

# Case in Lexical-Functional Grammar

Miriam Butt  
Universität Konstanz  
Draft: January 2007

## 1 Introduction

The treatment of case has been one of the central concerns within Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG) since its inception in the late 1970s. Several of the papers collected in the seminal book marking the emergence of LFG (Bresnan 1982) deal with case marking in particular (e.g., Neidle on Russian, KP Mohanan with respect to Malayalam). However, a sophisticated analysis of crosslinguistic case patterns only became available as LFG's Linking Theory (known as Lexical Mapping Theory) evolved. In particular, once it was recognized on the basis of argumentation by Rappaport (1983) that argument structure needed to be posited as a level of representation that was independent of constituent structure (e.g., very much unlike the assumptions of GB/MP, see Chapter 3), the way was paved for analyses of case to be stated in terms of generalizations over a(argument)-structure. That is, in terms of generalizations that take both *semantic* and *syntactic* factors into account.

This chapter first presents some LFG basics in section 2, then briefly charts the development of Linking Theory in section 3 and presents current theories of case in section 4. The chapter closes with a consideration of LFG-based analyses that are couched within Optimality-Theory (see Chapter 6 of this volume) in section 5.


## 2 LFG Basics

LFG separates facts about linear word order and constituency from the functional dependency structure analysis of a clause. Word order and constituency are represented at c(onstituent)-structure via tree representations, as shown in (1). LFG assumes a version of X'-theory that goes back to Bresnan (1977). For current assumptions about c-structural representations, see Bresnan (2001).


The f(unctional)-structure is represented in terms of an attribute-value matrix (AVM) and encodes functional syntactic information about gram-

mational relations, tense/aspect, case, number, person, etc. A sample f-structure for (1) is shown in (2).

(1) Peter drinks coffee.



(2) Peter drinks coffee.





F-structures are a *projection* from the c-structure because they are related to the c-structure via a formal system of annotations. The effect of the projection architecture is that the levels of representation *constrain* each other mutually. That is, an analysis can only be successful if the f-structure information is complete and consistent, and if the phrase structure rules license the structure. Information at f-structure may flow together from different sources (not illustrated here). The pieces of information are combined with one another via *unification*. In contrast to the fundamental derivational assumptions of GB/MP (Chapter 3 of this volume), LFG assumes no derivations from one structure to another. Indeed, this is one of the characteristics which makes LFG computationally tractable.

The f-structure is thus an abstract level of representation which is not tied to the particular word order or surface form of a language. Crosslinguistic generalizations about passivization, for example, are formulated with

respect to f-structure. The c-structures, in contrast, encode language specific requirements on word order and constituency. The idea is that an SVO language like English and an SOV language like Urdu may differ wildly on the surface, but are similar at the basic predicational level, as shown in (4) and (5). The c-structure analysis in (3) differs from the English one in (2) because Urdu is a free word order language in which the NPs of a sentence are sisters (there is no evidence for a VP).<sup>1</sup>

- (3) yassin                      dud<sup>h</sup>                      pi-t-a                      hε  
 Yassin.M.Sg.Nom milk.F.Sg.Nom drink-Impf-M.Sg be.Pres.3.Sg  
 ‘Yassin drinks milk.’ Urdu




---

<sup>1</sup>Within LFG, only minimal constituents are assumed, for which there is actual distributional evidence in the language. The difference between a language like English and a language like Urdu is taken to be a difference between endocentricity (all heads project maximally) and exocentricity (heads do not necessarily maximally project). See Bresnan (2001, Ch. 7) and Dalrymple (2001, Ch. 3) for further discussion.

## 2.1 Grammatical Functions

The above f-structures include two basic grammatical relations: SUBJ(ect) and OBJ(ect). Grammatical relations are assumed as part of the syntactic inventory of every language and are referred to as *grammatical functions* (GF) to indicate their functional status, which is the relation of arguments and predicational elements to one another. LFG assumes the GFs in (6). Like many other elements in linguistics, GFs can be arranged in a hierarchy, whereby the SUBJ is the “highest” on the hierarchy, the OBJ the next highest, etc.

### (6) Grammatical Functions

SUBJ OBJ OBJ<sub>θ</sub> OBL(ique)<sub>θ</sub> COMP(lement) XCOMP(lement) ADJUNCT

Dalrymple (2001:11–27) provides a useful discussion of the GFs as well as several syntactic tests by which they can be identified. GFs are not inherently identified with any particular case in LFG. That is, there is no assumption that SUBJ will always be nominative and that OBJ will always be accusative. This is because of the early recognition of non-nominative subjects due to Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson’s (1985) LFG-based investigation of Icelandic.

