I Nature of Univ. Grammar
Gov’t/Binding after 1981; then principles and parameters theory. What is knowledge about l., how acquired.
4- structure-dependency. based on phrase structure. S > NP VP VP > V NP passivization by movement. of obj to subject position.
Not a certain word, but phrase.
The manager who will fire Barnes will succeed.
*Will the manager who fire Barnes will succeed?
gotta move the right will.

Famous S Is the man who is here tall? *Is the man who here is tall?
Children never hear s’s like this. How do they learn s-dependency?
Other languages do the same. Q’s, passives, etc.
Hans wurde von Marie gesehen.

14- heads and complements. education for life, showed her the way. But Japanese in a head last lang. Postpositions
Exceptions to head-first or last: German (see later).

Lexical entry projects upward into the syntax the subcategorization of an entity.
like: Verb. [_ NP]
also built-in innate.

his competence ~ performance (cf. langue ~ parole). Competence is indep. of situation.
vs. his pragmatic competence: in its institutional setting.

24- purpose of language. Expression of thought, not communication.
Creativity: novel sentences.
movement: a parameter. English has it, Japanese does not. But doesn’t break the principle.
This vs. (28) implicational hierarchy or accessibility hierarchy, Keenan and Comrie.
Relativization. Subj > obj > ind obj > obj of P > gen > obj of comparison. Start at left and go down. Not all l’s have them all, but go in this hierarchy. Data-driven, observational, vs. UG: theory-driven, may not be breached but need not be present.

(see this).
the man who discovered
the house that Jack built
the man they gave the prize to
the car from which the plate was missing
man whose picture was
the building that Canary Wharf is taller than is St. Pauls

but Ch. will make U’s out of one language alone.
31- not cognitive, vs. Piaget’s continuity of cognitive processes.
Ch – module, a language organ, like the heart.

rules do not exist in their own right, they are interaction of principles and lexical properties.

“language is a set of specifications for parameters in an invariant system of principles of UG” – 1995b. “Generative” is a synonym for explicit and formal. Key is not psychology but truth about knowledge. [see the innateness]

2. Principles and parameters


43- sound-meaning bridge is syntax. Phonetic rep. and semantic rep. PF and LF. Key problem is how child gets the syntactic interface; the others are incidentals (!) LF is only the part of meaning inv. to syntax., e.g “it’s right across the bridge” – how you bracket this.

S-structure with traces: What1 are2 you t2 seeing t1 at the cinema?
D-structure: you are seeing what at the cinema
surface: What are you seeing at the cinema? (46)
T-model: D-structure, movement, S-structure, bridging PF and LF.
modularity of the theory: parts that all fit together. X-bar syntax deals with phrase structure and integrates the lexicon with the syntax via the projection principle. Theta-theory.

No isolated phenomena. Not passives, or questions.

Government. N, V, A, Prep, all lexical heads can be governors. Kate likes me. Case theory.

Interesting problem of the subject. INFL and IP, dealing, among other things, with tense and agreement. plays – play, played. An independent element, as can occur with auxiliaries is playing, was, had, has. Finite and non-finite clauses:

53- he considers Mervyn to play the piano well. Inside other clauses, to is also an independent element. (cf. French aux.)

54- what governs the subj? It is Nom only if there is a finite V; a finite INFL governs the subject, non-finite INFL does not (it is acc. – consider him.) (!!) Governors: N V A P, finite INFL. syntactic rel. betw. governor and governed element. Affects case and agreement.

55- Pro-drop. English in child speech, telegraph style, diaries, signs. Italian is pro-drop and can have VS order in declaratives: cade la notte. Never Eng *falls the night. Subjectless and inverted declaratives in Sp, Itali. [but Slavic, Cz vs. Russian!!] Chinese appears to be pro-drop. Shi ge haixian, Am the walrus. without subject wo. But not inversion here.

Also: one can say in Italian: Che credi che verra? *Who do you believe that will come? Fr. also non pro drop, non inversion. German also. (see later, though)

empty category e. Posit in D-structure pro cade la notte.

Principle of proper government (59): lexical cats govern properly, non-lexical cats do not. INFL is not a proper governor, as it is non-lexical. An empty category must be properly governed.

In prodrop languages, pro is properly governed. finite INFL is like a lexical category. pro is licensed by AGR feature. In non-pro-drop, pro is not properly governed. Whether AGR acts like a lexical category or not. Not in Eng.
Many prodrop have rich inflections, like Latin. Unfortunately Chinese, prodrop, has no inflection and certain verbs are SV only, never inversion (60). So problems here. Prodrop is sometimes called null subject parameter. Either INFL is proper gov or not. Engl *speaks he, Ital parla lui.

