Last time we began looking at **embedded sentences**.

Embedded sentences can be finite:

1) Shannon claimed [that she could catch a fish].

Or nonfinite:

2) Michael wants [PRO to leave].

3) Jin wants [Michael to return the watch].

4) Sun arranged [for him to return the watch].

**Embedded clauses**

- Embedded finite clauses are CPs, with a complementizer (*that* or *Ø*).
  1) Shannon claimed [CP that she could catch a fish].
  2) Shannon claimed [CP Ø she could catch a fish].

- Embedded nonfinite clauses have to as T, and can be CPs or bare TPs— the distinction is determined by case properties of the verb.
  3) Michael wants [CP Ø NULL PRO NULL to leave]
  4) Jin wantsACC [TP MichaelACC to return the watch].
  5) Sun arranged [CP forACC himACC to return the watch].

- Nonfinite T does not assign case, so the subject must get case (have its [case] feature checked) in some other way.

**Seems**

- Now, we’ll turn to another kind of embedded nonfinite clause.
  - Charlie seems [to dislike bees].
  - This looks a little bit like:
    - Charlie tried [to sneak away].
  - Which is really:
    - Charlie tried [PRO to sneak away].
    - *Charlie* is the Agent of *try*.
    - PRO (=Charlie) is the Agent of *sneak*.
  - So, what about *Charlie seems to dislike bees*?
    - What θ-roles go to *Charlie*?

**Charlie seems to receive (just) one θ-role**

- Seems can also embed a finite clause, so consider the pair:
  1) Charlie seems to dislike bees.
  2) It seems that Charlie dislikes bees.

- The *it* in the second sentence is the same *it* we find in *It rained*. It does not get a θ-role, because *rain* doesn’t have any θ-roles. We only have *it* there because sentences need subjects (EPP:T has a [uD"] feature).

- So what θ-roles does seem assign?
Disliking bees

• Starting with It seems that Charlie dislikes bees, we would build a vP that looks like this:
  • V (dislike) assigns a Theme θ-role to the DP bees.
  • θExperiencer assigns an Experiencer θ-role to the DP Charlie.

Disliking bees

• And then we add T and C to get that Charlie dislikes bees...
  • The [case] feature of Charlie is valued and checked by the [nom] feature of T.
  • The [uninf] feature of v is valued and checked by T: [uninf:pres3sg].
  • The [clause-type:] feature of T is valued and checked by the [clause-type:Decl] feature of C.

Disliking bees

• Does Charlie get a θ-role from seem?
  • Well, no. Seem only assigns the one θ-role.
  • So, unlike in Charlie tried [PRO to elude the bees], we have as many DPs as we have θ-roles.

Disliking bees

• So, what θ-role does Charlie get?
  • Still seems to be the Experiencer of dislike.
  • So, suppose that Charlie starts out in the same place, SpecvP.
  • But now, after building vP, we add a nonfinite T…
Disliking bees

- The [uInfl:] feature of v is valued and checked by T: [uInfl:none].
- **Nonfinite T has no [uclause-type:] feature.**
- The [case] feature of Charlie is still unchecked, since nonfinite T has no case feature.

Disliking bees

- So, we add seem, taking our TP (Charlie to dislike bees) as its Proposition complement.

Disliking bees

Finally, we move Charlie up to check the EPP ([uD*]) feature of T: (Subject (-to-subject)) Raising

Disliking bees

- Can we add a C to this?
- Let's assume not, by the following reasoning:
  - The only C that is compatible with a nonfinite T is Ø NULL, that assigns null case to PRO. Charlie is not PRO, so it can't get null case. So, this is just a TP not a CP.

Disliking bees

- We add T...
- Charlie has [case] to check.
  - Checked ([nom]) by T
  - T has [nom], [uD*], and [uφ:] features to check.
  - seem (v) has [uInfl:] to check
  - [uInfl:pres3sg], valued by [tense:pres] and [uφ:3sg] on T.

Disliking bees

- Recall our idea about idioms: For something to have an idiomatic interpretation (an interpretation not literally derivable from its component words), the pieces need to be very close together when initially Merged.

