C, T, and Case/Agreement:
A Unified Analysis of Finite and Nonfinite Clauses

Tomoyuki TANAKA

This paper argues that C is a locus of Case/agreement and the C-T configuration is responsible for Case assignment to the subject of both finite and nonfinite clauses. Mainly drawing upon English data, it is first shown that T with the complete set of ø-features is both insufficient and unnecessary for Case assignment to subjects, as opposed to the standard analysis of Chomsky (2000, 2001). Especially relevant for the proposed system of Case/agreement are nonfinite clauses with nominative subjects, which are argued to be licensed under the C-T configuration where a finite C is merged with TP whose head is ø-incomplete. Consequently, the proposed system leads to a unified analysis of Case/agreement in finite and nonfinite clauses, where the subjects are uniformly licensed under the C-T configuration with different Case realizations (nominative vs. accusative) depending on the properties of C as a probe.

1. Introduction

This paper is a revised and extended version of Tanaka (2003), which was an attempt to pursue and elaborate the lines of research suggested by Chomsky (2004a) that C is a locus of Case/agreement. Contrary to the standard assumption that T is the only element responsible for Case/agreement licensing of subjects (Chomsky 2000, 2001), that paper provided several arguments that both T and C are operating elements, proposing the novel system of Case/agreement based on the C-T configuration. One of the key assumptions is that C bears uninterpretable ø-features and enters into a checking relation with the subject in [Spec, TP], deleting its Case feature. Under the proposed system, the derivation of a finite clause will proceed as follows, concentrating on Case/agreement licensing of its subject:

(1) John read the book.
  a. [$_{TP}$ T [$_{vP}$ John [$_{v'}$ v [$_{VP}$ read the book]]]]
  b. [$_{TP}$ John$_i$ [$_{T'}$ T [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{v'}$ v [$_{VP}$ read the book]]]]]
  c. [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ John$_i$ [$_{T'}$ T [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{v'}$ v [$_{VP}$ read the book]]]]]]

At the stage (1a) in the derivation where T is merged with vP, the uninterpretable ø-features of T agree with the interpretable ø-features of *John*, deleting the former. Unlike the system of Chomsky (2000, 2001), the Case feature of *John* is not deleted under agreement with T, because all operations including feature deletion/valuation on DP can only be effected by a phase head, i.e. by C under the C-T configuration in this case. Therefore, the Case feature of *John* remains intact under agreement with T at the stage (1a), so that it can determine *John* as a phrase undergoing movement. This in turn allows *John* to raise to [Spec, TP] to satisfy

the EPP feature of T, leading to the stage (1b). Finally, at the stage (1c) where C is merged with TP, the uninterpretable ø-features of C agree with the interpretable ø-features of *John*, deleting the former and the Case feature of *John*.[1]

The following two sections of this paper are devoted to reviewing the arguments provided by Tanaka (2003) for the hypothesis that C is a locus of Case/agreement in finite and infinitival clauses. Then, English gerundive clauses are discussed at length that might at first appear challenging to the system of Case/agreement just reviewed. However, they turn out to be in its favor under a proper understanding of the structure of gerundive clauses, which is achieved by examining their behavior in early stages of English. As a net result of this paper, a unified Case/agreement licensing mechanism of subjects in finite and nonfinite clauses is suggested where different morphological realizations of Case (nominative vs. accusative) depend on the properties of C as a probe.

2. Finite Clauses

This section presents some pieces of evidence that C is a locus of Case/agreement in finite clauses.

2.1. C as a Locus of Agreement

Direct evidence for C as a locus of agreement in finite clauses comes from complementizer agreement in some of the Germanic languages (see Zwart 1997 for a good overview of this phenomenon). This is illustrated in the following paradigm from West Flemish, where the complementizer appears with the subject agreement morphology (as well as the subject clitic on its right):

(2) a. da-n-k   ik   komen
         that-1SG-CL   I   come-1SG
     b. da-ø-j   gie   komt
         that-2SG-CL   you come-2SG
     c. da-t-j   ij   komt
         that-3SG-CL   he   come-3SG
     d. da-ø-se   zij   komt [ø<t]
         that-3SG-CL   she come-3SG
     e. da-ø-me   wunder komen [ø<n]
         that-1PL-CL   we   come-1PL
     f. da-ø-j   gunder komt [ø<t]
         that-2PL-CL   you   come-2PL
     g. da-n-ze   zunder komen
         that-3PL-CL   they   come-3PL   (Zwart 1997: 138)

The present system of Case/agreement provides a straightforward account of complementizer agreement, in that it is simply an overt realization of the uninterpretable ø-features of C valued under agreement with the subject in [Spec, TP] (see Carstens 2003 for basically the

same analysis of complementizer agreement in terms of the split CP structure proposed by Rizzi 1997).