Binding Theory
65) anaphor is bound in a local domain
pronominal is free in a local domain
referring expression is free
McCabe said that Smith shot him – can be McCabe or someone outside.
use local domain q: Henry believes himself to be innocent. Henry is outside clause and yet there is anaphor.
he + pron, - anaphor
himself – pron. + anaphor
each other – pron + anaphor

70- Core and Periphery. UG specifies what a language may not be like. [ RJ ‘must’] . Limits various possibilities of languages. small subset of possibilities of the vast number that are possible. Periphery: irregular verbs, odd examples of subjectless S, inversion. A continuum of markedness. [cf. Jakobson!!!] . Departure from the neutral is non wayu. Central core is unmarked. Learnability: unmarked to marked. Less info needed to change the setting.
74- term ‘language’ is epiphenomenal, unimportant. Grammar is important. Grammar and knowing a grammar. (ha) The grammar in a person’s brain is real, the language is not.

3 General Concepts of Language Acquisition
Ch. crushes the behaviorists (Bloomfield, BF Skinner). not stimulus – response.
creativity of possible responses, eg to a Dutch painting. Sent a man to grocery, instead of pat phrases: “could you read this label for me, I forgot my glasses?”

Last contribution of Ch to psychology. Ha.
Initial state So and steady state Ss. ‘static competence’ (!!) Language development is seen as a logical problem.

The LAD – Language acquisition device, like a black box. Input > LAD > output.
80 – older theory had observational, descriptive and explanatory adequacy. Now only explanatory is considered important. Plato’s problem: the black box seems to be contributing things of its own. (Plato: memories or archetypes of past existence.) Poverty of the stimulus argument by Ch. How do they know *Is Sam is the cat that brown? Must be built-in if they know it, eg binding.
85 – cf. religious arguments. The world is so beautiful that it must be made by design. That designer is God. The principles of UG are the principles of the initial state, So.
The L1 learner cannot learn syntax from input alone. Just as the snooker player can’t learn what is not allowed by watching the game on TV. Head-first or head-last comes from positive examples.
Also indirect negative evidence may be relevant.
91 – occurrence and uniformity. It must be shown to occur, and uniformly so, in all classes and cultures. Some parents correct kids, others do not, yet all learn the L1.
92 – need positive evidence; occurrence; uniformity; take-up (children must actually use the evidence.)
imitation. Not sufficient. Repeat it a million times and the kid can’t extract the point.
explanation. Same problem. Conscious understanding is different from the intuitive grasp of the L1 learner. “No one has enough explicit knowledge to provide explanation and instruction” (ha – 95).
Correction: children rarely make errors in word order. vs. eg. I broked it, what did my mummy do at you, etc. Rare errors in structure-dependency. Cf. the oddity What does sheep make a noise, where ‘what’ seems to have moved and not the whole ‘what noise’.
Oddities of correction. (98). Child: Nobody doesn’t like me. Mother: No, say ‘nobody likes me.’ (Repeat ad lib.) Why??
Pragmatic competence, he concedes, does depend on some social environment. (ha) Piaget (101) on general cognitive semiotics. Ch. denies this for UG.
Thus imitation, explanation, correction, social interaction all fail uniformity requirement. The initial state is (104) a “function that maps experience onto the steady state.” A triggering and partially shaping effect. “John ate an apple” is all the kid needs for UG (ha!!) It is more like growing than learning, like a preset biological clock. Biology. Washoe. Seems to show VO order, new utterances, use language to communicate, etc. (108) his ironic comment on apes: “perhaps the distinction between jumping and flying is arbitrary, a matter of degree; people can really fly, just like birds, only not so well.” (ha) Study of L1. Children seem to learn anaphors more easily than pronominals. Why? Referring expressions are free: *He complained after John had the accident. John here is bound, no good. Children chose a referent for he inside the sentence, such as When he closed the book, Cookie Monster lay down. Permitted. But children don’t accept He turned round when Snuffles found the penny. So Principle C of reference known as a young age.

110 – prodrop. Switch can be in neutral, or set to nonprodrop, or set to prodrop. Nina Hyams (1986) makes a celebrated study of this. Finds lots of prodrop in English kids, but they could also use subjects. She concludes that prodrop is the initial setting. Want look a man. Later it is reset. Note presence of expletives there and it in nonprodop S’s. Italian can’t have them. [gmc—this is indefiniteness, to. Russian can have zero, as in impersonals, but is a nonprodrop. Cz is prodrop, but also has impersonals, or to.] Her work shows that actual study of childrens’ language is important.

