DP Movement

Introduction to Syntax
Adam Szczegielniak

Differences between head move and XP move

• Why does the grammar encode two types of relationships:
  – Head movement
  – XP movement
• X and XP’s are constituents.
• But so is X’ but there is no X-bar movement
  – X’ is a by product of phrasal assembly, after D-structure is assembled, intermediate X’ phrases are not visible to syntactic operations.
Why does XP move to Spec-Y and not Y?

• Head movement has been argued to target heads and adjoin the moved head to another head
  – Head movement is composing features of two or more heads where only one has PF features
    • Enrichment of existing PF material
• XP movement cannot adjoin to a head.
  – XP movement is composing features of two or more phrases
  – Triggered by features on a head

Features triggering DP movement

• A v active/passive head needs to discharge its Theta Role
• A V head needs to discharge its theta role
• DP’ s need theta Roles
• The level where theta roles are successfully assigned is called Deep-Structure
• DS is a representation of the argument structure of a clause.
**DS vs Case/EPP Agreement**

- DS encodes theta roles locally
- However, A DP needs also Case, participates in Agreement
- A T requires EPP
  - Extended Projection Principle
    - T needs to have Spec occupied by a DP
  - Projection Principle:
    - Every head needs to have a Phrase
  - EPP is not well understood
    - Captures that every clause needs a subject
    - Some connect it to Nominative case

**EPP**

- It rains
- *rains
- It seems it is raining
- *Seems is raining
- Not theta-role for It yet needs to be present.
- It In subject position
- VP ellipsis:
  - Yesterday it seemed that John likes Mary and
  - Today it does so too [seem that John likes Mary]
- ‘It’ is in Spec-T although there is no theta role for ‘it’
- Hence every DP needs a theta role, except an expletive ‘it’
EPP

- EPP is not easily reduced to Nominative Case
- Infinitival T needs a subject but its in Accusative case:
  - It is important for him to swim a lot
  - I expect him to swim a lot
- English requires a DP in Spec-T

Spec-T Case and Agreement

- It is important for him to swim a lot
- Case can be assigned by ‘for’
  - I expect him to swim a lot
- This is trickier, we will argue case assigned by Expect. We will return to this
- T assigns Nominative case when [+finite]
- Otherwise no case assigned by T
Subject –Verb agreement

- He swims a lot
- I swim a lot

• English has Subject verb agreement, main verb or auxiliary moving from v ->T
  - I have swam a lot
  - He has swam a lot
  - I am swimming
  - He is swimming

• When two Aux then agreement with top one (the one in T)
  - I have been swimming
  - He has been swimming

• Ignoring the complication with main verbs we can argue that Agreement between Subject and Verb is via T.

• Case, EPP and Agreement indicate that Subject has to be in Spec-T

• There is also word order:
  - I will swim a lot

Agent in Spec-v, Subject in Spec-T but it is the same DP

• Spec-v (active) position encodes the external argument function of the DPO
• Spec-T position encodes the Subject position of the DP

• Usually it is the same DP, hence we assume it moves from Spec-v(active) to Spec-T
DP Movement

- DP moves from Argument positions to Specifier positions
- DP movement is XP movement, always to Spec
- Head movement always to head
- DP movement is driven by Case, EPP

Causatives

- v (active) is considered to have a causative meaning
  - v causative in English is null but in other languages you see it.
  - Dutch:
    A. De politie deed/liet de auto stoppen.
    the police did/let the car stop
    ‘The police stopped the car.’
- Deed/liet are in v(causeative) which we call v(active). Either name is fine.
- Note the word order, the object is in between the main verb and the causative auxiliary
- Why would the object move, or is Dutch head final?
- Let us assume the object does move, where and why?
- Case.
Do objects get case from V

- Particle verbs
  - He picked up the book
  - He picked the book up
- How come the object can be in between the verb and its particle
- We propose that there is a v(acc) head assigning case to objects
  - In English the main verb moves to that head
  - In Dutch it does not.
- Both subject and object are structural positions derived via movement
- Internal and External arguments are thematic positions established at Deep structure
Passive active

• Not always Subject=Agent
  – He photographed her (acc)
  – She (nom) was photographed
  – I photographed them
  – We (nom) were photographed
• We see that Theme in passive acts like a subject:
  – Nominative case
  – Agreement with top v
  – Above T:
    – We will be photographed

Passive active have same D-structure

  – John photographed Mary
  – Mary was photographed by John
• Same theta roles
• Same truth conditions
• Different surface structure
• Different subjects
Passive transformation

- Little v(active/passive) can has +/-active feature
- When (+active)
  - Has Agent theta role
  - There is v(caus=active)
  - Agent in Spec-T = Subject
    - Nom case
    - verb agree
  - Has Theme/Patient theta role
  - There is v(acc) assigning case, Spec-v(acc) = Object
- When (+Passive)
  - No Agent theta role
  - No v(caus=active) but v (passive)
  - No v(acc)
  - Theme/Patient in Spec-T = Subject
    - Nom case
    - Verb agree