2.2. C-T as a Locus of Nominative Case

In contrast, it seems rather difficult to find evidence that not only T but also C have to do with nominative Case assignment in finite clauses, given the assumption that finite clauses are CPs regardless of whether they are root or embedded clauses. This assumption is motivated by the fact that finite clauses bear some kinds of illocutionary force, such as declarative, directive, exclamative, interrogative, etc., and it is generally agreed that C is a locus of illocutionary force (Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001, 2004a and Haegeman and Guéron 1999). Therefore, normal finite clauses are taken to involve both T and C, so it is unlikely that they provide evidence that independently of T, C is relevant for nominative Case assignment. However, under the present system of Case/agreement where the C-T configuration is a prerequisite for Case assignment to subjects, nominative Case assignment is predicted to be impossible in reduced finite clauses that lack either T or C. Two arguments from English are provided for this prediction in the remainder of this subsection.

2.2.1. Where C is Present and T is Absent

Let us consider reduced finite clauses that are analyzed as CPs lacking T. One such case comes from gapping and similar constructions in English observed by Siegel (1987). Consider the meaning contrast between (3) and (4):

(3)   Ward can't eat caviar and his guest, beans.
(4)   Ward can't eat caviar and his guest eat dried beans.   (Siegel 1987: 53)

(3), a gapping construction where the modal and the lexical verb are elided in the second conjunct, has two readings. In one reading, there are two separate allergies: 'Ward can't eat caviar and his guest can't eat beans.' This is a preferred reading that Siegel calls the narrow scope reading, where *can't* only has scope over the first conjunct. Note that this reading could be obtained by adding *can't* to the second conjunct, which would imply that gapping constructions like (3) typically involve a null modal in T (or have a modal literally deleted in the phonological component). In the other reading, 'it is not possible or fair for Ward to eat caviar and (at the same time) for his guest to be eating (only) beans.' Here, *can't* has scope over both the first and second conjuncts; this represents a marginal reading that Siegel calls the wide scope reading, which could not be obtained simply by adding *can't* to the second conjunct in (3).

On the other hand, it is remarkable that (4), a construction similar to (3) that I will tentatively call "gapping" construction, where the modal is elided but the lexical verb is stranded in the second conjunct, has only the wide scope reading. As just mentioned, since the wide scope reading could not be obtained simply by adding the elided modal to the second conjunct, the absence of the narrow scope reading in (4) would lead us to assume that "gapping" constructions do not involve T as a locus of a null or elided modal. Therefore, the structure of (4) would be roughly as follows, where the second conjunct is a category of CP

that lacks T with the subject in [Spec, vP]:

(5)   [$_{CP}$ [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ Ward can't [$_{vP}$ eat caviar]]] and [$_{CP}$ [$_{vP}$ his guest eat dried beans]]]

Since finite clauses are CPs as discussed above, the second conjunct in (4) must be a CP, given the standard assumption that categorial identity is imposed on coordinated elements.[2]

If these arguments are on the right track, "gapping" constructions like (4) instantiate a context in which C is present and T is absent. As correctly predicted by the present system of Case/agreement, when "gapping" constructions involve a pronominal subject in the second conjunct, it cannot appear in the nominative form, but only in the accusative form:

(6)   We can't eat caviar and him/*he eat dried beans.   (ibid.: 61–2)

Since "gapping" constructions lack T, the nominative subject in (6) cannot enter into a checking relation with T, leading the derivation to crash. According to Schütze (2001), such a situation can be salvaged in English by assigning default accusative Case to the relevant DP in a number of constructions including "gapping". One again, it should be stressed that "gapping" constructions like (6) provide support for the present system of Case/agreement; especially, they suggest that agreement with T is a necessary step for nominative Case assignment.

2.2.2. Where C is Absent and T is Present

Next, let us consider reduced finite clauses that are analyzed as TPs lacking C, which will provide a testing ground for the present system of Case/agreement featuring the roles of C. Directly relevant for this issue will be subject omission in English finite clauses. Unlike null subject languages like Italian, English generally does not allow subject omission in finite clauses. However, a series of recent studies by Haegeman and others (Haegeman 1997, Haegeman and Guéron 1999, and Haegeman and Ihsane 1999, 2001) show that subject omission is possible in English finite clauses in a certain range of registers, including informal spoken English and written English; the latter includes diaries, short notes, e-mail messages, and so on, where the limitation of length and/or the pressure of economy lead to some sort of abbreviated style:

(7)   a. Can't understand you newspaper chaps. (spoken)
      b. Contains no carotene. (short note)   (Haegeman and Guéron 1999: 615)
      c. Katharine Goodson came up to say they would be late. Kissed me. Asked after
         me and everybody. (diary)   (ibid.: 614)

One of the interesting properties of English "null" subjects is that they can only appear in root clauses, where they must occupy the left periphery, as shown in (7) and (8):

(8)   a. I think *(I) must read Dante of a morning. (Woolf 37)
      b. Ought *(I) to resign? (Woolf 17)
      c. What will *(I) write? (Woolf 40)   (ibid.: 617)
      d. I don't know when *(I) will come back. (Woolf)

e. This story *(I) repeated to Duncan last night. (Woolf 9)
f. Never have *(I) worked so hard at any book. (Woolf 16)   (ibid.: 618)

