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0. Introduction

A research strategy advocated by Booij (1997) regarding the autonomy of morphology is to discover phenomena in which morphology is different from the other grammatical modules, i.e., syntax and phonology. After a survey of Case mismatches between syntactic constituents that agree for other morphosyntactic features, e.g., Number and Gender, we propose that Case belongs to features which instantiate the autonomy of morphology and does not lend itself to simple reduction to syntax.

Following the minimalist framework, we show that the overt manifestation of Case, the most structurally relevant of all inflectional features (as defined by Kuryłowicz 1964), does not entirely depend on syntactic considerations (e.g., syntactically checked Case, cf. Chomsky 1995). In accordance with Ralli (1997, 1998), who claims that inflectional features are primarily morphological and, as such, are accounted for within morphology in a principled way, we work on the assumption that Case marking is handled within a morphological module of grammar: the overt occurrence of a Case feature is closely related to morphological structure and very much constrained by language-dependent characteristics. However, morphological Case affects with Syntax in several ways. It is shown that, in a language with a rich Case system like Greek, the syntactic manipulation of Case is very much affected by morphological constraints, although it must be as language independent as possible on the basis of the minimalist assumptions that syntax provides the bare essentials to the representation of the language faculty. This proposal brings additional support to Aronoff’s (1994) views (further elaborated by Ralli 1997, 1998 with respect to inflectional features) that morphology, although being independent, interacts with syntax on several aspects.

Our claims are supported with data mostly taken from Greek, a language rich in Case marking. A typical example illustrating these claims is the phenomenon of Case mismatch in Clitic left-dislocation (CLLD) constructions.
1. The data

1.1. Case mismatches in clitic left-dislocation constructions

Elaborating on Cinque (1990), Baker (1996) claims that dislocated constituents in languages, both polysynthetic and non-polysynthetic, form a non-movement chain with a unique pronominal in argument position. The conditions on this chain formation are stated as follows (cf. Baker 1996: 112):

(1) The Chain Conditions
X and Y may constitute a chain if:
(i) X c-commands Y.
(ii) X and Y are coindexed.
(iii) There is no barrier containing Y but not X
(iv) X and Y are nondistinct in morphosyntactic features (i.e., category, person, number, gender, case, etc.)

According to the condition given in (1iv), feature mismatches between left-dislocated constituents and the pronouns coindexed with them are not allowed. Baker, however, has observed some apparent feature mismatches between the two constituents in a polysynthetic language like Mohawk:

(2) Sak wa-shukën-i ken ana skare kanat-a-ku
Sak FACT-MsS/IDO-see-PUNC ne MsP-friend town-O-in
“Sak saw me with his girlfriend in town”
(Lit.: “His girlfriend, Sak saw us two in town”)


The occurrence of feature mismatches in polysynthetic languages is explained by Baker (1996) by the fact that, in these languages, the morphological expression of morphosyntactic features involved in the coindexation is not overt. Thus coindexation becomes possible since there is no formal marking for these features.

In a non-polysynthetic language like Greek, this explanation predicts that dislocated nominal constituents require a matching between their morphosyntactic features and the features of pronominal elements coindexed with them since, in this language, nominals are overtly marked for Gender, Number and Case.1 Any feature

---

1 Inflectional class is another feature that overtly marks the inflectional system of Greek nominals, but, as Ralli (1997, 1998) has shown, it is syntactically irrelevant.
mismatch between a dislocated DP and the pronominal element (clitic) in its chain would lead to a violation of the condition (iv) in (1), ruling out the well-formedness of the CLLD construction.

In Greek, however, there are counter examples to this prediction, particularly with respect to Case matching. Let us see some of these examples which are borrowed from works by Philippaki-Warburton & Stavrou (1986), Catsimali (1990), Philippaki-Warburton (1990), Tsimpli (1990), Alexiadou & Varlokosta (1996):

(3) a. Opjos m’agapai, ton agapo
   whoever-NOM me-ACC-loves, him-ACC love-1S
   “I love whoever loves me” (or Whoever loves me, I love him)

   b. Opjon den grapsi sosta afto to thema, tha ton aporipso
   whoever-ACC not write-PERF right this the topic FUT him-ACC discard-PERF
   “I will discard whoever does not write well this topic”

(4) I fitites, i kathijites tus agapane olus
   the students-NOM, the professors-NOM them-ACC love-3PL all-ACC
   “The professors love all the students” (or The students, the professors love them all)

