Contents

Acknowledgements **xi**

1 Introduction **3**
1.1 Scope . . . 3
1.2 Method . . . 4
1.2.1 Generative Linguistics . . . 4
1.2.2 Descriptive Adequacy . . . 4
1.2.3 Eclecticism . . . 5
1.2.4 Conservatism and Modularity . . . 6
1.3 Terminology and Abbreviations . . . 7
1.3.1 Configurationality . . . 7
1.3.2 *Adverb*, *Ad-verbal* and *Adverbial* . . . 7
1.3.3 Abbreviations . . . 8
1.4 Organization and Overview of Results . . . 11

2 Background **13**
2.1 HPSG . . . 13
2.1.1 Basics . . . 14
2.1.2 Phrase Structure Rules . . . 18
2.1.3 ARG-ST, VALENCE and SUBCAT . . . 24
2.1.4 Lexicon . . . 27
2.1.5 Abbreviatory Conventions and Terminology . . . 28
2.2 Polish . . . 30
2.2.1 Inflection . . . 30
2.2.2 Agreement . . . 33
2.2.3 Word Order . . . 34

I Case Assignment **37**

3 Previous Approaches to Case **41**
3.1 What is Case? . . . 41
3.1.1 Delimiting Cases . . . 41
3.1.2 Taxonomy of Cases . . . 43
3.1.3 Decomposition of Cases . . . 44
3.2 Case in GB . . . 48
3.2.1 Standard GB . . . 48

3.2.2 Slavic GB . . . 51
3.3 Case in LFG . . . 55
3.4 Case in HPSG . . . 58
3.4.1 Sag *et al.* (1992) . . . 58
3.4.2 Pollard (1994) and Heinz and Matiasek (1994) . . . 61
3.4.2.1 Pollard (1994) . . . 61
3.4.2.2 Heinz and Matiasek (1994) . . . 63
3.4.3 Similar Accounts . . . 66
3.4.3.1 Yoo (1993) . . . 67
3.4.3.2 Grover (1995) . . . 68
3.4.3.3 Przepiórkowski (1996a) . . . 69
3.4.3.4 Bratt (1996) . . . 70
3.4.4 Summary . . . 70

4 Non-Configurational Case Assignment 71
4.1 Problems with Previous Accounts . . . 71
4.1.1 Configurationality . . . 71
4.1.2 Non-Locality . . . 72
4.1.3 Extraction . . . 73
4.1.4 Cliticization . . . 74
4.1.5 Summary . . . 75
4.2 Non-Configurational Case Assignment in HPSG . . . 75
4.2.1 Locus of Case Assignment . . . 76
4.2.2 Configurational Information . . . 77
4.2.3 Case Principle . . . 78
4.2.3.1 Marking Arguments as Locally Realized . . . 78
4.2.3.2 Assigning Case to Realized Arguments . . . 79
4.3 Some Examples . . . 80
4.3.1 English Extraction . . . 80
4.3.1.1 Simple Facts . . . 80
4.3.1.2 Extraction . . . 85
4.3.2 Optional Argument Attraction in German . . . 86
4.3.3 Raising Quirky Subjects in Icelandic . . . 88
4.4 Similar Approaches . . . 89
4.4.1 Müller (1997a, 1998a) . . . 90
4.4.2 Meurers (1999b) . . . 91
4.5 Non-Configurational Case Principle Revised . . . 93
4.5.1 Formally . . . 93
4.5.2 Some Comparisons . . . 95
4.6 Conclusions . . . 95

5 Case in Polish 99
5.1 Structural and Inherent Case in Polish . . . 100
5.1.1 Irrelevance of Passivization . . . 100
5.1.2 Genitive of Negation . . . 104
5.1.3 Nominalization . . . 108
5.1.4 Non-Inherent Phrases . . . 112

