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The aim of this chapter is to provide an outline of HPSG work on grammatical case. Two issues that attracted much attention of HPSG practitioners in the 1990s and early 2000s are the locality of case assignment, especially the so-called structural case assignment, as well as case syncretism and underspecification; they are discussed in two separate sections. The third section summarises other work on case carried out within HPSG, including some computational efforts, as well as investigations of case phenomena at the syntax-semantics interface and at the border of syntax and morphology.

1 Introduction

HPSG is not widely known for its approach to grammatical case. For example, it is only mentioned in passing in the 2006 monograph *Theories of Case* (Butt 2006: 225) and in the 2009 *Oxford Handbook of Case* (Malchukov & Spencer 2009: 43), which features separate articles on GB/Minimalism, Lexical Functional Grammar, Optimality Theory and other grammatical frameworks. As most of the HPSG work on case was carried out in the 1990s and early 2000s, this perception is unlikely to have changed since the publication of these two volumes.

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of HPSG work on grammatical case and to show that it does offer novel solutions to some of the problems related to case. Two main research areas are presented in the two ensuing sections: structural case assignment is discussed in Section 1 and case syncretism and underspecification in Section 2. Some of the other HPSG work on case, including implementational work, is outlined in Section 3.
2 Structural case assignment

Pollard & Sag (1994) did not envisage a separate theory of case.1 “Nominative case assignment takes place directly within the lexical entry of the finite verb”, while “the subject subcat element of a nonfinite verb [...] does not have a case value specified” (p. 30). However, they added in a footnote on the same page that “for languages with more complex case systems, some sort of distinction analogous to the one characterized in GB work as ‘inherent’ vs. ‘structural’ is required.”

In the transformational Government and Binding theory of the 1980s (GB; Chomsky 1981; 1986), “inherent” – or “lexical” – case is understood as rigidly assigned by the head and independent of syntactic environment, while “structural” case varies with the structural context (e.g., Haider 1985: 70). This difference can be illustrated on the basis of the following examples from German (Przepiórkowski 1999a: 63, based on data from Heinz & Matiasek 1994):

(1) a. Der Mann unterstützt *den* Installateur.
   the man.NOM supports the plumber.ACC
   ‘The man is supporting the plumber.’

   b. Der *Installateur* wird unterstützt.
   the plumber.NOM AUX supported
   ‘The plumber is supported.’

   c. das Unterstützen *des* Installateurs
   the supporting the plumber.GEN
   ‘the support for/from the plumber’

(2) a. Der Mann hilft *dem* Installateur.
   the man.NOM helps the plumber.DAT
   ‘The man is helping the plumber.’

   b. Dem Installateur wird geholfen.
   the plumber.DAT AUX helped
   ‘The plumber is helped.’

   c. das Helfen *des* Installateurs
   the helping the plumber.GEN
   ‘the help from/*for the plumber’

In (1), both arguments of the verb Unterstützen2 ‘support’ receive structural

---

1This section is to some extent based on Przepiórkowski (1999a), Section 3.4 and Chapter 4; see also Müller (2013), Chapter 14.
2Note the convention of using small capitals to typeset lemmata.
case: the patient argument occurs in the accusative in (1a), in the nominative in (1b), and in the genitive in (1c). Similarly, the agent argument is in the nominative in (1a), but it may only occur in the genitive in (1c); hence, the single argument marked as genitive in (1c) is ambiguous between the agent and the patient. In the case of (2), the agent argument of *helfen* ‘help’ is similarly assigned structural case, but the patient argument receives a rigid inherent case: it is always the dative, so, e.g., the genitive in (2c) may only be understood as marking the agent.

Examples such as those above may still be handled without any general principles of case assignment. For example, lexical rules (Pollard & Sag 1987: 209–218) responsible for forming passive participles (as in the b. examples above) and gerunds (as in the c. examples) might be responsible for manipulating case values of arguments, e.g., for translating nominative and accusative – but not dative – to genitive in the case of gerunds. However, the interaction of the structural/inherent case dichotomy with raising (and – in some languages – with control) motivates a more comprehensive approach to case assignment.

Consider Icelandic raising verbs (all Icelandic data is taken from Sag et al. 1992: 304–305):

(3)  
---

a. *Hann* virðist elska hana.  
He.NOM seems love.INF her.ACC  
‘He seems to love her.’

b. Þeir telja *Maríu* hafa skrifað ritgerðina.  
they believe Mary.ACC have.INF written the.thesis  
‘They believe Mary to have written her thesis.’

As in other languages, the subject of the infinitival verb raised to the higher subject position, as in (3a), normally receives the nominative case there, while – in the case it is raised to the object position, as in (3b) – it normally receives the accusative case. This could be easily modelled in accordance with the suggestion of Pollard & Sag (1994: 30) that infinitival verbs do not assign case to their subjects, while finite verbs – in this case finite raising verbs – normally assign the nominative to their subjects and the accusative to their objects. But, as is well known (Andrews 1982; Zaenen & Maling 1983; Zaenen et al. 1985), some Icelandic verbs idiosyncratically assign specific “quirky” cases to their subjects, and when they do, the higher raising verbs must honour this assignment:

(4)  
---

a. *Hana* virðist vanta peninga.  
her.ACC seems lack.INF money  
‘She seems to lack money.’
b. Hann telur mig vanta peninga.
   he.NOM believes me.ACC lack.INF money
   ‘He believes that I lack money.’