In (3a), the head of the dislocated free relative opjos occurs in nominative case, although it is coindexed with an accusative clitic, i.e., ton. In (3b), the head of the dislocated free relative opjon has the same case (Accusative) with the coindexed clitic in the matrix clause, but it cannot be checked by the verb of the relative which

---

2 As noted by Philippaki-Warburton & Stavrou (1986), in the matching cases of free relatives, the phrase raises to the head position, whereas in the non-matching ones, it remains in COMP. Cheila-Markopoulou (1991) has observed that the basic problem in this analysis is that it seems to involve improper movement from an A’ to an A position. Generally, an attempt to relate the non-matching effect to the pro-drop parameter is not correct as pointed out by Alexiadou & Varlokosta too (1996).

3 As noted by Tzartzanos, Case mismatches, such as the one illustrated below, are much better if some material (related to the dislocated constituent) intervenes between the dislocated constituent and the rest of the sentence:

   (i) I kira-Rini tu Kritu, tu Duka i thigatera, xronia tis etimazun ta prikia (from Tzartzanos (1946: 264)).
   The-NOM Irene-NOM of Kritos, the daughter of Dukas, years-ACC her-GEN prepare-3PL the dot
   “Mrs. Irene of Kritos, Duka’s daughter, they prepare her dot for years”.
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requires nominative case. In (4), the dislocated DP \textit{i tìtites} "the students" shows nominative case, but it is coindexed with an accusative clitic, i.e. \textit{tus} "them."

These Case mismatches pose a problem for Baker's (1996) unified account of dislocated constituents in both polysynthetic and non-polysynthetic languages. Particularly, any attempt to provide a syntactic explanation for the presence of nominative marking for the dislocated DP in (4) is problematic since this nominative case is syntactically unjustified and remains unchecked contrary to recent minimalist claims that [-interpretable] features should be checked and erased before the C-I level. In fact, Alexiadou and Varlokosta (1996) have already pointed out that Case matching in constructions involving dislocated constituents does not concern abstract syntactic identity, but seems to be relevant to PF interface.  

That Case marking and Case mismatch in Greek CLLD constructions cannot be accounted for within the strict limits of a syntactic analysis is also supported by the fact that in other syntactic contexts, e.g., in contexts where the free relative or the DP occur in a non-dislocated position, the relative pronoun or the DP must bear the Case marker checked by the matrix verb. Compare the following examples:

(5) a. *Agapo opjos \textit{m'agapai}  
love-1S whoever-NOM me-ACC-loves  

b. Agapo opjon \textit{m'agapai}  
love-1S whoever-ACC me-ACC-loves  

"I love whoever loves me"

(6) a. *I kathigites agapan olí i \textit{fìtites}  
the professors-NOM love all-NOM the-NOM students-NOM  

b. I kathigites agapan olus tus \textit{fìtites}  
the professors-NOM love all-ACC the-ACC students-ACC  

"The professor love all the students"

Moreover, constructions involving a leftward movement of the free relative or the DP, do not allow the Case mismatch observed in (3) and (4):

\footnote{That Free Relatives involving non-matching effects are left dislocated has also been claimed by Alexiadou & Varlokosta (1996). They argue that left-dislocated DPs are base generated and do not involve movement. They base their proposal, however, on Marantz's (1991) approach concerning Case Theory. They suppose that the case marker is added after Spell-Out and case realization depends more or less on syntactic considerations, that is on whose element's complement domain the NP appears at PF. Since the D of the dislocated DP (or the wh-element of the free relative) does not appear in the complement domain of any predicate, non-matching is possible.}
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(7) a. *OPJOS m'agapai, agapo
   whoever-NOM me-ACC-love-3S love-1S
b. OPJON m'agapai, agapo
   whoever-ACC me-ACC-love-3S love-1S

(8) a. *OLI I FITITES agapane I kathijites
   all-NOM the-NOM students love-3PL the-NOM professors-NOM
   “The professors love all the students”
b. OLUS TUS FITITES agapane i kathijites
   all-ACC the-ACC students-ACC love-3PL the professors-NOM
   “The professors love all the students”

(7) and (8) show that nominative DPs cannot appear in object position, and fronting due to Focus does not trigger the possibility of Case mismatch, as noted by Alexiadou & Varlokosta (1996).

