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### 1. The puzzle

(1) **Nominal phrases with paucal numerals:**

| étí poslednie dva krasivyx stola these-NOM.PI. last-NOM.PI two-NOM beautiful-GEN.PI. table-GEN.SG |

'these two beautiful tables'

Key questions include:
- Why is *stola* 'table' singular while the modifiers and demonstrative are plural?
- Why is the noun and adjective following *dva* 'two' marked with genitive case, while the modifier and demonstrative preceding *dva* are nominative?

"Единственное число при таких словах, как два, три и четыре, где ясно указана множественность, представляется на первый взгляд очень странным и является характерным примером того, насколько грамматическое мышление может расходиться с логическим."

"The singular with such words as *dva* 'two', *tri* 'three' and *četyre* 'four', where plurality is clearly indicated, seems at first glance very strange, and constitutes a typical example of the extent to which grammatical and logical thinking may diverge"  
(Peškovskij 1956, 438)

- Why does the pattern change if we replace *dva* 'two' with a numeral higher than 'four'? In particular, N is now plural:

(2) **Nominal phrases with non-paucal numerals:**

| étí poslednie pijat’ krasivyx stolov these-NOM.PI. last-NOM.PI five-NOM beautiful-GEN.PI. table-GEN.PI. |

'these last five beautiful tables'

**Claim:** These questions bear on a deeper issue: "what is case morphology?"

### 2. Introduction

- **Case morphology:** Russian nouns, adjectives, numerals and demonstratives bear *case* suffixes. The shape of a given case suffix is determined by two factors:
  1. its *morphological environment* (properties of the stem to which the suffix attaches; e.g. declension class, gender, animacy, number); and
  2. its *syntactic environment*.

The traditional cross-classification of case suffixes by declension-class and by case-name (nominative, genitive, etc.) reflects these two factors.

- **Specialness of the standard case names:** Traditionally, the cases are called by special names (*nominative, genitive, etc.*) not used outside the description of case-systems. The specialness of case terminology reflects what looks like a complex relation between syntactic environment and choice of case suffix.

- **Eliminating the special case-names:** How we perceive the relation between case and syntactic environment depends not only on our view of the syntax-morphology relation, but also on our view of how the syntax itself works. In this paper, I offer two proposals about syntax that offer an interesting simplification of the theory of morphological case.

In particular, these proposals allow one to abandon some of the traditional case terminology, and instead view the case suffixes as instances of familiar syntactic categories:

(3) Genitive = N  
Accusative = V  
Nominative = D  
Obliques = P

A genitive-marked word is thus a stem to which a suffix of category N has been attached; a nominative-marked word is a stem with a suffix of category D; and an accusative bears a suffix of category V (with some caveats discussed below).

A dative, instrumental, prepositional or locative-marked word bears a suffix of category P. Only the distinctions among these last cases will fail to correspond to syntactic category distinctions, but may reflect the kinds of lexical differences that independently distinguish subcategories of overt prepositions.

- **Terminology:** I will use the abbreviations *NGEN, Dnom, VACC, PDAT*, etc. to remind us of the traditional names for the cases whose actual nature is simply N, D, V, and (types of) P. The case-name suffixes to these designations are thus present merely for our convenience.

Genitive: The most unusual aspect of the proposal will be the treatment of genitive as N -- with which I will begin the discussion in the next section.

- **Syntax:** The treatment of case as in (3) will depend on two ideas that are novel in the context of a syntax based on external and internal Merge, but are also revivals of well-known older proposals, as well as a third important concept:

  1. **Morphology assignment:**

    When α [or a projection of α] merges with β and α assigns an affix, the affix is copied onto β and realized on the (accessible) lexical items dominated by β.

This proposal revises the notion of *case assignment* (Vergnaud (2006), Rouvet & Vergnaud (1980)); Chomsky (1980, Chomsky (1981)). Other properties of the case assignment process, however, continue to follow from the theory of *agreement* (Chomsky (2000); Pesetsky and Torrego (2004); and others).
2. **Head Movement as complement-formation:**
This proposal maintains the traditional view of head-movement as complement-forming internal merge (Travis 1984, Baker 1988, Pollock 1991).

The relevance of points 1 and 2 to morphological case in Russian: Head movement that gives a new complement to a head that already has one bleeds morphology assignment to the previous complement.

