If you can’t agree, move on!
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1. Overview

• Constructions with non-nominative elements in what looks like a subject position (English, Polish, Russian, and Lithuanian).¹

1) a. **Down the hill** rolled John.  

b. **Janowi** podobała się ta książka.  

   JanDAT please3SG,FEM refl this bookNOM  
   ‘Jan likes this book.’  

   (Polish)

c. **Lodku** vybrosilo na skaly (volnoj).  

   boatACC threwNEUT on rocks waveINST  
   ‘The boat was thrown on the rocks (by a wave).’  

   (Russian, Babby 1994: 25)

2) a. **Moim najlepszym przyjacielem** był Jan.  

   myINSTR bestINSTR friendINSTR was Jan  
   ‘My best friend was Jan.’  

   (Polish)

b. **Mokytojo ištaisyta klaidos.**  

   teacherGEN correctPART mistakesNOM  
   ‘The teacher apparently corrected the mistakes’  

   (Lithuanian)


3) \[ 
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{TP} \\
\times P_{i} \\
T' \\
T_{EPP} \\
\nuP/VP \\
\ldots t_{i} \ldots 
\end{array} \]

¹ The authors are listed in alphabetical order. Unless otherwise noted, all Lithuanian judgments come from Aušra Valančiauskienė. Many thanks to her.
• Certain recent theoretical developments make this analysis impossible (Chomsky’s 2008, 2013, 2014 labeling algorithms).

4) a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FP} \\
\text{XP} \\
\phantom{F} \\
F \\
\phantom{T} \\
T \\
T \\
vP/VP
\end{array}
\quad b. \quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FP} \\
\text{XP} \\
\phantom{F} \\
F \\
\phantom{T} \\
T \\
vP/VP
\end{array}
\]

A. What excludes the analysis in (3)?
B. Which alternative structure is right?
   - what type of movement does XP undergo? (A or A-bar, discourse driven or not?)

2. Labeling Algorithm(s)

A. There exists a fixed labeling algorithm (see also Chomsky 2008, 2013, Citko 2008b, Cecchetto & Donati 2015)

• Chomsky’s (2013: 43) Labeling Algorithm (LA)

5) a. \[\text{SO} = <H, XP> \text{ (H a head and XP not a head). LA selects H as the label.}\]
   a'. \[\begin{array}{c}
X \\
YP
\end{array}\]
   a''. \[\begin{array}{c}
XP
\end{array}\]

b. \[\text{SO} = <XP, YP> \text{ (neither a head). The search is ambiguous, locating the heads X, Y of XP, YP, respectively. There are, then, two ways in which SO can be labeled: (A) modify SO so that there is only one visible head, or (B) X and Y are identical in a relevant respect, providing the same label, which can be taken as the label of the SO.}\]
   b'. \[\begin{array}{c}
XP \\
YP
\end{array}\]
   b''. \[\begin{array}{c}
XP \\
YP
\end{array}\]
   c'. \[\begin{array}{c}
XP \\
YP
\end{array}\]
   c''. \[\begin{array}{c}
XP_{[F]} \\
YP_{[F]}
\end{array}\]
B. Small clauses (Moro 1997; Moro 2000)

6) a. John is my best friend.

   b. ??

      \[
      \text{DP}_1 \quad \text{DP}_2 \quad \text{Pred} \quad \text{DP}_2
      \]

   c. \[\text{IP} \left[ \text{DP}_1 \text{John} \right] \text{is} \quad \text{PredP} \left[ \text{Pr} \left[ \text{DP}_2 \text{my best friend} \right] \right]\]

C. Successive cyclic movement

7) a. What article do you think that Mary wrote?

   b. \[\ldots \left[ \text{IP} \text{what article} \right] \text{that} \left[ \text{IP} \text{Mary wrote} \right]\]

   c. \[\ldots \left[ \text{IP} \text{what article} \right] \text{that} \left[ \text{IP} \text{Mary wrote} \right]\]

D. Embedded interrogatives

8) a. Bill wondered what article Mary wrote.

   b. \[\ldots \left[ \text{IP} \text{what article} \right] \text{that} \left[ \text{IP} \text{Mary wrote} \right]\]

E. Agreeing subjects in [Spec,TP]

‘Perhaps that can be achieved by the device suggested for embedded interrogatives. NP and TP share prominent features, namely \(\phi\)-features.’ (Chomsky 2013: 45)

9) a. Mary runs.

   b. \[\left[ \text{IP} \text{Mary} \right] \text{vP runs}\]

   c. \[\left[ \text{TP} \text{Mary} \right] \phi:3SG.FEM \text{vP runs}\]

