

FASL 11  
May 2002

## Locality Restrictions on Case, Agreement, and Clitics

Ellen Woolford  
University of Massachusetts

### Abstract:

While some locality restrictions apply equally to Case, agreement, and clitics, there are also interesting differences in the locality restrictions in each domain. These are important for what they can tell us about locality in general, and also for what they can tell us about the properties of Case, agreement, and clitics that interact with locality to produce these similarities and differences in behavior.

The focus of this paper will be on new(er) locality restrictions that have not been (much) discussed in the literature (as opposed to well-known locality problems such as ECM constructions and clitic climbing). With respect to Case locality, the discussion will center on constructions which have (or potentially could have) nominative objects. Nominative objects are commonly found in constructions with non-nominative subjects (e.g. dative, ergative), so commonly that one might easily get the impression that nominative Case is always available to the object whenever it is not assigned to the subject. Nevertheless, nominative licensing on the object is blocked in certain constructions in languages such as Icelandic, Faroese, and Nez Perce. What is so interesting is the unexpected nature of the locality restriction that holds in these particular situations. Obvious ways of formulating the locality restriction turn out to be wrong: these languages do not limit nominative Case to Spec IP; nor does V, as the closer head, block nominative licensing to the object. Instead, it is the presence of, and the Case of, the closer DP that blocks nominative licensing on the object in these situations. In terms of Relativized Minimality, it is the presence of a closer potential target for Case licensing that blocks nominative licensing in these instances (even though the closer potential target is not necessarily an actual target, and may not actually intervene). It will be argued that such Case locality restrictions are best stated in terms of what potential targets can/cannot be contained in the Case licensing domain of a head. In addition, these facts rule out certain ideas in the literature concerning the nature of nominative Case and how it is licensed, including the idea that nominative is not a Case and the idea that there are actually two different heads in the clause that can license nominative Case.

Verbal agreement appears to obey the locality restrictions that hold of Case, but clitics are less restricted in several ways. Clitics do not appear to be affected by the presence of other elements in the domain and clitics may cross-reference arguments across certain additional types of boundaries such as PP or even DP that block Case and agreement. Nevertheless, clitics and agreement share another type of locality restriction which does not hold of Case. This has commonly been described as a restriction limiting checking to a Spec-head configuration, but it will be argued that empirical considerations support the view that grammar does not make specific reference to Spec-head configurations. Alternative proposals from the literature will be discussed that formulate the locality restriction in terms of c-command instead of the Spec-head relation.