3. **Phases:**
Also important will be the notion of syntactic phase as a Spell-out Domain.

The relevance of points 1 and 3 to morphological case in Russian: Morphology assignment cannot affect the lexical items of a domain D after D is spelled out or linearized.

**Head movement** and the spelling out of phases thus serve as two brakes on an otherwise general process of Morphology Assignment. The value of these brakes to us is that they free for our inspection earlier stages of the derivation, allowing us to verify our theory of that derivation.

---

### 3. Genitive, nominative and oblique

#### Beginnings of the proposal

- The basic form of the Russian noun is genitive -- that is, a noun left to its own devices would bear genitive morphology.
- The nominative (the citation form) is what such a noun looks like after D is merged to it. Other case forms represent the morphological effect of other merged elements on N.
- The presence of genitive morphology on a N may thus represent the effect of not assigning another case to it, rather than the presence of a specific genitive assigner.

---

#### Russian as a case stacking language

**Observation:** The Russian noun contains just one slot for pronunciation of an inflectional suffix.

**If this observation is a maxtter of pronunciation, as in (4)...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>The One-Suffix Rule (Russian Nouns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only the final overt inflectional suffix on a noun is pronounced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**... then the One-Suffix Rule (4) allows the following characterization of genitive morphology:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>Genitive morphology is N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each Russian noun enters the syntax with a suffix N, realized as genitive morphology. Attaching N to a stem categorizes it as a noun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that nouns are not always morphologically genitive reflects situations in which other affixes are added outside genitive.

*Note: NGEN is not the "little n" of Marantz (1997), which merges in the syntax with a category-neutral phrase that already contains the predicate's internal argument. A noun crucially already bears NGEN when its internal argument is merged.*

The shape of NGEN is context-dependent: sensitive to noun-class and number on N. (See Nevins and Bailyn (2006) for a phonologically explicit proposal.). In its plural form, it is sometimes phonologically null on the surface — but in fact there is an underlying "yer"-suffix, indicated here by the Cyrillic "ъ" (Lightner (1972), Gussmann (1980), Pesetsky (1979, 1985), Halle & Matushansky (2006)).

#### Realization of genitive (i.e. +N) on singular and plural nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem</th>
<th>NGEN sg.</th>
<th>NGEN pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. stol</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ stola</td>
<td>→ stolov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. lamp</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ lampy</td>
<td>→ lamp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...so we must distinguish the affixation of NGEN -- a collection of features -- from the context-dependent phonological realization of these features (Pesetsky (1985), Halle and Marantz (1993)).

- Any adjective phrase merged with a noun in the genitive case must itself bear genitive morphology...

#### Genitive adjective + noun as dependent member of compound

| nastojas-ego    | linguist-a    |
| real-MAS.GEN.SG | linguist-GEN.SG |

'real linguist'  

....but we delay discussion of adjective concord for a bit.

---

#### Nominative

- I propose that nominative morphology results from the **affixation of D to N**. By the One-Suffix Rule (4), the Nominative Dnom suffix suppresses the pronunciation of the NGEN suffix:
But why believe...

Some aspects of our Russian proposal need less argument than others. For example, includes present work).

If this proposal is correct, language like Lardil

If we can find a syntactic configuration which blocks the overwriting of an old case with a new case ending, we should find the old case surfacing in an environment where one otherwise expects the new case.

[See Nikolaeva (2007) (and references therein) for fuller discussion of the uses of the genitive in Russian.]

4. Argument 1 for the proposal: the freezing effect of head movement

Step 1: Explain the number mismatch between adjective and noun in paucal numeral constructions.

A nominative (or accusative) paucal numeral ('two', 'three', 'four') takes a GEN.SG noun...

... but a modifying adjective following the paucal numeral is plural, even though the noun is not.

dva novyx pidžaka.
two-NOM new-NOM.PL coat--GEN.SG

In general, when an attributive adjective merges with a projection of N, its morphological number is determined by the number of the N it modifies:

Proposal: The adjectives in (12) are no exception to the general rule. They are merged with and modifying a plural phrase. Though the noun is singular, the combination of noun and paucal numeral is plural.

