CAS LX 522
Syntax I

Week 13b.
Raising, etc.
(8.2.6-8.4)

Reminder: Try

- Try embeds a nonfinite CP, headed by the special null C with the [null] case feature.
- In turn, the subject must be PRO, in order to successfully check that feature of C.
- If the [case] feature of any other DP is valued and checked as [null], the derivation crashes: only PRO can have null case.
- The embedded clause must be nonfinite (T can't itself have a [nom] feature).
- If the [nom] feature of T checks the [case] feature of the subject, nothing is left to check C's [null] feature.

Believe

- Another place where nonfinite clauses can be embedded is under the verb believe.
  1) I believe [him to be innocent].
- Here, we have an accusative subject, and a nonfinite T that is not capable of checking case.
- How is the (accusative) case of him checked?
- This relates to the fact that believe can also simply take a DP object:
  2) I believe him.
- So, how is the accusative case of him checked here?

ECM

- The idea is that believe (actually the v that combines with the V believe) has an [acc] feature that can check the case of him in I believe him.
- Suppose that believe can either have a DP or a TP as its complement.
- What do we expect?

ECM

Nonfinite T cannot check the case feature of him. But the higher v of believe can.

Checking the case of a subject “from above” like this goes by the name Exceptional Case Marking (ECM).
Arranging to leave

- A somewhat similar phenomenon occurs with verbs like arrange.
  1) Harry arranged for Tom to leave MI-5.
- Here, we have:
  - Nonfinite T, which cannot check case.
  - An overt subject (Tom) in the accusative.
  - The word for, which we classify as C.
- For, as a P, checks accusative case (*He baked a cake for her*).

Arranging to leave

- Arrange-type verbs can take a CP complement.
  1) Harry arranged for Tom to leave MI-5.
- Notice that it is also possible to say
  2) Tom arranged PRO to leave MI-5.
- But this is expected.
  - Nonfinite T, cannot check case.
  - The null C with [null] case can check the case of PRO.
  - An overt subject can’t get null case:
    *Harry arranged Tom to leave MI-5.*
  - PRO cannot get anything but null case:
    *Tom arranged for to leave MI-5.*

Summary

- Complementizers indicate clause type (*that*/*Ø* for declaratives, *if*/*whether* for interrogatives).
- Some verbs embed clauses. Finite clauses are always CPs.
- Some verbs can embed nonfinite clauses, some embedding TP and others embedding CP.
- Believe (*expect, …*) embed TP and check accusative case (ECM verbs).
- Try (*want, …*) embed CP. This can either be:
  - C[nul], checking null case on PRO.
  - for[acc], checking acc case on an overt subject. Not all verbs allow this option (*want* does, *try* doesn’t).

Sentences inside sentences

- So, to recap: 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 PRO to leave*]
  4) Jin wants [*TP Michael ACC to return the watch*].
  5) Sun arranged [*CP for ACC him ACC 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 [uDθ] feature).
- So what θ-roles does seem assign?

Back to Charlie

1) It seems [that Charlie dislikes bees].
2) Charlie seems [to dislike bees].
- These two sentences mean basically the same thing.
- Dislike assigns two θ-roles, we might say Experiencer and Theme.
- It's the same verb dislike in both sentences. So, we presume that the bottom of both trees will look the same...

Seem seems to assign (just) one θ-role.

- What seem (and appear) mean when paired with an embedded sentence is that the proposition expressed by the embedded sentence appears true.
- There's only one participant in a seeming, the Proposition.
  1) It seems [that seem assigns one θ-role].
- So, seem assigns a Proposition θ-role (structurally, to its sister, the CP daughter of V'), and nothing else (hence, it is needed to check the EPP feature).

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.
  - vExperiencer assigns an Experiencer θ-role to the DP Charlie.

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 [unfl:] feature of v is valued and checked by T: [unfl:pres3sg].
- The [uclause-type:] feature of T is valued and checked by the [clause-type:Decl] feature of C.

And then we add the main clause (seem, v, T, it, C)
• 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.

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, Spec vP.
• But now, after building vP, we add a nonfinite T…

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

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.

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

We add T…
• Charlie has [case] to check.
• Checked ([nomin]) by T
• T has [nom], [u[D*]], and [uϕ:] features to check.
• seem (v) has [uinf:] to check
• [uinf:pres3sg], valued by [tense:pres] and [uϕ:3sg] on T.
Disliking bees

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

Idioms

• 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 θ-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.
  • [The cat], is likely [TP t] to be out of the bag.
  • [The cat], appears [TP t] to have his tongue.
  • [The jig], proved [TP t] to be up.
  • [The cat], began [TP t] to get his tongue.
• What these verbs (in this use, anyway) have in common is that they have no external θ-role and an internal Proposition θ-role.