2. The analysis

In this paper, we claim that Case mismatches are mainly due to the fact that morphology, where word formation occurs, is independent from Syntax. We follow the approach according to which words are firstly built within Morphology and enter Syntax already marked for their morphological features, Case being one of these features (cf., among others, Chomsky 1995).

In our analysis, we take advantage of the following assumptions put forward by Ralli (1997):

a) in a modularly built grammar (cf. Di Sciullo 1996), morphology is an independent module interacting with syntax on several aspects within the computational system of the language faculty.
b) General linguistic properties, inherent to human language, may be represented as features. These features belong to a feature theory module interacting with the grammatical modules, that is morphology, syntax and phonology.
c) Inflectional features constitute the morphological expression of some of these features, but not all of them are visible to syntactic operations.

According to these assumptions, Case is an abstract notion, a universal notion, belonging to a feature theory module. The encoding of Case takes place within an autonomous morphological module, but Syntax manipulates only the Case informa-
tion that is syntactically useful. This means that, in languages, there are instances where a word can be morphologically marked for a particular Case value without any need for syntax to provide a syntactic licensing (e.g., checking) for this value.

The assumptions above also predict that all members of the module of features are not overtly realized, i.e., morphologically expressed, in every single language and each grammatical component chooses the features that are appropriate for its own purposes. Since it depends on the particular language to choose the features for its own morphological system, the features of Case, Number and Gender, which are overtly realized in the Greek inflection, belong to the morphological make-up of Greek words, but some of these features could eventually be absent from the morphological system of another language, e.g., Mohawk. The three features, however, as is further predicted, do not have to be equally visible to Syntax.

Let's proceed now by examining first the operation of feature coindexation.

2.1. Feature coindexation

In this section, we would like to propose that coindexation between dislocated constituents and pronominal elements affects syntax only because it is a function of the C(onceptual) I(ntentional) level and, following Chomsky 1995, there is no difference between the pre-Spell-Out syntactic operations and those of the C-I Interface. Thus, coindexation should involve semantically relevant features e.g., Number, and exclude grammatical features such as Case. Contrary to Baker's (1996) claims, we do not believe that this coindexation depends on the overt morphological make-up of the dislocated constituents and on the overt expression of features participating in word-formation procedures. Were we to follow Baker's approach, the Case mismatch observed above would remain unexplained since Case overtly participates in the word-formation of Greek nominals (each Case value corresponds to a particular morpheme).

Within the minimalist framework (cf. Chomsky 1995), there is a postulation of a \([\pm \text{interpretable}]\) feature that has no morphological motivation, but is relevant to syntactic purposes, in the sense that the \([-\text{interpretable}]\) value designs categories used within the strict limits of syntax while the positive value refers to categories that may also have a semantic relevance. On the basis of this feature, Case is syntacti-

---

5 That Case is an abstract universal notion from which one can deduce concrete forms in Morphology as well as more or less concrete notions in the other grammatical modules, has been firstly proposed by Hjelmslev (1935: 85). He also states that these notions cannot be determined in isolation, but only throughout a system of syntactically and semantically variants.

6 As may be expected by such assumptions, the overt manifestation of Cases is not isomorphic with the set of functions that these Cases may express. For instance, more than one function are expressed by Genitive case in Greek, e.g., indirect object, adnominal relation.
cally characterized as [-interpretable], while Gender and Number are [+interpretable]. A [-interpretable] feature, i.e., Case, is invisible to the C-I level, as opposed to the [+interpretable] features of Gender and Number which belong to the features visible to this level. Since coindexation is primarily a C-I level operation, we can explain why coindexation with respect to Case does not occur between the dislocated constituent and the pronominal element in Greek while, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the data below, coindexation applies to Gender and Number:

(9) a. *Opja m'agapai, ton agapo
   whoever-FEM-NOM me-ACC-loves, him-MASC-ACC love-1S
   "I love whoever loves me" (or Whoever loves me, I love him)
b. *O kathijites tus agapan olus
   the student-NOM-S, the professors-NOM them-ACC-PL love-3PL all-ACC-PL
   "The professors love all the students" (or The students, the professors love them all)

Now we can use this distinction of [+interpretable] features to modify Baker's fourth condition on non-movement chain formation given in (1), as follows:

(10) X and Y are non-distinct in [+interpretable] features (i.e., Number, Gender, Person, etc.)

(10) excludes [-interpretable] features, such as Case, from the matching conditions on the non-movement chain formation. As already said, the exclusion of [-interpretable] features from the coindexation procedure makes sense if we view the coindexation relation between a dislocated constituent and its clitic as a reflex of a C-I relation, which, by definition, can only be expressed in terms of features interpretable at that interface.

