

## On the source of parochialism in Case Transmission

**I.** Although case agreement on adjectival secondary predicates has inspired linguists of different theoretical persuasions for at least the past 25 year, the cross-linguistic aspect of it still remains a mystery. Icelandic, Czech and Polish are three languages which display striking differences concerning case agreement in infinitival complements. To the extent that case agreement with the Subject in raising verbs is expected on theoretical grounds, case agreement in control environments has constituted a problem for the Case-based account of the distribution of PRO for two reasons: (i) if floating quantifiers can agree with PRO for quirky case, then PRO must be case-marked (cf. e.g. Sigurðsson, 1991), (ii) if predicative adjectives agree with PRO's antecedent then PRO must somehow mediate in case-transmission (cf. e.g. Franks, 1995), as agreement is clause-bounded and the antecedent has never been in the embedded clause. On the other hand, movement approaches to (Obligatory) Control (cf. Hornstein, 1999 and subsequent work) circumvent the problem in (ii) while facing a different challenge related to (i), i.e. how is movement possible out of a case-marked position. If, however, C/case does not drive movement and is instead epiphenomenal spell out of various sizes of a universal nominal functional sequence ( $f_{seq}$ ) resulting from the argument moving through subsequent positions in the verbal  $f_{seq}$  (i.e. Starke's *peeling*), the movement approach becomes unproblematic.

**II.** The control paradigm I focus on is as follows: in both Subject Control and Object Control Icelandic displays the option of the predicative adjective agreeing with NOM, ACC and DAT Subjects and NOM, ACC and DAT Objects (I illustrate the crucial ACC and DAT Object agreement only in (2a) and (2b)), apart from the more generally available non-agreeing Nominative adjective (cf. Sigurðsson, 2002). In Czech, on the other hand, agreement with Dative Objects (4b) is excluded (note that Dative Subjects are arguably absent), whereas agreement with Nominative and Accusative ECM Subjects ((3a) and (3b)) and Accusative objects ((4a)) is allowed, alongside the Nominative option (cf. Przepiórkowski and Rosen, 2004).<sup>1</sup> Finally, the agreeing option is most restricted in Polish, where agreement with Accusative or Dative objects ((5b) and (5c)) is excluded, inducing instead the generally available Instrumental case on the adjective (cf. Bondaruk 2008). In Polish it is only the Nominative subject that can control case agreement on the adjective ((5a)).

**III.** Following the idea in Taraldsen (2006), I will argue that there is a crucial boundary in the nominal  $f_{seq}$ , call it  $X_nP$ , which is opaque for the percolation of features required for the relevant kind of agreement. Cases which spell out nominal structures more deficient than  $X_nP$  will result in predicative agreement, whereas for more 'unpeeled' arguments agreement would be blocked. The particular lexical specification of case markers for all the three languages is in (1).

- (1) a. Icelandic:             $[X_nP [DAT [ACC [NOM ]]]]$   
b. Czech:                 $[DAT [X_nP [ACC [NOM ]]]]$   
c. Polish:  $[DAT [ACC [X_nP [NOM ]]]]$

In other words, Czech ACC nouns spell out a more deficient structure than their Polish equivalents, and the Icelandic ACC nouns are even more impoverished. This particular analysis reduces parametrization to lexical accidents of particular languages, whereas the operation Agree is kept universal.

---

<sup>1</sup>The only context where NOM is not available in both Icelandic and Czech is ECM.

Interestingly, the relevant difference is replicated in other domains, e.g. relative clauses without resumption (possible for NOM, ACC and DAT arguments in Icelandic, NOM and ACC in Czech and only NOM in Polish), availability of ‘quirky subjects’, as well as ECM constructions (available in Icelandic and Czech, but not Polish). These correlations seem to indicate that the parametrization must be tied to the peculiarities of morphological case endings, rather than the parochial restrictions on the grammatical function and/or case of the controller (cf. e.g. Hudson, 2003, Przepiórkowski and Rosen, 2004).

Finally, there is a question of what should the ‘default’ non-agreeing pattern be due to. I will try to relate this difference to the various sizes of the complements spelled out by infinitives in particular languages, in the spirit of Wurmbrand (2000). The Polish infinitive spells out the smallest complement, reflecting the lowest degree of subject *peeling* in the Instrumental case on the predicate, whereas Czech and Icelandic infinitives spell out bigger structures, and hence NOM is available.

- (2) a. Hún bað hann að vera **góðan/ góður**  
 she-NOM requested him-ACC to be good-ACC/ good-NOM  
 ‘She requested him to be good.’
- b. Hún skipaði honum að vera **góðum/ góður.**  
 she-NOM ordered him-DAT to be good-DAT/ good-NOM  
 ‘She ordered him to be good.’ (Hudson:(29ab))
- (3) a. Petr se bál přijít neohlášený.  
 Petr-NOM refl feared come-inf unannounced-NOM  
 ‘Petr was afraid to arrive impromptu.’ (Przepiórkowski and Rosen, 2004:(11a))
- b. Marie viděla Honzu přijít **střízlivého/ \*střízlivý.**  
 Marie-NOM saw Honza-ACC come-inf sober-ACC/ \*sober-NOM  
 ‘Marie saw Honza come sober.’ (Przepiórkowski and Rosen, 2004:(16))
- (4) a. Marie naučila Honzu chodit domu **střízliveho/ střízlivý.**  
 Marie-NOM taught Honza-ACC go-inf home sober-ACC/ sober-NOM  
 ‘Marie taught Honza to come home sober.’ (Przepiórkowski and Rosen, 2004:(14a))
- b. Marie nařídila Honzovi přijít **střízlivý/ \*střízlivému.**  
 Marie-NOM ordered Honza-DAT come-inf sober-NOM/ \*sober-DAT  
 ‘Marie ordered Honza to come sober.’ (Przepiórkowski and Rosen, 2004:(13a))
- (5) a. Jan boi się być **zadowolony/ zadowolonym** z życia  
 Jan-NOM fears refl be-inf satisfied-NOM/ satisfied-INSTR from life  
 ‘Jan is afraid to be satisfied with life.’
- b. Maria nauczyła Jana przychodzić do domu **trzeźwym/ \*trzeźwego.**  
 Maria-NOM taught Jan-ACC come-inf to home sober-INSTR/ \*sober-ACC  
 ‘Maria taught Jan to come home sober.’
- c. Maria kazała Janowi przyjść **trzeźwym/ \*trzeźwemu.**  
 Maria-NOM ordered Jan-DAT come-inf sober-INSTR/ \*sober-DAT  
 ‘Maria ordered Jan to come sober.’ (Jabłońska, p.c.)