Today’s topics and goals

- Analyze the case pattern in Finnish, with a focus on the case that adjuncts appear with.
- Compare two theories of case assignment.
  1. Case assigned by a dedicated head
  2. Configurational view of case assignment
- Evaluate the claims and the assumptions needed to make these claims.
• **NOM/ACC alignment:** in transitive clauses, the subject is NOM and the object, ACC:

(1) Pekka osti kirja-n.
    Pekka.NOM bought book-ACC
    ‘Pekka bought the/a book.’
(2)  a. *Passivized verb: nom object*

Kirja oste-ttiin.
book.NOM buy-PASS.PAST
‘The book was bought/People bought the book.’

b. *Imperative: nom object*

Osta kirja!
buy.IMP book.NOM
‘Buy the/a book!’

c. *Subject bears lexical case: nom object*

Minu-n täytyy osta-a kirja.
I-GEN need buy-INF book.NOM
‘I have to buy the/a book.’
Two possible analyses of the data so far:
  1. Case assigned by functional heads analysis
  2. Dependent case analysis
1. If case is assigned by a dedicated head:
   ▶ Transitive verb/verb assigns ACC to an object and $T_{FIN}$ assigns NOM to the subject.
   ▶ In passives and imperatives: no transitive verb/verb to assign ACC (Burzio’s generalization).
   ▶ **Assumption:** transitive verb/verb that assigns lexical case to a subject is unable to assign ACC to the object.
1. If case is assigned by a dedicated head:
   - Transitive verb/ν verb assigns ACC to an object and $T_{\text{FIN}}$ assigns NOM to the subject.
   - In passives and imperatives: no transitive verb/ν to assign ACC (Burzio’s generalization).
   - **Assumption:** transitive verb/ν that assigns lexical case to a subject is unable to assign ACC to the object.
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2. Dependent case analysis:

- **ACC** is dependent case in Finnish. It is assigned downwards via competition with the subject.
- If the subject is not a case competitor, the object is **NOM**.
  - Postulation: absent subject (imperative and passive)
  - Subject with lexical case
- No postulation about constructions where the subject receives lexical case and the object, **NOM**.
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▶ ACC is dependent case in Finnish. It is assigned downwards via competition with the subject.
▶ If the subject is not a case competitor, the object is NOM.
  ■ Postulation: absent subject (imperative and passive)
  ■ Subject with lexical case
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But there is a postulation (that can be tested) about the sentences where there is no (overt) subject (passives and imperatives):
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b. The ship was sunk to collect the insurance.  
c. The ship sank to collect the insurance.
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- Is this implicit agent a case competitor? What happens in Finnish?
But there is a postulation (that can be tested) about the sentences where there is no (overt) subject (passives and imperatives):

(3)  

a. The captain sank the ship to collect the insurance.

b. The ship was sunk to collect the insurance.

c. ?* The ship sank to collect the insurance.

- Passives (in English) may have an implicit agent, which licenses the rationale clause.
- Is this implicit agent a case competitor? What happens in Finnish?
Likewise, imperatives (in English) may have a null subject, the syntactic reality of which can be tested with binding:

(4) Give yourself a break!

What about Finnish? It could be the case that imperatives in this language do not have a null subject, but this can be tested.
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• What about Finnish? It could be the case that imperatives in this language do not have a null subject, but this can be tested.
Likewise, imperatives (in English) may have a null subject, the syntactic reality of which can be tested with binding:

(4) $\textit{pro}_{2\text{sg}}$ Give $\textit{yourself}$ a break!

What about Finnish? It could be the case that imperatives in this language do not have a null subject, but this can be tested.
• Likewise, imperatives (in English) may have a null subject, the syntactic reality of which can be tested with binding:

\[
(4) \quad pro_{2sg} \text{Give } \textbf{yourself} \text{ a break!}
\]

• What about Finnish? It could be the case that imperatives in this language do not have a null subject, but this can be tested.
• Crucial data to distinguish between these two theories: case exhibited by certain adjuncts.
• In intransitive clauses, an adjunct is ACC:

(5) Minä opiskelin **vuode-n.**
    I.NOM studied year-ACC
    ‘I studied for a year.’

