Case and Movement

What the syntax of a sentence is.

1. A grammatical sentence must have a well-formed derivation. A derivation is a series of phrase-markers such that:
   a. The first is generated by the $X$ Skeleton and Lexical Insertion, and satisfies the \( \Theta \) Criterion and the Projection Principle, (D-structure)
   b. Each subsequent phrase marker is derived from the previous by an application of one rule (e.g., Argument Movement), (S-structure)
   c. The final phrase marker satisfies the EPP and is fed to the linearization algorithm.
   d. The Case Filter is satisfied if there is an element of a derivation that meets its requirements.

2. a. \( \text{XP} \to \{(\alpha P), \overline{X}\} \)
   b. \( \overline{X} \to \{\overline{X}, \beta P\} \)
   c. \( \overline{X} \to \{X^\theta, (\gamma P)\} \)

3. **Lexical Insertion**
   Insert into every \( X^\theta \) in a phrase marker a morpheme of category $X$.

4. **The Theta Criterion**
   a. For every $\theta$-role there is exactly one XP to which that $\theta$-role is assigned.
   b. Every argument phrase is assigned exactly one $\theta$-role.

5. **The Projection Principle**
   If \( X^\theta \) assigns (non-external) $\theta$ roles, then one of its projections must contain all the phrases it assigns those $\theta$ roles to and nothing else.

6. **Extension of the Projection Principle (EPP)**
   The Specifier of IP must have a phrase in it.

7. The external (underlined) $\theta$-role is assigned by $\alpha$ to the Specifier of $\alpha P$.

8. **Case Positions**
   a. Finite \( I^\theta \) assigns Nominative Case to its Specifier position.
   b. Genitive \( D^\theta \) assigns Genitive Case to its Specifier.
   c. Accusative Case is assigned to the position adjacent to a verb or preposition.

9. **Case Filter**
   Every argument DP must be in a Case marked position.

10. **Heavy NP Shift**
    Right adjoin XP to the smallest IP dominating it, when XP is "heavy."
    - Finite CPs are always heavy,
    - Other XPs are heavy when they are "long."

11. **Argument Movement**
    Move an XP into Specifier position.

The description of where accusative Case is assigned does not produce the right results when coupled with the derived subjects hypothesis. To see this, consider the D-structures of some of the examples we’ve looked at.
The ability to assign accusative Case is part of the lexical specification of a verb.

We also need to ensure that make doesn’t assign Accusative Case to the subject argument in its Specifier position.

Accusative Case is assigned by some verbs and prepositions to positions that they c-command and are adjacent to.

α c-commands β iff:

1. Every phrase that dominates α also dominates β, and
2. α does not dominate β.

NB: “dominates” is not reflexive.

This way of measuring relative “height” in a phrase marker comes from Reinhart (1976).

The syntax we’ve adopted for small clauses extends to an interesting class of clausal complements, sometimes called “Exceptional Case marking” infinitives:

Sally believes Sam to be happy with mustard.

And another construction that looks similar, but involves “gerunds.”

Sally remembers Sam drinking mustard.
There is also a locality condition on Accusative Case assignment:

19.  a. * She made him to run possible.
    b. She made this possible.
    c. For him to run is possible.

20. Accusative Case is assigned by some verbs and prepositions to positions that they c-command, are klose to, and are adjacent to.

    α is klose to β iff there is no more than one phrase that dominates β but not α.

21. α c-commands β iff
    a. every phrase dominating α also dominates β, and
    b. α does not dominate β.

An alternative way of talking:

22. Accusative Case is assigned by some verbs and prepositions to positions that they govern and are adjacent to.

    α governs β iff α c-commands β and α is klose to β.

Consider the pair of sentences in (23).

23.  a. She made them happy.
    b. They were made happy.

In both examples, the third person plural pronoun seems to get the same θ-role. We can speculate, then, that the D-structure representation for (23b) is (24).

24. IP
    I
    VP
    be
    V
    VP
    made
    DP
    A
    D
    A
    D
    happy
    they

We can credit A-movement with creating (25).
We seem to be looking at a rule that creates new verbs from old ones in the way described by (26).

(26) Passive
   a. Remove Accusative Case.
   b. Remove external $\theta$ role.

Consider next (27).

(27) Jill was admired.

This could be a passive too, giving rise to the derivation in (28).

But *admired* is also an adjective, in English, so we might also have (29).

Indeed, there is a regular lexical rule that converts verbs into adjectives, and the output of this rule is (often) homophonous with the Passive.
(30)  a. the admired woman
     b. the devoted man
     c. the baked dish

The existence of this confound, and how to navigate it, is the subject of Wasow (1977).

One leading idea is that the passive describes the same action event that the active does, whereas the adjective describes a resulting state. Because remain only selects stative complements, we have adjectives, by this criterion, in (31).

(31)  a. Sally remains admired.
     b. * Sally remains made happy.

There are also various English specific morphological tricks. For instance, the prefix un has a different meaning depending on whether it attaches to a verb or adjective.

(32)  a. unhappy = not happy
     b. untie = tie reversed

And, so, we can see the ambiguity directly from the meaning of un in examples such as (33).

(33)  These were untied yesterday.
     compare:
     These remained untied yesterday.

Tell me what the derivation for (34) is.

(34)  They were considered to be happy.

Another context where we seem to need Argument Movement is in (35).

(35)  a. Sandy seems happy.
     b. Sandy seems to be happy.
     c. Sandy appears happy.
     d. Sandy appears to be happy.

We decided last week that seem does not have an external θ-role because of contrasts like (36).

(36)  a. It seems that this isn’t obvious.
     b. * The fact seems that this isn’t obvious.

Similar contrasts support the same conclusion for appears.

(37)  a. It appears that this isn’t durian.
     b. * The fact seems that this isn’t durian.

If we have the same seem and appear in (35), then the arguments in theSpecifier of IP of these examples are not their arguments. That would give to (35a) the derivation in (38).

(38)  IP  
     DP  
     I  
     VP  
     pres  
     V  
     AP  
     seems  
     A  
     θ  
     happy

Indeed, the semantic context of the θ-role borne by the subject of seem appears to be determined by the predicate in the lower position.

(39)  a. Sandy seems to like natto.
     b. Sandy seems to eat natto.
     c. Sandy seems to make natto.

Indeed, even whether the subject can bear a θ-role seems to be determined by the lower predicate.

(40)  a. It seems to appear that natto reeks.
     b. * The fact seems to appear that natto reeks.
The infinitives that show up under *seem* and *appear* are called “raising infinitives.” They have a resemblance to control infinitives. Like control infinitives, the subject of *seem* and *appear* corefers with the subject of the embedded predicate. The salient difference between the cases involving control infinitives and raising infinitives concerns the Θ Criterion. The verbs whose internal argument is a control infinitive assign an external θ-role, and those which select a raising infinitive don’t.

(41)  
  a. Sandy tried PRO to like natto.  
  b. Sandy seems PRO to like natto.

Sandy is the agent of the trying action, but she isn’t doing any “seeming.” The Θ Criterion prevents Argument Movement from applying to Sandy in (41a), therefore.

(4) The Theta Criterion  
  a. For every θ-role there is exactly one XP to which that θ-role is assigned.  
  b. Every argument phrase is assigned exactly one θ-role.
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