It should be noticed that English "null" subjects are impossible in environments where CP is projected; what (8) show is that nominative Case assignment is obligatory in such environments. This will point to the relevance of C for nominative Case assignment and follow from the present system of Case/agreement. In environments like (8) where CP is projected, the C-T configuration values the Case feature of the subject as nominative. Since English, not being a null subject language, does not have a null argument that can bear nominative Case, that is, *pro*, the subject must be realized as a lexical DP. I will leave the exact nature of English "null" subjects for future research, but it would follow from the arguments above that they are Caseless null elements, because the absence of C implies that there is no Case assignment to "null" subjects in examples like (7). See section 5 for the possibility that PRO is analyzed along the similar lines, based on the assumption that control infinitives are TPs and therefore do not provide a prerequisite for Case assignment to their subjects. Anyway, subject omission in English finite clauses constitutes evidence that C is crucially involved in nominative Case assignment, and moreover, T with the complete set of ø-features does not participate in nominative Case assignment unless selected by C (see Chomsky 2004a and Tanaka 2003 for discussion of Balkan subjunctives that support the same conclusion).

3. Infinitival Clauses

This section presents some pieces of evidence that C is a locus of Case/agreement in infinitival clauses.

3.1. C as a Locus of Agreement

As in the case of finite clauses, direct evidence for C as a locus of agreement comes from complementizer agreement in infinitival clauses. As shown in (9), complementizer agreement is observed in Welsh infinitival clauses when the subject is pronominal. This is taken to be an overt realization of the uninterpretable ø-features of C valued under agreement with the subject in [Spec, TP]:

(9) a. Dywedodd Aled iddi   hi fynd.
         said   Aled C:3FEM.SG she go
         'Aled said that she had gone.'   (Tallerman 1998: 107)
     b. Dywedodd Mair iddo   fo fynd.
         said   Mair C:3MASC.SG he go
         'Mair said that he had gone.'
     c. Mae'n   angenrheidiol iddyn nhw fynd.
         is-PRED necessary   C:3PL they go
         'It is necessary for them to go.'   (ibid.: 118)

3.2. C-T as a Locus of Case
3.2.1. *For To* Infinitives in English

It is generally agreed that *for* as a complementizer assigns accusative Case to the subject of infinitival clauses like (10) (see Chomsky 1981 among others):

(10) It is important for John to read the book.

Concerning the roles of T (=*to*) in Case assignment in *for to* infinitives, Watanabe (1993) proposes that the *for to* complex checks accusative Case of their subjects in [Spec, AgrP] and *for* moves to C to eliminate an uninterpretable feature created in the process of accusative Case checking. Although I do not adopt his specific proposals, I will assume the following derivation of *for to* infinitives, following his lines of reasoning that both T and C are relevant for Case assignment to their subjects:

(11) a. [TP to [vP John [v′ v [VP read the book]]]]
     b. [TP John [T′ to [vP ti [v′ v [VP read the book]]]]]
     c. [CP for [TP John [T′ to [vP ti [v′ v [VP read the book]]]]]]

At the stage (11a) in the derivation where T (=*to*) is merged with vP, the ø-features of T agree with the ø-features of *John*, deleting the former. Note that the ø-features of T are incomplete, so that they cannot induce deletion of the Case feature of *John*. Therefore, it can determine *John* as a phrase undergoing movement, which in turn allows *John* to move to [Spec, TP] to satisfy the EPP feature of T, leading to the stage (11b). Then, at the stage (11c) where C (=*for*) is merged with TP, the ø-features of C agree with the ø-features of *John*, deleting the former and the Case feature of *John*.

Support for the relevance of both C and T for Case assignment in *for to* infinitives would come from the fact that omission of either *for* or *to* leads to ungrammaticality, as shown in (12):

(12) a. *It is important John to read the book.
     b. *It is important for John read the book.

The ungrammaticality of (12b) is not due to the fact that C does not select TP but vP, if the analysis in (5) is correct where C selects vP in the second conjunct of "gapping" constructions. Moreover, Schütze (2001) presents striking evidence from elliptical *for to* infinitives that *to* plays a crucial role in Case assignment to their subjects:

(13) a. For Mary to be the winner and us/*we to be the losers is unfair.

                                                        (Schütze 2001: 213)
     b. For Mary to be the winner and us/??we the losers is unfair.   (ibid.: 212)

In (13a), the presence of *to* serves to create the C-T configuration for accusative Case assignment to the subject of the second conjunct, in which *for* participates in an across-the-board manner. This has the effect of making nominative Case assignment totally impossible. In contrast, the nominative subject is marginally acceptable in (13b), which

indicates that the absence of *to* leads to a context with no Case assigners, thereby making default Case assignment at work. Without the C-T configuration, the subject of the second conjunct in (13b) is assigned accusative Case by default, unlike that in (13a). Therefore, these examples will provide another argument that agreement with T is necessary for accusative Case assignment in *for to* infinitives, even though it is incomplete.