Notice that Case as well as Number and Gender are also involved in the word-formation procedure of both the dislocated constituent and the clitic. However, despite the fact that the three features receive a separate treatment in Syntax, they behave dif-

---

7 Notice that this [+interpretable] opposition is only applicable to the most structural cases, that is to Cases, such as Accusative, that are closely related to grammatical relations. Even these Cases, however, may sometimes be related to a semantic interpretation, depending on the particular language, as the following Latin example seems to denote:

(ii) Vado Romanum
    Go-1P-S Rome-ACC (destination)
    "I go to Rome"

As Blake (1994: 32) notes, the rationale for separating meaning and functions is not so explicit.
ferently in Morphology. For instance, Case and Number belong to the same inflectional cluster representing the nominal ending, while Gender characterizes the stem.8 On the other hand, in clitics and determiners, the same portmanteau morpheme hosts all three features. This difference in use of the same features by Morphology and Syntax may be a further proof that the two modules are independent and that each module provides its own means to manipulate the features appropriate for its purposes.

Having said this, the following questions remain with no answer, however.

a) Why is nominative the only alternative Case value for CLLD constituents, as shown in (11a-b)?9

(11) a. O Pavlos, tu pirane to pedi
    the-NOM Paul-NOM, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid
b. Tu Pavlu, tu pirane to pedi
    the-GEN Paul-GEN, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid
  “They took the kid away from Paul”
c. *Ton Pavlo, tu pirane to pedi
    the-ACC Paul-ACC, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid

b) Why is “strict identity” of features, i.e. (12b) and (13b), in which the dislocated constituent agrees in Number, Gender and Case with the clitic, better than “partial identity” of features, i.e. (12a) and (13a), where the dislocated constituent and the clitic do not agree in Case?

(12) a. O Pavlos, tu pirane to pedi
    the-NOM Paul-NOM, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid
b. Tu Pavlu, tu pirane to pedi
    the-GEN Paul-GEN, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid
  “They took the kid away from Paul”

8 See Ralli (1994) for more details on this claim and for an analysis of the Gender feature as an inherent marker of Greek stems.

9 As shown by the following example, the sentence becomes ungrammatical if the dislocated constituent appears also in Vocative.
(iii) *Pavle, tu pirane to pedi
    Paul-VOCl, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid
Vocative is the fourth value of the Greek Case system, but it won’t be considered here because of its special character: it is the case form of “address” and marks constituents that stand outside construction, bearing no relation of dependents to heads. On the other hand, as shown by Kuryłowicz (1964 158) Nominative, Accusative and Genitive are the “most” grammatical cases, that is the cases closely related to grammatical relations.
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(13) a. I fitites, i kathijites tus agapane olus
   the students-NOM, the professors-NOM them-ACC love-3PL all-ACC
   "The professors love all the students" (or The students, the professors love
   them all)

   b. Tus fitites, i kathijites tus agapane olus
   the students-ACC, the professors-NOM them-ACC love-3PL all-ACC
   "The professors love all the students" (or The students, the professors love
   them all)

2.2. Nominative as a default Case value

With respect to the first question, we would like to claim that Nominative acts as
a default Case value in CLLD contexts. Since non-movement chain formation does
not involve identity of [-interpretable] features, as claimed in (10), any Case value
could be possible in CLLD contexts. On the other hand, CLLD contexts do not in-
volve Case- checking configurations for the dislocated constituent, which in prin-
ciple exclude checking of any Case feature on a CLLD constituent, and thus, the oc-
currence of any Case marked constituent as CLLD constituent on syntactic grounds,
as opposed to what we have seen in Greek. The data we have considered so far
show that the dislocated constituent may have either the same Case value as the one
on the clitic, or Nominative (cf. (12) and (13)). Our proposal then is that Nominative
is firstly assigned within Morphology and its presence in Syntax can be considered
as that of a default Case value which becomes possible for two reasons:

a) dislocated constituents and clitics do not need to agree in Case (cf. (10)), and
b) all Greek nominals must bear a Case value, as a consequence of their morpho-
logical make-up.