Of course, individual languages may prove to have strict ideas about the association of case and GFs. For example, it is claimed for German that subjects are always nominative and that nominatives are always subjects. These correlations are taken into account on a language-particular basis within LFG, but are not assumed to necessarily be crosslinguistic universals.

## 2.2 Argument Structure and Thematic Roles

In addition to the basic c- and f-structural representations, LFG’s projection architecture potentially allows for several other projections. One standard additional projection is the s(ematic)-projection (e.g., Halvorsen and Kaplan 1988, Dalrymple 1999), which encodes the semantic analysis of the clause. The a-structure can also be conceived of as a projection, it can also be seen as an elaboration of the PRED value in f-structures such as (2) or (5) (Alsina 1996). A-structure in LFG in theoretical papers is generally represented as in (7), though it can also be formally represented as an AVM (Butt 1998), in line with f-structure representations.

(7) *pinch* < agent theme >

The a-structure encodes predicate-argument relationships in terms of thematic roles. These thematic roles are generally arranged in a thematic hierarchy, shown in (8) (based on Bresnan and Kanerva 1989). However, in practice very little reference is ever made to the hierarchy, except to the agent as being highest.

(8) **Thematic Role Hierarchy**

*agent > beneficiary > recipient/experiencer > instrumental > theme/patient > location*

### 3 Linking Theory

The first paper to associate case marking patterns with a-structure information was also the first paper to formulate some initial linking principles. Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson (1985) looked at case marking patterns in Icelandic. Besides devising tests that conclusively established the existence of non-nominative subjects, Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson (ZMT) formulated principles which governed a complex relationship between thematic roles, case and grammatical functions. As an example, their association principles for Icelandic are shown in (9).

(9) **Icelandic Association Principles**

1. AGENTS are linked to SUBJ (Universal)
2. Casemarked THEMES are assigned to the lowest available GF. (Language Specific)
3. If there is only one thematic role, it is assigned to SUBJ; if there are two, they are assigned to SUBJ and OBJ; if there are three, they are assigned to SUBJ, OBJ, 2OBJ [NB: the modern OBJ<sub>θ</sub>]. This principle applies after principle 2 and after the assignment of restricted GFs. (Universal)
4. Default Case-Marking: the highest available GF is assigned NOM case, the next highest ACC. (Universal)

The effect of the association principles is best illustrated via a concrete example. The Icelandic verb *óska* ‘to wish’ can be used either transitively or as a ditransitive so that the goal ‘her’ in (10) is optional. When it is present, it is realized as the direct object (OBJ). When it is not present, the theme argument is instead linked to the direct object, as shown in (11).

- (10) þú hefur óskað (henni) þess  
 you have wished her.Dat this.Gen  
 ‘You have wished this on/for her.’ (ZMT 1985:470) Icelandic
- (11) *óska*: < agent theme (goal) >  
 [+gen] [+dat]  
 a. SUBJ 2OBJ OBJ  
 b. SUBJ OBJ

ZMT define inherent lexical case as being an idiosyncratic property of a lexical item, assigned by a verb, preposition or adjective. In (11), the theme ‘this’ is assigned inherent genitive case by the verb ‘wish’. If the theme were not marked with the genitive feature, then it would be linked to an OBJ in both the transitive and the ditransitive scenario by the association principles in (9). But given the special marking in conjunction with the language specific principle in (9.2), it is assigned to a secondary object rather than the direct object in (11a). In (11b), the theme is linked to the direct object because that is the lowest available GF, given that there are no further arguments to be accommodated.

ZMT’s notion of inherent case came to be known as quirky case. The term ‘quirky’ suggests a random lawlessness, but a close inspection of ZMT’s original paper shows that inherent case assignment actually proceeds in a very regulated manner. The ‘quirky’ genitive or dative cases are always regularly associated with a given thematic role. Genitives regularly occur on themes (11) and datives mark goals as well as themes. There seem to be no instances of truly idiosyncratic case, rather case assignment seems to be principled and follows from lexical semantic factors.