3.2.2. Infinitives with Nominative Subjects in Early English[3]

This section examines at length a limited range of infinitives with nominative subjects attested in Middle and Modern English. Visser (1966) identifies several contexts in which infinitives take nominative subjects, among which the four major types in (14) are discussed here:

(14) a. subject (§905)
  thou to loue that loueth not the, is but grete foly
                         (Malory M. d'A (Sommer) 237. 16 / Visser 1966: 957)
  b. after *than* (§971)
  A heavier taske could not haue beene impos'd, Than *I* to speake my griefes vnspeakeable   (Shakesp. Com. Err. I. i. 31 / ibid.: 1027)
  c. exclamatory infinitive (§985)
  I to bere a childe that xal bere mannys blyss: ho mythe have joys more?
                         (Coventry Myst. viii. 77 / ibid.: 1048)
  d. absolute infinitive (§992-3)
  and if they may not accorde, *ze and I* to be umpere, for we stande bothe in like cas   (Paston Lett. (Gairdner) I. 120 / ibid.: 1055)

As is obvious, T with the complete set of ø-features is absent and hence simply irrelevant for nominative Case assignment in (14). Given that the infinitival T (=*to*) has never assigned nominative Case in the history of English (see Amano 1999 and Tanaka 2004), it might be conjectured that C is responsible for nominative Case assignment to the subject of infinitives like (14), in conformity with the present system of Case/agreement (though still assuming that agreement with T is a necessary step, as discussed in the preceding sections).

Let us consider the four types of infinitives in (14) to see that they are indeed CPs. First, topicalization may occur in infinitives as subjects and infinitives after *than*, as shown in (15a, b), respectively:

(15) a. [*hit* I to beleue] is but fantecy, Ne had I hir sain in the bath only
                         (Partenay (EETS) 3485 / ibid.: 957)
  b. It is better that we slee a coward than [*thorow a coward* alle we to be slayne]
                         (Malory M. d'A (Sommer) I. xvi. 60 / ibid.: 1027)

Assuming that topicalization involves movement to the CP domain, these examples will provide support for the CP status of the types of infinitives in (14a, b).

Next, the exclamatory infinitive in (14c) occurs in root clauses, expressing emotions like astonishment, incredulity, sorrow, longing, and so on. Like other root clauses, it seems to be

associated with some sort of illocutionary force, typically exclamative or interrogative. This is explicitly shown by the use of the exclamation mark in (16a) and the coordination with the interrogative clause that is reinforced by the use of the question mark in (16b):

(16) a. She, in spite of nature … To fall in love with what she fear'd to look on!

(Shakesp. Othello I. iii. 96 / ibid.: 1048)

b. Why am I made a stranger? Why that sigh, and [I not know the cause]?

(Otway Venice Preserved (Gollancz) III. ii. 83 / ibid.)

Given the assumption that C is a locus of illocutionary force (see subsection 2.2 and the references therein), this semantic property of the exclamatory infinitive would show that its category is CP.

Finally, the absolute infinitive in (14d) occurs in root clauses as well as embedded clauses, typically used as ordinances, wills, prescriptions, arrangements, contracts, and so on. As pointed out by Koma and Hirose (1993) and Visser (1966), it is sometimes accompanied by the complementizer *that*, as illustrated in the following examples of conditionals:

(17) a. yf they were not a (=in) powere to pay redy money, [*that* then they to fynd suffycyant surety to pay the money …]

(PL 182. 9–11 / Koma and Hirose 1993: 268)

b. yff he appyre not wyth-in vj monthys aftere the fyrst proclamacion, [*that* then he for to be depryvyd and the patron to present wham he luste];

(PL 183. 6–8 / ibid.)

Moreover, Koma and Hirose observe that the absolute infinitive may be coordinated with a finite clause involving a modal, arguing that it is associated with a modal interpretation:

(18) a. they shulde not pay no money … , and [he to saue them harmeles …]

(PL 225. 27–9 / ibid.: 267)

b. arguments to his conclusioun, That she on him wolde han compassioun, And [he to ben her man, whil he may dare]   (Chaucer Troil. I. 466 / Visser 1966: 1056)

Based on these observations, it seems plausible to assume that the absolute infinitive is a CP with the illocutionary force of declarative corresponding to that of a finite clause with a modal.

Thus, there is good reason that the types of infinitives in (14) with nominative subjects are CPs, where there is no T with the complete set of ø-features. This will lead us to conclude that C is responsible for nominative Case assignment, in accordance with the present system of Case/agreement. In particular, the fact that the exclamatory and absolute infinitives bear the sorts of illocutionary force typically associated with finite clauses would suggest the presence of a finite C as a nominative Case assigner. (It might be speculated that the same analysis also holds of infinitives with nominative subjects in Italian and European Portuguese briefly mentioned in note 3.)