   (5) a. Barninu virðist hafa batnað veikin.
      the.child.DAT seems have.INF recovered.from the.disease
      ‘The child seems to have recovered from the disease.’
   b. Hann telur barninu hafa batnað veikin.
      he believes the.child.DAT have.INF recovered.from the.disease
      ‘He believes the child to have recovered from the disease.’

   (6) a. Verkjanna virðist ekki gæta.
      the.pains.GEN seems not be.noticeable.INF
      ‘The pains don’t seem to be noticeable.’
   b. Hann telur verkjanna ekki gæta.
      he believes the.pains.GEN not be.noticeable.INF
      ‘He believes the pains to be not noticeable.’

Thus, in (4), the understood subject of the infinitival vanta ‘lack’ must be in the accusative, whether it is raised to the object position, as in (4b), where the accusative would be expected anyway, or to the subject position, as in (4a), where normally the nominative case would be expected. This works similarly in the case of verbs idiosyncratically assigning their subject the dative case, as in (5), or the genitive case, as in (6).

The difficulty presented by such examples is this. If the finite raising verbs were assumed to assign case to the raised subjects – nominative in the case of raising to subject and accusative in the case of raising to object – then this would clash with “quirky” cases assigned to their subjects by some verbs: (4a), (5) and (6) would be predicted to be ungrammatical. If, on the other hand, such raising verbs did not assign case to the raised arguments, instead relying on the lower verbs to assign appropriate cases to their subjects, then it is not clear what case should be assigned to their subjects by the usual – not “quirky” – verbs: it cannot always be the nominative, as the accusative case is witnessed when the subject is raised to the object position, as in (3b); similarly, it cannot always be the accusative, as the nominative case surfaces when the subject is raised to the subject position, as in (3a).

The intuition of the analysis proposed in Sag et al. (1992) relies on the distinction between structural and inherent case assignment, although these terms do
not appear in that paper. Verbs such as those in (4)–(6) assign their subjects specific inherent cases (accusative in (4), dative in (5) and genitive in (6)), while the usual verbs, as in (3), only mark their subjects as structural, to be assigned case elsewhere. Finite raising verbs are, in a way, sensitive to this distinction, and only assign the nominative (in the case of raising to subject) or accusative (in the case of raising to object) to such structural arguments. While Sag et al. (1992) represent this distinction between structural and inherent case implicitly, via the interaction of two attributes, \textsc{case} (realised case) and dcase (default case), later HPSG work assumes explicit representation of the two kinds of case as two subtypes of \textsc{case} in the type hierarchy: str(uctural) and lex(ical). Such a \textsc{case} type hierarchy is, apparently independently, alluded to in Pollard (1994) and introduced in detail in Heinz & Matiasek (1994), to which we turn presently.

On the basis of German examples such as (1)–(2), Heinz & Matiasek (1994) argue that out of four morphological cases in German – nominative, accusative, genitive and dative – the first three (i.e., with the exception of the dative) may be assigned structurally, by general case assignment principles. Similarly, they argue that the last three (i.e., apart from the nominative) may also be assigned lexically, in which case they are stable across various syntactic environments. These empirical observations are translated into the \textsc{case} hierarchy in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Case hierarchy for German encoding the structural/lexical distinction](image)

Particular verbs may assign specific lexical cases to their arguments, e.g., \textit{ldat}. They may also specify arguments as bearing structural case, in which case only the \textit{str(uctural)} supertype is mentioned in the lexicon. For example, the lexical entries for \textsc{unterstützen} ‘support’ and \textsc{helfen} `help’ contain the following subcategorisation requirements:
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(7)  
  a. **Unterstützen**: [subcat ⟨ NP[str], NP[str] ⟩] 
  b. **Helfen**: [subcat ⟨ NP[str], NP[ldat] ⟩]

Assuming a similar *case* hierarchy for Icelandic, the difference between the usual verbs, such as *elska* ‘love’ in (3a), and “quirky” subject verbs, such as *vanta* ‘lack’ in (4), could be represented as below (omitting non-initial arguments):

(8)  
  a. **Elska**: [subcat ⟨ NP[str], …⟩] 
  b. **Vanta**: [subcat ⟨ NP[lacc], …⟩]

Since Pollard (1994) and Heinz & Matiasek (1994), such representations of case requirements are generally adopted in HPSG, with the only difference that *subcat* is currently replaced with *arg-st*. The point where different approaches diverge is how exactly structural case is resolved to a specific morphological case.