Today’s standard Linking Theory relates GFs to thematic roles via two abstract linking features, [ $\pm$ o](b)jective) and [ $\pm$ r](e)strictive), by which both thematic roles and GFs can be classified. Additionally, a number of principles govern the association of GFs and thematic roles. Furthermore, argument changing operations such as passives (argument deletion) or applicatives (argument addition) are taken into account (see Butt 2006 for a detailed discussion). The role of case in most accounts has stayed much as it was in ZMT’s analysis of Icelandic: an extra piece of information that helps determine the mapping between GFs and thematic roles. However, there are also some approaches that take the theory of case within LFG a bit further. Two of these are sketched briefly in the next section.

## 4 Some Theories of Case

### 4.1 Constructive Case

Nordlinger (1998, 2000) takes on the phenomenon of *case stacking* in Australian languages and develops a theory of *Constructive Case*. The phenomenon is exemplified by (12), where the word ‘pouch’ is marked with three cases: one to show that it is signalling a location, one to show that it is part of a possessive or accompanying relation to another word (the proprietive case), and one to show that it is part of (modifying) an accusative case marked noun (see Chapter 52 for more discussion of this type of case marking). The word ‘joey’ (a baby euro — a type of kangaroo) has two cases. The proprietive shows that it stands in an accompanying relationship with another (with the euro), and the accusative to show that it is part of (modifying) an accusative case marked noun. Finally, the ‘euro’ is accusative as the direct object, while the ‘I’ is nominative (unmarked).

- (12) Ngayu nhawu-lha ngurnu tharnta-a mirtily-marta-a  
I saw-Past that.Acc euro-Acc joey-Prop-Acc  
thara-ngka-marta-a.  
pouch-Loc-Prop-Acc  
‘I saw the euro with a joey in (its) pouch.’ Martuthunira  
(Dench 1995:60)

The f-structure analysis in (13) shows that the case markers indicate which functional layers of analysis the case marked word is embedded in. That is, the three case markers on ‘pouch’ signal that it is a locative adjunct embedded under a proprietive adjunct that in turn modifies an accusative direct object.

Nordlinger (1998) sees the case morphology itself as playing a large role in *constructing* the syntax of the clause. An ergative case in her analysis, for example, carries the following pieces of syntactic information: i) that there be a subject; ii) that it be ergative (ergatives are always subjects, but subjects are not always ergative). These pieces of information are encoded as part of the lexical entry of the ergative, as shown in (14a). Similarly, the abstract entries for the accusative, proprietive and locative in Martuthunira specify the grammatical function they indicate, as well as the case feature, as shown in (14b–d).

Note the special use of the  $\uparrow$  in the lexical entries of the case markers. The specification of the case feature is standard: each case marker specifies that the attribute CASE is assigned a certain value (ergative, accusative,

etc.). This ensures that whatever constituent carries the case marker will be analysed as ergative, or accusative, or locative, etc. The second line in each entry involves *inside-out functional designation* (Dalrymple 1993, 2001). The  $\uparrow$  following the specification of a grammatical function formulates a requirement that, come what may, the constituent should be analysed as a subject in (14a), an object in (14b), and an adjunct in (14c–d).<sup>2</sup>

(13)	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">[ PRED 'see&lt;SUBJ,OBJ&gt;'</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">]</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SUBJ</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">[ PRED 'PRO'</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">NUM SG</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">PERS 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">CASE NOM</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">]</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">[ PRED 'euro'</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">PERS 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">NUM SG</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">CASE ACC</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">]</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">OBJ</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">[ PRED 'joey'</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">PERS 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">NUM SG</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">CASE PROP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">]</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">ADJUNCT</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">[ PRED 'pouch'</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">PERS 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">NUM SG</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">CASE LOC</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">]</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">ADJUNCT</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">]</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">TENSE PAST</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="padding: 5px;">]</td> </tr> </table>	[ PRED 'see<SUBJ,OBJ>'	]	SUBJ	[ PRED 'PRO'		NUM SG		PERS 1		CASE NOM		]		[ PRED 'euro'		PERS 3		NUM SG		CASE ACC		]		OBJ		[ PRED 'joey'		PERS 3		NUM SG		CASE PROP		]		ADJUNCT		[ PRED 'pouch'		PERS 3		NUM SG		CASE LOC		]		ADJUNCT		]		TENSE PAST		]
[ PRED 'see<SUBJ,OBJ>'	]																																																						
SUBJ	[ PRED 'PRO'																																																						
	NUM SG																																																						
	PERS 1																																																						
	CASE NOM																																																						
	]																																																						
	[ PRED 'euro'																																																						
	PERS 3																																																						
	NUM SG																																																						
	CASE ACC																																																						
	]																																																						
	OBJ																																																						
	[ PRED 'joey'																																																						
	PERS 3																																																						
	NUM SG																																																						
	CASE PROP																																																						
	]																																																						
	ADJUNCT																																																						
	[ PRED 'pouch'																																																						
	PERS 3																																																						
	NUM SG																																																						
	CASE LOC																																																						
	]																																																						
	ADJUNCT																																																						
	]																																																						
	TENSE PAST																																																						
	]																																																						