Degeneracy of the data. Children need phonological clues, intonation. word boundary, what Morgan 1986 calls bracketed data so the phrases can be cued: The dog [bites the cat]. The unmarked setting is the starting point (119). Peripheral grammar needs more evidence, eg. irregular verbs.

What about wild grammar? (122) Children would resist this if UG were fully developed in the initial state. Perhaps it takes time to develop.

124 – L2 acquisition. Few become as good as with L1. What is different about L2 learning? Children already possess one grammar, or when L1 is incomplete. Most are substantially less efficient in L2 than in L1. Neither the initial nor the final stage are the
same as So – Ss. Instead it’s Si > St. St is variable, all learners are variable. Imitation is not sufficient. Nor is explanation, though learners demand it. No one knows the deep truth, it can’t be conveyed. Natural social exchanges are a clear route to L2, but they can’t help UG acquisition any more than they did in L1. Mental processes often are used.
Interesting data in parameter setting acquisition.
4- X-bar Theory
‘consists of’ can be rewrite rules or bracketing. Immediately dominate. All phrases must be endocentric, at least a head. NP contains a N, etc. XP > …X… (135)
4 lexical phrases VP NP AP and PP. drink milk is V, NP > N milk. Phrase level XP and category level, X, are insufficient. Need an intermediary level.
The education minister will resign her post on Tuesday. on Tuesday is an adjunct, try the so test: And so will the Prime Minister (on Weds.)
139 – see diagram. VP > V’ > V resign, NP her post. V’ and PP on Tuesday are sisters.
We have X’’ > X’ > X. Complements: X’ > X complement(s) OR complements X played – the flute, proof – of his guilt, with – a stick. English is head-first, Japanese is head-last. See 142-3.
Specifier belongs alongside the X’. Determiner – the. Order is parametrized.
Two cell-like structures: X’’ consists of the head and possible specifiers, X’, the head and possible complements (144).
The man who paid the bill was John. The rel clause is also an adjunct, not a specifier (the), not a complement, since man has no complement. Can be infinitely expanded by a recursion rule, a rule calling on itself. (146) each adjunct is added onto. Note N’ and the adjunct are sisters.
146 – the subject is in the specifier of the VP.
link between head and its sister complements; link between specifier and head.
148 – Structure of functional phrases
IP > I’ > I Tense, Agr
and > VP the child find the toy
functional phrases are built around funcional heads, tense, agr
150 – whether is a CP > C’ > C whether
then the IP. The CP can be an empty place for, eg., auxiliary to move to, eg in *are you going to the concert?*

154 – see tree of the child finds the toy. subj moves to empty spec position of IP, leaving a trace (see tree 155). How does the verb get up to its I constituent? See later chapter.

156 the invisibility of the trace can have exceptions. Eg *who do you want to visit* has ambiguity, with t before or after *to visit*. But “who do you wanna visit” can only occur if visit – t.

157 – the IP is built on top of the VP and contains the inflectional head. CP in turn is built on top of IP and contains a head complementizer in embedded clauses and an empty head position in matrix clauses.

5 Theta-Theory and Functional categories

predicates (e.g. deplore) and arguments (eg. Mary, violence). Argument structure. Patient th-role, agent, agent, theme, goal: John gave the cheque to his friend

Predicate s-selects (semantic) a particular number of arguments. category selection is c-selection. NP after ask, not after wonder. Subcategorization frame:

ask [\(_\text{CP/NP}\)]

wonder [\(_\text{CP}\)]

theta grid: cook <agent, patient> [\(_\text{NP}\)]

an item both c-selects and s-selects its complements, but only s-selects its subject. (163). Maybe the c-sel can be reduced to s-selection and the subcat frames could be eliminated.

Once the head is inserted, the rest of the lexical information will project up into the structure. UG: info in the lexicon cannot be altered by transformations (166). Or added to.

The Projection Principle: Representations at each syntactic level (LF, D-, S- structure) are projected from the lexicon, in that they observe the subcategorization properties of lexical items. (166).

Theta criterion: only one argument per role. Each argument bears one and only one th-role, and each th-role is assigned to one and only one argument.

What about *John left the room angry*? Are the 2 th roles? More study needed.

No superfluous elements in language. *Every the man loves the woman. Full Interpretation states that every element must be interpreted in some way.*
FI means that structures must be as economical as possible. Principle of Economy. Later shows up in Minimalism.