In this connection, it seems worthwhile to touch upon the development of the types of infinitives in (14) in the history of English. Almost all the relevant examples provided

by Visser (1966) date from Late Middle English onwards. Their emergence in Late Middle English would be explained as follows in terms of the changes in the category and features of the infinitive marker *to* (Tanaka 2003, 2004). In Old and Early Middle English, *to* assigned dative/accusative Case as a preposition; therefore, infinitives with nominative subjects were simply impossible in these periods. With the shift from a preposition to a functional category T, *to* lost its Case assigning ability in Late Middle English, which served to create a configuration for nominative Case assignment by merging an infinitival TP with a finite C, yielding the types of infinitives with nominative subjects in (14). Then, with the introduction of *for* as a prepositional complementizer, the types of infinitives in (14a, b) were replaced by *for to* infinitives during Modern English where their subjects are assigned accusative Case under the C-T configuration (see subsection 3.2.1). On the other hand, the exclamatory and absolute infinitives in (14c, d) were not replaced by *for to* infinitives and have survived into Present-day English (perhaps as rhetorical devices), judging from Visser's (1966) collection of the relevant examples. This might be due to the fact that they bear the same sorts of illocutionary force as finite clauses, which would have helped the otherwise strange combination of an infinitival TP and a finite C to survive into Present-day English.

3.3. Summary

Summarizing the discussion so far, I have claimed that C is a locus of Case/agreement in finite and infinitival clauses, with the relevant evidence mainly from English data. In the course of arguing for C as a locus of Case/agreement, it became clear that T with the complete set of ø-feature is neither sufficient nor necessary for Case assignment to subjects. It is insufficient because there are cases where T bears the complete set of ø-features, but nominative Case is not assigned: English finite clauses with "null" subjects. It is also unnecessary because nominative Case is assigned in the absence of T with the complete set of ø-features in a limited range of infinitives in Middle and Modern English. Nevertheless, agreement with T is a necessary step for Case assignment to subjects, regardless of whether T bears the complete set of ø-features or not; this is evidenced by "gapping" constructions and *for to* infinitives in English. Finally, it was suggested that the presence of a finite C is crucial in nominative Case assignment.

4. Nominative Absolutes in English

This section discusses English gerundive clauses of the type illustrated in (19) where the subject appears in the nominative form, which are called "nominative absolutes":

(19) Elaine's winking at Roddy was fruitless, *he* being a confirmed bachelor.
<div align="right">(Reuland 1983: 101)</div>

Nominative absolutes constitute another case where nominative Case is assigned in the absence of T with the complete set of ø-features, strengthening the arguments in the preceding sections. However, a question will arise how nominative absolutes fit in with the present system of Case/agreement based on the C-T configuration. In fact, there are only

a few generative studies dealing with their categorial status and Case assignment to their subjects, two of which are briefly reviewed here.

First, Reuland (1983) claims that the category of nominative absolutes is S' (=CP), and nominative Case is assigned to their subjects by *-ing*, which is an INFL element specified as [–Tense, +Agr], under the condition that it is ungoverned. Second, Amano (1999) argues that nominative Case is assigned under a predication relation between the subject and the VP of nominative absolutes, which are small clauses with the structure [sc NP VP]. However, these analyses would predict that absolute gerundive clauses allow their lexical subjects to appear only in the nominative form as determined by their specific Case assignment rules just mentioned, but there indeed exist absolute gerundive clauses where the subject appears in the accusative form, as informal alternatives to nominative absolutes:

(20) They appointed Max, *him* being the only one who spoke Greek.
                                             (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1191)

Reuland suggests attributing the possibility of accusative subjects in absolute gerundive clauses to the general loss of morphological nominative Case for those speakers who accept examples like (20). However, the relation between the two is not entirely obvious because it is hard to imagine that such speakers do not allow nominative subjects at all, for example, in finite clauses. In fact, there seems to be a structural difference between nominative absolutes and "accusative absolutes" (an abbreviation for absolute gerundive clauses with accusative subjects, which is adopted here for the sake of convenience), which are discussed below in the light of some data from Middle and Modern English.

Now, let us examine the categorical status of nominative absolutes in detail. Although Reuland (1983) does not provide any arguments for his S' (=CP) analysis, there are some pieces of evidence that the category of nominative absolutes is CP at least until Modern English, contrary to Amano's (1999) small clause analysis. The following three arguments are based on the fact that operations targeting the CP domain may apply in nominative absolutes. First, lexical verbs as well as auxiliaries can precede nominative subjects in nominative absolutes of Middle and Modern English as illustrated in (21), which indicates that nominative absolutes are CPs to whose head position verb movement can occur:

(21) a. [*Seyng* Iuly this fals fortunite], The soroes great in hym so multiplied
                                             (Hardyng, Chron. B 37 / Visser 1966: 1154)
      b. [*Plesyng* yow to know of my welfare … at the makyng of thys letter] we wer in
           gode hele of body   (Paston Lett. (Gairdner) I. 84 / ibid.: 1157)
      c. the xxviij day of August …, [*being* there thanne a grete congregacion of people]
                                             (Paston Lett. (Gairdner) I. p. 13 / ibid.: 1161)

Judging from the large collection of the relevant examples provided by Visser (1966: §§1078-89), verb movement was optional in nominative absolutes of these periods and it seems to have been lost during the seventeenth century.[4] In fact, among eighty-eight examples of nominative absolutes collected from the investigation of *The Second Edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English* (PPCME2) (Kroch and Taylor 2000),

there are fourteen examples (15.9%) where the verb or auxiliary appears in front of the nominative subject. The positioning of subjects and verbs/auxiliaries in the relevant examples is summarized in (22). Incidentally, I have found twenty-one examples of absolute gerundive clauses with pronominal subjects (all of which do not involve verb movement to C); among them, nineteen examples involve nominative subjects and only two examples involve accusative subjects, indicating that accusative absolutes were infrequent in Middle English as well.

(22) *Positioning of Subjects (S) and Verbs/Auxiliaries (V/A) in Nominative Absolutes[5]*

	M1(1150–1250)	M2(1250–1350)	M3(1350–1420)	M4(1420–1500)	Total
S-V/A	4	14	2	54	74
V/A-S	1	0	7	6	14
Total	5	14	9	60	88

Second, the following examples would indicate that topicalization may apply in nominative absolutes of Middle and Modern English, with the italicized topic elements preceding the nominative subjects:

(23) a. But [*by his furtherance* such things being done], he is saied sometimes … to do them him selfe

(Th. Stapleton A Counterblast (Louvain 1567) 189v / ibid.: 1154)

b. [*At my comynge thedyr* God wyllynge] I shale cawse the sayd Hanggyns to be made (in Ellis Orig. Lett.; Ser. III. I. 234 / ibid.: 1157)

c. And [*aftirwarde* I beynge in the Tower, hauynge leaue to come to the Lieutenauntes table], I hearde hym saye …

(Latimer Sermons (Arber) 154 / ibid.: 1159)

It might be objected that these elements are not topicalized, but are base-generated in the left periphery of TP, since they are adjuncts. However, it seems obvious from the following examples that topicalization may indeed occur within nominative absolutes; in (24), the nominative subject is preceded by the locative and the direct object, respectively, which are arguments and hence cannot be base-generated in sentence-initial position. Moreover, these nominative absolutes look like verb second clauses due to the application of verb movement to C as well as topicalization. It would be more appropriate to analyze the nominative absolute in (24a) as involving locative inversion, but not verb second; if this is the case, a number of arguments have been adduced that locative inversion in English targets the CP domain (Coopmans 1989, Culicover 1991, and Nishihara 1999):

(24) a. at the drawe brygge there was a nothyr ryalle toure, [*there yn stondynge* iij empressys ryally arayde]

(Gregory's Chron. (ed. Gairdner, Camd. Soc.) p.173 / ibid.: 1152)

b. [*This report hearing* the Lady his wife], she would in no wise assent to lyve in his companye there (Edm. Campion Hist. Irel. (ed. Vossen) 103. 9. / ibid.: 1159)

Third, it is remarkable that there are a number of examples where *wh*-movement applies within nominative absolutes in Middle and Modern English; (25) contain subject, object, and adjunct *wh*-phrases, respectively, which are taken to occupy [Spec, CP]. Judging from the large collection of the relevant examples provided by Visser (1966: §§1078-89), nominative absolutes featuring *wh*-movement seems to have been lost during the eighteenth century:

(25) a. Lord Marney, [*who* making him no aunswere neyther], he seuerally asked the
        same question   (Harpsfield's Life of More (EETS) 32 / ibid.: 1153)
     b. [he] incloses the adverse ones in a bag, [*which* his companions untying], they are
        driven back again   (Pope, tr. Odyssey (World's Classics) X p.150 / ibid.: 1156)
     c. [*Where* the impression of mine eye infixing], Contempt his scornful perspective
        did lend me   (Shakesp. All's Well V. iii. 47 / ibid.: 1153)

Finally, it is worth pointing out that nominative absolutes may be coordinated with finite clauses in Middle, Modern, and even Present-day English (though some of the Present-day English examples are from Irish English), as observed by Visser (1966: §1089):

(26) a. What koude a sturby housbonde moore deuyse To preeve hire wyfhod and hir
        stedefastness, And [he continuynge ever in sturdinesse]?
                                                        (Chaucer C.T. E698 / ibid.: 1163)
     b. I envy people maunching peaches and grapes, and [I not daring to eat a bit]
                                                        (Swift Journ. to Stella 285 / ibid.)
     c. It's the life of a young man to be going on the sea, and who would listen to an
        old woman with one thing, and [she saying it over]?
                                            (Synge Riders to the Sea (Dublin 1922) p.37 / ibid.)