Passive movement
Unaccusatives vs unergatives

• Is it possible that some intransitive verbs have just internal argument?
• Yes, we will argue that Molti studenti in Italian below has moved from inner argument position of ‘arrive’, but agrees with the verb and gets Nom case:
• Molti studenti sono arrivato
  Many students are arrived
  ‘Many students have arrived’
• Such verbs will be called unaccusatives, and contrasted with
  • Unergatives, like ‘telephone’ where there is no inner argument:
  • Molti studenti hanno telefonato
    Many students have telephoned

Difference between unaccusatives and unergatives

A. Ne sono arrivati molti
   Of them are arrived many
   ‘Many of them have arrived’

*B. Ne hanno telefonato molti
   of them have telephoned many
   ‘Many of them have telephoned’
   ‘Ne’ can raise out of the DP ‘Ne molti’ leaving ‘molti’ in object position in A but not in B. Because arrive has one inner argument, whereas telephone has one outer argument.
Transitives Ne extraction

• Support for the claim that Ne can be extracted from inner argument but not outer argument position comes from intransitives

A. I bamibini NE mangiano molti
   The children of them eat many
   ‘The children eat a lot of them’

*B. Molti Ne mangiano gli spaghetti
   Many of them eat the spaghetti

Derivation of unaccusatives and unergatives

Unacc

Unerg

Note: V→v(caus)
Burzio’s Generalization

• If a verb does not assign a Agent/Theme theta role it does not assign an Accusative Case
• Unaccusatives
  – He(nom) arrived
• Passives
  – She(nom) was photographed
• Both have no Agent/Theme theta role and inner argument gets Nom case by moving to Spec-T for EPP

Raising

A. John will seem to dance
B. It will seem that John is dancing
• If seems does not assign an Agent theta roles as (B) shows because of ‘it’ then in A we have one theta role and one DP which is OK.
• But we also have two TP’s meaning two subject positions.
• One TP headed by ‘will’ the other by ‘to’
Raising movement

Raising

• Raising is possible out of a clause that does not assign Nominative case
• to a clause with a verb that does not assign
  – an Agent theta role and
  – that does not have an inner DP argument
• Raising verbs:
  • Seem
  • Appear
  • Is likely
  • Seems likely
  • Appears likely
Raising out of passive

• Raising verbs allow to move an argument into the Spec-T above them
  – They have a subject but no External argument
  – Theta roles are from the verb the argument moved from

• Idioms:
  – The tabs would appear to be kept by the FBI
  – The sh*t seems to have hit the fan

• The above idioms show that the DP subject (first case from passive) of the embedded infinitival can raise to the Spec-T of the raising verb

• Extraposition is also possible with raising verbs
  – It appears likely [that John will leave]
  – [That John will leave] appears likely
Not every structure is raising

• It is likely that John will dance
• John is likely to dance
• Compare with
• John is keen to dance
• *It is keen that John will dance
• Many verbs take CP’s with infinitival T, but not all are raising structures.
• But there is still no over subject!

Control
– The sh*t is likely to hit the fan (Raising)
– The sh*t is eager to hit the fan (Control)
– That John will dance is likely (Raising)
– That John will dance is eager (Control)
• Non raising verbs do not pass the test for raising.
• They assign their own Agent theta role
• But then we need two DP’s
• The Null DP is PRO
• We can have subject or object control
• John likes to swim
• John told Roger to swim
PRO

- PRO is a phonetically null pronounal that does not get case but absorbs theta role and satisfies EPP
- PRO shows up in binding:
  A. John is eager \[\text{CP}_1 \text{PRO} \text{ to photograph himself/him}^*\]
  - Condition A says ‘himself’ needs a DP antecedent in the same minimal CP that c-commands it
  - Condition B says pronoun cannot be co-indexed with DP in the same minimal CP that c-commands it
- Why is A fine with reflexive
  - PRO c-commands it, and in same minimal Domain
- Why is pronoun not possible with index same as John?
  - PRO C-commands it, and is in the same minimal domain
  - Him cannot directly refer to John just like:
- John said he likes him
  - Pronoun cannot have same index as c-commanding and same domain DP antecedent
- PRO is hybrid of pronoun (can be in different CP domain) and reflexive (needs to have overt antecedent)

Control structure
ECM

- Raising to object
- John wants her (acc) to go home
- Her gets accusative case but has Agent theta role from go?
- Movement from External argument position to Object position?
- This is evidence for our assumption that Internal Arguments get their case from a separate v

Exceptional Case Marking
Binding

• John\textsubscript{i} wants her to like herself\textsubscript{i}
• John\textsubscript{i} seems to like himself\textsubscript{i}
• Condition A appears to apply at Deep Structure
• John\textsubscript{i} wants him\textsubscript{i/j} to leave
• John\textsubscript{i} wants him\textsubscript{i/j} to like him\textsubscript{i/j}
• Condition B applies at both D-structure and Surface structure