

## Accusative Numeral Subjects in Polish as (non)small nominals

In Polish, ACC numeral subjects (ANS) behave exactly like NOM subjects but for a different case and default agreement on T<sub>3SG.N</sub>. (cf. Franks 1995, Bosković 2006, Przepiórkowski and Patejuk 2012). This fact challenges the nature of the structural case in (1-2):

- (1) Te/tych pięć tancerek widziało maskaradę.  
these-ACC/GEN five-ACC dancers-GEN.PL saw-3SG.N masquerade-F.ACC.SG  
'These five dancers saw the masquerade.'

- (2) a. NOM = T<sub>[uφ]</sub> → [VP DP<sub>[iφ, case]</sub> ...]      b. ACC = v<sub>[uφ]</sub> → [VP V DP<sub>[iφ, case]</sub> ]

The ANS shares several properties with NOM in Polish: (a) only these two subject types require rigorous binding of reflexive possessives, while DAT subjects tolerate both the possessive reflexive and the pronominal possessive, (b) only these two subject types can be coordinated, (c) they both participate in the NOM(ACC)/GEN alternation in the existential construction, (d) they both follow the NOM-taking comparative P *jak* 'as' and (e) they both show referential properties (somewhat unexpectedly, cf. Pereltsweig 2006). Through the notion 'small nominal' Pereltsvaig captures properties of Russian numerals, carbon copies of the Polish ANS, which, among others, trigger default T<sub>3SG.N</sub>, cannot bind, do not support the partitive, individuated and referential readings and wide scope. Importantly, they alternate with NOM forms. The Polish ANS supports all the readings above, has no NOM equivalent but acts like one.

I take the (a-e) diagnostics to show that the head T participates in Agree not only with NOM subject but with the ANS as well. I assume that the head T bears two probes: one for φ-features and the other for case. The latter is unvalued, though interpretable (Pesetsky and Torrego 2004). The case probe on the nominal is internally structured similarly to Bejar's (2003) analysis of the closest φ-agreement:

- (3) nominative case: [structural > nominative]  
(4) accusative case: [structural]

Structural case means ACC by default, while NOM is its subset. Both the φ-features and the case feature are copied from the nominal onto T (Marusić, et. al. 2015). In the case of NOM a probe of T matches and copies the features of NP embedded in the Kase Projection (KP) cf, Caha (2010):

- (5) T<sub>{[φ: φ-features][case: structural>nom]}</sub> ... ↔ ... [VP ... KP<sub>{[φ-features][case: ...structural>nom]}</sub> ]

Internally to head T, both of its probes are compared for the maximal effect of matching and valuation, in line with the following version of the economy principle Maximize (Chomsky 2001):

- (6) Maximize the matching effect, so that [T<sub>{[φ + val] ↔ [case: structural>nom]}</sub>]

The formula in (6) determines a positive correlation between full exposition of the φ-features on T and the value [structural>nom] copied from the goal onto its case probe. It also means that if the NOM form of the noun is available in the paradigm it is preferred over the ACC form. The Polish ANS violates Maximize in (6), as it lacks the NOM form and ACC is the only structural case (as a residue of a diachronic change of the numeral system). When these features are copied onto T, Maximize of (6) is not met, as the case feature is only [case: structural] rather than [case: structural>nom] and although the derivation converges, the φ-features of T come out as default ([-val]) (cf. Preminger 2009):

- (7) T<sub>{[φ: -val][case: structural]}</sub> ... ↔ ... [ QHP<sub>{[φ-features][case: structural]}</sub> ]

ACC is second best to NOM and takes over its morpho-syntactic function if the latter is absent from the declension paradigm, hence the properties in (a-e).

### Selected References:

Bošković, Ž. 2006. Case and agreement with genitive of quantification in Russian. In C.Boeckx (ed.), *Agreement Systems*, 99–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Caha, P. 2010. The parameters of case marking and Spell-Out driven movement. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001026>. Franks, S. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic*

*morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pereltsvaig, A. 2006. Small nominals. *NLLT* 24: 433-500.  
**Pesetsky, D. 2014.** *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.