CAS LX 522
Syntax I

Week 14b. Bonus section:
Articulating the tree

Using the microscope

- We started off with a relatively simple structure, with a CP, an IP, a VP.

Using the microscope

- As we looked closer, we had reason to think that the “VP” was more complicated, involving a “little v’.”

Using the microscope

- But for many purposes, we don’t need to focus on the minute details of the VP. In those situations, you’ll find that people still write VPs like this, with the understanding that the v’ is there.

Using the microscope

- What we’re going to do now is put “IP” under the microscope, where we’ll find it is more complicated. For most purposes, we can continue to think about it as “IP”, but this is a preview of where syntax can go from here.

Let’s go back to French…

- Jean mange souvent des pommes.
  
  “Jean often eat apples.”

  *Jean souvent mange des pommes.

- Recall that this was one of our early examples showing verb-movement to I. French and English differ in whether they move finite main verbs to I.
French negation

- This happens with respect to negation too—the finite verb move to the left of negative pas...
- Jean ne mange pas des pommes.
  "Jean doesn't eat apples."
- But fortunately or unfortunately, things are more complex that this...

French and a problem...

- Finite verbs (main verbs and auxiliaries) in French precede adverbs and precede negative pas—they must move to I.
- Nonfinite auxiliaries can either move past pas (to I) or not, it appears to be optional.

French and a problem...

- +Fin aux: V Adv, V neg ; Moves to I.
- +Fin verb: V Adv, V neg ; Moves to I.
- –Fin aux: (V) Adv (V), (V) neg (V): (Opt) Moves to I.

French and a problem...

- Nonfinite main verbs...and adverbs...
  - Souvent paraitre triste pendant son voyage de noces, c'est rare.
    Often appears sad during one's honeymoon, it's rare.
  - "To often look sad during one’s honeymoon is rare."
  - "Not to seem happy is a prerequisite for writing novels."
  - A head here in the tree for the verb to move to...
  - That means we need to insert a whole phrase (heads always head something)...
A new FP

- "Fin aux / verb: V Adv, V neg. Moves to (I, then to) I.
- "Fin aux: (V) Adv (V), (V) neg (V) (Opt.) Moves to (I, then to) I.
- "Fin verb: (V) Adv (V), neg V (Opt.) Moves to F.

Now we have a place for nonfinite main verbs to move, past adverbs but under negation. They can move to F.

What is FP?

- Vous avez pris les pommes. You have taken the apples.
- Vous les avez pris. you them have taken
- Quelles pommes avez-vous prises? Which apples have you taken?

Object agreement phrase

Based on this, FP is generally called AgrOP. Object agreement phrase.

AgrOP

- AgrOP, Object agreement phrase.
- As the verb moves up to I, it has to stop in AgrOP (the Head Movement Constraint requires it), forming successively more complex heads.
- V
- AgrO+V
- I=[AgrO+V]
- But why does the object have to move to Spec:AgrOP?

ECM

- AgrOP can solve a serious problem we had in English too...
- Here's the current way we analyzed ECM sentences, where me gets Case from want because me is in the "government radius" of want.
- The thing is, the embedded subject actually acts like it's in the matrix clause somewhere.

A new FP

- As the verb and the object make their way up the tree, assuming the object moves to SpecFP, there is a point where the verb and object are in a Spec-head configuration.
- This is how the verb would check its object agreement features.
- Based on this, FP is generally called AgrOP. Object agreement phrase.

AgrOP

- Why does the object have to move to SpecAgrOP?
- What makes DPs move? We know the subject moves. Partly for the EPP, but partly to get Case.
- The subject gets Case in SpecIP, so we know Case can be assigned to a specifier.
- What if we revise our notion of how objects get Case and say that they too get Case in a specifier, of AgrOP? Then it would have to move.
- Plus, it's pleasingly symmetrical
ECM v. BT

- Mary wants her to leave.
- Bill considers himself to be a genius.
- Before we said that the binding domain for anaphors and pronouns was a clause (say, IP).
- *Her and himself* above act like they are in the higher clause with the matrix subject.
- Our options are basically to
  - complicate the definition of binding domain in Binding Theory
  - suppose the object has really moved out of the embedded clause.

ECM

- If
  - There is an AgrOP
  - Normal objects generally go there
  - ECM subjects act like objects
- Then
  - We can suppose that ECM subjects move *there*.

A moment of silence for Case under government

- Let’s take stock here for a second.
- French told us:
  - There needs to be an FP between NegP and VP.
  - Objects that move past FP have to stop there (inducing object agreement)—so FP is AgrOP.
  - Why do they have to stop in AgrOP?
  - They need Case. So AgrOP is what’s responsible for accusative Case.
  - But V used to be responsible for that!
  - Yet now we have a more symmetrical solution; Case is always assigned in the specifier of a functional projection. (Just about, anyway)
  - And we have no more need for the “government radius” in Case assignment now that ECM is taken care of too.
  - Plus, we have evidence from binding theory that objects do seem to move by LF to someplace outside the clause in ECM constructions.