Details: Number (Nbr) may be added to N either pre-syntactically (as morphology) or by syntactic Merge. The choice depends on the species of Nbr being added. A noun to which Nbr has not merged pre-syntactically bears singular morphology.
Plural Nbr — added pre-syntactically (as morphology):
A normal plural N is formed by lexically (i.e. pre-syntax) merging a noun with plural Nbr or perhaps by simply adding a valued Nbr feature to it.

Paucal Nbr — added syntactically (by Merge that does create a word)
Numerals 2-4 are not numerals, but syntactically independent instances of non-singular number (Nbr). Assuming that a noun may merge only once with Nbr, this accounts for the genitive singular (actually non-plural) morphology on N with the paucal numerals. It is 'two', 'three' or 'four' that pluralizes N by syntactically merging with it:

(14)  a. paucal
      (syntactically merged Nbr)  
      \   /  
     Nbr A   N
     'two' (no Nbr)

b. normal plural
      (presyntactically added Nbr)
      \   /  
     Nbr A   N
     \ /    or \   /  
     N° (pl.) N° or N°

• Adjectives: An adjective that merges with (14a) is merging with a non-singular (poplarly known as "plural") phrase. This explains its plural morphology:

(15)  Adjective modifying a plural will be morphologically plural (compare (13c))
      \   /  
     A   N
     [plural]  
     \   /  
     Nbr N
     'two' (numberless)

Step 2: Explain the word order among adjective, noun and paucal numeral.

• The agreement mismatch between noun and adjective leads us to expect the order: "adjective-numeral-noun" instead of the actual unmarked order "numeral-adjective-noun" seen in (12).

(16)  Paucal numeral precedes adjective
      a. dva novyx pidžaka
          two-NOM NEW GEN PL COLD GEN SG
      b. #novyx dva pidžaka  (unless adjective is focused)

Step 3: Explain the absence of nominative case on N and adjective.

• Nominative paucal, genitive N: The paucal numerals dva 'two', tri 'three', and četyre 'four' do have distinct genitive forms dvux, trëx and četyrëx. Why does the paucal numeral show nominative case morphology in nominative environments, while their noun (along with modifying adjectives) bears genitive.

• Effects of Nbr-to-D movement: If the movement shown in (16) obligatorily takes place, and if nominative case is D NOM, assigned by D, a generalization emerges.

In (17), D assigns its D NOM morphology only to the new complement formed by Nbr-to-D movement (the paucal numeral "Nbr"), leaving its former complement (the remnant NP) untouched and genitive.

Step 4: Oblique phrases with paucal numerals — Merge P with (17)

(18)  A temporary proposal (to be replaced shortly)
      A head such as D assigns its morphology (D NOM) under c-command (once DP is complete).

• The proposal in (18) predicts the assignment of D NOM to the paucal numeral, and the retention of genitive (N GEN) on the lexical items of the rest of the NP.

In contrast to most other proposals (e.g. Pesetsky (1982), Bailyn (2003)), genitive in the paucal numeral construction is thus not assigned by the numeral. It is instead "primeval genitive". The initial genitive morphology of the NP, not been overwritten by other morphology — because of the Nbr-to-D movement in (17).

• Further Prediction: If a P is merged with (17), it will c-command not only D+Nbr, but also the remnant NP. Consequently, the lexical items of the remnant NP, along with Nbr itself, will receive any morphology assigned by P...
• ...predicting correctly that oblique case, e.g. P_dat, will be found not only on the paucal numeral, but also on the lexical items of the remnant NP:

\[ \text{DPs with a paucal numeral in an oblique (dative) environment} \]

- a. dvum xorošim stolam b. trěm xolodnym dnjam
two-DAT good-DAT.PL table-DAT.PL three-DAT cold-DAT.PL day-DAT.PL

- c. čtyr-ěm krasivym stakanam
four-DAT beautiful-DAT.PL glass-DAT.PL

**Step 5: Why are the oblique nouns in (20a-c) plural?**

Suppose P bears unvalued, uninterpretable number (uNbr[ ] in the notation of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007). This feature will probe to value its Nbr feature, and the closest Goal will be plural, as we have already seen. Consequently, the morphology assigned by P to DP will be the plural variant of the relevant oblique case, e.g. P_dat plural. This argues for the distinctness of Agree and morphology (case) assignment.