1) Ortega took a dive.
2) It seems that the jig is up.
3) It seems that the cat is out of the bag.
4) It seems that the cat has your tongue.
Idioms

• If pieces of the idiom move away after the original Merge, we can still get the idiomatic interpretation:
  1) [The cat], seems t, to have your tongue.
  2) [The cat], seems t, to be out of the bag.
  3) [The jig], seems t, to be up.

• The important thing is that they be originally Merged together (the \(\theta\)-role needs to be assigned by the predicate to the noun).

  Compare:
  4) [The cat] tried to have your tongue.
  5) [The cat] arranged to be out of the bag.

• (What’s different? Why no idiomatic meaning?)

Other raising verbs

• So far, we’ve only talked about seem, but there are a couple of other raising verbs as well.
  1) [The cat], is likely \([\text{TP} t, \text{to be out of the bag}]\).
  2) [The cat], appears \([\text{TP} t, \text{to have his tongue}]\).
  3) [The jig], proved \([\text{TP} t, \text{to be up}]\).
  4) [The cat], began \([\text{TP} t, \text{to get his tongue}]\).

• What these verbs (in this use, anyway) have in common is that they have no external \(\theta\)-role and an internal Proposition \(\theta\)-role.

There seems…

• We also find seem with there.
  1) Vincent seems to be lost.
  2) It seems that Vincent is lost.
  3) There seems to be a dog in the woods.

• It is an expletive subject that checks both the EPP and case features of T. There checks only the EPP feature of T (a dog checks T’s case feature).

*There seems a man to be in the garden.

• [TP There seems [TP there to be a man in…]]

• There appears in SpecTP, satisfying the EPP feature.
  • There are two TPs here, and each TP has/had an EPP feature.
  • \([\text{TP} \text{There seems} [\text{TP} \text{to be a man in…}]]\)
  • So, there must have first Merged into the lower SpecTP and then moved to the upper SpecTP.
  • \([\text{TP} \text{There seems} [\text{TP} \text{<there> to be a man in…}]]\)

*There seems a man to be in the garden

• [TP There seems [TP <there> to be a man in…]]
  • This makes sense, both EPP features are satisfied, a man gets case from (the higher, finite) T.
  • But think back to when we were building the structure and had reached this point:
  • [\(\text{T} t, \text{to be a man in the garden}\)]
  • We now have to satisfy the [uDI*] feature of T. We have there lying around in our numeration. But if we didn’t, we could have just moved a man to SpecTP to satisfy the EPP.
  • [TP a man to be <a man> in the garden]

*There seems a man to be in the garden

• [TP a man to be <a man> in the garden]
  • After doing this, we can continue to add on seem, v, T, and then insert there into the higher SpecTP, yielding:
  • [TP there seems [TP a man to be <a man> in…]]
  • But this is ungrammatical. So what goes wrong?
  • The difference between There seems a man to be in the garden and There seems to be a man in the garden is at the point where we’ve got [\(\text{T} t, \text{to be a man in the garden}\)]. Here there’s a choice: Move a man or Merge there.
  • The usual approach here is to say Merge is preferred to Move, so if you have the choice, you always Merge (it’s “easier”).
Object control

- One last type of nonfinite complement, those that appear with verbs like persuade.
  1) Sayid persuaded Kate to stay.
- Once again, we think through the “participants” to get a handle on whether we have enough DPs for the θ-roles.
  - Stay has only one participant, Kate.
  - Persuade has three—the one doing the persuading (Sayid), the one being persuaded (Kate), and the proposition in question ([TP Kate to stay]).
  - So we don’t have enough DPs for the job—Kate appears to be playing two roles (one from stay, one from persuade). This sounds like a job for PRO.

Object control

- Sayid persuaded Kate [CP Ø|null|PRO|null to stay]
- Again we have PRO, as we do in
  - Kate tried [CP Ø|null|PRO|null to see]
- But in Sayid persuaded Kate to stay, what “controls” PRO?

Classes

- So, we have the following classes:
  - ECM verbs, e.g., believe
    - I believe [TP him to have told the truth].
  - Subject control verbs, e.g., attempt
    - I attempted [CP Ø|null|PRO|null to drive to work].
  - Object control verbs, e.g., convince
    - I convinced her [CP Ø|null|PRO|null to drive to work].
  - Raising verbs, e.g., appear
    - I appear [TP tø to be low on time].