A moment of silence for Case under government

- This is a step forward.
  - We have a simpler theory (Case is assigned in only one way, we don’t need the strange-looking construct of “government radius”).
  - We have an account for why ECM subjects act like they’re in the higher clause by LF.
  - Moreover, we have yet another reason to think that there is an LF level.
  - So what does it mean for a verb to “assign accusative case”?  
    - Sadly, this is one place where we pay for the elegance elsewhere—*verb that assigns accusative case* is now another name for *verb that has an AgrOP above it*.
    - In Syntax II, we’ll see a potential solution to even this apparent illegality, but for now we just assume that transitive verbs are those with an AgrOP above them.
An AgrO you can see?

- Recall from earlier this semester that Irish is VSO, but yet seems to be SVO underlyingly:
  - Phóg Máire an lucharachán.
    Kissed Mary the leprechaun
    ‘Mary kissed the leprechaun.’
  - Tá Máire ag-pógáil an lucharachán.
    Is Mary ing-kos the leprechaun
    ‘Mary is kissing the leprechaun.’
- If an auxiliary occupies the verb slot at the beginning of the sentence, the main verb appears between the subject and verb. Otherwise, the verb moves to first position.

Northern Irish

- So, basically everything points to Irish being a head-initial language except…
  - Ba mhaith liom [Seán an abairt aí scriobh]
    C good with. S ACC the sentence ACC PRT write
    ‘I want S to write the sentence.’
    S writing the sentence is good with us (lit.)
  - (cf. also I want him to meet me)
  - Ba mhaith liom [Seán fanacht]
    C good with. 1S S. ACC wait
    ‘I want S to wait.’

Morphology on French verbs

- Past, varying persons: je mange-ai-s
  ‘eat’
  - tu mange-ai-s
  il mange-ai-t
- Fut, varying persons: je mange-er-a
  ‘eat’
  - tu mange-er-as
  il mange-er-a
- Tense morphology is inside and separate from subject agreement morphology.
- Kind of looks like after tense, another, subject-agreeing morpheme is attached…

AgrSP?

- AgrOP, Object agreement phrase.
- AgrSP, Subject agreement phrase?
- Pleasingly symmetrical!
- Complex heads:
  - V
  - AgrO+V
  - T+[AgrO+V]
  - AgrS+[T+[AgrO+V]]

Split-INFL

- The assumption of this structure is sometimes referred to as the “Split-INFL” hypothesis; the INFLectional nodes have been “split” into subject agreement, tense, and object agreement.

The EPP & NOM

- We said before the T needs a specifier, that’s the essential content of the EPP. Plus, we said before that this is where NOM is assigned.
- Now there is AgrSP as well.
- AgrSP is responsible for NOM.
  - In a symmetrical world, seems like AgrSP should be responsible for NOM.
- So, now that (kind of mysterious) double motivation for moving to SpecIP has been clarified: The subject has to move to both SpecTP and SpecAgrSP, but each movement happens for a different reason. T for EPP, AgrSP for NOM.
**Adopting the Split-INFL hypothesis**

- Lots of good syntax has been done both *adopting the Split-INFL hypothesis* (trees contain AgrSP, TP, AgrOP) or *not* (trees contain only IP).
- For many things, it doesn’t matter which you choose—analyses can be directly translated into a Split-INFL tree or vice-versa.
- Where it doesn’t matter, it doesn’t matter, but sometimes it matters.

**Split-INFL**

- In recent literature, almost everything you read will make this assumption, that cross-linguistically, the clause is minimally constructed of these projections, generally in this order:
  - CP
  - AgrSP
  - TP
  - AgrOP
  - VP

**Adopting the Split-INFL hypothesis**

- The general program is that every dissociable piece of the structure should get its own place in the lexicon, its own functional head…
  - Subject agreement is basically common across verbs, an independent piece.
  - Tense too is an independent piece.
  - And object agreement
  - And… plural marking… and progressive -ing, aspectual -en, …
- In Syntax II, we’ll spend a lot of the semester looking at places in the tree where functional projections need to be added.

**Split-INFL**

- Another line of thought (described by Radford in ch. 9) puts them in a different order (with AgrOP between vP and VP), but the same idea:
  - CP
  - AgrSP
  - TP
  - vP
  - AgrOP
  - VP
- There are various empirical and theoretical advantages and disadvantages to this order; they jury’s still out.