

Relative Case Attraction in Ancient Greek

A good deal of work has been done on case-matching phenomena in free relatives (Bresnan & Grimshaw, 1978; Groos & van Riemsdijk, 1981; Harbert, 1983; Vogel, 2003). Many languages require that the *wh* DP in a free relative match either the case or the grammatical function of the free relative clause's position in the matrix—hence the term *matching*. Some languages, though, can resolve mismatches between the *wh* DP's expected case and the case appropriate to the position of the relative clause in the matrix by allowing the *wh* DP to take the case morphology appropriate to the higher clause. A phenomenon often mentioned in passing in these papers is Relative Case Attraction (RCA) in Ancient Greek.

Relative case attraction is the term used by Classicists to describe a phenomenon in which a relative pronoun, rather than taking the case morphology appropriate to its base-generated position (r-case, or relative clause case), takes case morphology drawn from the embedding clause (m-case, or matrix case). This is seen in (1), where genitive m-case overrides accusative r-case. The antecedent noun and *wh* pronoun are in boldface, and the expected case of the pronoun is given in curly brackets in the base-generated position:

- (1) axioi **eleutherias** **he:s** kektethe {he:n}.
 worthy **freedom**.GEN **which**.GEN you.possess {t, ACC}
 worthy of the freedom which you possess.

The term RCA refers to both headed and free relative clauses, and a more detailed look at it should point to a common mechanism underlying both. The goal of this work is to provide a mechanism for accounting for the phenomenon in Ancient Greek, keeping in mind cross-linguistic evidence.

In pursuit of this goal, this paper focuses on how the unexpected morphological patterns seen in RCA are constrained by the syntactic structures in which they occur. The analysis presented draws on McFadden (2001) for its model of case assignment, which uses the framework of Distributed Morphology. This theory posits sets of case features that are incrementally more complex, with nominative being the simplest and genitive the most complex. However, RCA requires a more detailed look at case in A-bar moved DPs and case concord than McFadden provides, and these aspects of the theory are addressed. The structure of the relative clauses in question also requires some examination. The question then is exactly how the morphological component of the grammar licenses m-case on the relative DP, which is presumably already marked with r-case features in its base generated position.

This paper proposes that a rule that copies case features onto the nominal elements within a certain domain is responsible for RCA. This domain is formulated to include the *wh* DP in the specifier of the embedded CP. The basis for asserting that oblique cases are able to override structural cases lies in the relative complexity of the feature sets they bear. The analysis draws on general linguistic principles such as phases, command and the theory of case assignment in McFadden 2001. After sketching this analysis, I look at the possibility that this mechanism is actually an instantiation of a broader linguistic process, namely case concord, and thus one which could explain RCA in other languages.