---

<sup>2</sup>See also Andrews (1996)



- (14) a. ERG:                 (↑CASE) = ERG  
                                       (SUBJ ↑)
- b. ACC:                 (↑CASE) = ACC  
                                       (OBJ ↑)
- c. LOC:                 (↑CASE) = LOC  
                                       (ADJUNCT ↑)
- b. PROPRIETIVE:     (↑CASE) = PROP  
                                       (ADJUNCT ↑)

Now consider the example in (15) from Wambaya. Here the NP ‘big dog’ is a discontinuous constituent. This poses no problem for Nordlinger’s view of case as the effect of the analysis is that the combination of information from the lexical entries of ‘big’, ‘dog’ and the ergative case in (14a) results in the two partial f-structures shown in (16) and (17). Both the ergative ‘dog’ and the ‘big’ specify that they are parts of the subject. The ‘dog’ serves as the head of the phrase and the ‘big’ as an adjunct which modifies it.

- (15) galalarrinyi-ni gini-ng-a                         dawu bugayini-ni  
       dog.I-ERG     3SG.MASC.A-1.O-NFUT bite   big.I-ERG  
       ‘The big dog bit me.’   Wambaya

$$(16) \left[ \text{SUBJ} \left[ \text{PRED 'dog ' } \right] \left[ \text{CASE ERG} \right] \right]$$

$$(17) \left[ \text{SUBJ} \left[ \text{CASE ERG} \right] \left[ \text{ADJUNCT} \left[ \text{PRED 'big ' } \right] \right] \right]$$

These two sets of information are unified into the structure shown in (18) as a routine part of the clausal analysis within the LFG formalism. The problem of discontinuous constituents is solved by using the case morphology as a primary source of information about clausal structure.

$$(18) \left[ \text{SUBJ} \left[ \text{CASE ERG} \right] \left[ \text{PRED 'dog ' } \right] \left[ \text{ADJUNCT} \left[ \text{PRED 'big ' } \right] \right] \right]$$

However, note that Nordlinger’s system makes no mention of a-structure and, in contrast to ZMT on Icelandic, draws no connection between a-structural information and case marking. The next section introduces a model of case within LFG that assumes a complex interaction between a-structure, GFs and case marking.

## 4.2 Differential Case Theory

Urdu exhibits alternations in which the only difference between two clauses is the case morphology on one of the noun phrases. This morphological difference signals a difference in semantic interpretation. Some examples are shown in (19) and (20). In (19a), the ergative subject indicates that the participant (‘Nadya’) has some control over the action, whereas the dative case in (19b) implies more of an obligation to perform the action (see Bashir 1999 for a more differentiated analysis). This is an example of case marking involving a *subject alternation*, or *differential subject marking* as it has come to be called in the Optimality Theoretic literature (see Chapter 6).

- |      |    |                                 |              |             |              |      |
|------|----|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------|
| (19) | a. | nadya=ne                        | zu           | ja-na       | hε           |      |
|      |    | Nadya.F.Sg=Erg                  | zoo.M.Sg.Obl | go-Inf.M.Sg | be.Pres.3.Sg |      |
|      |    | ‘Nadya wants to go to the zoo.’ |              |             |              | Urdu |
|      | b. | nadya=ko                        | zu           | ja-na       | hε           |      |
|      |    | Nadya.F.Sg=Dat                  | zoo.M.Sg.Obl | go-Inf.M.Sg | be.Pres.3.Sg |      |
|      |    | ‘Nadya has to go to the zoo.’   |              |             |              | Urdu |

Example (20) involves an *object alternation*, or *differential object marking* in Optimality Theoretic terms. Here the only difference between the two sentences is the case marker on the object in (20b). In addition to marking dative case, as in (19b), the *ko* also functions as a marker of specificity/definiteness on direct objects in Urdu. Because it appears only on direct objects in this semantic context, and because it is not retained under passivization, this case marker can be analysed as an accusative. The effect of *ko* in (20b) is that Nadya must be interpreted as having a particular giraffe in mind that she wants to go to see. In (20a), in contrast, it could be some generic giraffe or giraffes that Nadya would like to see (at the zoo, for example). The ‘giraffe’ in (20a) is glossed as nominative. This case has no overt morphophonological realization in Urdu, something which is crosslinguistically quite common.