The simplest principle would resolve the case of the first *str* argument of a pure (non-gerundial) verb to nominative, i.e., to *snom*, the case of any subsequent *str* argument of a pure verb to accusative, i.e., to *sacc*, and the case of any *str* argument of a gerund to *sgen*. Unfortunately, this simple principle would not work in various cases of raising, e.g., in the case of the Icelandic data above. While the “quirky” cases in (4)–(6) would be properly taken care of by this approach — once the subject is assigned a specific lexical case it is outside of the realm of a principle resolving structural cases — structural subjects raised to a higher verb would be assigned specific case twice (or more times, in the case of longer raising chains): on the *subcat* (or *arg-st*) of the lower verb and on the *subcat* (or *arg-st*) of the raising verb. This would not necessarily lead to problems in the case of raising to subject verbs, as in (3a), as the structural argument would be the subject in both subcategorisation frames, so it would be resolved to *snom* twice, but it would create a problem in the case of raising to object verbs, as in (3b), as the raised argument would be resolved to the nominative on the lower subcategorisation frame and to the accusative on the higher frame. So, the problem is not limited to Icelandic, but may be observed in any language with raising to object (also known as Exceptional Case Marking or Accusativus cum Infinitivo or AcI), including German (cf., e.g., Heinz & Matiasek 1994: 231). Obviously, even if a structural argument occurs on a number of *subcat* or *arg-st* lists, it should be assigned specific morphological case according to its position on just one of them — the highest one.

Both Pollard (1994) and Heinz & Matiasek (1994) account for such facts via configurational case principles, e.g. (Heinz & Matiasek 1994: 209):

---

*A recent example being Machicao y Priemer & Fritz-Huechante (2018: 169).*
(9) **Case Principle (for German):**

In a *head-complement-structure* whose head has category

\[
\text{verb[fin]} \quad \text{the external argument has a case value of } snom,
\]

\[
\text{verb} \quad \text{the internal argument has a case value of } sacc,
\]

\[
noun \quad \text{the internal argument has a case value of } sgen.
\]

These are the only saturated or almost saturated *head-complement_structures* with structural arguments.

(10) **Syntactically External Argument (‘Subject’):**

If the first element of the SUBCAT list of a sign is an NP[\text{str}], it is called the (syntactically) external argument of that sign.

(11) **Syntactically Internal Argument (‘Direct Object’):**

If the second element of the SUBCAT list of a sign is an NP[\text{str}], it is called the (syntactically) internal argument of that sign.

Heinz & Matiasek (1994: 209–210) formalize this Case Principle by giving the following constraints:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phrase} & \quad \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \quad \text{HEAD} \quad \text{vform fin} \quad \text{subcat } \langle \rangle \\
\text{DTRS} & \quad \text{h-c-str} \quad \text{HEAD-DTR|...|SUBCAT } \langle \text{NP[\text{str}], ...} \rangle \\
& \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{DTRS|HEAD-DTR|...|SUBCAT } \langle \text{NP[\text{snom}], ...} \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{phrase} & \quad \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \quad \text{HEAD} \quad \text{vform fin} \quad \text{subcat } \langle \rangle \vee \langle \text{synsem} \rangle \\
\text{DTRS} & \quad \text{h-c-str} \quad \text{HEAD-DTR|...|SUBCAT } \langle \text{synsem, NP[\text{str}], ...} \rangle \\
& \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{DTRS|HEAD-DTR|...|SUBCAT } \langle \text{synsem, NP[\text{sacc}], ...} \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
Note that the locus of this Case Principle is phrase and that it makes reference to head-complement-structure values of the daughters (dtrs) attribute. In this sense, this principle is configurational. Similar principles were proposed for Korean (Yoo 1993; Bratt 1996), English (Grover 1995) and Polish (Przepiórkowski 1996a), inter alia.

This configurational approach to case assignment is criticised in Przepiórkowski (1996b; 1999a,b) on the basis of conceptual and theory-internal problems. The conceptual problem is that a configurational analysis is employed for what is usually considered an essentially local phenomenon, one concerned with the relation between a head and its dependents (Blake 1994). The – more immediate – theory-internal problem is that such configurational case principles are restricted to locally realised arguments, and are not necessarily compatible with those – dominant since Pollard & Sag (1994: Chapter 9) – HPSG analyses of extraction which do not assume traces and with those HPSG approaches to cliticisation in which the clitic is realised as an affix rather than a tree-configurational constituent (cf., e.g., Miller & Sag 1997 on French and Monachesi 1999 on Italian).

The solution proposed in Przepiórkowski (1996b; 1999a,b) is to resolve structural cases directly within arg-st, via local principles operating at the level of category of a word (where both head information and argument structure information – but not constituent structure – are available) rather than at the level of phrase. This seems to bring back the problem, discussed in connection with the Icelandic data above, of raised arguments, which occur on a number of arg-st lists. The innovation of Przepiórkowski (1996b; 1999a,b) is the proposal to mark, within arg-st, whether a given argument is realised locally (either tree-configurationally, or as a gap to be extracted higher on, or as an affix) or not. If it is realised locally, it may be assigned appropriate case; if it is not (because it is raised), its structural case must be resolved higher up. On this setup, the above constraints (12)–(13) responsible for the assignment of structural nominative and accusative are replaced with the following two constraints (and similarly for the
Obviously, for such constraints to work, values of ARG-ST must be lists of slightly more complex objects than synsem (these are now values of ARG within such more complex objects), and additional principles must make sure that values of REALIZED are instantiated properly (see Przepiórkowski 1999a: 78–79 for details).