F. What about non-agreeing subjects in [Spec,TP]?

10) a. \textit{Przyczyną wypadku} były te plotki. \textit{Polish}

cause\textit{instr} accident\textit{gen} were these rumors

‘The cause of the accident were these rumors.’

   b. \[\left[ \text{IP} \text{cause of the accident} \right] \phi:3SG.FEM \text{vP were} \left[ \text{IP} \text{these rumors} \right]\]

11) a. \textit{Mokytojo ištaisyta klaidos}. \textit{Lithuanian}

teacher\textit{gen} correct\textit{part} mistakes\textit{nom}

‘The teacher apparently corrected the mistakes’

   b. \[\left[ \text{IP} \text{teacher} \right] \phi:3SG.FEM \text{vP corrected mistakes}\]
Assumptions:

A. Split CP (Rizzi 1997, Dyakonova 2009 for Russian)

12) Force > Foc > (TopP) > Fin > T

B. Features can be inherited (Chomsky 2008, Richards 2008)

13) a. Force_{uwh,EPP} > Foc > (TopP) > Fin_{uphi,EPP} > T
b. Force > Foc_{uwh,EPP} > (TopP) > Fin > T_{uphi,EPP}

C. Feature Inheritance is optional (Legate 2011, Ouali 2008).

14) Force_{uwh,EPP} > Foc > (TopP) > Fin_{uphi,EPP} > T

D. phi-features can get inherited by T without EPP features necessarily getting inherited (Split Feature Inheritance of Germain 2015, Germain in progress)

15) Force_{uwh,EPP} > Foc > (TopP) > Fin_{EPP} > T_{uphi}

16) a. Instrumental subjects    b. Genitive subjects    c. Others
3. **Case Studies**

- Nominative subjects in [Spec,TP] (henceforth canonical subjects) exhibit the following properties (Sigurðsson 2002 and the references therein)
  
    - They trigger (verbal) agreement (*Mary runs*)
    - They bind anaphors (*Mary saw herself in the mirror*).
    - They can participate in raising and ECM constructions (*Mary seems to run, I consider Mary to be a runner*).
    - They license silent DPs in coordinate structures (*Mary can run and will win*).
    - They can be controlled (*Mary wants PRO to run*).
    - They can exhibit inverse scope (*Everyone saw something*).
    - They can be dropped in pro-drop languages.
    - They are restricted under resumption (e.g. Highest Subject Restriction).

3.1 **Copula/Predicate Inversion Structures** (Bondaruk 2013, Citko 2006, 2008a, Harves 2002, Partee 1999, Pereltsvaig 2007, among others)

17) a. Te rysunki były przyczyną protestów.  
   *te drawings*<sub>NOM</sub> *were* *cause*<sub>INSTR</sub> *protests*<sub>GEN</sub>  
   ‘These drawings were the cause of the protests.’

   b. Przyczyną protestów były te rysunki.  
   *cause*<sub>INSTR</sub> *protests*<sub>GEN</sub> *were* *te drawings*<sub>NOM</sub>  
   ‘The cause of the protests were these drawings.’

- Inverted/Instrumental DP cannot be in [Spec,TP] due to the inability to label the structure.
- Inverted/Instrumental DP moves to [Spec, TopP] (as in Bondaruk 2013).
- The shared Top feature allows the resulting structure to be labeled.

18) a. 

   ![Diagram]

   `DP` `TP`

   `cause`<sub>INSTR</sub> of the protests `T` `were`

   `these drawings`<sub>NOM</sub> `were` `t`
A. Agreement

• Inverted/Instrumental DPs do not agree with the verb:

19) Przyczyną protestów były/*była te rysunki.  

‘The cause of the protests were these drawings.’

→ T agrees with the postverbal Nominative subject

B. Anaphor binding

• Inverted/Instrumental DPs cannot bind:

20) a. Jan, jest swoim, najgorszym krytykiem.  

‘Jan is his worst critic.’

b. * Nowym szefem jest swój, zastępca.  

‘The new boss is his/the boss’s deputy.’

→ [Spec,TopP] an A-bar position (Bondaruk 2013)

C. Raising and ECM

• When inverted/instrumental DPs raise, they retain Instrumental case:

21) a. Te rysunki wydają się być przyczyną protestów.  

‘These drawings seem to be the cause of the protests.’

b. * Przyczyna protestów wydawała się być te rysunki.  

‘The cause of the protests seemed to be these drawings.’
c. Przyczyną protestów wydawały się być te rysunki.
   ‘The cause of the protests seemed to be these drawings.’

• Inverted DPs cannot raise to object/ECM:

22) a. Uważam te rysunki za przyczynę protestów.
   ‘I consider these drawings as the cause of the protests.’

   b. *Uważam przyczynę protestów za te rysunki.
   ‘I consider cause as for these drawings.’