---

**Independent evidence from gender agreement that paucal numerals start low**

- **Lexical gender** of non-neuter nouns in Russian is predictable, and is a function of declension class and natural gender. [See Asarina (2008)]

- **Gender agreement with vrač-type ('doctor') nouns**
  An otherwise masculine noun of the 2nd declension class that denotes a profession traditionally exercised by males (e.g. vrač 'doctor') may optionally trigger feminine agreement on both modifying adjectives and past-tense verbs.

  Crucially, feminine adjective entails feminine verb; but the verb may be feminine and the adjective masculine:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{F} \\
\text{Novyj} & \quad \text{vrač} \\
\text{prišel} & \quad \text{prišel} \\
\text{new.NOM.M} & \quad \text{doctor.NOM.SG} \\
\text{arrived.M.SG} & \\
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{F} \\
\text{Novyj} & \quad \text{vrač} \\
\text{prišla} & \quad \text{prišla} \\
\text{new.NOM.M} & \quad \text{doctor.NOM.SG} \\
\text{arrived.F.SG} & \\
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{M} \\
\text{*Novaja} & \quad \text{vrač} \\
\text{prišel} & \quad \text{prišel} \\
\text{new.NOM.F} & \quad \text{doctor.NOM.SG} \\
\text{arrived.M.SG} & \\
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{F} \\
\text{Novaja} & \quad \text{vrač} \\
\text{prišla} & \quad \text{prišla} \\
\text{new.NOM.F} & \quad \text{doctor.NOM.SG} \\
\text{arrived.F.SG} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

- Crucially, feminine agreement with vrač-type nouns is impossible on a structurally low adjective with a non-interpretive or argumental interpretation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{F} \\
\text{Glavnyj} & \quad \text{vrač} \\
\text{polikliniki skazala} & \quad \text{čtoby...} \\
\text{head.NOM.M/F.SG} & \quad \text{doctor.NOM.SG clinic.GEN say.PST.F.SG that.SBJI...} \\
\text{'The (female) head doctor of the clinic ordered that...'} & \\
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{M} \\
\text{Klassnyj} & \quad \text{vrač} \\
\text{klassnaja rukovoditel' sobščila Česnokovu, čto...} \\
\text{class.NOM.M/F.SG} & \quad \text{supervisor inform.PST.F.SG Česnokov that...} \\
\text{'The (female) class supervisor informed Česnokov that...'} & \\
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{F} \\
\text{Priiskovoyj} & \quad \text{vrač} \\
\text{soščetov ser'ežno zablolela.} \\
\text{mine.NOM.M/F.SG} & \quad \text{accountant seriously take-ill.PST.F.SG} \\
\text{'The (female) mine accountant took seriously ill.' (Crockett (1976, 95-97))} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

- In combination with higher modifiers that do allow feminine agreement, a gender mismatch is even allowed:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{F} \\
\text{U nas byla očen' xorošaja zubnoj vrač.} & \quad \text{by us COP.PST.F.SG very good.NOM.F.SG dental.NOM.M.SG doctor} \\
\text{'We had a very good (female) dentist.' Crockett (1976, 97)} & \\
\text{NOM} & \quad \text{M} \\
\text{moja novaja klassnyj rukovoditel' svi pričitala...} & \quad \text{my.NOM.F.SG new.NOM.F.SG class.NOM.M.SG supervisor ITR. complain.PST.F.SG} \\
\text{'my new (female) class supervisor continually complained (that)...'} & \quad \text{blog entry (http://detochka.ru/forum/index.php?showtopic=19618&st=30)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

**Analysis of feminine agreement with vrač-class nouns**

An optional null morpheme Ж 'female' may be merged at any point above a certain threshold within a nominal. It cannot be merged lower than low adjectives. From that point on, the nominal counts as feminine for a greement purposes.

---

1 This is the so-called "homogeneous pattern" of Babby (1987). See also Babby (1980) and Pesetsky (1982a). For cross-Slavic variation, see especially Franks (1995).