Th-roles are transferred from predicate to argument by th-marking.

Subjects are more distant from V; they are s-selected, and often it is not the head alone that determines which th-role it may bear. It is a comb. of head and complement, as in John broke the window ~ John broke his arm. Here he is a patient. Subjects are external arguments.

Complements are th-marked by the head under a sisterhood condition. Subj are also th-marked under sisterhood, but it is the whole V’ which does it. (COOL). This is indirect assignment via the X’ vs. direct marking between head and compl.

173 – Eng. has external role to the left of the V’ and internal to the right. Variation in word order may be caused by the parameter setting for direction of th-role assignment. Which does it, the X-bar setting or the th-theory??

Grammatical Functions.

GF’s, eg subject of and object of. Object is NP of X’ and subject is the NP of X’’. Same for obj of a preposition (see 175).

Her parents phoned the school on Friday. NP her parents is immediately dominated by VP’’. the school is imm dominated by V’. Hence it is defined in terms of configurations in D-s.

A-positions, the specifier of VP, complement of PP, VP.

Positions that cannot take arguments are non-A-positions or A-bar positions. the specifier of CP and the complement of VP’’ (see tree 178). Can’t project arguments here.

Th-positions restricted by sisterhood; sis of a head for internal, sis of X’ for external.

Not all A-positions get a th-role. They are always subj positions, eg. spec of IP is an A-position but get no role. Or dummy subj like there and it, no th-role.

All subjects have subject regardless of whether they are semantically required or not (180) !!! The Extended Projection Principle. *Seems that Sarah has left. Got to have a subject filled.

Further types of FP. (181). Separate AGR and tense? Which is higher (181). VSO Berber has AGR inside tense, French, AGR outside tense.

Hungarian: Mutatom a süteménýt show-+st sg def the cake-obj
vs. Mutatok egy süteményt show-1st sg indef a cake-obj
AGR obj P and AGR subj P. (sorry for font problems above – you’ll need E European
font to read this, Times CE) – see the text
Also NEG. Fissioning out of IP. Modal, aspect, passive…DP determiner phrase.
Put NP as the complement of D (184). non-head must be maximal phrases, determiners
are heads of DP. Pronouns are heads of DP’s, I Claudius, We men, you fool
John’s picture of Bill. John is ‘subject’ of DP, later gets affix POSS.
see tree 185.
Functional elements like C are closed, can’t invent a new one. Difficulty in inventing a
new non-gender-specific pronoun for English. Lexical elements are open, can invent. P
seems to straddle the line.
Function elements are clitics. Only they have parameters. The functional Parametrization
hypothesis. Languages differ only in the properties they select for their functional
categories, while lexical cats are universal and uniform (!! –186). Eg tense varies, but hit
does not.
Mixed reception. Main idea is each infl ending has its own phrase. But many endings
show several cats at once [eg Slavic]. Theory runs into difficulty with languages with
highly complex morphology. Maybe AGRP is not necessary for them.

6 Movement and Case Theory

Move alpha. What are the restrictions? either maximal projections XP such as NP or
heads of phrases such as N. D-structure and S-st. Where1 is2 the hospital t2 t1? Not
really movement, but as if they moved. See as chains: (where, t1) and (is, t2). Movement
froms a chain (alpha, t,) where alpha, the head, is the moved and t is its trace.
Take passive as an example (192).
defeat V, [_NP] <agent, patient>. c-select an NP, s-selects two th-roles.
The Saxons were defeated t. This is S-structure. D-s locates its i its original position:
were defeated the Saxons.
Subject? needed by Extended Proj principle. So use e. Diagram 193. Here spec of AGRP
has the e; also there is an e in spec of VP.
Specification must be satisfied at all levels, hence the t and the two e’s.

D e were defeated the Saxons
S The Saxons were defeated t

Passive morphology triggers movement. eg the past part and an auxiliary V. *Were defeated the Saxons is not allowed.

In Spanish, the sentence
ha sido devorada la oveja por el lobo
it has been devoured the sheep by the wolf. Here (195) the NP obj may stay.

Or impersonal passives with expletive: Es wurde getrunken. Engl it was thought that…

Parametrized. movement shifts Saxons from one A-position, the GF obj, to the A-position of GF subj. Can’t have a th-role already. Position must be free of thematic content, no th-role assigned to subj. “Languages have devices for suppresing the subj.”

196 – the passive morph acts like an argument that needs a th-role, eg subj. Absorbed and assigned to it (!!!)

