

Accounting for Case (Mis)matching within Move & Project

Evangelia Daskalaki
University of Alberta

My aim in this paper will be to consider the case (mis)matches observed in nominal Free Relatives (FRs, henceforth) occupying argument positions, and the way in which they can be accommodated within a Move & Project Account of FR clause formation (Larson 1998; Iatridou et al 2001; Pancheva 2000; Bury 2003). I will show that an empirically adequate and theoretically desirable analysis suggests itself, once we combine the main premises of Move & Project with the KP Hypothesis (Lamontagne & Travis 1986, 1987; Travis & Lamontagne 1992). Even though the analysis is developed on the basis of Greek data, I will show that it is flexible enough to accommodate the observed cross-linguistic variation.

Move & Project goes a long way in accounting for the hybrid semi-clausal, semi-lexical categorial status of FRs: the FR phrase Moves. Hence, the clausal properties of FRs. The FR phrase Projects its category. Hence their distributional properties. When it comes to the accommodation of case (mis)matches though, the framework raises a couple of issues that have not been adequately addressed in the literature. In connection with this, consider the Greek pattern, exemplified in (1).

If the relation between the deleted and the pronounced copy of the FR phrase is one of movement – as the claim is within Move & Project – how can we account for the fact that a single DP, i.e. the FR phrase, is originally valued upon Agree with the I-Predicate, and subsequently ‘re-valued’ upon Agree with the E-Predicate? Does the derivation undermine the Activity Condition (Chomsky 2001) and the narrow syntactic status of case altogether? I will propose that this is an unnecessary compromise and that a principled solution suggests itself once we combine Move & Project with the independently motivated hypothesis that nominal phrases are maximally KPs (Lamontagne & Travis 1986). More precisely, I will suggest that the surface effect of case re-valuation in Greek FRs, results from a) moving the DP substructure out of its internally valued Kase layer (resulting in what is known as Kase Peeling/Stranding, see Nevins 2004 on A movement constructions), and b) merging of a second Kase layer after the DP has moved and projected. Given that the External K bears an uninterpretable feature, the second Agree relation is theoretically unproblematic. As to the Internal Kase layer, this is either deleted “under non-distinctness” with the External one (if non-oblique, as in 1a), or spelled out as a resumptive clitic (if oblique, as in 1b). Resumption of oblique case, therefore, could be seen as the result of “subdeletion” governed by the Subset Principle. That Kase Peeling/Stranding is an option provided by the Greek grammar is further backed up by its possible application in constructions other than FRs, such as amount relatives, and Restrictive Relatives of the complementizer type.

A further question concerns cross-linguistic variation. In addition to Greek, in which the FR pronoun realizes the case required by the E-Predicate even when the latter is in conflict with the case required by the I-Predicate (E-Matching), there are *I-Matching languages*, in which the FR pronoun realizes the case required by the I-Predicate even when the latter is in conflict with the case required by the E-Predicate (German (Pittner 1991, 1995), Finnish (Bresnan & Grimshaw 1978; McCreight 1988), Hungarian, Estonian, Lithuanian (Daskalaki 2008) and Ancient Greek (Harbert 1983; Chila-Markopoulou 1991; Philippaki-Warbuton & Stavrou 1986; Alexiadou & Varlokosta 2007), and *strictly Matching languages*, in which FRs are impossible in case mis-matching contexts (Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian (Pancheva 2000), Polish (Citko 2000)) (for the cross-linguistic distribution of case mis-matches, see also the extensive typological work of Grosu 1994 and Vogel 2001). I exemplify I-Matching with German in (2) and Matching with Serbo-Croatian in (3). Our system opens up the possibility of reducing the observed cross-linguistic variation to the licitness of Kase Peeling/Stranding. More precisely, I will suggest that the surface effect of I-Matching, instantiated in languages such as German results from a) moving the internally valued KP, and b) merging of a second Kase layer after the KP has moved and projected (resulting in what could be described as a Kase Stacking configuration). Given the fusional case morphology of German, though, the spell-out of both cases is not an option. Thus, unless the External Kase layer deletes under “non-distinctness” with the Internal one, the derivation will crash. That Kase Stranding/Peeling is not a (productive) option in I-Matching languages, is further backed up by the marginal availability (or, unavailability) of resumption in these languages. As to strictly Matching languages, such as Serbo-Croatian, these

could be taken to follow the same derivation as E-Matching languages up to the stage of deletion. In other words, whereas E-Matching languages license deletion under “non-distinctness”, strictly Matching languages license deletion under strict identity.

- (1) a. *Irthan* < *ópi* > *kálesa* < *ópjús* >. (Greek)

came-3rd Pl <who-D, Nom, 3rd Pl> invited-1st Sg <~~who-D, Acc, 3rd Pl~~>

‘Whoever I invited arrived.’

[E(xternal)- Predicate: Nominative ≠ I(ternal)- Predicate: Accusative]

- b. *Me* *efcharístisan* < *ópi* > **(tus)* *édosa* *leftá*.

cl-1st Sg Acc thanked-3rd Pl who-Nom *(cl-3rd Pl Gen) gave-1st Sg money

‘Whoever I gave money to, thanked me.’

[E(xternal)- Predicate: Nominative ≠ I(ternal)- Predicate: Genitive]

- (2) a. **Uns besucht wer Maria vertraut.* (German)

us visit-3rd Sg who-Nom Maria trusts

- b. *Uns besucht wem Maria vertraut.*

us visit-3rd Sg who-Dat Maria trusts

‘Whoever Maria trusts visits us.’

[E-Predicate: Nom ≠ I-Predicate: Dat] (Vogel 2001: 903)

- (3) a. **Pomoći će kome god dodje prvi.* (Serbo-Croatian)

help will-3rd Sg who-Dat ever comes first

‘He will help whoever comes first.’

- b. **Pomoći će ko god dodje prvi.*

help will-3rd Sg who-Nom ever comes first

‘He will help whoever comes first.’

[E-Predicate: Dat ≠ I-Predicate: Nom] (Pancheva 2000: 5)