(b) leads to the possibility for the presence of a default value in nominals for which
no particular value is syntactically justified. There are many pieces of independent
evidence which square quite well with the idea that Nominative should be considered as
the default option in the Greek Case system. For instance, Nominative has always been
the Case outside construction in Greek, the Case for "naming" (onomazo in Ancient
Greek). According to Humbert (1960: 249), it can be conceived independently of any
grammatical/syntactic relations. On the other hand, Jakobson (1958) attributes the
close relation between Nominative and the concept of topichood (observation which
goes back at least to Aristotle) to the fact that Nominative is the Case value with less
relational content. Thus we are allowed to claim that in a non-checking syntactic configuration, such as the one involving left-dislocated constituents, Nominative could appear as the only alternative value expressed by these constituents, beside Genitive (12b) or Accusative (13b), depending on the case.

The proposal that CLLD contexts constitute a kind of non-checking syntactic configuration, where Nominative may be used as a default option is also supported by the examples below: it is shown that when there is a clearcut checking requirement for the presence of another case value, i.e., Genitive or Accusative, Nominative is not possible.

(14) a. Opjon tu dosis to onoma mu, tha ton voithiso whoever-ACC him-GEN give-PERF-2S the name my-GEN, FUT him-ACC help-PERF-1S

"I’ll help whoever you give my name to"
b. Opju tu dosis to onoma mu, tha ton voithiso whoever-GEN him-GEN ... ...................... him-ACC......
c. Opjos tu dosis to onoma mu, tha ton voithiso whoever-NOM him-GEN ....................... him-ACC......
d. *Opjos tu dosis to onoma mu, tha voithiso whoever-NOM him-GEN ....................... FUT help-PERF-1S

As shown in (14a), Greek free relative clauses can also contain clitics agreeing with the relativized constituent, (cf. Horrocks & Stavrou 1987). With two clitics, in the free relative and in the main clause, we have three possible Cases for the relative pronoun: Accusative (14a), Genitive (14b), and also Nominative (14c), although somehow marginally. However, Nominative for the relative pronoun is completely excluded if one of the clitics is missing, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (14d-e). This shows that Nominative is only possible on the relative pronoun when the pronoun is coindexed with clitics, i.e. tu and ton in (14). When one of the clitics is missing, which tantamounts to say that there is a movement chain (which requires a Case corresponding to the one checked against the verb without a clitic), then Nominative is not an option anymore. Thus we can conclude that Nominative is a sort of

---

The idea that the default use of Nominative is related to the notion of topichood is also exploited by Alexiadou & Varlokosta (1996). In their paper, the authors characterize the left-dislocated constituents as instances of “hanging topics” marked for a default Nominative value (1996: 20).
sort of default option, only available when the relative pronoun does not check any
Case, neither in the free relative nor in the main clause.

Assuming now that a default option may equal what can be considered as the
unmarked one, this default use of Nominative for syntactic reasons does not coin-
cide with the morphologically unmarked Case realization, since Nominative in
Greek very often constitutes the marked form of the nominal paradigm. Consider,
for instance, the very common masculine nouns in -is or -as (cf. below), where the
Nominative singular is expressed by the affix -s whereas the Genitive is not overtly
expressed (or expressed by the 0 affix). This is another example in favor of the in-
dependence of the morphological module:

(15) Nominative. Genitive
    fititi-s fititi “student”
    tamia-s tamia “cashier”

2.3. Consequences for the Morphology-Syntax Interface

The use of a default nominative option in the constructions examined above leads
to the consequence that Syntax may actively use only partial morphological infor-
mation in its operations. Our analysis crucially shows that, in specific contexts, Syntax
ignores pieces of information coming from fully inflected items, i.e., Case, while ma-
nipulates some other information characterizing the same items, i.e., Gender, and
Number.

Until now, we have restricted our attention to cases that do not involve checking
configurations. The Greek language, however, also show instances of checking con-
figurations where Syntax shows inconsistencies with respect to Case information
coming from Morphology. Consider the following pair of examples:

(16) a. Opjous den simbatho, den tha perasi tis eksetasis
    whoever-NOM not like-1P-S not pass-FUT-3S the exams
    “Whoever I don’t like, won’t pass the exams”
    b. Opjon troi poli, ton koroidevume
    whoever-ACC eat-3S very much, him-ACC make fun-1PL
    “Whoever eats very much, we are making fun of him”

Given the examples above, a Nominative is checked in a position requiring Ac-
cusative (cf. 16a inside the free relative), or an Accusative is checked in a position
requiring Nominative (cf. 16a inside the free relative). This does not occur, how-
ever, when the verb of the free relative requires Genitive case:

(17) a. Opju dosume to vravio, tha jini diasimos
    whoever-GEN give-PERF-1PL the prize, FUT become-PERF-3S famous
    “Whoever we give the prize will become famous”
b. *Opjos dousume to vrawio, tha jini diasimos
   whoever-NOM give-PERF-1PL the prize, FUT become-PERF-3S famous

c. *Opjon dousume to vrawio, tha jini diasimos
   whoever-ACC give-PERF-1PL the prize, FUT become-PERF-3S famous

In (17), only Genitive is the possible Case value for the head of the free relative, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (17b) and (17c), where neither Nominative nor Accusative can check Genitive inside the free relative. This different behaviour of Case values with respect to checking suggests that there is a sort of opposition between Nominative and Accusative on one hand and Genitive on the other, and that this opposition seems to interfere with the operations of checking. In fact, we would like to propose that a special morphological feature [±Genitive] that crosscuts the Greek morphological system of Case values interferes with the syntactic operation of checking as an instance of Morphology-Syntax interaction. The syntactic visibility of this morphological feature makes possible for a constituent bearing an overt Accusative, or an overt Nominative, i.e., a constituent marked as [-Genitive], to be checked in a syntactic context requiring one of the two values (cf. 16). As opposed to this, in a syntactic context requiring [+Genitive], only constituents morphologically marked for Genitive can be checked (cf. 17).

The idea of grouping together Nominative and Accusative, against Genitive, is supported from several points of view. Firstly, this division has always been made by traditional grammarians on both syntactic and morphological grounds, and, as noted by Humbert (1960: 248), the history of Greek has always shown a direct relation between Nominative and Accusative. On the basis of head-dependent relations, Genitive is considered to be an adnominal Case as opposed to the adverbia1 Cases of Nominative and Accusative. On the other hand, in the evolution of the language, there are many instances of nouns which have adapted their irregular nominative form analogically to the “more regular” accusative form:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. pater</td>
<td>patera</td>
<td>pateras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“father”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. meter</td>
<td>metera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“mother”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of syntactic grounds, the same division of cases is also proposed by Simon of Dacia for the Case system of Latin. Simon of Dacia divides the cases in these which express a substance to substance relation and those which do not:


Substance to substance - - +

Case syncretism in Greek also functions on the basis of this opposition. Neuter nouns show the same inflected form in both Nominative and Accusative while their Genitive form is different. Consider, for example, the inflectional paradigm of the neuter noun *soma* "body" below:

(19)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td><em>soma</em></td>
<td><em>somata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td><em>soma</em></td>
<td><em>somata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td><em>somatos</em></td>
<td><em>somaton</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, some derived words today, e.g., the diminutives in -*aki*, do not have an inflected form for Genitive in both Singular and Plural, while they are fully inflected as far as Nominative and Accusative are concerned:

(20)  

a. *pedaki*  
"small child"  
< ped- + -aki  
child small-NOM/ACC-SING

b. *pedakia*  
< ped- + -akia  
child small-NOM/ACC-PL

c. *pedakiu*  
< ped- + -aki  
child small-GEN-SING

d. *pedakion*  
< ped- + -akion  
child small-GEN-PL

The idea of Case checking being influenced by the language-dependent morphological feature of [±Genitive] allows us to explain the situation given in (16) and (17). The question is, however, whether a word bearing a morphologically overt Accusative, or an overt Nominative, can freely check one or the other value. In other words, can Nominative forms alternate with Accusative forms in all appropriate contexts? As (21) shows, this is not possible:

(21)  

a. *Tón Janí* efere luludja
    the-ACC John-ACC brought flowers-ACC-PL

b. *O Janí* efere luludja
    the-NOM John-NOM brought flowers-ACC-PL
    "John brought flowers"

In (21a), the DP *ton Jani*, is morphologically marked for Accusative, but the sentence is ungrammatical because only Nominative is the syntactically checked case for subjects. At this point, we would like to claim that there is a M(orphological) M(odule) Constraint according to which information provided by morphological forms should be transparent as much as possible to syntactic operations.

(22)  

*Opacity on Syntactic Operations*
The constraint in (22) captures the observation that unexpected Case values only raise whenever two syntactic relations mediating Case require different Case values on a concrete lexical item. The MM Constraint in (22) introduces the notion that Case-marked morphological representations are “optimal” expressions of syntactic Case-checking requirements. This allows for an account of why both Nominative and Accusative Case values are possible in (23), but not in (21).