The analysis of Przepiórkowski (1996b; 1999a,b) assumes that an argument is locally realised – and hence may be assigned structural case – if and only if it is not raised to a higher argument structure. Meurers (1999a,b), on the basis of empirical observations in Haider (1990), Grewendorf (1994) and Müller (1997), shows that this assumption does not always hold in German; rather, structural case should be assigned to arguments on the basis of whether they are raised or not, and not whether they are locally realised or not. Consider the following data (Meurers 1999a: 294):

(17) a. [Ein Außenseiter gewinnen] wird hier nie.
   an.NOM outsider win.INF will here never
   ‘An outsider will never win here.’

   b. [Einen Außenseiter gewinnen] läßt Gott hier nie.
   an.ACC outsider win.INF lets god here never
   ‘God never lets an outsider win here.’

Assuming that fronted fragments, marked with square brackets, are single constituents,\(^5\) the subject of gewinnen ‘win’ forms a constituent with this verb, i.e.,

\(^4\)The antecedents of such principles could be further constrained to apply to words only. As usual, ‘⊕’ indicates concatenation of lists.

\(^5\)This assumption is not completely uncontroversial; see Kiss (1994: 100–101) for apparent counterexamples and Müller (2003; 2005; 2017) for a defense of this assumption.
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it has the same configurational realisation in both examples. Hence, configurational case assignment principles should assign it the same case in both instances, contrary to facts: ein Außenseiter occurs in the nominative in (17a) and einen Außenseiter bears the accusative case in (17b). As argued by Meurers (1999a,b), the reason is that – although the subject is realised locally to its infinitival head – it is in some sense raised further to the subject position of the auxiliary wird in (17a) and to the object position of the Acl verb läßt in (17b), hence the difference in cases. This suggests that structural case should be assigned not where the argument is realised, but on the highest ARG-ST on which it occurs. A corresponding modification of the non-configurational case assignment approach of Przepiórkowski (1996b; 1999a,b) – replacing the [REALIZED +] with [RAISED −] in constraints such as (15)–(16) and providing appropriate constraints on values of RAISED − is proposed in Przepiórkowski (1999a: 93–95); see also Müller (2013), Section 17.4 (and references therein) for further improvements.

While this non-configurational approach to syntactic case assignment was motivated largely by the need to capture complex interactions in a precise way, it turns out to formalise sometimes apparently contradictory intuitions expressed in various approaches to case. First of all, it preserves the common intuition that case is a local phenomenon, an intimate relation between a head and its dependents. Second, it successfully formalises the distinction between structural and inherent/lexical case known from the transformational literature of the 1980s, and non-configurally encodes the apparently configurational principles of structural case assignment. Third, while most HPSG literature on case is concerned with syntactic phenomena in European languages, this approach has been extended to case stacking known, e.g., from languages of Australia and case attraction observed, e.g., in Classical Armenian and in Gothic (Malouf 2000). Fourth, by allowing antecedents of implicational constraints such as (15)–(16) to be local objects, not just syntactic categories, semantic factors influencing case assignment may also be taken into account, as in differential case marking, repeatedly considered in Lexical Functional Grammar (cf., e.g., Butt & King 2003 and references therein), but apparently not (so far) in HPSG. Fifth, as pointed out in Przepiórkowski (1999a,b), the above approach to case formalises the “case tier” intuition of Zaenen et al. (1985), Yip et al. (1987) and Maling (1993) (see also Maling 2009).

Let us illustrate the last point with some Finnish data from Maling (1993):

(18) a. Liisa muisti matkan vuoden.
   Liisa.NOM remembered trip.ACC year.ACC
   ‘Liisa remembered the trip for a year.’
b. Lapsen täytyy lukea kirja kolmannen kerran.
   child.gen must read book.gen [third time].acc
   'The child must read the book for a third time.'

c. Kekkoseen luotettiin yksi kerta.
   Kekkonen.ill trust.passp [one time].nom
   'Kekkonen was trusted once.'

d. Kekkoseen luotettiin yhden kerran yksi vuosi.
   Kekkonen.ill trust.passp [one time].acc [one year].nom
   'Kekkonen was trusted for one year once.'

Maling (1993) argues at length that some adjuncts (adverbials of measure, duration and frequency) behave just like objects with respect to case assignment and, in particular, notes the following generalization about syntactic case assignment: only one NP dependent of the verb receives the nominative, namely the one which has the highest grammatical function; other dependents receive the accusative.6 Thus, if none of the arguments bears inherent case, the subject is in the nominative and other dependents are in the accusative, cf. (18), but if the subject bears an idiosyncratic case, it is the object that gets the nominative, cf. (18b). Furthermore, if all arguments (if any) bear inherent case, the next “available” grammatical function is that of an adjunct, thus one of the adjuncts receives the nominative, cf. (18c)–(18d).