23) a. I consider John my best friend.
   b. *I consider my best friend John.
   (Den Dikken, Meinunger & Wilder 2000:86 citing Williams 1983)

→ TopP is too big to be embedded under ECM verbs

D. Conjunction Reduction

• Inverted DP cannot be deleted under identity with a nominative subject:

24) *? Przyczyna protestów to te rysunki i będą komentarze. Polish
   cause protests PRON these drawings and will be comments
   ‘The cause of the protests were these drawings and will be comments.’

E. Control

• Inverted DPs cannot be controlled:

   ‘Jan wants to be my best friend.’

    ‘My best friend wants to be Jan.’

    ‘Jan wants to be my best friend.’

→ The controllee (PRO) has to be in [Spec,TP] (PRO Theorem)
F. Scope

- Inverted/Instrumental DPs have frozen scope (see Moro 1991 on English):

26) a. Każdy profesor jest czymś promotorem.  
   Polish:  
   every professor\textsubscript{NOM} is somebody\textsubscript{INST}'s advisor  
   ‘Every professor is somebody’s advisor.’  
   \((\forall > \exists, \neg\exists > \forall)\)

   b. Czyimś promotorem jest każdy profesor.  
   Polish:  
   somebody\textsubscript{INST}'s advisor is every professor\textsubscript{INST}  
   ‘Somebody’s advisor is every professor.’  
   \((\exists > \forall, *\forall > \exists)\)

27) a. Every book is some student’s purchase.  
   \((\exists > \forall, *\forall > \exists)\)

   b. Some student’s purchase is every book.  
   \((\forall > \exists, \exists > \forall)\)

\(\rightarrow\) The nominative DP cannot QR over the Instrumental DP (cf. Nevins and Anand 2003)

G. Other Properties/Consequences:

- Movement is not discourse neutral:

28) a. What happened?

   b. Te rysunki były przyczyną protestów.  
   Polish:  
   te drawings\textsubscript{NOM} were cause\textsubscript{INST} protests\textsubscript{GEN}  
   ‘These poems were the cause of the protests.’

   c. # Przyczyną protestów były te rysunki.  
   cause\textsubscript{INST} protests\textsubscript{GEN} were these drawings\textsubscript{NOM}  
   ‘The cause of the protests were these drawings.’

- Inverted DPs cannot be pro-dropped:

29) *(pro) jest Jan.  
   Polish:  
   is Jan\textsubscript{NOM}  
   Intended: ‘Him is Jan.’

- Inverted DPs reconstruct:

30) Wrogiem swojego sąsiada było [każe państwo w Europie Zachodniej].  
   Polish:  
   enemy\textsubscript{INST} self’s \textsubscript{GEN} neighbor\textsubscript{GEN} was every country\textsubscript{NOM} in Europe Western  
   Lit. ‘The enemy of its neighbor was every country\textsubscript{NOM} in Western Europe.’  
   (Bondaruk 2013: 288)

- This construction conveys a reportative or inferential reading; the subject non-canonically bears genitive case, and the verb bears non-agreeing neuter perfective participial endings -ma/-ta.

31) a. Mokytojo ištaisyta klaidos. Lithuanian
    teacher$_{GEN}$ correct$_{PART-AGR}$ mistakes$_{NOM}$
    ‘The teacher apparently corrected the mistakes.’

    b. Mokytojas ištaisė klaidas.
    teacher$_{NOM}$ correct$_{3\text{sg}.PAST}$ mistakes$_{ACC}$
    ‘The teacher corrected the mistakes.’

- Uninterpretable features (including the EPP) start on Fin head
- EPP not inherited by T, Genitive moves directly to [Spec, FinP]
- T is defective, NOM assigned to object by default (as in Lavine 2010 but see Germain in progress for a gerundive alternative)

32) FinP
    DP Fin’
        teacher$_{GEN}$ Fin$_{[EPP]}$ TP
            T$_{[FIN]}$ vP
                t$_{v}$ v’
                    v corrected$_{PART}$ VP
                        V DP
                            mistakes$_{NOM}$

- Fin can be nominal (see Rizzi and Shlonsky 2006)
  - Fin can ‘acquire’ a Topic feature from a Topic head above it (via Feature Inheritance)

33) a. L’homme qui/*que va partir
    b. -i : [+Fin], [+N]
A. Agreement

• Genitive subjects don’t trigger verbal agreement:

34) *Mindaugo buvo žiauraus.  
Mindaugas\textsubscript{M,GEN} be\textsubscript{3sg,PAST} cruel\textsubscript{M,GEN}  
Mindaugas is said to have been cruel.’

