseva (2000), a.o.).

Now, what (A) means for the case at hand is that the possessor DP matches with a head probing for φ-features; in consequence, it gets assigned Case, and thus can be dropped or extracted.

3. Structural Case: historical perspective and empirical evidence. From a historical perspective, I show that (A) simply spells out the old intuitions that (i) Case and *pro*-drop and (ii) Case and extraction are closely related (cf. Chomsky (1981) and Rizzi (1986)). Then, I show that, as expected if the possessor gets Case, in the languages listed above prototypically (i) possessors bear the same morphological case as other Structural Case-marked constituents, i.e. subjects or objects (cf. (4a-b)), and (ii) the possessor-possessee agreement paradigm is the same as the subject-verb or object-verb paradigm.

4. When nouns do not agree. In this section, I show that the pattern inverse to (B) exists, and that it too is accounted for by (A). Languages like Boumaa Fijian, Chamorro and Palauan have an alternative pattern for possession, expressed by a *linker* (I call it *Pattern L*). Crucially, the possessor cannot be extracted (cf. (3)) or dropped in Pattern L; hence beyond (B), (C) holds in these languages.

(C)   *Generalization on possessor-extraction and -drop in Boumaa Fijian, Chamorro and Palauan*: A possessor DP can be extracted or dropped *if and only if* the noun agrees with it.

Again, (A) accounts for this data: Pattern L corresponds to the case in which there is no probe looking for a DP to agree with, thus the possessor does not get Case and hence, due to (A), it cannot be extracted or dropped. As predicted by (A), the possibility of extraction and dropping of the possessor always go together.

Finally, I end up with a discussion of broader linguistic facts. First, I show that the data from Imbabura Quechua and English, with a pattern inverse to that of other Pattern A languages (no agreement, no dropping and no extraction) is also accounted for by (A); these languages are thus Pattern L languages. Furthermore, as expected if possessors in Pattern L are not targeted by an Agree operation, they do not bear the same morphological case as do subjects or objects (compare Chamorro (4a) with (5), English nominative subjects with genitive possessors, etc.). Finally, I briefly discuss the Romance PP possessors that can extract: they are out of the scope of (A).

Summarizing, in this talk I explore a hypothesis that, under different forms, has been part of the generative enterprise for a long time, and I show that it holds in the nominal domain: dropping and extraction of possessors depend on Structural Case. The corollary of this result is that the functional structure is not universally fixed (cf. Fukui & Speas 1986, *pace* Sigurðsson (2004)).

Examples

(1)a Agupa'   i   kumpliaños-ña *pro*   [Chamorro]
      tomorrow   the   birthday-3sg
      'Tomorrow is his birthday.'

(1)b j-moch *pro*   [Tzotzil]
      1-basket
      'my basket'

(1)c az   *pro* asztal-a-ø   [Hungarian]
      the   table-POSS-3sg
      'his/her table'

(2)a Hayi ti   man-mäguf [famagon-ña *t*]?   [Chamorro]
      who not agr-happy   children-3sg
      'Whose children are unhappy?'

(2)b Buch'u av-il-be [s-tot   *t*]?   [Tzotzil]
      who   2-see-io 3-father
      'Whose father did you see?'

(2)c Ki-nek   ismer-té-tek   [a *t* vendég-e-ø-t]?   [Hungarian]
      who-DAT know-past-2pl the   guest-POSS-3sg-acc
      'Whose guest did you know?'

(3)a *Hayi un-yulang [muñika-n *t*]?   [Chamorro]
       who   infl-break   doll-L
      'Whose doll did you break?'

(3)b O   cei   a   o-na   i-sele yai?   [Boumaa Fijian]
      ART   who ART belonging-3sg   knife this   (in-situ wh-phrase)
      'Whose is this knife?'

(4)a Ha-li'i' si   Juan i   pätgun lahi.   *Chamorro subject*
      agr-see unmarked.case Juan the child   male
      'Juan saw the boy.'

(4)b i   haga-ña   si   Rita   *Chamorro Pattern A*
      the daughter-3sg unmarked.case Rita
      'Rita's daughter'

(5)   i   haga-n   Rita   *Chamorro Pattern L*
      the   daughter-L Rita
      'Rita's daughter'

References

Béjar, S. 2003. *Phi-syntax: A theory of agreement*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Chomsky, N 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N., 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In *Step by Step*, eds. Martin, Michaels and Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N., 2001, 'Derivation by phase', in M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chung, S., 1998, *The Design of Agreement*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fukui, N. & M. Speas, 1986, Specifiers and projection. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 8: 128-172.

Gavruseva, E., 2000, "On the syntax of possessor extraction", *Lingua* 110, 734-772.

Georgopoulos, C., 1991, *Syntactic variables*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, L. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:501-557.

Sigurdsson, H. Á., 2004, "Meaningful silence, meaningless sounds." Ms., Lund University.

Szabolcsi, A. 1994, "The noun phrase", in Kiefer & Kiss (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 27: the Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, New York: Academic Press, 179-274