Given such facts, Maling (1993) claims that syntactic case is assigned in Finnish on the basis of grammatical hierarchy and that (at least some) adjuncts belong to this hierarchy. Moreover, as evidenced by (18c)–(18d), adjuncts do not form a single class in this hierarchy: although the multiplicative adverbial yksi kerta is nominative in (18c), this case is won over by the duration adverbial in (18d). Taking into consideration also the partitive of negation facts (measure adverbials, but not duration or frequency adverbials, behave like direct objects in the sense that they take partitive case under sentential negation), Maling (1993) extends the grammatical function hierarchy for Finnish in the following way:

(19)  SUBJ > OBJ > MEASURE > DURATION > FREQUENCY

While these generalisations are developed in the context of Lexical Functional Grammar, it is not clear how they could be encoded in LFG: there are no formal mechanisms for stating such a hierarchy of grammatical functions and, addition-

---

6See also Zaenen & Maling (1983) and Zaenen et al. (1985) for a similar generalisation with respect to Icelandic.
ally, all adjuncts are assumed to be elements of an unordered set.\(^7\) On the other hand, given the “adjuncts as complements” approach of Bouma et al. (2001) and others, upon which at least some adjuncts are added to \textsc{arg-st} (perhaps renamed to \textsc{deps}), and assuming – as is standard in HPSG – that \textsc{arg-st} elements satisfy the obliqueness hierarchy, formalisation of the “case tier” approach is easy and consists of two implicational principles similar to (15)–(16). The first principle resolves the first structurally-cased element of extended \textsc{arg-st} to nominative, whether this element is the first element of \textsc{arg-st} or not (it is not in the case of (18b)–(18d)), and whether it corresponds to the subject, the direct object or an adjunct. The second principle resolves the structural case of all subsequent elements, if any, to accusative.

### 3 Case syncretism and neutrality

Another important strand of HPSG work on case concerns situations in which a single syncretic form seems to simultaneously bear two (or more) case values, as in the following examples involving coordination, free relatives and parasitic gaps:

(20) Polish coordination (Dyła 1984: 701–702):

a. Kogo Janek lubi a Jerzy
   who.acc/gen Janek.nom likes(obj.acc) and Jerzy.nom
   nienawidzi?
   hates(obj.gen)
   ‘Who does Janek like and Jerzy hate?’

b. * Co Janek lubi a Jerzy
   what.nom/acc Janek.nom likes(obj.acc) and Jerzy.nom
   nienawidzi?
   hates(obj.gen)
   Intended: ‘What does Janek like and Jerzy hate?’

(21) English coordination (Goodall 1987: 70; Levine et al. 2001: 206):

This is the man who_I.nom/acc Robin saw e_I.acc and thinks e_I.nom is handsome.

(22) German coordination (Pullum & Zwicky 1986: 764–765):

\(^7\)But see Przepiórkowski (2016) for an attempt to introduce a single ordered list of dependents and formalise the functional hierarchy in LFG.
a. Er findet und hilft
   he.NOM finds(OBJ.ACC) and helps(OBJ.DAT)
   Frauen.
   women.NOM/ACC/GEN/DAT
   ‘He finds and helps women.’

b. * Sie findet und hilft Männer.
   she.NOM finds(OBJ.ACC) and helps(OBJ.DAT) men.NOM/ACC/GEN
   Intended: ‘She finds and helps men.’

c. * Sie findet und hilft Männern.
   she.NOM finds(OBJ.ACC) and helps(OBJ.DAT) men.DAT
   Intended: ‘She finds and helps men.’

(23) German free relatives (Groos & van Riemsdijk 1981: 212):

Was du mir gegeben hast, ist
given(OBJ.ACC) have is(SUBJ.NOM)
prächtig.

‘What you have given to me is wonderful.’

(24) English parasitic gaps (Hukari & Levine 1996: 482; Levine et al. 2001: 205):

Robin is someone who even good friends of e_i.ACC believe
e_i.NOM should be closely watched.

In (20a), the fronted syncretic accusative/genitive form kogo ‘who’ satisfies the requirements of the two coordinated verbal constituents: in one, lubi ‘likes’ requires an accusative object, and in the other, nienawidzi ‘hates’ expects a genitive object. A form which is not syncretic between (at least) these two cases cannot occur in the place of kogo; this is illustrated in (20b), where the element putatively shared by the two verbal constituents is syncretic between accusative and nominative, rather than accusative and genitive. The English example (21) is similar and involves the relative pronoun who, syncretic between accusative and nominative. The well-known example (22) illustrates essentially the same phenomenon in German: the form Frauen ‘women’, which is fully syncretic with respect to case, simultaneously satisfies the accusative requirement of findet ‘finds’ and the dative requirement of hilft ‘helps’. By contrast, this joint requirement is not satisfied either by Männer, which is accusative (among other cases) but not dative, or by Männern, which is dative but not accusative. The other two examples show that this phenomenon is not restricted to coordination. In (23), the
syncretic form was ‘what’ simultaneously satisfies the constraint that the object of *gegeben* ‘given’ is accusative and that the subject of *ist* ‘is’ is nominative. Similarly, the extracted *who* in (24) seems to simultaneously bear the accusative case assigned by the preposition *of* and the nominative case of the subject of *should*.