(23) Opjōs/opjon den simbatho, den tha perasi tis eksetasis

whoever-NOM/ACC not like-1S not FUT-pass-3S the exams

“Whoever I don’t like, won’t pass the exams”

Following what we have said till now, the sentence in (21a) is acceptable from the morphological point of view, since the [+Genitive] feature that interferes with checking simply requires a [-Genitive] constituent form. However, the sentence violates the constraint given in (22) because the form of the DP ton Jani, overtly expresses an Accusative and does not correspond to the Nominative Case that the word has checked in syntax. Therefore the construction crashes. The alternative form O Janis (cf.21b), marked for Nominative, is thus preferred since the constraint in (22) forces the most exhaustive possible Case matching, between MM forms and Syntax, ruling out Accusative, and “imposing” Nominative.

Assuming that the MM Constraint proposed in (22) applies to all syntactic representations entering MM, a further question arises: why a sentence, like the one given in (23), is acceptable?

In (23), the Nominative form opjōs “whoever” is morphologically opaque with respect to the Accusative Case that is checked inside the free relative by the verb simbatho “like”: it does not constitute the more “transparent” representation with respect to the checked Nominative. On the other hand, the Accusative form opjon is licenced inside the relative, but it participates in a chain with a pro in Nominative (i.e., the subject of the matrix verb): from the morphological point of view, it is also opaque with respect to the chain since it does not constitute the more “transparent” representation with respect to the coindexation. Under both choices, Nominative or Accusative, the constraint in (22) is violated once. In contexts such as (23), the two possibilities are equally good candidates, and thus the two are possible morphological Case values for the relative pronoun whose stem is *opj-*.  

2.4. Strict identity of features

Before concluding, let us try to give an answer to the last question posed above, that is why strict identity of features is better than “partial identity”, as shown by the examples (12) and (13), repeated here for convenience as (24) and (25):
Feature mismatches in Greek clitic left-dislocation constructions

(24) a. O Pavlos, tu pirane to pedi
    the-NOM Paul-NOM, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid
 b. Tu Pavlu, tu pirane to pedi
    the-GEN Paul-GEN, him-GEN took-away-3PL the kid
   "They took the kid away from Paul"

(25) a. I fittites, i kathijites tus agapane olus
    the students-NOM, the professors-NOM them-ACC love-3PL all-ACC
    "The professors love all the students" (or The students, the professors love them all)
 b. Tus fittites, i kathijites tus agapane olus
    the students-ACC, the professors-NOM them-ACC love-3PL all-ACC
    "The professors love all the students" (or The students, the professors love them all)

As proposed above, in a non-movement chain, there is a coindexation between the clitic and the left-dislocated constituent as far as the [+interpretable] features are concerned, i.e., Number and Gender. Since [-interpretable] features, such as Case, are not coindexed, the left-dislocated constituent may also appear in a default Nominative case value. In (24) and (25), both a. and b. are acceptable. However, it is true that speakers of Greek show a certain preference for the b. form. Since there is no syntactic motivation for this preference (cf. above), we would like to propose that this preference is also due to an intervention of Morphology. Morphologically, Case, Number, and, in some cases, Gender (e.g., in determiners and clitics) are parts of the same inflectional cluster (see section 2.1.). Greek nouns (and DPs) are obligatorily marked for case. Consequently, this preference towards b. could be dictated by the MM Constraint in (22) which requires the most possible matching of Case of the dislocated element to that of the clitic. On the other hand, this application of the MM Constraint is overruled when the default Nominative value occurs, because the use of Nominative in dislocated constituents may be related to interpretative properties (see Nominative related to toposhood, as proposed by Jakobson 1958) and, it may be the case that the relation between Morphology and Semantics obviates Syntax, something which goes beyond the scope of this paper.

3. Conclusions

In this paper, we have shown that an attempt to link the Case forms directly to syntactic operations is unwieldy since grammatical relations need not be in a one-for-one correspondence with Case forms, e.g., Nominative forms in CLDC. We argued that Case marking is handled within Morphology and Syntax manipulates only partial Case information coming from Morphology. Our analysis provides a strong argument for
the existence of a morphological module, but also a confirmation for the interaction between Morphology and Syntax. The cases we considered here are instances in which either Syntax does not use all the information provided by Morphology, or the syntactic operations are affected by constraints coming from Morphology.
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