Since nominative absolutes normally can be paraphrased into finite subordinate clauses, it would be obvious that they are semantically equivalent to finite clauses. Examples like (26) will allow us to further argue that they are syntactically equivalent to finite clauses that are CPs, with which they share the same sorts of illocutionary force, as suggested on similar grounds for the absolute infinitive in subsection 3.2.2 (see (18)).

In sum, I have argued that the category of nominative absolutes is CP, which is supported by the facts that they may involve verb movement to C, topicalization, and *wh*-movement, and that they may be coordinated with finite clauses. Although most of the relevant arguments are from Middle and Modern English, the second property still holds of Present-day English, so that the CP analysis would be tenable for nominative absolutes of Present-day English as well. (Of course, it remains to be seen why the first property was lost during Modern English, with the result that operations targeting the CP domain are no longer observed in nominative absolutes of Present-day English.) If this is correct, nominative absolutes do not pose any problems for the present system of Case/agreement. On the contrary, they constitute another argument that nominative Case assignment is conducted under the C-T configuration where T with the complete set of ø-features is absent. Furthermore, the coordination facts in (26) might point to the roles of a finite C

in nominative Case assignment, as suggested for the exclamatory and absolute infinitives in subsection 3.2.2.

Finally, some comments are in order with regard to the categorical status of accusative absolutes and its consequences for Case assignment to their subjects. Surveying the examples of absolute gerundive clauses provided by Visser (1966: §§1078-89), I have found no examples of accusative absolutes that feature verb movement to C and *wh*-movement, whereas two examples are cited where topicalization seems to occur in accusative absolutes. However, both of them are from the works of Wycliffe, and moreover, they involve the same collocation *it him speaking*. It would therefore be possible to dismiss these examples as exceptional and limited to one of the Middle English writers who used them as formulae. Furthermore, Visser (1966: §1089) observes that examples of accusative absolutes coordinated with finite clauses were extremely rare in Middle and Modern English. Therefore, there seems to be little evidence that the category of accusative absolutes is CP; instead, they would be analyzed as TPs or vPs without the projections of C. Given this analysis, it follows that accusative Case assignment to their subjects is by default, in the absence of the C-T configuration necessary for nominative Case assignment (as well as external Case assigners).

5. Concluding Remarks

This paper has claimed, elaborating and extending the arguments provided by Tanaka (2003), that the C-T configuration is responsible for Case/agreement licensing of subjects in both finite and nonfinite clauses. Among the conclusions reached above should be mentioned the following that differentiate the present system of Case/agreement from the standard one advocated by Chomsky (2000, 2001). First, it was argued that T with the complete set of ø-features is not only insufficient but also unnecessary for Case assignment to subjects. Evidence for the former comes from English finite clauses with "null" subjects, where nominative Case is not assigned in the absence of C, while evidence for the latter comes from a limited range of infinitives and nominative absolutes in Middle and Modern English, where nominative Case is assigned perhaps due to the presence of a finite C. Nevertheless, it was shown that agreement with T is necessary for Case assignment to subjects (regardless of whether T is ø-complete or not), which is supported by "gapping" constructions and *for to* infinitives in English.

As a whole, this paper has provided a unified analysis of Case/agreement in finite and nonfinite clauses, where their subjects are licensed exactly in the same C-T configuration (apart from ECM subjects that are externally licensed by the matrix v). Under the present system of Case/agreement, the distinction between nominative and accusative Case can be attributed to the properties of the relevant probes, i.e. a finite C and a nonfinite prepositional C (=*for*), respectively. Along these lines, it might be argued that null Case is also assigned under the C-T configuration with a nonfinite nonprepositional C (which is phonologically null in English), in accord with Chomsky's (2000, 2001) CP analysis of control infinitives. Instead, under the TP analysis of control infinitives (Bošković 1997), PRO might be treated as a

Caseless null element that is identical to "null" subjects in English finite clauses discussed in subsection 2.2.2, which appears when the C-T configuration necessary for Case assignment is not available due to the lack of C (see the discussion at the end of section 2). In the latter view, however, the relation must be clarified between the use of Caseless null elements and default Case assignment, both of which seem to operate in similar configurations. The treatment of PRO will be one of the most important issues to be addressed in terms of the present system of Case/agreement, which lies beyond the scope of this paper.

Notes

1 Recently, Chomsky (2004b) proposes that C as a locus of Case/agreement assigns its uninterpretable ø-features to T, so that once a subject enters into a checking relation with T and raises to [Spec, TP], it is frozen with its Case feature deleted under agreement with T. However, it is difficult to see how this proposal can accommodate complementizer agreement facts discussed in subsections 2.1 and 3.1, which point to the existence of agreement between C and the subject in [Spec, TP].

2 Note that vP-coordination is independently excluded in (4); that would involve movement of *Ward* to [Spec, TP] only in the first conjunct, violating the Coordinate Structure Constraint under the across-the-board convention for rule application.