- (20) a. nadya=ne            jiraf                    dek<sup>h</sup>-na        hε  
 Nadya.F.Sg=Erg giraffe.M.Sg.Nom see-Inf.M.Sg be.Pres.3.Sg  
 ‘Nadya wants to see a giraffe/giraffes.’ Urdu
- b. nadya=ne            jiraf=ko                    dek<sup>h</sup>-na        hε  
 Nadya.F.Sg=Erg giraffe.M.Sg=Acc see-Inf.M.Sg be.Pres.3.Sg  
 ‘Nadya wants to see the giraffe.’ Urdu

Parallels to this alternation between nominative and accusative can be found in Turkish (Enç 1991) and other South Asian languages. In this example, as in (19), the only difference between the a and b versions is the case marking. This, and the clear connection to a semantic difference prompted Butt and King (1991) to begin formulating an approach to case that included a notion of *semantic case*. This term has generally been used to refer to the case marking of adjuncts such as locatives or temporal expressions. Butt and King used this term to apply to those case markers of core arguments which also contribute information that is relevant for the final semantic interpretation of the clause. In order to allow the semantic information contributed by the case markers to flow directly into the analysis of the clause, Butt and King (1991), exactly like Nordlinger (1998), proposed explicit lexical entries for case markers. An example taken from later work (Butt and King 2003), is shown in (21) for the use of accusative *ko* in (20b).

- (21) ko    (↑ CASE) = ACC  
           (OBJ ↑)  
           (↑<sub>sem-str</sub> SPECIFICITY) = +

Butt and King’s (1991) proposals for semantic case foreshadowed Nordlinger’s ideas about *constructive case* in that the case markers themselves are considered to be active components which contribute to the analysis of a clause. The lexical entry for the accusative use of *ko* states that: i) the case is accusative; ii) the relevant NP should be a direct object; iii) the NP should be interpreted as specific at the level of s(emantic)-structure.

But the information carried by case markers is only part of a more complex system that accounts for differential case marking patterns. Butt and King (2003, 2005) assume the version of linking theory proposed in Butt (1998). In this version of linking theory, no explicit thematic hierarchy is assumed and the thematic roles are restricted to a very basic set: *agent, goal, theme, locative*. Beneficiaries, recipients, experiencers, etc. are all assumed to be an instance of a goal, more or less abstract.



In both cases, the dative is associated with a more or less abstract goal. In (23) the ‘cat’ is the goal of the giving. In *experiencer* constructions as in (19b) or (24a–c), the experiencer of the event can be thought of as a kind of abstract goal (cf. Landau 2002).

- (24) a. nadya=ko          skul                  ja-na          paṛ-a  
 Nadya.F.Sg=Dat school.F.Sg.Obl go-Inf.M.Sg fall-Perf.M.Sg  
 ‘Nadya had to go to school.’ Urdu
- b. nadya=ko          ḍar                  lag-a  
 Nadya.F.Sg=Dat fear.M.Sg.Nom be attached-Perf.M.Sg  
 ‘Nadya was afraid.’ Urdu
- c. nadya=ko          kahani              yad          a-yi  
 Nadya.F.Sg=Dat story.F.Sg.Nom memory come-Perf.F.Sg  
 ‘Nadya remembered the story.’ Urdu
- d. nadya=ne          kahani              yad          k-i  
 Nadya.F.Sg=Erg story.F.Sg.Nom memory do-Perf.F.Sg  
 ‘Nadya remembered the story (actively).’ Urdu

With psych predicates as in (24c) there is again an alternation with the ergative, though in this case it correlates with the use of the agentive ‘do’ in (24d) vs. the non-agentive ‘come’ in (24c). The dative use of *ko* is also governed by a combination of syntactic and semantic factors. It is restricted to indirect objects and subjects, but is subject to a coherent *goal* semantics in Urdu.