2 'Dental doctor' is the normal Russian expression for 'dentist',
Interim summary

- The number mismatch between adjective and noun motivated a structure that predicted the order adjective-numeral-noun.
- Nbr-to-D movement explains the actual order order numeral-adjective-noun, and simultaneously suggests a structure in which the numeral is a sister to D, but not the remnant NP.
- This derived structure allows us to explain why only the numeral, and not the rest of the NP, is nominative — and why the rest of the NP is genitive...assuming our configurational proposal for case assignment and the "primeval" status of genitive on N. [Gender agreement just provided an independent argument for this movement.]
- It is further predicted, correctly, that a higher assigner such as P will overwrite both nominative and genitive with whatever oblique morphology the P controls, e.g. P_{DAT}, with number of the morphology dictated by the valuation of the number feature of P via Agree.

5. Behavior of other Quantifiers

- DPs with non-paucal numerals (and a variety of other quantificational elements) behave like the paucals, except for the number mismatch.
- Analysis: What D actually attracts is a subclass of quantifiers that I will call +Q that includes both paucals and numerals. Paucals are [+Nbr, +Q], but non-paucal numerals are [-Nbr, +Q]:

(26) Gender agreement in paucals dva 'two', obo 'both'
  a. dva/oba stola b. dve/obe lampy
two/both-M table-GEN two/both-F lamp-GEN

...but feminine agreement with vrač-class nouns is absolutely impossible!

(27) No feminine agreement between paucals and vrač-class nouns
  a. dva/oba vrača b. *dve/obe vrača
two/both-M doctor-GEN two/both-F doctor-GEN

Explanation:
Like low adjectives, paucals are merged below the threshold for insertion of Ж.

But...
Paucals do precede high adjectives (cf. (12))

Conclusion:
The initial merge site for paucals is low. They reach their final position by movement.

...just as we argued on independent grounds.
6. V_{ACC}

The take-home message: V sometimes assigns V_{ACC} morphology, but its shape and distribution is somewhat complex. Sometimes V_{ACC} mimics the genitive; sometimes it has its own form in -'u;' and sometimes it is not assigned at all — depending on declension class, number and animacy.

- **Special accusative form 1:** In an animate DP, an accusative noun or adjective is morphologically genitive if (1) it belongs to Declension II (nouns), (2) is masculine (adjectives) or (3) is plural. We may view all of these as involving Declension II, on the grounds that plurals of all nouns and adjectives are the same regardless of declension class (with complications in the genitive) and that the masculine adjectives are arguably of Declension II (Halle and Matushansky (2006)).

(33) Genitive morphology on animate accusative nominals
   we saw real-MASC looks-like-GEN.SG linguist-looks-like-GEN.SG 'We saw the (a) real linguist.'
   
   b. My videli malen'ki [x] sobak-č.
   we saw small-looks-like-GEN.PL dog-looks-like-GEN.PL 'We saw the (some) small dogs'

- **Special accusative form 2:** A noun with theme vowel -a or a feminine adjective shows a special accusative form in the singular, common to animates and inanimates. Since the feminine adjectives arguably also have theme vowel -a, we may assume that this special form is triggered by theme vowel -a in both nouns and adjectives.

(34) Acc morphology on nouns and adjectives with -a
   we saw real-FEM.ACC.SG dog-ACC/lamp-ACC 'We saw (the/a) real dog/lamp.'
   
   b. My videli malen'ko [!] mužčinu.
   we saw real-MASC looks-like-GEN.SG man-ACC 'We saw (the/a) small man.'

- **Otherwise...** there is no special accusative. Traditional grammar would say that there is an accusative identical to the nominative:

(35) Direct object with nominative form
   a. My videli nastojašči [x] stol,
   we saw real-MASC.NOM.SG table-NOM.SG 'We saw (the/a) real table.'
   
   b. My videli malen'ki [x] lampy,
   we saw small-looks-like-NOM.PL lamp-NOM.PL 'We saw (the/some) small lamps'

- We may assume that the special accusative morphology in (33) reflects the assignment of V_{ACC} by V (or by V selected by v). I do not explain why it is sometimes genitive in shape.

- But the animate genitive of direct objects is clearly not the "primeval genitive" with which nouns enter the syntax. When an animate direct object contains a paucal numeral, genitive plural (not singular) is found on the head N, just as when P assigns oblique morphology (cf. (20) — and the numeral itself is genitive:

(36) Animative genitive-for-accusative on paucal numerals
   a. Kitajskie organy pravoporjadka arestovali dvux studentov.
   'The Chinese organs of law and order arrested two students.'
   
   b. Vlasti arestovali trex graždan Portugalii.
   'The authorities arrested three citizens of Portugal.'
   
   c. V Avstrii arestovali četyrëx ukraincev.
   'In Austria, they arrested four Ukrainians.'

