

LINGUIST 601
Assigned on November 30, 2006
Due on December 12, 2006

Assignment 11

1 Icelandic Quirky Case and Control

Icelandic presents a rich system of non-nominative subjects which can have a variety of oblique cases, sometimes called Quirky Cases.

- (1) a. Hana/*H ún vantaDi vinnu.
she.Acc/she.No lacked job
'She lacked a job.'
- b. Henni/*Hún leiddist.
she.Dat/she.Nom bored
'She was bored.'
- c. Hennar/*Hún var getiD.
she.Gen/she.Nom was mentioned
'She was mentioned (by someone).'

The availability of quirky case is predicate dependent. It depends upon the predicate at hand whether the subject will bear a quirky case and what particular quirky case it will bear.

What are the implications of the following facts for the theory of PRO? How does PRO in Icelandic differ from PRO in English? When do we get PRO and when do we get overt subjects in Icelandic? Provide an analysis of the Icelandic facts. For concreteness, you can assume that information about Quirky Case is available at the point where the subject is merged.

1.1 Controlling Quirky Subjects

Positions that receive Quirky Case cannot be overtly realized in the infinitival clauses in (2). We could say that these positions are occupied by PRO.

- (2) a. Hún vonast til [aD PRO vanta ekki vinnu].
she.Nom hopes for to lack not job
'She hopes not to lack a job.'
- b. Hana langar ekki til [aD PRO leiDast].
she.Acc wants not for to bore
'She does not want to be bored.'
- c. PaD vaeri gaman [aD PRO verDa getiD].
it were nice to be mentioned
'It would be nice to be mentioned.'

(the exact surface position of PRO is open to debate. For all we know it precedes *aD*.)

1.2 Floating Quantifiers and Quirky Subjects

Floating Quantifiers in Icelandic inflect for case, number, and gender. They show agreement with the NP they are associated with.

- (3) a. Strákarnir komast allir í skóla.
the-boys.Nom got all.Nom.MPl to school
'The boys all managed to get to school.'
- b. Strákana vantaði alla í skólann.
the-boys.Acc lacked all.Acc.MPl in the-school
'The boys were all absent from the school.'
- c. Strákunum leiddist öllum í skóla.
the-boys.Dat bored all.Dat.MPl in school
'The boys were all bored in school.'
- d. Strákanna var allra getið í ræðunni.
the-boys.Gen were all.Gen.Ml mentioned in the-speech
'The boys were all mentioned in the speech.'

Floating quantifiers are also possible in control constructions where they display the following behaviour:

- (4) a. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO komast allir í skóla].
the-boys.Nom hope for to get all.Nom.MPl to school
'The boys hope to all get to school.'
- Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO vanta ekki alla í skólann].
the-boys.Nom hope for to lack not all.Acc.Pl to the-school
'The boys hope to not be all absent from school.'
- Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO leiddast ekki öllum í skóla].
the-boys.Nom hope for to bore not all.Dat.MPl in school
'The boys hope to not be all bored in school.'
- Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO verða allra getið í ræðunni].
the-boys.Nom hope for to be all.Gen.Pl mentioned in the-speech
'The boys hope to be all mentioned in the speech.'

1.3 Predicate Agreement and Quirky Subjects

You need to formulate an account of agreement in Icelandic that extends to both finite and non-finite clauses, to tensed verbs, adjectives, and participles.

1.3.1 Matrix Predicate Agreement

The finite verb agrees with the nominative subject in number and person. Adjectives and certain Participles agree with the subject in number, gender, and case. Other participles are simply invariable.

- (5) a. Strákarnir höfDu veriD duglegir.
 the-boys.Nom.MPl had.3Pl been energetic.Nom.MPl
 'The boys had been energetic.'
- b. Stelpurnar höfDu veriD duglegar.
 the-girls.Nom.FPl had.3Pl been energetic.Nom.FPl
 'The girls had been energetic.'
- c. Börnin höfDu veriD dugleg.
 the-children.Nom.NPl had.3Pl been energetic.Nom.NPl
 'The children had been energetic.'

If we put the above sentences in an ECM environment where the subject gets accusative case, the predicate agrees with the subject and appears in the accusative. Of course, ECM environments are non-finite so we cannot say anything about finite verb agreement there.

But sometimes the agreement pattern is different.

- (6) a. Strákunum hafDi veriD kalt.
 the-boys.Dat had.Default been cold.Default
 'The boys had been cold.'
- b. Stelpunum hafDi veriD kalt.
 the-girls.Dat had.Default been cold.Default
 'The girls had been cold.'
- c. Okkur hafDi veriD kalt.
 we.Dat had.Default been cold.Default
 'We had been cold.'

In general, Quirky Subjects never trigger agreement.

Sometimes the agreement is with the object.