In DCT, there is thus explicit reference to a-structure concepts such as *goal* (datives) or *agent* (ergative) in addition to further semantic concepts such as specificity as part of the analysis of case. DCT recognizes case as an extremely complicated and complex part of the morphosyntactic and semantic interface, particularly as there are also some instances of case marking which appear to be tied to purely positional/structural or idiosyncractic factors. In DCT, therefore, examples such as the English adnominal genitive (e.g., *John’s hat*) are analyzed as purely positional/structural case.

DCT also assumes a notion of default case. Indeed, it can be observed that structural/positional case is often an instance of default case (the Elsewhere Case, Kiparsky 1973). There are some languages which require that all NPs have case. For these languages default case satisfies something that has become known as the Case Filter (Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980). That

is, if a given NP is not already associated with case due to some specification in some other part of the grammar, then default case assignment principles can apply. Typical crosslinguistic default cases are nominative or genitive. Default case only applies to the core grammatical relations subject and object. The other grammatical relations tend to involve some kind of specialized semantics and therefore do not involve defaults. Note that this is essentially the insight behind GB/Minimalism’s postulation of exactly two structurally Case marked arguments, which are associated with nominative and accusative case.

Finally, DCT also acknowledges that some instances of case marking are due to truly coincidental historical developments: no generalization can be made and the case marking has to be stated as an exception to the system. These instances of case marking are labeled *quirky*.

An example of truly idiosyncratic marking is shown in (25). Urdu requires that subjects of agentive transitive perfect verbs be marked with the ergative case. However, the verb ‘bring’ in (25) is a transitive verb with perfect morphology and the bringer can be unproblematically classified as an agent. But the subject ‘Nadya’ in (25) is nominative and not ergative.

- (25) nadya                      kitab                      la-yi  
 Nadya.F.Sg.Nom book.F.Sg.Nom bring-Perf.F.Sg  
 ‘Nadya brought a book.’

The reasons for this aberrant case marking are not clear. Also, there are no other agentive transitive verbs which behave like this. Therefore this bizarre nominative case marking must be stipulated as part of the lexical entry of ‘bring’ (the nominative on objects is regular in Urdu).

On the whole, however, DCT assumes that such instances of quirky case are relatively rare. Rather, most case marking phenomena should fall under the rubrik of *semantic case*, i.e., as being constrained simultaneously by both syntactic and semantic conditions. This stands in marked contrast to many theories of case, but does seem to reflect the rather unique crosslinguistic positioning of case at the interface between lexical and clausal semantics, syntax and morphophonology.

## 5 Incorporating Optimality Theory

The advent of Optimality Theory (OT, see Chapter 6) was observed with a great deal of interest in LFG and adopted into the theory very quickly (Bresnan 2000). The input to an evaluation by OT constraints is assumed

to be f-structure and c-structure pairings. The task of the OT constraints is to pick the most optimal pairing.

Several OT-LFG analyses exist with respect to case and they tend to fall in line with OT analyses of case in general. I.e., they adopt the insights with respect to differential case marking advanced by Aissen (1999, 2003). Some examples are Sharma's (2001) analysis of Kashmiri case clitics, Deo and Sharma's (2005) analysis of typological and diachronic variation in Indo-Aryan ergative patterns, Asudeh's (2001) analysis of optional case patterns in Marathi. These analyses have all the advantages and disadvantages of the general OT analyses that are discussed in Chapter 6 of this volume. Asudeh's analysis, however, proposed an interesting extension to OT, namely, the availability of optionality in the evaluation of the most optimal candidate. In addition, Lee's (2001a,b; 2003) work on bidirectional OT and output-output correspondences provides a new perspective on Hindi and Korean case as well as word order freezing effects, which are due to identically case marked arguments in a clause.

## 6 Summary

In sum, LFG contains a range of differing approaches to case marking. No account would claim to have developed a complete theory of case marking crosslinguistically. Rather, new ideas are continually being developed and tried out in light of new empirical evidence. This does not mean, however, that each account discards already established insights. Rather, each new account builds on the strong points of previous insights within LFG, but is simultaneously not willing to let itself be blinded by the previously established ideas.