Such examples were at one point considered problematic not only for HPSG, but for unification-based theories in general (Ingria 1990). The reason is that, on the straightforward approach to case, they should all be ungrammatical. For example, in the case of (22a), the assignment of the accusative to the object of *findet* ‘finds’ should clash with the assignment of the dative to the object of *hilft* ‘helps’, as both objects are realised by the same noun *Frauen* ‘women’. In other words, the attempt to unify accusative and dative should fail.

The solution first proposed by Levine et al. (2001: 207–208) is to enrich the case hierarchy in such a way that the unification of two different morphological cases does not necessarily result in failure. Specifically, assuming that nominative and accusative are structural cases in English, they propose the part of the structural case hierarchy shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Case hierarchy for English encoding case syncretism](image)

Particular nominal forms are specified in the lexicon as either pure accusative (*p-acc*), pure nominative (*p-nom*) or syncretic between the two (*p-nom-acc*):

(25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal Form</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>[CASE <em>p-nom</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him</td>
<td>[CASE <em>p-acc</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whom</td>
<td>[CASE <em>p-acc</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td>[CASE <em>p-nom-acc</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>[CASE <em>p-nom-acc</em>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, heads – or constraints of a case principle of the kind presented in the previous section – specify particular arguments as *nom* or *acc*. So,

---

8 See Ingria (1990: 196) for an earlier implementation of roughly the same idea in the context of unification grammars.

9 Type names follow the convention in Daniels (2002), for increased uniformity with the remainder of this section.
in the case of the parasitic gap example (24), the acc requirement associated with the preposition of and the nom requirement on the subject of should are not incompatible: their unification results in p-nom-acc and the shared dependent may be any form compatible with this case value, e.g., who (but not whom). Examples (20)–(23) can be handled in a similar way.

A situation often perceived as dual to such case neutrality, sometimes called “case underspecification”, occurs when a head specifies the case of its dependent disjunctively and may combine with a coordinate structure containing phrases in both cases, e.g.:

(26)  

a. Polish (Przepiórkowski 1999a: 175):

Dajcie wina i całą świnię!
give wine.gen and whole.acc pig.acc
'Serve (some) wine and a whole pig!'

b. Russian (Levy 2001: 11):

Včera večer'den' on proždal svoju podrugu Irinu
yesterday all day he expected self's.acc girlfriend.acc
i zvonka ot svoego brata Grigorija.
and call.gen from self's brother Grigory
'Yesterday he waited all day for his girlfriend Irina and for a call from his brother Grigory.'

In Polish, the object of the verb dajcie ‘give’ is normally in the accusative, but may also be realised as the genitive, when its meaning is partitive; in (26a), the object is a coordination of such a genitive noun wina ‘(some) wine’ and the accusative całą świnię ‘whole pig’. Similarly, according to Levy 2001, the Russian verb proždal ‘awaited’ may combine with accusative or genitive, and in (26b) it happily combines with a coordinate phrase containing both.

If such “accusative and genitive” coordinate phrases bear case at all, the value of this grammatical category must be something like acc+gen. Note that this situation differs from case neutrality discussed above: a syncretic case such as p-acc-gen intuitively corresponds to intersection: a nominal bearing this case is accusative and genitive at the same time. On the other hand, the intuition behind acc+gen is that of union: a (coordinated) nominal with this case value has accusative elements and genitive elements, so it may fill a position disjunctively specified as requiring accusative or genitive. However, acc+gen coordinate phrases cannot fill either purely accusative positions (because such phrases contain genitive – i.e., non-accusative – conjuncts), or purely genitive positions (be-
cause of accusative – i.e., non-genitive – conjuncts), or positions simultaneously specified as accusative and genitive, as in (20) above (for both reasons).

This duality is a feature of the Categorial Grammar approach to case and coordination of Bayer (1996) (see also Bayer & Johnson 1995) and the corresponding HPSG analyses were presented in Levy (2001) and Levy & Pollard (2002), as well as in Daniels (2002). As noted in Levy & Pollard (2002: 233), the two HPSG approaches are isomorphic. The main technical difference is that the relevant case hierarchies are construed outside of the usual HPSG type hierarchy in the approach of Levy (2001) and Levy & Pollard (2002), but they are fully integrated in the approach of Daniels (2002). For this reason, and also because it is the basis of some further HPSG work (e.g., Crysmann 2005), this latter approach is presented below.