- (7) a. Okkur höfDu leiDst strákarnir.
 we.Dat had.3Pl bored the-boys.Nom.3Pl
 'We had been bored by the boys.'
- b. Okkur höfDu veriD sagDar sögurnar áDur.
 we.Dat had.3Pl been told.Nom.FPl the-stories.Nom.FPl before
 'We had been told the stories before.'

And sometimes the agreement is with nothing.

- (8) Okkur hafDi veriD sagt frá Þessu áDur.
 we.Dat had.Default been told.Default about this.Dat before
 'We had been told about this before.'

1.3.2 Agreement in Control Environments

- (9) a. Strákarnir voru aðstoðaðir/*aðstoðað.
the-boys.Nom were aided.Nom.MPI/aided.Default
'The boys were aided.'
- b. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO verDa aðstoðaðir/*aðstoðað].
the-boys.Nom hope for to be aided.Nom.MPI/aided.Default
'The boys hope to be aided.'
- (10) a. Strákunum var hjálpað/*hjálpaðir/*hjálpuðum.
the-boys.Dat was helped.Default/helped.Nom.MPI/helped.Dat.MPI
'The boys were helped.'
- b. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO verDa
the-boys.Dat hope for to be
hjálpað/*hjálpaðir/*hjálpuðum].
helped.Default/helped.Nom.MPI/helped.Dat.MPI
'The boys hoped to be helped by somebody.'
- (11) In finite clauses, *get to the party* and *be elected* assign nominative to their subjects.
- a. *want* assigns Quirky Accusative to its subject:
Strákana langaði til [að PRO komast allir í veisluna].
the-boys.Acc wanted.Default for to get all.Nom.MPI to the-party
'The boys wanted to get to the party.'
- b. *bored* assigns Quiry Dative to its subject:
Strákunum leiddist [að PRO verDa kosnir í stjórnina].
the-boys.Dat bored.Default to be elected.Nom.MPI to the-board
'The boys were annoyed to be elected to the board.'

1.4 A comparison with Hindi-Urdu

Hindi-Urdu also allows for non-nominative subjects.

- (12) us-ko vo kitaab pasand nahī: aa-ii.
s/he-Dat that book.f.Nom pleasing come-Pfv.f
'S/he liked that book.'

But it differs in what can be controlled (i.e. realized as PRO).

- (13) a. mĒ [un logō-ko PRO pasand aa-naa] nahī chaah-taa
I.Nom those people-Dat pleasing come-Inf Neg want-Impfv.MSg
'I don't want those people to like me.'
- b. *mĒ [PRO vo kitaab pasand aa-naa] nahī chaah-taa
I.Nom that book pleasing come-Inf Neg want-Impfv.MSg
'I don't want to like that book.'

How do Hindi-Urdu and Icelandic differ with respect to control into non-nominative subject constructions? Assuming that PRO in Hindi-Urdu can be taken to have properties similar to that of PRO in English, articulate the difference between Icelandic and Hindi-Urdu in this domain in terms of the properties of their null infinitival subjects and other independent properties of the two languages.

2 Hindi-Urdu Again

Provide an analysis of the agreement facts seen in the following data. Compare them with the Icelandic facts. The rest of the problem examines the intricacies of the passive in Hindi-Urdu.

For concreteness assume that v_{AG} , perfective aspect, and finite T^0 assign ergative case to subjects. You should also assume that the ϕ -features of any DP with an overt case-clitic (the Ergative *-ne* and the Dative/Accusative *-ko*) are invisible. Please feel free to email me if you need additional data.

2.1 Promotion

It is unclear if there is ever promotion in Hindi-Urdu passives. This is because accusative and nominative are both unmarked, word order is not informative, and given the right configurations objects can trigger agreement.

(14) Split Ergativity:

a. Perfective transitive, Ergative Subject:

Ram-ne yeh țehnii kal kaaț-ii thii.
 Ram-Erg this branch.f yesterday cut-Pfv.f be.Pst.f

‘Ram had cut this branch yesterday.’

b. Non-Perfective transitive, Nominative Subject:

Ram yeh țehnii kal kaaț-egaa
 Ram.M this branch.f tomorrow cut-Fut.3MSg

‘Ram will cut this branch tomorrow.’

(15) Passive:

yeh țehnii kal kaaț-ii gayii thii.
 this branch.f yesterday cut-Pfv.f Pass.Pfv.f be.Pst.f

‘This branch was cut yesterday.’

Thus we do not know whether this branch in (15) has nominative case (i.e. case-licensed by T^0) or accusative (i.e. case-licensed by the specifier-less v_{AG}).

Non-pronominal/Non-Proper name NPs in Hindi-Urdu can optionally be marked with a marker *-ko* that contributes specificity. *-ko* can also appear on the unique argument of a passive.

(16) *-ko*-marked objects:

a. Perfective transitive, Ergative Subject:

Ram-ne is ʔehnii-ko kal kaaʔ-aa thaa.
 Ram-Erg this.Obl branch.f-Acc yesterday cut-Pfv.Default be.Pst.Default
 'Ram had cut this branch yesterday.'

b. Non-Perfective transitive, Nominative Subject:

Ram is ʔehnii-ko kal kaaʔ-egaa
 Ram.M this.Obl branch.f-Acc tomorrow cut-Fut.3MSg
 'Ram will cut this branch tomorrow.'