## References

- Aissen, Judith. 1999. Markedness and Subject Choice in Optimality Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17(4):673–711.
- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21:435–483.
- Alsina, Alex. 1996. *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar: Evidence from Romance*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Andrews, Avery. 1996. Semantic Case-Stacking and Inside-Out Unification. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 16:1–54.
- Asudeh, Ash. 2001. Linking, Optionality, and Ambiguity in Marathi: An Optimality Theory Analysis. In *Formal and Empirical Issues in Optimality Theoretic Syntax*, ed. Peter Sells. 257–312. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Bashir, Elena. 1999. The Urdu and Hindi Ergative Postposition *ne*: Its changing role in the Grammar. In *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, ed. Rajendra Singh. 11–36. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1977. Transformations and Categories in Syntax. In *Basic Problems in Methodology and Linguistics. Part Three of the Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, London, Ontario, Canada, 1975*, ed. R.E. Butts and J. Hintikka. 261–282. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Bresnan, Joan (ed.). 1982. *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 2000. Optimal Syntax. In *Optimality Theory: Phonology, Syntax and Acquisition*, ed. Joost Dekkers, Frank van der Leeuw, and Jeroen van de Weijer. 334–385. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bresnan, Joan, and Jonni Kanerva. 1989. Locative Inversion in Chicheŵa: A Case Study of Factorization in Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:1–50.
- Butt, Miriam. 1998. Constraining Argument Merger through Aspect. In *Complex Predicates in Nonderivational Syntax*, ed. Erhard Hinrichs, Andreas Kathol, and Tsuneko Nakazawa. 73–113. New York: Academic Press. Syntax and Semantics Volume 30.
- Butt, Miriam. 2006. *Theories of Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 1991. Semantic Case in Urdu. In *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 31–45.



- Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 2003. Case Systems: Beyond Structural Distinctions. In *New Perspectives on Case Theory*, ed. Ellen Brandner and Heike Zinsmeister. 53–87. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 2005. The Status of Case. In *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, ed. Veneeta Dayal and Anoop Mahajan. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 1993. *The Syntax of Anaphoric Binding*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Dalrymple, Mary (ed.). 1999. *Semantics and Syntax in Lexical Functional Grammar*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 2001. *Lexical Functional Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Davison, Alice. 1999. Ergativity: Functional and Formal Issues. In *Functionalism and Formalism in Linguistics, Volume I: General Papers*, ed. Michael Darnell, Edith Moravcsik, Frederick Newmeyer, Michael Noonan, and Kathleen Wheatley. 177–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Deo, Ashwini, and Devyani Sharma. 2005. Typological Variation in the Ergative Morphology of Indo-Aryan Languages. To appear in *Linguistic Typology*.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The Semantics of Specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(1):1–25.
- Halvorsen, Per-Kristian, and Ronald M. Kaplan. 1988. Projections and Semantic Description in Lexical-Functional Grammar. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Fifth Generation Computer Technology*, 1116–1122. Reprinted 1995 in Dalrymple et al. (eds) *Formal Issues in Lexical-Functional Grammar*.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1973. ‘Elsewhere’ in phonology. In *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky. 93–106. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Landau, Idan. 2002. The Locative Syntax of Experiencers. ms.
- Lee, Hanjung. 2001a. Markedness and Word Order Freezing. In *Formal and Empirical Issues in Optimality Theoretic Syntax*, ed. Peter Sells. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Lee, Hanjung. 2001b. *Optimization in Argument Expression and Interpretation: A Unified Approach*. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Lee, Hanjung. 2003. Parallel Optimization in Case Systems. In *Nominals: Inside and Out*, ed. Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King. 15–58. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Nordlinger, Rachel. 1998. *Constructive Case: Evidence from Australian Languages*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Nordlinger, Rachel. 2000. Australian Case Systems: Towards a Constructive Solution. In *Argument Realization*, ed. Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King. 41–72. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Rappaport, Malka. 1983. On the Nature of Derived Nominals. In *Papers in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, ed. L. Levin, M. Rappaport, and A. Zaenen. Indiana University Linguistics Club. Reprinted in M. Butt and T.H. King (eds.) *Lexical Semantics in LFG*, CSLI Publications, 2006.
- Rouveret, Alain, and Jean Roger Vergnaud. 1980. Specifying Reference to the Subject: French causatives and conditions on representations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:97–202.
- Sharma, Devyani. 2001. Kashmiri Case Clitics and Person Hierarchy Effects. In *Formal and Empirical Issues in Optimality Theoretic Syntax*, ed. Peter Sells. 225–256. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and grammatical functions: The Icelandic passive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3:441–483. Reprinted in Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (Eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax*, 95–164. New York: Academic Press. 1990.