• In passives the adjunct is NOM.

(6) Opiskel-tiin **vuosi.**
    study-PASS.PAST year.NOM
    ‘People studied for a year.’

• Generalization: if a DP is present, the adjunct is ACC; if there isn’t, it is NOM.
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1. Case assigned by dedicated heads analysis:

- We could say that in (6) $T_{FIN}$ in Finnish can assign NOM to an adjunct in the absence of a DP that needs case.

  (6) Opiskel-tiin **vuosi**.
  study-PASS.PAST year.NOM
  ‘People studied for a year.’

- What about (5)?

  (5) Minä opiskelin **vuode-n**.
  I.NOM studied year-ACC
  ‘I studied for a year.’

- No dedicated head to assign ACC to the adjunct.
2. Dependent case analysis:

(5) Minä opiskelin **vuođe-n.**
I.NOM studied year-ACC
‘I studied for a year.’

[TP I[Case:__] studied year[Case:__]]

(6) Opiskel-tiin **vuos**i.
study-PASS.PAST year.NOM
‘People studied for a year.’

[TP studied-PASS year[Case:__]]
2. Dependent case analysis:

(5) Minä opiskelin *vuode-n.*
I.NOM studied year-ACC
‘I studied for a year.’

\[
[TP \text{ I[Case:__]} \text{ studied } year[\text{Case:ACC}]]
\]

(6) Opiskel-tiin *vuosi.*
study-PASS.PAST year.NOM
‘People studied for a year.’

\[
[TP \text{ studied-PASS } year[\text{Case:}]]
\]
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2. Dependent case analysis:

(5) Minä opiskelin **vuode-n.**
I.NOM studied year-ACC
‘I studied for a year.’

[TP I[Case:NOM] studied year[Case:ACC]]

(6) Opiskel-tiin **vuosi.**
study-PASS.PAST year.NOM
‘People studied for a year.’

[TP studied-PASS year[Case:NOM]]
• More data to distinguish between the two case theories: multiple adjuncts

• Prediction made by each case theory:
  1. Case assigned by a functional head: no ACC adjunct should be possible in passivized or intransitive sentences, due to the absence of v.
  2. Dependent case: an ACC adjunct is possible even if the sentence is passivized or intransitive, as long as there is a case competitor for it.
Two adjuncts

- More data to distinguish between the two case theories: multiple adjuncts
- Prediction made by each case theory:
  1. Case assigned by a functional head: no ACC adjunct should be possible in passivized or intransitive sentences, due to the absence of v.
  2. Dependent case: an ACC adjunct is possible even if the sentence is passivized or intransitive, as long as there is a case competitor for it.
(7) *Baseline: lexical illative object*

Minä luotin Kekkose-en [ yhde-n vuode-n ] [ kolmanne-n I.NOM trusted Kekkonen-ILL [ one-ACC year-ACC ] [ third-ACC kerra-n ].
time-ACC ]

‘I trusted Kekkonen for a year for a third time.’
(8) *Passivized theme with lexical case*

a. Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [kolmas kerta].
   Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [third.NOM time.NOM]
   ‘Kekkonen was trusted for a third time.’

b. Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi] [kolmanne-n kerra-n].
   Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM] [third-ACC time-ACC]
   ‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’
1. Case assigned by dedicated heads analysis:

▶ We could again say that in (8a) $T_{\text{FIN}}$ in Finnish can assign NOM to an adjunct in the absence of a DP that needs case.

(8a) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [kolmas kerta].
Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [third.NOM time.NOM]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a third time.’

▶ What about (8b)?

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi] [Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM] [kolmanne-n kerra-n].
third-ACC time-ACC]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’
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▶ What about (8b)?

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [ yksi vuosi ] [ Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [ one.NOM year.NOM ] [ kolmanne-n kerra-n ].
third-ACC time-ACC ]
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1. Case assigned by dedicated heads analysis:

- We could again say that in (8a) $T_{FIN}$ in Finnish can assign NOM to an adjunct in the absence of a DP that needs case.

(8a) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [kolmas kerta].
Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [third.NOM time.NOM]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a third time.’