Intuitively, just as the common subtype of acc and nom, i.e., p-nom-acc in Figure 2, represents forms which are simultaneously accusative and nominative, the common supertype, i.e., case, which should perhaps be renamed to nom+acc, should represent coordinate structures involving nominative and accusative conjuncts. However, given that all objects are assumed to be sort-resolved in standard HPSG, saying that the case of a coordinate structure is case (or nom+acc) is paramount to saying that it is either p-acc (pure accusative), or p-nom-acc (syncretic nominative/accusative), or p-nom (pure nominative). One solution is to “make a simple change to the framework’s foundational assumptions” (Sag 2003: 268) and to allow linguistic objects to bear non-maximal types. This is proposed and illustrated in detail in Sag (2003). A more conservative solution, proposed in Daniels (2002), is to add dedicated maximal types to all such non-maximal types; for example, the hierarchy in Figure 2 is modified as shown in Figure 3. Apart from the trivial renaming of case to the more explicit nom+acc, a maximal type corresponding to this renamed non-maximal type is added here, namely, p-nom+acc.

Let us illustrate this approach with the two Polish examples (20a) and (26a),
repeated below as (27a)–(27b):

(27) a. Kogo Janek lubi a Jerzy nienawidzi?
   who.acc/gen Janek.nom likes(obj.acc) and Jerzy.nom hates(obj.gen)
   'Who does Janek like and Jerzy hate?'

b. Dajcie wina i całą świnię!
   give wine.gen and whole.acc pig.acc
   'Serve (some) wine and a whole pig!'

As these examples involve accusative and genitive, I will assume that the complete case hierarchy contains a subhierarchy such as that in Figure 3 above, but with all occurrences of nom replaced by gen as in Figure 4.

![Case (sub)hierarchy encoding accusative/genitive syncretism and underspecification](diagram)

First of all, heads subcategorise for (or relevant case principles specify) “non-pure” cases, i.e., acc, gen, gen+acc, etc., but not p-acc, p-gen, p-gen+acc, etc. For example, lubi ‘likes’ and nienawidzi ‘hates’ in (27a) expect their objects to have the case values acc and gen, respectively. Moreover, dajcie ‘give’ in (27b) specifies the case of its object as gen+acc. On the other hand, nominal dependents bear “pure” cases. For example, kogo ‘who’ in (27a) is lexically specified as p-gen-acc. Similarly to the analysis of the English parasitic gap example above, this neutralised case is compatible with both specifications: acc and gen.

The analysis of (27b) is a little more complicated, as a new principle is needed to determine the case of a coordinate structure. The two conjuncts, wina ‘wine’ and całą świnię ‘whole pig’, have – by virtue of lexical specifications of their head nouns – the case values p-gen and p-acc, respectively. Now, the case value of the coordination is determined as follows: take the “non-pure” versions of the cases of all conjuncts (here: gen and acc), find their (lowest) common supertype (here: gen+acc), and assign to the coordinate structure the “pure” type corresponding to this common supertype (here: p-gen+acc). This way the coordinate structure in (27b) ends up with the case value p-gen+acc, which is compatible with the gen+acc requirement posited by the verb dajcie (or by an appropriate principle...
of structural case assignment). Obviously, a purely accusative, purely genitive or accusative/genitive neutralised object would also satisfy this requirement.

One often-perceived – both within and outside of HPSG – problem with this approach is that it leads to very complex type hierarchies for case and rather inelegant constraints (Sag 2003: 272, Dalrymple et al. 2009: 63–66). Let us, following Daniels (2002), simplify the presentation of type hierarchies such as that in Figure 3, by removing all those “pure” types which are only needed to represent some non-maximal types as maximal as in Figure 5. Hence, the representation

```
nom+acc

acc  nom

nom-acc
```

Figure 5: Simplified case (sub)hierarchy encoding nominative/accusative syncretism and underspecification

in this figure corresponds to seven types shown explicitly in Figure 3 (each non-maximal type in Figure 5 has an additional p-type, while the maximal nom-acc in Figure 5 is the same as p-nom-acc in Figure 3). What would a similar hierarchy for three morphological cases look like? Daniels (2002: 143) provides the visualisation in Figure 6, involving 18 nodes corresponding to 35 types in the full type hierarchy. As mentioned in Levy & Pollard (2002: 225), the size of such a type hierarchy grows double exponentially with the number of grammatical cases, so it would already be next to impossible to visualise such a hierarchy for German, with its four cases, not to mention Polish with its seven cases or Finno-Ugric languages with around 15 cases. And matters are further complicated by the fact that sometimes form syncretism simultaneously involves a number of grammatical categories, so perhaps such type hierarchies should combine case information with person, gender and number (Daniels 2002: 145, Crysmann 2005), and by the fact that coordinated elements may be specified for different categories (e.g., an NP specified for case may be coordinated with a sentence), in which case it is not clear what categories should be borne by the coordinate structure as a whole (see, e.g., the inconclusive fn. 10 in Sag 2003: 277).

