Possible things to review: LX522 *Syntax I*; Fall 2008; Dec 11, 2008

Case

Nom from finite T
no case from nonfinite T (T [inf], M *to*)
Null case for PRO (from C $Ø_{NULL}$ or from T [ing])
Acc from *v*—if *v* has a specifier (θ-role assigned to it, Exp or Ag)
of-case from *n*
Acc from P

θ-roles/UTAH:

Agent to Specv_{AGENT}P (DP daughter of v_{AGENT}P)
[$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ <**John**> bought flowers]]
Agent to Specn_{AGENT}P (DP daughter of n_{AGENT}P)
[$_{DP}$ John's $Ø_{GEN}$ [$_{nP}$ <**John**> buying of flowers]]
Experiencer to Specv_{EXP}P (DP daughter of v_{EXP}P)
[$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ <**John**> heard a noise]]
Experiencer to Specn_{EXP}P (DP daughter of n_{EXP}P)
[$_{DP}$ John's $Ø_{GEN}$ [$_{nP}$ <**John**> hearing of a noise]]
Theme to DP daughter of VP
[$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ <John> bought [$_{VP}$ **flowers**]]]
Theme to DP daughter of NP
[$_{DP}$ John's $Ø_{GEN}$ [$_{nP}$ <John> buying [$_{DP}$ **of flowers**]]]
Goal to PP sister of V
[$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ gave [$_{VP}$ flowers <gave> [$_{PP}$ **to Mary**]]]
Goal to PP sister of V
[$_{DP}$ John's $Ø_{GEN}$ [$_{nP}$ gift [$_{NP}$ of flowers <gift> [$_{PP}$ **to Mary**]]]
Possessor to SpecPossP (DP daughter of PossP)
[$_{DP}$ John's $Ø_{GEN}$ [$_{PossP}$ <**John**> [$_{nP}$ house]]]
Proposition to TP or CP sister of V
[$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ said [$_{CP}$ **that he bought flowers**]]]
[$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ considers [$_{TP}$ **me to be annoying**]]]
Proposition to TP or CP sister of N
[$_{DP}$ John's $Ø_{GEN}$ [$_{nP}$ assertion [$_{CP}$ **that he bought flowers**]]]
[$_{DP}$ John's $Ø_{GEN}$ [$_{nP}$ expectation [$_{TP}$ **of me to buy flowers**]]]
Possessee to DP sister of V_{HAVE} (double-object constructions only)
[$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ <John> gave Mary [$_{DP}$ **flowers**]]]

Wh-movement/phases/islands:

Phases: C and complement are "frozen" when CP is finished.

SpecCP is also "frozen" if the CP doesn't get a θ-role (adjunct)

Wh-words must move to SpecCP in order to be able to move higher.

"Islands" are cases where *wh*-words are trapped in a phase.

Wh-island: *wh*-word needs to move higher but can't move to intermediate SpecCP because it is already filled:

**What did John wonder who bought?*

Adjunct island: Even SpecCP is invisible when phase completes (no θ-role).

**What did John kick the chair while Mary read?*

CNP island (DP island): *DEFINITE* SpecDP is not a good place for *wh*-words.

**What did John read the book about?*

**What did John read my book about?*

but ok: *What did John read a book about?*

but ok: *What did John read books about?*

Binding theory:

Binding: X binds Y if and only if X c-commands Y and X and Y are coindexed.

Sharing an index implies sharing of reference.

Binding is "assignment of reference" (from X to Y)

Binding domain is "minimal TP containing Y."

Principle A: Anaphors must be bound within their binding domain.

ok: John said [$_{CP}$ that **[$_{TP}$ Mary$_i$ saw herself$_i$]**]

not: *John$_i$ said [$_{CP}$ that **[$_{TP}$ Mary saw himself$_i$]**]

not: *John said [$_{CP}$ that **[$_{TP}$ herself$_i$ saw Mary$_i$]**]

Principle B: Pronouns must *not* be bound within their binding domain.

ok: John$_i$ said [$_{CP}$ that **[$_{TP}$ Mary saw him$_i$]**]

ok: John$_i$ said [$_{CP}$ that **[$_{TP}$ he$_i$ saw Mary]**]

not: *John said [$_{CP}$ that **[$_{TP}$ Mary$_i$ saw her$_i$]**]

Principle C: R-expressions (referring expressions) must not be bound *at all*.

ok: [$_{DP}$ his$_i$ mother] told me that John$_i$ skipped work.

not: *He$_i$ told me that [$_{DP}$ John$_i$'s mother]$_i$ skipped work.

PRO:

PRO is a DP (essentially a pronoun) and can wind up in SpecTP.
PRO can only get null case and *must* get null case.
Null case can only come from $Ø_{NULL}$ C or from [ing] T.
PRO gets a θ-role, it can only be there if there is an "extra" θ-role.
The referent of PRO can be the same as the higher subject (subject control verbs).
John promised Mary [$_{CP}$ $Ø_{NULL}$ [$_{TP}$ PRO to leave]]
The referent of PRO can be the same as the higher object (object control verbs).
John persuaded Mary [$_{CP}$ $Ø_{NULL}$ [$_{TP}$ PRO to leave]]
In some cases, PRO can be "arbitrary"
[$_{CP}$ $Ø_{NULL}$ PRO to leave now] would be a mistake.
In *ing* adjuncts, PRO is generally controlled by the subject
[$_{CP}$ Upon PRO hearing the complaint] John called his lawyer.

Raising/ECM:

Raising verbs do not assign an "external" θ-role (Agent, Proposition).
The subject of a raising verb has come from its embedded proposition:
[$_{TP}$ John seems [$_{TP}$ <John> to have left]]
ECM verbs assign accusative case to the embedded subject.
[$_{TP}$ John finds [$_{TP}$ me to be annoying]]
It is easy to combine control, raising, and ECM verbs:
John seems to want me to appear to have forced Bill to look to be grumpy.
[$_{TP}$ John seems [$_{TP}$ <John> to want [$_{TP}$ me to appear
raising *ECM* *raising*
[$_{TP}$ <me> to force Bill [$_{CP}$ $Ø_{NULL}$ PRO to look [$_{TP}$ <PRO> to be grumpy…
obj.control *raising*

Mary knows John’s innermost secrets.

What does John know?

Who did he say John was told to feed?

John knows what Pat was told to feed us.

*Who does John know what Pat was told to feed?

After embarrassing himself, Pat left.

*After snowing, Pat left.

*Who did Pat leave after embarrassing?

The consumption of beer is considered to have caused the problem.

The story John was told caused him to cry.

*Who did Mary meet a lawyer that introduced to her?

What did Mary buy a bundle of?

*What did Mary buy my bundle of?

After sinking the Titanic, the iceberg melted.

John seems to have persuaded Mary to promise to leave.