- What about (8b)?

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi][Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM][kolmanne-n kerra-n].
third-ACC time-ACC]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’
1. Case assigned by dedicated heads analysis:
   ▶ We could again say that in (8a) $T_{\text{FIN}}$ in Finnish can assign NOM to an adjunct in the absence of a DP that needs case.

   (8a) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [kolmas kerta].
       Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [third.NOM time.NOM]
       ‘Kekkonen was trusted for a third time.’

   ▶ What about (8b)?

   (8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi][
       Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM][
       kolmanne-n kerra-n].
       third-ACC time-ACC]
       ‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’

   ▶ No source for the ACC in the second adjunct.
2. Dependent case analysis:

▶ **NOM** is unmarked case. In (8a), it is the only case available for the adjunct because there is no case competitor for it.

(8a) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin \[ kolmas kerta \].
Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST \[ third.NOM time.NOM \]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a third time.’

▶ What about (8b), specifically what about **ACC**?

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin \[ yksi vuosi \] \[\]
Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST \[ one.NOM year.NOM \] \[\]
kolmanne-n kerra-n \].
third-ACC time-ACC \]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’
2. Dependent case analysis:

- NOM is unmarked case. In (8a), it is the only case available for the adjunct because there is no case competitor for it.

(8a) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [kolmas kerta].
Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [third.NOM time.NOM]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a third time.’

- What about (8b), specifically what about ACC?

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi] [Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM] [kolmanne-n kerra-n].
third-ACC time-ACC]
‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’
2. Dependent case analysis:

▶ **NOM** is unmarked case. In (8a), it is the only case available for the adjunct because there is no case competitor for it.

(8a) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [kolmas kerta].
    Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [third.NOM time.NOM]
    ‘Kekkonen was trusted for a third time.’

▶ What about (8b), specifically what about **ACC**?

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi] [kolmanne-n kerra-n].
    Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM]
    third-ACC time-ACC]
    ‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’
Proposal: an adjunct can be a case competitor for a lower adjunct.

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [ yksi vuosi ] [ kolmanne-n Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [ one.NOM year.NOM ] [ third-ACC kerra-n ]].

time-ACC ]

‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’

(9) [TP Kekkonen-ILL was.trusted [one year[Case:__]] [third time[Case:__]]]
Proposal: an adjunct can be a case competitor for a lower adjunct.

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi] [kolmanne-n]
Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM] [third-ACC
kerra-n].
time-ACC

‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’

(9) [TP Kekkonen-ILL was.trusted [one year[Case:__]] [third time[Case:__]]}
Proposal: an adjunct can be a case competitor for a lower adjunct.

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi] [kolmanne-n Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM] [third-ACC kerra-n]. time-ACC]

‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’

(9) [TP Kekkonen-ILL was.trusted [one year[Case:__]] [third time[Case:ACC]]]
Proposal: an adjunct can be a case competitor for a lower adjunct.

(8b) Kekkose-en luote-ttiin [yksi vuosi] [kolmanne-n Kekkonen-ILL trust-PASS.PAST [one.NOM year.NOM] [third-ACC kerra-n].

time-ACC]

‘Kekkonen was trusted for a year for a third time.’

(9) [TP Kekkonen-ILL was.trusted [one year[Case:NOm]] [third time[Case:ACC]]]
Exercise

How could we account for case pattern in the baseline example (7)?

(7) Baseline: lexical illative object

Minä luotin Kekkose-en [ yhde-n vuode-n ] [ kolmanne-n I.NOM trusted Kekkonen-ILL [ one-ACC year-ACC ] [ third-ACC kerra-n ] time-ACC ]
‘I trusted Kekkonen for a year for a third time.’

Assume that dependent case is calculated with pairs of case competitors, starting from the bottom of the structure and proceeding upwards.
Missing: support for the c-command relationship between the adjuncts.¹

(10) *Scope of adjuncts*

a. Mary opened the window for three minutes for two days.

b. # Mary opened the window for two days for three minutes.

(11) *Scope of adjuncts*

a. The dog ate twice three times.

b. The dog ate three times twice.

¹Thank you to Peter Grishin for the suggestion!