5.1.4.1 *Dużo*-type Phrases . . . 112
5.1.4.2 *Nic* . . . 116
5.1.4.3 Distributive *po*-Phrases . . . 117
5.1.5 Predication by NP[*ins*]s . . . 119
5.1.6 Intermediate Summary . . . 122
5.1.7 Arguments of Prepositions . . . 123
5.1.8 Arguments of Adjectives and Adverbs . . . 126
5.1.9 Partitive Arguments . . . 129
5.1.10 Summary . . . 131
5.2 Genitive of Negation . . . 132
5.2.1 Basics . . . 132
5.2.1.1 Basic Data . . . 133
5.2.1.2 Basic Analysis . . . 135
5.2.2 What Exactly Triggers GoN? . . . 137
5.2.2.1 *Nie* as a Prefix . . . 137
5.2.2.2 Morphosyntactic Negation vs. Semantic Negation . . . 140
5.2.2.3 Summary . . . 143
5.2.3 Long Distance Genitive of Negation . . . 143
5.2.3.1 Empirical Generalizations . . . 145
5.2.3.2 Possible Analyses . . . 150
5.2.3.3 Argument Composition Analysis . . . 151
5.2.3.4 Other Clause Union Effects . . . 156
5.2.4 Summary of GoN . . . 164
5.3 Case Assignment in Numeral Phrases . . . 164
5.3.1 *Pięć*-Type Numerals . . . 165
5.3.1.1 The Case of Subject Numeral Phrases . . . 166
5.3.1.2 The Structure of Numeral Phrases . . . 175
5.3.1.3 An HPSG Analysis . . . 179
5.3.1.4 Summary . . . 189
5.3.2 Other Numerals . . . 189
5.3.2.1 Paucal Numerals . . . 189
5.3.2.2 Collective Numerals . . . 193
5.3.2.3 Numeralizations . . . 194
5.3.2.4 Indefinite Numerals . . . 196
5.3.2.5 Other Semantic Numerals . . . 199
5.3.3 Summary of Numeral Phrases . . . 200
5.4 Case Assignment and Predication . . . 201
5.4.1 Case (Non-)Agreement and Predication . . . 201
5.4.1.1 Basic Generalizations . . . 201
5.4.1.2 Case Agreement and Case Assignment . . . 205
5.4.1.3 Case of Predicative Phrases . . . 214
5.4.1.4 Case of PRO . . . 217
5.4.2 Subject Control and Object Control . . . 222
5.4.2.1 Previous Considerations . . . 223
5.4.2.2 Control and Raising Revisited . . . 226
5.4.2.3 Other Cases of Control . . . 230
5.4.2.4 Distance Effects on Case (Non-)Agreement . . . 231

5.4.3 Predication and Numeral Phrases . . . 233
5.4.3.1 Numeral Phrases and Case Agreement . . . 234
5.4.3.2 An HPSG Analysis . . . 235
5.4.3.3 A Note on an (Im)Possible Alternative . . . 241
5.4.3.4 Numeral Phrases and Instrumental Predicates . . . 242
5.4.4 Summary of Case Assignment and Predication . . . 244
5.5 Conclusions . . . 245

II The Complement/Adjunct Dichotomy 251

6 Previous Approaches 255
6.1 Complements vs. Adjuncts: Inconsistent Intuitions . . . 255
6.2 Polish Linguistics . . . 256
6.3 Principles and Parameters . . . 257
6.3.1 Textbooks . . . 258
6.3.1.1 Intuitions . . . 258
6.3.1.2 Representations . . . 260
6.3.2 Government and Binding in the 1980's . . . 261
6.3.3 Complements/Adjuncts and Referentiality . . . 263
6.3.3.1 Rizzi (1990) and Cinque (1990) . . . 263
6.3.3.2 Critique . . . 264
6.3.4 The Minimalist Program . . . 266
6.4 LFG . . . 267
6.4.1 Intuitions . . . 267
6.4.2 Representations . . . 268
6.5 HPSG . . . 270
6.5.1 Pollard and Sag (1987) . . . 270
6.5.1.1 Intuitions . . . 270
6.5.1.2 Representations . . . 271
6.5.2 Pollard and Sag (1994) . . . 272
6.5.3 Kasper (1994) . . . 274
6.6 Complements vs. Adjuncts: Summary . . . 276
6.6.1 Intuitions . . . 276
6.6.2 Representations . . . 277
6.6.3 Conclusions . . . 277

7 *Do So* 279
7.1 The *Do So* Test . . . 279
7.2 Deep and Surface Anaphora . . . 280
7.2.1 Deep vs. Surface Anaphora: A Short History . . . 280
7.2.1.1 Hankamer and Sag (1976) . . . 280
7.2.1.2 The Debate . . . 282
7.2.1.3 Sag and Hankamer (1984) . . . 285
7.2.1.4 Chao (1987) and Hardt (1993) . . . 286
7.2.2 *Do So* as Surface Anaphora . . . 288
7.3 Against the *Do So* Test . . . 290

7.3.1 Miller (1990, 1992) . . . 290
7.3.2 Nonparallelism of *Do So* . . . 291
7.3.2.1 Passive Antecedents . . . 291
7.3.2.2 Nominal Antecedents . . . 297
7.3.2.3 Other Cases of Syntactic Nonparallelism . . . 298
7.3.2.4 Summary . . . 301
7.3.3 Pragmatic Character of *Do So* . . . 301
7.3.3.1 Nash-Webber and Sag (1978) and Webber (1979) . . . 302
7.3.3.2 Split Antecedents . . . 303
7.3.3.3 Pragmatically Controlled Antecedents . . . 304
7.3.3.4 Summary . . . 308
7.4 Conclusions . . . 308
7.5 Appendix: Sources Used in §7.3 . . . 309

