

### Nominative Subject or Object, what is the difference?

The present paper investigates quirky subject and Case shift phenomena. An illustration from Russian is given in (1)-(2). These examples represent psychological constructions with Experiencer-Object (EO) verbs (in Bouchard's 1995 terms) *nadoest'* (to bore) (1) and *udivit'* (to surprise) (2). In (a), a non-nominative argument (Experiencer) occupies the [Spec, T] position (dative (DAT) in (1) and accusative (ACC) in (2)), whereas a nominative one (NOM) is located in situ. In (b), the arguments are shifted: NOM is in [Spec, T], and DAT/ACC follows the verb. Note that (a) and (b) have the same interpretation; both imply a neutral reading.

- (1) a. Avtoru            nadoela eta kniga.  
author-DAT   bored   this book-NOM  
"This book has bored the author."  
b. Eta kniga            nadoela avtoru.  
this book-NOM   bored   author-DAT  
"This book has bored the author."
- (2) a. Avtora            udivila    eta kniga.  
author-ACC   surprised   this book-NOM  
"This book has surprised the author."  
b. Eta kniga            udivila    avtora.  
this book-NOM   surprised   author-ACC  
"This book has surprised the author."

In Russian, the Case shift phenomenon is lexically constrained. The alternations shown in (1)-(2) cannot have a neutral reading with Experiencer-Subject (ES) psychological verbs, such as *ljubit'* (to like) in (3), nor with non-psychological verbs, for example *kupit'* (to buy) in (4).

- (3) a. \*Etu knigu        ljubil    avtor.  
this book-ACC liked   author-NOM  
"The author liked this book."  
OK: "It was the author who liked this book."  
b. Avtor            ljubil    etu knigu.  
author-NOM   liked   this book-ACC  
"The author liked this book."
- (4) a. \*Etu knigu        kupil    avtor.  
this book-ACC bought   author-NOM  
"The author bought this book."  
OK: "It was the author who bought this book."  
b. Avtor            kupil    etu knigu.  
author-NOM   bought   this book-ACC  
"The author bought this book."

Finally, the data in (5) use weak crossover effects permitting to discover the position (A or  $\bar{\_}$ ) of the fronted accusative NP in (2a)-(4a). An EO construction (5a) does not exhibit such effects (given its ungrammaticality); thus, an accusative NP has moved to an A-position, i.e. [Spec, T]. On the other hand, ES and non-psychological constructions (5b) and (5c), respectively, instantiate the weak cross over effects. In this case, the accusative fronting results in the substitution to a category higher than  $T^{0max}$ .

- (5) a.\* Svoego <sub>i</sub>        avtora            udivljaet        ka\_daja kniga <sub>i</sub>.            (cf. 2a)  
his:REFL   author-ACC   surprises    every book-NOM  
"Every book <sub>i</sub> surprises its <sub>i</sub> own author."  
b. Svoju <sub>i</sub>        knigu            ljubit ka\_dyj avtor <sub>i</sub>.            (cf. 3a)  
his:REFL   book-ACC   likes   every   author-NOM  
"His <sub>i</sub> own book likes every author <sub>i</sub>."  
c. Svoju <sub>i</sub>        knigu        pokupaet        ka\_dyj avtor <sub>i</sub>.            (cf. 4a)  
his:REFL   book-ACC   buys            every author-NOM  
"His <sub>i</sub> own book buys every author <sub>i</sub>."

Quirky subjects and alternations illustrated in (1)-(2) are attested exclusively in morphological Case languages (Ura 2000; for subjects of Icelandic psych-verbs see Platzack 1999). This fact can be attributed to the property of these languages to allow a flexible word order. This argument leaves the fundamental question (6) without explanation.

- (6) Why is there free word order in morphological Case languages? Why do morphological Case languages exist at all?

Some particular questions (7) also arise from the data presented in (1)-(4).