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 to stay.
  • Sayid persuaded Kate [CP ØNULL PRONULL to stay]
• Again we have PRO, as we do in
  • Kate tried [CP ØNULL PRONULL to see]
• But in Sayid persuaded Kate to stay, what “controls” PRO?
Persuasion and promises

- Not all ditransitive control verbs are object control verbs.
- Though all object control verbs are ditransitives.
- David persuaded Sherry [PRO to leave]
- David promised Sherry [PRO to run for office]
- Chase asked Jack [PRO to be allowed to continue]
- Chase asked Jack [PRO to get off his case]
- Whether a verb is a subject control verb or an object control verb is an individual property of the verb. Promise is recorded in our lexicon as a subject control verb, persuade as an object control verb.

ECM verbs

- ECM verbs also take infinitive complements, but with an overt subject (that checks accusative case with the ECM verb).
- Tony found [Michelle to be charming]
- Tony found [that Michelle was charming]
- Jack expected [Tony to take the day off]
- Jack expected [that Tony would take the day off]

Raising verbs

- Raising verbs have no Agent/Experiencer in SpecvP and take a nonfinite complement. The subject of the embedded complement moves into their subject position:
  - Jack seems [<Jack> to be tired]
  - It seems [that Jack is tired]
  - The time appears [<the time> to have expired]
  - It appears [that the time has expired]
  - The President happened [<the P> to have a pen]
  - It happened [that the President had a pen]

Verb classes in summary

- ECM verbs, e.g., believe, find
  - I believe [TP him to have told the truth]
  - We find [TP these truths to be self-evident]. (or hold)
- Subject control verbs, e.g., attempt, promise
  - Kimk promised Jack [cp òû òò to avoid kidnappers].
  - Kimk will try [cp òû òò to avoid kidnappers].
- Object control verbs, e.g., convince, ask
  - I convinced herk [cp òû òò to drive to work].
  - Jack asked Kimk [cp òû òò to avoid kidnappers].
- Raising verbs, e.g., appear, seem
  - I appear [TP <I> to have missed the bus].
  - Jack seems [TP <Jack> to need a nap].

One more argument for PRO

- **Principle A**: An anaphor must be bound in its binding domain.
  - Jack hoped [that Kim would explain herself]
  - Jack wanted [Kim to explain herself]
  - *Jack hoped [that Kim would call himself]
  - *Jack wanted [Kim to call himself]
  - Jack hoped [PRO to see Kim]
  - Jack hoped [PRO to exonerate himself]
- **Principle B**: A pronoun must be free in its binding domain.
  - Jack hoped [that Chase would exonerate him]
  - Jack wanted [Chase to exonerate him]
  - Jack hoped [PRO to exonerate him]

Before we finish embedded clauses...

- Embedded clauses can also be modificational adjuncts.
  - Pat ate lunch [pp on the hill]
  - [pp by the tree] [pp in the rain].
- To express reasons and times, we also find whole CPs adjoined to our clause:
  - We discussed adjuncts [cp before we finished our discussion of embedded clauses]
  - There’s nothing really new here, except the observation that before can have category C.
  - Just like after, while, during, etc.
Adjunct clauses: where do they go?

- Pat cleaned poorly yesterday.
- #Pat cleaned yesterday poorly.
- Pat cleaned poorly [before Chris arrived].
- #Pat cleaned [before Chris arrived] poorly.
- Pat cleaned [before Chris arrived] yesterday.
- Pat cleaned yesterday [before Chris arrived].
- Pat heard that [before Chris arrived] [Tracy cleaned the sink].
- Pat heard [before Chris arrived] that [Tracy cleaned the sink].

because clauses

- Reason clauses are also clausal adjuncts.
  - Because I lost the game, I left.
  - I left because I lost the game.

if clauses

- If clauses are like because clauses.
  - If he loses the game, I will leave.
  - I will leave if he loses the game.

While thinking about syntax

- Before finishing his homework, Ike watched TV.
  - Finish: transitive (Agent, Theme)
    - Agent: ?
    - Theme: his homework
  - Watch: transitive (Agent, Theme)
    - Agent: Ike
    - Theme: TV
  - Ike watched TV is the main clause.
  - Before finishing his homework is a modifier.

While PRO thinking about syntax

- Before PRO finishing his homework, ...
  - This PRO does seem to be controlled by the subject somehow (*While raining, Ike dashed to the store).
  - The form finishing is not the progressive, it is the present participle, a nonfinite form.
Before PRO finishing…

- T is not finite, so no \[\text{tense}\] feature.
- It is not the \text{infinitive} either.
- We’ll say this form has the \[\text{[ing]}\] feature.
- The \([\text{uInf}]\) feature of \(v\) is matched, valued, and checked by the \[\text{[ing]}\] feature, resulting in \text{finishing}.

The only thing left is to attach the modifier into the main clause…

The only thing left is to attach the modifier into the main clause…

On gerunds

- There is yet another form of the verb that shows up with -ing on the end of it in English: the \text{gerund}.

A gerund is basically a verb acting as a noun—we’ve been looking at this kind of deverbal noun already. One way to tell whether you are looking at a gerund (noun) or not (a verb) is to see whether it is modified by adjectives or adverbs:

- Before his quick(\text{ly}) cooking of the t(\text{of})urkey…
- Before quick-(\text{ly}) finishing his homework…

Some relevant sentences:

- Before he finished his homework, Ike watched TV.
- Before Ike’s finishing of his homework, tension was high.