E was won the battle by the Normans. agent role assigned to the PP, acting as an adjunct.

You can have other th-roles, eg goal: the witness was sent a summons. [I was told, mne skazali].

197 – raising does a similar thing: e seem they to be competent. they gets its th-role from be competent, moves to subj: they seem t to be competent.

In both cases no agent role is assigned at D-structure to the external subj position so that movement can take place to an unmarked position.

movement history from an a-position in D to an empty A-position that has neither contained a real NP nor had a th-role.

eg S: the book was said t’ to be lost t. Moves twice.

199 – Wh-movement

who, which, how. Either head of a phrase or of a DP containing an NP, hence either q’s or relatives. Who did he see?

see V, [_NP] <experiencer, source>.

D: he past see who
he: exp, source: who. Where can who move?? Into a non-A-position, getting who he past see t
the spec of CP!! see 200. This is not an A-position, th-roles cannot be assigned to it.
Can have several steps, as with NP-movement.
What did he believe he saw? < what he past believe t’ he past see t (S)
First to spec of embedded CP, then to spec of main clause.
What triggers this? Is there an abstract feature forcing wh- to move to it, likes verbs
moving to AGR to pick up features? Some complementizers are interrog (whether), some
not (that). “All +wh- complements have to have a +wh- element”
Specifier-head agreement. eg. the subj of a finite clause in spec of AGRP agrees with the
head of AGRP. If this is universal, then spec of CP will agree with its head, both having
+ wh- (202),
but *who do you wonder John likes t? Perhaps there is no +wh in the CP, so it’s violated.
*I think who John kissed. the pred subcats for a –wh CP complement, hence it can’t stay
here, but it could move up to ‘who do I think John kissed t’
203- relatives. The student who the examiner failed was Tom.
D – the student [the examiner failed who] was Tom. Who is GF object, a-position. Moves
to spec of CP.
Starts from a th-marked A-position and goes to a non-th-marked.
204 – but you could have no relative: the student the examiner failed, or that the
examiner failed. This is the complementizer as in I think that… (??)
Can’t have both who and that. Doubly Filled COMP filter: can’t contain both wh- and
overt COMP. Not universal, see Dutch
205 – Ik vroeg him wie of hij had gezien
I asked him who whether he had seen
________________________
wh- also a chain. Who did he see? with S: who did he see t
is a chain who, t. A non-A-chain.
hence both q’s and rel’s involve movement of wh- from object position to spec of CP.
207 – Subject and verb movement
Susan likes tomatoes. moves by NP-movement to the spec of AGRP, sister of AGR’.
Leaves a trace, of course. See. A parameter: Welsh and Catalan can stay in VP.
ha ficat les sabates a l’armari l’Oriol
has put the shoes in the closer the Oriol = it was Oriol who put…
Catalan subj don’t raise and can move within the VP.

209 Verb movement. Will Judith pass? When will you leave?

will might come in as head of TP, but this is far from clear. see 209. Judith moves to spec of AGR’. The aux moves first to the head of AGRP, then to the head of CP (sic!!), produces in the order in 209. Gets its inflection in AGR, then to its final position in front of the subj.

Inversion q’s in English demand an auxiliary. If there is none, a dummy do: Did John see him?

Be and Have with possessive meaning can act like auxiliaries and go to the C position: Is he a fool? Have you many children? (cf. American do you have children and the stock answer ‘not very often’ from the British).

This is parametric variation again.

Negative. John does not like Mary *John likes not Mary. But French Jean n’aime pas Marie.

211 see the Fr tree. Subj moves way up to the spec of AGR – s; aime moves first to the head of AGR –obj, then to the head position of NEG, picking up ne, then ending up at the head of TP, picking up present; it is before pas but with ne stuck to it (!!!)

Eng has the same D-structure but the verb can’t pass the NEG. This is called a weak AGR obj, meaning that if a lexical verb were to move into it, the verb would not be able to assign its th-roles. (?) The French AGR obj is transparent and allows the V to assign its roles.

The reason have and be can move is that they too do not assign th-roles.

This is another parameter setting.

Main verbs can’t come in Eng at the beginning - *likes he Mary, but they can in French.

Adverbs can’t come after the V in English, as the V can’t move inot the head of AGRP because of its weakness, but they can in French: Jean embrasse souvent Marie.

Quantifier all precedes the V in Engl, tout follows it:

My friends all love Mary.

214 – Mes amis aiment tous Marie.