B. Binding

• The genitive subject of this construction can bind possessive anaphor savo ‘self’s’

35) Motinos sudeginta savo namas.  
mother\textsubscript{GEN} burned-down\textsubscript{AGR self’s} house\textsubscript{NOM}  
‘Mother apparently burned down her own house’ (Lavine 2010: 126)

C. Raising and ECM

• When genitive subjects raise, they retain genitive case:

36) a. *Jis pasirodo ištaisytą klaidąs.  
he\textsubscript{NOM} seemed\textsubscript{3sg,PAST} correct\textsubscript{PAST,PASS.-AGR} mistakes\textsubscript{NOM}  
‘He seemed to correct the mistakes.’

b. Jo pasirodyta didvyrio.  
he\textsubscript{GEN} seemed\textsubscript{PAST,PASS.-AGR} hero\textsubscript{GEN}  
‘He seemed (to be) a hero.’ (Lavine 2000: 213, citing Schmalstieg 1988:185)

• The genitive subject cannot raise to object/ECM (see Arkadiev 2012 on ECM in Lithuanian):

37) a. Įtariu mokytoją ištaisytą klaidąs.  
I suspect teacher\textsubscript{ACC} correct\textsubscript{PAST,ACT.-AGR} mistakes\textsubscript{ACC}  
‘I suspect the teacher to have corrected the mistakes.’

b. *Įtariu mokytoją ištaisytą klaidąs.  
I suspect teacher\textsubscript{ACC} correct\textsubscript{PART.-AGR} mistakes\textsubscript{NOM}  
‘I suspect the teacher to have corrected the mistakes.’

→ FinP too large to be embedded under an ECM verb

D. Conjunction Reduction

• Unlike NOM subjects, genitives cannot be omitted in coordinate structures when the antecedent is NOM, due to lack of identity:
38) Jonas nusipirko šimtą knygų ir *(jo) perskaityta visos.
Jonas bought 3sg.PAST.REFL [hundred books] ACC and him read PAST.PASS.-AGR all NOM
‘Jonas bought himself one hundred books, and apparently read them all.’

E. Control

• Genitive subjects cannot be controlled:

39) *Mokytojas norėjo ištaisyta klaidos.
teacher NOM wanted 3sg.PRES correct.PAST.PASS.-AGR mistakes NOM
‘The teacher wanted to apparently correct the mistakes.’

→ The controllee (PRO) has to be in [Spec,TP] (PRO Theorem)

F. Other Properties

• Genitive subjects cannot be pro-dropped:

40) *(Jo) ištaisyta klaidos.
he GEN correct.PAST.PASS.-AGR mistakes NOM
‘The teacher wanted to apparently correct the mistakes.’

• In wh-questions, the genitive subject must be preverbal:

41) a. Kokių studentų klaidos mokytojo ištaisyta?
which student GEN mistakes NOM teacher GEN corrected AGR
‘Which students’ mistakes did the teacher apparently correct?’

b. *Kokių studentų klaidos ištaisyta mokytojo?
which student GEN mistakes NOM corrected AGR teacher GEN
‘Which students’ mistakes did the teacher apparently correct?’

c. Kokių studentų klaidas ištaisė mokytojas?
which student GEN mistakes ACC corrected 3.SG teacher NOM
‘Which students’ mistakes were corrected by the teacher?’

• The movement is discourse neutral

42) a. [I come home and tea is set on the table] What happened?

b. Mamos būta!
mom GEN be PART.-AGR
‘Mom must be here!’
c.  # Būta Mamos!
    be_{PART-AGR} mom_{GEN}
    'Mom must be here!'

4. Conclusion

43) Summary of Facts/Patters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Binding</th>
<th>Raising</th>
<th>ECM</th>
<th>Conjunction Reduction</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Inverse Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y¹</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y¹</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N²</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Allowed as long as case is preserved
² Ungrammatical if antecedent is nominative

- The Labeling Algorithm prevents non-agreeing ‘subjects’ from occupying [Spec,TP] position
- There are two possible solutions

A. The XP first moves to [Spec,TP] first and continues to a higher position (to allow T to label), also compatible with XP moving directly to [Spec,Top]. In this higher position, the XP shares some feature with the head (i.e. Topic feature). This is what occurs with the Polish inverted copular construction as well as Locative inversion in English (see Citko and Germain, in progress).
B. The XP moves directly to a higher position. The [Spec,TP] position remains unprojected (due to Split Feature Inheritance). This is what happens in Lithuanian evidentials as well as Polish and Russian dative subject constructions and adversity impersonals (see Citko and Germain, in progress).

45)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FinP} \\
\text{XP} \quad \text{Fin'} \\
\text{Fin}_{[\text{EPP}]} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{T}_{[\upsilon]} \quad \nuP/\nuP
\end{array}
\]
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