

The dual face of dependent case: On Lithuanian genitive of negation
Einar Freyr Sigurðsson and Milena Šereikaitė
University of Iceland and University of Pennsylvania

1. Background: This paper analyzes genitive of negation (GN) in Lithuanian. GN is a type of case that *prima facie* tracks and overwrites structural accusative case, when the verb is negated as in (2). However, GN does not affect inherent case, e.g., dative (3).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) Jonas perskaitė laišką.
 J.NOM read.PST letter.ACC
 ‘Jonas didn’t read a letter.’</p> <p>(3) Jis ne-padėjo tėvui/*tėvo.
 he.NOM NG-help.PST father.DAT/GEN
 ‘He didn’t help the father.’</p> | <p>(2) Jonas ne-perskaitė laiško/*laišką.
 J.NOM NG-read.PST letter.GEN/ACC
 ‘J. didn’t read a letter.’ (Arkadiev 2016)</p> |
|---|---|

These data naturally raise important questions regarding where and how case is determined in environments where multiple cases can be realized on a single element. We argue that GN is a realization of dependent case, which, in turn, is a translation of structural case.

2. Previous approaches: Lithuanian GN is a syntactic phenomenon (Arkadiev 2016) in contrast to Russian GN, whose realization can be influenced by semantic factors (Kagan 2013). Syntactic approaches to Russian GN analyze it through covert case stacking (Pesetsky 2013)/replacement (Richards 2013): GN is stacked on the structural nominative and accusative cases, but is eliminated in the context of inherent case. For Richards (2013), GN is assigned syntactically and is a subject to timing: it applies to nominative subjects of passives and unaccusatives suggesting that movement to SpecTP takes place after GN assignment. While Lithuanian GN patterns like Russian in not alternating with inherent case (3), it poses problems to case-stacking approaches. **First**, GN cannot replace a structural nominative DP, e.g., a subject of passives (4). **Second**, GN is not sensitive to timing: the passive subject is never genitive regardless of whether it is in SpecTP (4) or in situ (5).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(4) Laiškas/*laiško ne-buvo skaitoma
 Letter.NOM/*GEN NG-be.PST read.PRT-F.SG
 tėvo.
 father.GEN
 ‘A letter was not read by the father.’</p> | <p>(5) Tėvo ne-buvo skaitomas
 father.GEN NEG-be.PST read.PRT-M.SG
 laiškas/*laiško.
 letter.NOM/GEN
 ‘A letter was not read by the father.’</p> |
|---|--|

3. Proposal: We offer a new account of GN, arguing that it is a reflection of dependent case on a case realization disjunctive hierarchy (Marantz 1991). On such an algorithm (e.g., McFadden 2004, Preminger 2014), dependent case is accusative and unmarked case is nominative (in nom-acc languages). For Lithuanian we argue that unmarked case is realized as nominative whereas dependent case has two realizations: either as accusative or as genitive under *c*-commanding negation. This proposal accounts for the problematic cases in (4–5).

4. Genitive as a realization of dependent case: Lithuanian GN tracks dependent case which in our account has two realizations. First, it is realized in environments where the structural accusative would otherwise surface. When a DP bearing unmarked case (nominative) is visible to a lower DP, also marked for structural case, its structural case will be translated as dependent case. At Vocabulary Insertion, dependent case is realized as morphologically accusative case; see (1). However, when dependent case is *c*-commanded by negation, its realization at Vocabulary Insertion is genitive case; see (2). Second, genitive is not realized under negation where unmarked case is found, such as in passives (4–5), unaccusatives (6) and unergatives (7).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(6) Traukinys/*traukinio ne-atvažuoja.
 train.NOM/GEN NEG-arrive.PRS
 ‘The train doesn’t arrive.’</p> | <p>(7) Jonas/*Jono ne-dirba.
 Jonas.NOM/GEN NEG-work.PRS
 ‘Jonas does not work.’</p> |
|---|---|

This difference becomes particularly clear in dat-nom (8–9) vs. dat-acc structures (10–11):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(8) Man patinka muzika.
 me.DAT like.PRS music.NOM
 ‘I like music.’</p> | <p>(9) Man ne-patinka muzika/*muzikos.
 me.DAT NG-like.PRS music.NOM/*GEN
 ‘I don’t like music.’</p> |
| <p>(10) Man skauda galvą.
 me.DAT ache.PRS head.ACC
 ‘I have a headache.’</p> | <p>(11) Man ne-skauda galvos/*galvą.
 me.DAT NG-ache.PRS head.GEN/ACC
 ‘I don’t have a headache.’</p> |

In the ‘like’-class (8–9), the argument in direct object position is realized in the nominative in clauses with or without negation. This shows that unmarked case is realized as nominative, even under negation, unlike in Russian. In the ‘ache’-class, the direct object is realized in the accusative when it is not c-commanded by negation. This suggests that the direct object is in dependent case even though there is no unmarked case visible (we do not give an analysis of this structure here). When negation is present, dependent case is realized as genitive.

5. Realizing accusative and genitive: We argue that structural case is assigned in syntax resulting in other arguments than those that bear lexical case to bear structural case, [STR]. At the Morphological Component (on the PF branch), [STR] on subjects and objects is translated to either unmarked case, [UNM], or dependent case, [DEP], according to a disjunctive case hierarchy. These are in turn realized at Vocabulary Insertion according to the elsewhere principle, [UNM] as nominative and [DEP] as genitive (12a) or accusative (12b).

- (12) *Realization of dependent case*
- | | |
|----|---|
| a. | DP _[DEP] → DP _[GEN] / Neg ___ |
| b. | DP _[DEP] → DP _[ACC] / elsewhere |

6. Implications: We make a clear distinction between unmarked and dependent case, on the one hand, and their realization, on the other (as nom, acc, etc.). On our approach, GN in Lithuanian is a realization of dependent case. Our analysis predicts that we should find more than one realization of unmarked or dependent case in special environments cross-linguistically. Indeed, Marantz (1991) argues that the genitive case inside a DP is the realization of unmarked case; Baker (2015) argues for an account of Finnish partitive as unmarked case; and Greek dative and genitive case objects have also been argued to qualify as dependent cases (Anagnostopoulou & Sevdali 2017).

References: •Anagnostopoulou&Sevdali 2017.From Lexical to Dependent: the Case of the Greek Dative •Arkadiev 2016: Long-distance genitive of negation in Lithuanian •Kagan 2013: Semantics of Genitive Objects in Russian •Marantz 1991: Case and Licensing •McFadden 2004: The position of morphological case in the derivation •Pesetsky 2013: Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories •Preminger 2014: Agreement and Its Failures •Richards 2013: Lardil “Case Stacking” and the Timing of Case Assignment