Thus the para difference has huge consequences.
V-movement involves head of phrase to head position, vs. NP, known as head-movement. Has to be in a series of steps. Head movement constraint; only to a position that governs its maximal projection.

How does the Eng verb get tense and number if no auxiliary and no dummy do?

Got to be lowering?? Or, assume if has movement at LF rather than in syntax, as Japanese has wh-movement at LF. Idea in minimalism that the inflections come in lexicon and that movement to the noes is to check that the verb has the right features.

Word order. Eng is SVO. Japanese is SOV.

Shikisha-ga boo-o furu
conductor baton waves.

216- Welsh is VSO: killed the dragon the man. All possibilities occur. SOV 45%, SVO, 42%, VSO 9%, VOS 3%. Less than 1% are OVS and OSV – all in the Amazon basin.

How can we have VSO, with the V separated from obj? The V has got to move out of the VP over the subject. 217.

V-movement in German. Main clause, finite V always in 2nd position after S, O or adverb.

Bruno verlor dieses Buch, Dieses Buch verlor Bruno, Heute verlor Bruno dieses Buch.
aux is the finite V and main vb is final: Bruno hat dieses Buch verloren.

If sub, finite is last: dass Bruno dieses Buch verloren hat, verlor.

Starts out in VP-final and then moves to the C, if this is free. Then, in main clauses, the other element moves to the spec of CP. see 219.

D: Brno (spec of V) dieses Buch verlor (head last). Verlor goes to the C position and Subject to specifier, producing Bruno verlor dieses Buch. see 220 and note that the heads are all to the right of the complements. (Except that C is to the left of AGR, and specifier are all to the left, as in Eng).

If there is a dass, then the V stays in the AGR in final position (221).

Most Germanic langs are V2 (complementizer), not all underlying SOV like German.

English is SVO, Danish SVO. Thus v-movement to the C is a key here.

Hungarian: what the hell is its order? Maybe non-configurational. [Note bad errors in agreement in the chart on p. 222].
222 – Case Theory. Engl: genitive in NPs and pronoun system, vs. inflected languages.

Case Theory assigns abstract Case to NPs and helps explain movement. She dislikes him. She is nom (subj usually nom), him is acc. Like th-roles in that there are Case assigners, V and P. Nom case is restricted to subj in finite clauses. *I tried she to hit him. not allowed. the nonfinite to is minus tense, finite has + tense. nonfinite have no AGR, only a tense. Hence they should be in a TP (tense phrase), see 225. Subj of finite clause in in spec of AGRP, while subj of nonfinite is in the spec of TP (see). AGR assigns NOM case. Structural case like these vs. inherent case, like Sie hilft ihm, Ihm wird geholfen, [Russ case valences.] Structural case assigned at S-level, after movement; eg nom is assigned by AGR in S-structure to the GF subject: he disappeared. Inherent is in the lexicon.

Genitive may be the spec of NP, inherent as argument of nouns. np [NP _ ]

The Case Filter. Every phonetic NP must be assigned Case.

I was sorry to have to leave.

*I was sorry I/me/myself to leave.

I was sorry I had to leave (finite).

Can’t have overt subj because there is no AGR to assign nom case. It is ungrammatical because of the case filter: you have to have some case assigned.

But in

228 – I believe him to be intelligent. We were anxious for him to leave

the case is assigned by the V believe and the COMP for. English is exceptional in allowing these overt subj and not all infinitival clauses can have them hence they are

Exceptional Case Marking, ECM.

How do the subjects of passives get Case? The passive morphology absorbs the external th-role by taking it for itself. What about Case? If assigned at S-structure, it moves to a position where it can get case and the filter is satisfied. Indeed this is such a position.

And, indeed, the Case Filter FORCES this movement to a Case-marked position from a caseless one.

Filter will also force raising, as in e seems John to be intelligent to John seems t …
230 – and in declarative clauses, John will kiss Mary, the subj has to move out of the spec of VP to get Case. To motivate this further, say that it effects the visibility of th-arguments. Now it is in the Full Interpretation theory.

231 Parameters of Case theory. ECMs? (I want them to go.) Engl demands the Case assigner be adjacent to the NP that it assigns case to. *I liked very much him. *I banged very loudly the door. But allowed: I banged very loudly on the door. Fr: J’aime beaucoup la France.

Case Adjacency is thus postulated.

Engl assigns case to the right and Japanese to the left. You could have a marked situation which is different from the X-bar structure. Eg Chinese, a head-final, still has VO. case is assigned rightwards.

Should move alpha be affect alpha?