3 As is well-known, European Portuguese has infinitival clauses whose verbs are inflected for the ø-features of their subjects that are assigned nominative Case (Raposo 1987). At first sight, it might appear that T with the complete set of ø-features is responsible for nominative Case assignment in such infinitival clauses. But the presence of the infinitival T with the complete set of ø-features seems to be a language-particular property of European Portuguese that has nothing to do with nominative Case assignment, because nominative subjects are possible in infinitival clauses without subject agreement morphology on their verbs, as observed in Italian (Rizzi 1982) and Early English (see below). See also Mensching (2000) for a comprehensive survey of infinitival clauses with lexical subjects in the Romance languages, which support the same conclusion.

4 Italian also has absolute gerundive clauses, where the auxiliary must appear in front of the nominative subject, that is, verb movement to C is obligatory:

(i) a.*(?) Mario *avendo* accettato di aiutarchi, …
            Mario having accepted to help us
      b. *Avendo* Mario accettato di aiutarchi, …
            having Mario accepted to help us   (Rizzi 1982: 83)

That *Mario* in (i) is indeed assigned nominative Case is shown by the following example with the pronominal subject that is morphologically nominative:

(i) Essendo egli improvvisamente tornato   a casa, …
      having   he suddenly   come back home   (Rizzi 1997: 303)

5 Needless to say, the two examples of accusative absolutes just mentioned are excluded from (22); also excluded are three examples involving *unwitting*, whose sole argument sometimes appears as PP headed by *to* and therefore would be an indirect object, as Visser (1966: §1077) suggests. Note also that the five examples from M1 might not instantiate nominative absolutes because the earliest example with a pronominal subject that is morphologically nominative is from AYENBI (1340) in PPCME2 (though nominative absolutes were attested in several texts of Old English, as observed by Visser 1966: §1014). It remains to be seen whether these five examples are treated as nominative absolutes or accusative absolutes.

References

Amano, M. (1999) *On the Licensing of Linguistic Elements: Verbs, Noun Phrases, and Adverbs*, Kenkyusha, Tokyo.

Bošković, Ž. (1997) *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Carstens, V. (2003) "Rethinking Complementizer Agreement: Agree with a Case-Checked Goal," *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 393–412.

Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, N. (2000) "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," in R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, eds., *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, N. (2001) "Derivation by Phase," in M. Kenstowicz, ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press,

Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, N. (2004a) "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy," in A. Belletti, ed., *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Chomsky, N. (2004b) "Three Factors in Language Design," ms., MIT.

Coopmans, P. (1989) "Where Stylistic and Syntactic Processes Meet: Locative Inversions in English," *Language* 65, 728–751.

Culicover, P. (1991) "Topicalization, Inversion, and Complementizers in English," ms., Ohio State University.

Haegeman, L. (1997) "Register Variation, Truncation, and Subject Omission in English and in French," *English Language and Linguistics* 1, 233–270.

Haegeman, L. and J. Guéron (1999) *English Grammar: A Generative Perspective*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Haegeman, L. and T. Ihsane (1999) "Subject Ellipsis in Embedded Clauses in English," *English Language and Linguistics* 3, 117–145.

Haegeman, L. and T. Ihsane (2001) "Adult Null Subjects in the Non-Pro-Drop Languages: Two Diary Dialects," *Language Acquisition* 9, 329–346.

Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Koma, O. and H. Hirose (1993) "Nominative with Infinitive in Late ME," in The Editorial Board of *Studies in Modern English*, ed., *Aspects of Modern English*, Eichosha, Tokyo.

Kroch, A. and A. Taylor (2000) *The Second Edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English*, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Mensching, G. (2000) *Infinitive Constructions with Specified Subjects: A Syntactic Analysis of Romance Languages*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Nishihara, T. (1999) "On Locative Inversion and *There*-Construction," *English Linguistics* 16, 381–404.

Raposo, E. (1987) "Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese," *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 85–109.

Reuland, E. (1983) "Governing -*ing*," *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 101–136.

Rizzi, L. (1982) *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Rizzi, L. (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," in L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Schütze, C. (2001) "On the Nature of Default Case," *Syntax* 4, 205–238.

Siegel, M. (1987) "Compositionality, Case, and the Scope of Auxiliaries," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10, 53–75.

Tallerman, M. (1998) "The Uniform Case-Licensing of Subjects in Welsh," *The Linguistic Review* 15, 69–133.

Tanaka, T. (2003) "C as a Locus of Case/Agreement," *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 8, 83–108.

Tanaka, T. (2004) "The Rise of Lexical Subjects in English Infinitives," ms., Nagoya University.

Visser, F. (1966) *An Historical Syntax of the English Language: Volume II*, E.J. Brill, Leiden.

Watanabe, A. (1993) *Agr-Based Case Theory and Its Interaction with the A-bar System*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Zwart, J.-W. (1997) *Morphosyntax of Verb Movement: A Minimalist Approach to the Syntax of Dutch*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.