- Non-paucal +Q quantifiers do not show the animate accusative, but this is because they are not morphologically plural, nor do they belong to Declension II:

(37) No animative genitive-for-accusative morphology on non-paucal Q
   My videli mnogo/šest/dostatočno nastojašč-ix lingvist-ov
   we saw many/six/enough real-GEN.PL linguist-GEN.PL
   
   - The non-paucal +Q quantifiers are Declension III. Others do not show case at all — except for sorok 'forty', which does show case but is in a strange declension class by itself.

7. Argument 2 for the proposal: the freezing effect of phases

- In a genitive NP, how does an attributive adjective acquire genitive?

(38) Modifier of N’ with genitive is genitive (= (7))
   nastojašče-ego linguist-a
   real-MAS GEN.SG linguist-GEN.SG
   'real linguist' (GEN)

Preliminary answer:
Merger of α to any projection of an element with N_{GEN} assigns N_{GEN} to α.

- Likewise, Merge of α to any projection of D appears to assign D_{NOM} (i.e. nominative) to α.
Possessive genitive inside a DP in an oblique environment

a. k domu [starogo soldata] to house-DAT.SG old-GEN.SG soldier-GEN.SG 'the old soldier's house'

b. *k domu [staromu soldatu] to house-DAT.SG old-DAT.SG soldier-DAT.SG

Claim: the following is a related question:

V_{ACC} problem: Why does P_{DAT} on the object of P not get overwritten with V_{ACC} when V merges with a PP complement?

Assignment of V_{ACC} is not possible across a PP boundary

a. Assignment of V_{ACC} to DP in [V DP]
   My videli nastojascego lingvista.
   we saw real-MASC.ACC.SG linguist-ACC.SG
   'We saw (the/a) real linguist.'

b. No assignment of V_{ACC} to DP in [V [P P DP]]
   My podolsi k nastojaschemu lingvistu / *nastojascego lingvista
   we went-up-to to real-MASC.DAT.SG linguist-DAT.SG
   'We went up to (the/a) real linguist.'

It's not the fact that PP is a maximal projection:
We have already seen morphology assignment crossing maximal projections. For example, P may affect the morphology of elements of NP contained within DP, as may V.

There is clearly something special about DP...yet we've also seen morphology assignment affecting DP, as when P_{DAT} or V_{ACC} is assigned.

Apparently, an element H may assign morphology that affects the lexical items dominated by a DP if H merged with the DP...but not if the DP is a subpart of a phrase that H merged with.

Preliminary Proposal:

1. DP is a phase (but NP, PP, etc. are not) (Chomsky (2001)). The lexical items dominated by a phase are not accessible to morphology assignment once the phase is spelled out.

2. A phase is not spelled out until it undergoes Merge.

3. Morphology assignment by H precedes spell-out of the complement of H.
• **Consequences:**

   **for the V\textsubscript{ACC} problem:** If the complement of V is a DP, V\textsubscript{ACC} will affect the lexical items of that DP. But if the complement is a PP whose object is a DP, V\textsubscript{ACC} will not affect the lexical items of DP. Consequently, the DP will retain the morphology assigned to it by P.

   **for the possessor problem:** A possessor will be assigned morphology by the N’ with which it merges, but this morphology will thereafter be frozen, since the DP is spelled out right after merger with N’.

---

*Sadly, time will not permit me to tell you about... what happens if a P that otherwise assigns P\textsubscript{DAT} (distributive \textit{po}) attracts +Q D, and that D contains a paucal or a numeral in it...*

---

**8. Summary**

• Russian genitive, nominative, accusative and oblique morphology are instances of N, D, V and P, respectively. That is, except for the distinctions internal to the class of (non-genitive) obliques...

   **...the morphological cases are just the syntactic categories.**

• Case morphology, intrinsic to N, D, V and P, is \textit{copied} by these heads onto the lexical items of the elements that they merge with — once complementation requirements have been satisfied.

• The sequence of case assignments, and their relation to the various syntactic categories, is revealed by circumstances in which the otherwise obligatory overwriting of one case affix by another (in Russian) fails to take place, and morphology that would otherwise be hidden remains out in the open.
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