(17) Passive with *-ko* retention:

is ʔehnii-ko kal kaaʔ-aa gayaa thaa
 this.Obl branch-Acc yesterday cut-Pfv.Default Pass.Pfv.Default be.Pst.Default
 'The branch was cut yesterday.'

Since there are independent reasons to believe that *-ko* never appears on elements that are case-licensed by T^0 (e.g. subjects of transitives), we can safely assume that *this branch* in (17) is definitely accusative (case-licensed by the specifier-less v_{AG}). But then we still do not have a clear cut case where we can be certain that there is promotion (i.e. the unique argument of the passive is case-licensed by T^0).

2.2 Proper Names and Pronouns

Now consider the following data. Do they provide evidence of obligatory promotion? Your answer should include a discussion of why you think the data tells us what you think it does.

Unlike other direct objects, proper names and human pronominal direct objects must be *-ko* marked. This is part of a crosslinguistically attested phenomena known as Differential Object Marking (DOM).

(18) a. Ram-ne mujhe/*mē baazaar-mē dekh-aa thaa
 Ram-Erg I.Dat/I market-in see-Pfv.Default be.Pst.Default
 'Ram had seen me in the market.'

b. Ram-ne Rina-ko/*Rina baazaar-mē dekh-aa thaa
 Ram-Erg Rina.f-Dat/Rina.f market-in see-Pfv.Default be.Pst.Default
 'Ram had seen Rina in the market.'

Now consider the passives:

(19) with *-ko*:

a. mujh-ko baazaar-mē dekh-aa gayaa thaa
 I.Obl-Acc market-in see-Pfv.Default Pass.Pfv.Default be.Pst.Default
 'I had been seen in the market.'

- b. Rina-ko baazaar-mē dekh-aa gayaa thaa
 Rina-Acc market-in see-Pfv.Default Pass.Pfv.Default be.Pst.Default
 'Rina had seen in the market.'

(20) without *-ko*:

- a. (assume speaker is a woman)
 mĒ baazaar-mē dekh-ii gayii thii
 I.f market-in see-Pfv.F Pass.Pfv.F be.Pst.F
 'I had been seen in the market.'
- b. Rina baazaar-mē dekh-ii gayii thii
 Rina.f market-in see-Pfv.F Pass.Pfv.F be.Pst.F
 'Rina had been seen in the market.'

2.3 Subject Case in Infinitivals

Infinitival subjects in Hindi-Urdu are in general either null (i.e. PRO) or genitive marked (you do not need to provide an explanation as to how Genitive is assigned). This has been taken to suggest that infinitivals in Hindi-Urdu are really gerunds.

- (21) a. PRO:
 [PRO mehnat kar-naa] acchii baat hai
 hardwork do-Inf good thing be.Prs.Default
 'To work hard is a good thing.'
- b. Genitive Subject:
 [Ram-kaa is tarah mehnat kar-naa] acchii baat hai
 Ram-Gen this way hardwork do-Inf good thing be.Prs.Default
 'For Ram to work hard this way is a good thing.'

The subjects of transitive predicates cannot appear in the nominative:

- (22) *[Ram is tarah mehnat kar-naa] acchii baat hai
 Ram.Nom this way hardwork do-Inf good thing be.Prs.Default
 (The subject is simply unmarked, I am assuming it's in the nominative.)

With passives, we find the following.

- (23) a. DPs that don't need *-ko* as regular direct objects:
 [per-kaa/per-ko/per is tarah-se kaat-aa jaa-naa] sharam-kii baat hai
 tree-Gen/tree-Acc/tree this.Obl way-in cut-Pfv Pass-Inf shame-Gen.f thing.f is
 'For the tree to be cut down like this is a matter of shame.'
- b. DPs that need *-ko* as regular direct objects:
 [Rina-kaa/Rina-ko/*Rina baazaar-mē dekh-aa jaa-naa] sharam-kii baat hai
 Rina-Gen/Rina-Acc/Rina.f market-in see-Pfv Pass-Inf shame-Gen.f thing.f is
 'For Rina to be seen in the market is a matter of shame.'

Finally, with unaccusatives a third pattern is found:

(24) a. DPs that don't need *-ko* as regular direct objects:

[khatō-kaa/khat/*khatō-ko der-se aa-naa] aam baat hai
letters-Gen/letter(s)/letters-Acc delay-with come-Inf common thing is
'For letters to come later is common.'

b. DPs that need *-ko* as regular direct objects:

[Rina-kaa/*Rina/*Rina-ko der-se aa-naa] aam baat hai
Rina-Gen/Rina/Rina-Acc delay-with come-Inf common thing is
'Rina's coming late is a common occurrence.'

What's going on?