8 Complements and Adjuncts in Polish **311**
8.1 Verbal Proforms . . . 311
8.1.1 Verbal Proforms in Polish . . . 311
8.1.2 Problems with the Proform Test in Polish . . . 312
8.1.3 *Zrobić To* is a Pragmatic Anaphor . . . 314
8.2 Extraction . . . 316
8.2.1 Adjuncts vs. Complements? . . . 316
8.2.2 Extraction *of* Complements and Adjuncts . . . 317
8.2.3 Extraction *from* Complements and Adjuncts . . . 319
8.2.3.1 Extraction from Subordinate Clauses . . . 320
8.2.3.2 Extraction from NPs and PPs . . . 322
8.2.4 Multiple Wh-Fronting . . . 323
8.3 Parasitic Gaps . . . 325
8.4 Binding . . . 327
8.4.1 Adjuncts outside the Scope of BT? . . . 327
8.4.1.1 Reflexives . . . 328
8.4.1.2 Pronouns . . . 329
8.4.1.3 R-Expressions . . . 330
8.4.2 Condition C Effects . . . 331
8.4.3 Some Consequences . . . 333
8.4.3.1 Logophors in Polish? . . . 333
8.4.3.2 Binding in HPSG . . . 334
8.4.3.3 *Reflexivity* Approach . . . 337
8.5 Negative Concord . . . 343
8.6 Conclusions . . . 344

9 Adjuncts as Complements **345**
9.1 Previous HPSG Work . . . 345
9.1.1 Miller (1992) . . . 346
9.1.2 Dutch Verb Clusters: van Noord and Bouma (1994) . . . 347
9.1.2.1 Linguistic Motivation . . . 347
9.1.2.2 Formalization: Relational Constraints . . . 349
9.1.3 Japanese Causatives . . . 349

9.1.3.1 Manning *et al.* (1997) . . . 350
9.1.3.2 Manning *et al.* (1998): A Technical Remark . . . 352
9.1.4 Extraction . . . 353
9.1.4.1 Hukari and Levine (1994, 1995) . . . 354
9.1.4.2 Bouma *et al.* (1999b, 1998a) . . . 355
9.2 Our Formalization . . . 358
9.2.1 Disadvantages of Bouma *et al.* (1999b) . . . 358
9.2.1.1 ARG-ST vs. DEPS . . . 358
9.2.1.2 Passive-Sensitive Adverbs . . . 359
9.2.1.3 Japanese Causatives . . . 360
9.2.1.4 Post- and Pre-verbal Adjuncts . . . 361
9.2.2 Formalization Based on Manning *et al.* (1997) . . . 363
9.3 'Adjuncts-as-Complements' and Quantification . . . 367
9.3.1 Quantification: Pollard and Yoo (1998) . . . 367
9.3.2 An Alternative Account . . . 369
9.3.2.1 Problems with Pollard and Yoo (1998) . . . 369
9.3.2.2 Lexical Retrieval . . . 370
9.3.2.3 *A unicorn appears to be approaching.* . . . 375
9.3.2.4 *Wh*-Retrieval . . . 378
9.3.3 Adjuncts and Scope Ambiguities . . . 379
9.3.3.1 A Problem? . . . 379
9.3.3.2 *Kim almost saw a unicorn.* . . . 380
9.3.3.3 MLRs Formalization . . . 384
9.4 Conclusions . . . 388

10 Case Assignment and Adjuncts 389
10.1 Case Assignment: An Argument for 'Adjuncts-as-Complements' . . . 389
10.1.1 Russian Genitive of Negation . . . 389
10.1.2 Korean Accusative/Nominative Alternation . . . 390
10.1.3 Finnish Nominative and Accusative . . . 392
10.1.3.1 Generalizations . . . 392
10.1.3.2 Evidence for 'Adjuncts-as-Complements' . . . 393
10.2 Case and Adjuncts in Polish . . . 396
10.2.1 Semantic Case . . . 396
10.2.1.1 Instrumental of Predication . . . 396
10.2.1.2 Instrumental of Means . . . 398
10.2.1.3 Recipient Dative . . . 399
10.2.1.4 Summary . . . 400
10.2.2 Genitive of Negation . . . 400
10.2.2.1 Genitive (of Negation) Adjuncts are Partitive? . . . 400
10.2.2.2 A Remark on Nominalization . . . 403
10.2.2.3 Case Assignment and Referentiality . . . 404
10.2.3 Predication . . . 410
10.3 Conclusions . . . 414

A Formalization in RSRL **417**
A.1 Introduction 417
A.2 Basic Assumptions 417
A.3 Case Assignment 422
A.3.1 RAISED Marking 422
A.3.2 Case Principle for Polish 424
A.4 Case Agreement 428
A.5 'Adjuncts-as-Complements' 429
A.6 Control and Raising 434
A.7 ARG-ST on Phrases? 435

Bibliography **443**