

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page</i>	x
<i>Abbreviations and conventions</i>		xiii
<i>Map of principal languages investigated and their case systems</i>		xviii
1	The issue of structural case	1
1.1	Introduction: Some challenges of structural case assignment	1
1.1.1	The problem of language-particular detail	3
1.1.2	The problem of crosslinguistic generality	6
1.1.3	The goals of the inquiry	9
1.2	Related topics to be identified and put aside	12
1.2.1	More on inherent case and how to recognize it	12
1.2.2	Morphological as opposed to syntactic factors in case	17
1.3	The structure of the book	26
2	The variable relationship of case and agreement	28
2.1	Sometimes case is assigned via agreement	29
2.2	Sometimes case is not assigned by agreement	34
2.2.1	Case in languages with no evidence of agreement	34
2.2.2	Issues with accusative case and object agreement	35
2.2.3	Issues with ergative case marking	39
2.2.4	Robustness of case across different clausal domains	43
2.3	The alternative: Dependent case	47
2.3.1	The leading idea	47
2.3.2	Initial attractions of dependent case	50
2.3.3	Comparison with some related ideas	53
2.4	Is accusative case ever assigned by agreement?	60
2.5	Case sensitive agreement	64
2.5.1	Another way that agreement relates to case	64
2.5.2	Integrating case-sensitive agreement into the picture	67
2.5.3	Applying the idea: on the non-universality of case	74
2.6	Conclusion	78

3	C-command factors in case assignment	79
3.1	Positive c-command conditions	80
3.2	When c-command does not hold: NP in PP	80
3.3	Negative c-command conditions	89
3.3.1	Negative c-command conditions versus markedness reversal	93
3.3.2	Negative c-command conditions versus case assigned by agreement	98
3.3.3	When c-command fails in languages with negative c-command conditions	104
3.3.4	Japanese and Korean as marked nominative languages	108
3.4	Conclusion	110
4	Domains of dependent case assignment	111
4.1	CP-TP as a case domain	112
4.1.1	Basics	112
4.1.2	Edge effects	114
4.1.3	Restructuring and dependent case assignment	118
4.2	VP as a distinct domain for case	124
4.2.1	VP inhibiting case: Differential object marking and beyond	125
4.2.2	Special structural cases assigned in VP: Dative, oblique, partitive	131
4.2.3	On the variability of VP domain effects	146
4.3	Aspect phrases as phases: Split ergativity (and accusativity)	155
4.4	Structural case in DP and NP	163
4.4.1	Genitive as unmarked case in DP	163
4.4.2	Ergative as high dependent case in DP	166
4.4.3	On the absence of structural accusative case in nominals	171
4.5	Conclusion	181
5	Categories involved in case interactions	183
5.1	NP, PP, and oblique NP	184
5.1.1	PPs are not case competitors	185
5.1.2	PPs versus dative objects: Warlpiri and Burushaski	187
5.1.3	PPs versus dative subjects: Tamil	188
5.1.4	Parameterizing the status of oblique NPs	194
5.2	Embedded clauses with and without nominalization	197
5.3	Phonetically null NPs	201
5.4	Nominal adverbs	213
5.5	Predicate nominals	221
5.6	Conclusion	227

6	On the timing of case assignment	229
6.1	On the underapplication of dependent case in structures with two internal arguments	230
6.1.1	Dependent case in double object constructions	230
6.1.2	The underapplication of dependent case with dyadic verbs	240
6.1.3	Derivation by phase in languages with negative c-command conditions	246
6.2	Case-marked adverbs and cyclic derivation by phase	251
6.2.1	Some immediate results	251
6.2.2	Adverb-argument asymmetries due to the late spell out of adverbs	256
6.3	On the interaction of movement and structural case assignment	263
6.3.1	Movement before or after case assignment?	264
6.3.2	Case, movement, and the late spell out of adjuncts	266
6.3.3	On case inheritance in chains	272
6.3.4	On NPs receiving multiple case values	281
6.4	General conclusion	285
7	Conclusion: Putting together the big picture	287
7.1	The role of basic syntactic structure	287
7.2	The role of spell out	291
7.3	The role of realization at PF	297
7.4	The more languages differ, the more they are the same	298
	<i>References</i>	303
	<i>Index</i>	317