After the early 2000s, such complex case hierarchies do not appear in HPSG work. A possible reason for this is the increasing popularity of ellipsis-based accounts of various coordinate constructions, including unlike category coordination cases, of which the “case underspecification” examples (26a)–(26b) may
be seen as special cases. Such ellipsis accounts are usually formulated within the linearisation approach of Reape (1992; 1994) and Kathol (1995), and they have been claimed to deal with some of the cases discussed in this section, e.g., by Crysmann (2008), Beavers & Sag (2004), and Chaves (2006; 2008). However, such linearisation-based approaches to coordination have more recently come under attack: see Levine (2011) and Kubota & Levine (2015) (as well as Yatabe 2012; 2016 and, especially, Yatabe & Tam 2018 for a defence of ellipsis-based accounts of some cases of coordination). Hence, it is difficult to predict at the moment whether ellipsis-based analyses will permanently remove the need for complex type hierarchies modelling neutralisation and underspecification in coordination. But even if they do, some of the examples given at the beginning of this section, namely (23)–(24), demonstrate that feature neutrality is not limited to coordinate structures, but also occurs at least in free relatives and multiple gapping, so case hierarchies of the kind illustrated in Figure 2, with separate types representing syncretic cases, are still needed in contemporary HPSG, regardless of the analysis of coordination; an example of a more recent analysis which does

---

10 Another HPSG approach to unlike category coordination which obviates the need for such complex hierarchies is that of Yatabe (2004), according to which the – perhaps disjunctive or underspecified – requirements of the head independently distribute to all conjuncts, in a manner similar to (but more general than) distributivity within coordinate structures assumed in LFG (Dalrymple & Kaplan 2000; Dalrymple et al. 2009; Przepiörkowski & Patejuk 2012).
assume such a case hierarchy (to account for gapping and resumptive pronouns in Modern Standard Arabic) is Alotaibi & Borsley (2013).\textsuperscript{11}

4 Other HPSG work on case

Apart from the two clearly identifiable strands of HPSG work described in the two preceding sections, there are also single papers concerned with various theoretical and implementational aspects of grammatical case. Of these, the report by Drellishak (2008) on modelling complex case phenomena in the Grammar Matrix (Bender et al. 2002) has the widest typological scope. It describes the treatment of various case systems in the multilingual platform for implementing HPSG grammars: not only the pure nominative-accusative, ergative-absolutive and tripartite systems, but also systems with various types of split ergativity, systems – known from Austronesian languages, including Tagalog – in which case marking interacts with focus marking, and so-called “direct-inverse” systems, exemplified by Algonquian languages, in which case marking partially depends on the hierarchies – or scales – of nominal phrases, e.g., based on person and/or animacy. Similarly to the non-configurational case assignment principles discussed in Section 1 above, such systems are described – via constraints on specific lexical types – by specifying case values of elements on ARG-ST. Also, a typologically very interesting language, Nias, usually assumed to display the ergative-absolutive alignment but with the typologically exceptional property of marking the absolutive – rather than the ergative – case, is reanalysed as a nominative-accusative language in Crysmann (2009), with the sole argument of intransitive verbs mapped to the grammatical function of object, rather than subject.

Two other works mentioned here are concerned with two very different aspects of case systems of particular languages. Ryu (2013) investigates the issue of case spreading from an argument of a verb to certain nominal dependents of this argument in Korean. He investigates the semantic relations that must hold between the two nominals for such “case copying” to occur and proposes a repertoire of 16 semantic relations (collected in five coherent groups, further classified into two general classes) which make the spreading of the nominative possible, 10 of which (three of the five groups, one of the two classes) license the spreading of the accusative. On the syntactic side, the dependents of such nominal arguments are raised to become valency elements of the governing verbs. In

\textsuperscript{11}But see Crysmann (2017) for a reanalysis which does not need to refer to such a case hierarchy.
particular, dependents of the subject are raised to the \texttt{VAL|SUBJ} list, resulting in multiple valency subjects. Configurational case assignment rules constrain the value of case of each valency subject to nominative, and of each valency complement to accusative. The paper does not discuss the (im)possibility of formulating such case assignment rules non-configurationally, within local \texttt{ARG-ST} (or \texttt{DEPS}), but the challenge for the non-configurational case assignment seems to be the fact that multiple argument structure elements may correspond to valency subjects (and multiple to valency complements), so – looking at the argument structure alone – it is not immediately clear how many initial elements of this list should be assigned the nominative case, and which final elements should get the accusative.

Finally, a very different aspect of Hungarian case is investigated in Thuilier (2011), namely, whether case affixes should be distinguished from postpositions and, if so, where to draw the line. In Hungarian, postpositions behave in some respect just like case affixes (e.g., they do not allow any intervening material between them and the nominal phrase), which has led some researches to deny the existence of this distinction. Thuilier (2011) shows that, in this case, the traditional received wisdom is right, and that case affixes and postpositions differ in a number of morphological and syntactic ways. The proposed tests suggest that the essive element \texttt{ként}, normally considered to be a case affix, should be reanalysed as a postposition, thus establishing the number of Hungarian cases as 16. The resulting analysis of Hungarian case affixes and postpositions is couched within Sign-Based Construction Grammar (Boas & Sag 2012).

In summary, while HPSG is perhaps not best known for its approach to grammatical case, it does offer a range of interesting accounts of a variety of case-related phenomena in diverse languages ranging from German, Icelandic and Polish through Finnish and Hungarian to Korean and Nias; it provides perhaps the only formal implementation of the influential “case tier” idea; and it successfully captures somewhat conflicting intuitions concerning the locality of case assignment.
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