

## Syntax II – Class #17

### Unaccusativity and AgrO

#### Unaccusativity

*see handout from class #16*

#### Exceptional Case Marking and AgrO

- Argument that ECM subjects, under *believe*-class verbs, are indeed embedded subjects (Rosenbaum 1967)

- (1) I believe that Wallace convinced Gromit.
- (2) a. I believe Wallace to have convinced Gromit.  
b. = I believe Gromit to have been convinced by Wallace.
- (3) a. I compelled Wallace to examine Gromit.  
b. I compelled Wallace to have been examined by Gromit.
- (4) a. I believe there to be a sheep in the living room.  
b. I believe advantage to have been taken of Gromit.
- (5) a. \* I forced there to be a sheep in the living room.  
b. \* I forced advantage to have been taken of Gromit.

- Differences between infinitival subjects and embedded nominative subjects (Postal 1974)

- (6) a. Wendolene believed Wallace to be dashing.  
b. Wallace was believed to be dashing by Wendolene.
- (7) a. \* Wallace believed him to be dashing.  
b. Wallace believed himself to be dashing.
- (8) Wallace and Gromit believed each other to be good chums.
- (9) a. The FBI proved that few students were spies.  
b. The FBI proved few students to be spies.

- Condition C effects: ECM subjects parallel matrix clause objects (Postal 1974, extended by Lasnik & Saito 1991)

- (10) a. ?\*Wendolene believes him even more fervently than Wallace's mother does.  
b. ?\* Wendolene believes him to be a genius even more fervently than Wallace's mother does.

c. Wendolene believes he is a genius even more fervently than Wallace's mother does.

- Reciprocal Binding: ECM subjects parallel matrix clause objects (Lasnik & Saito 1991)

- (11) a. ? The DA accused the defendants during each other's trials.  
b. ? The DA proved [the defendants to be guilty] during each other's trials.  
c. ?\*The DA proved [that the defendants were guilty] during each other's trials.

- Negative Polarity Item licensing: ECM subjects parallel matrix clause objects (Lasnik & Saito 1991)

- (12) a. The DA accused none of the defendants during any of the trials.  
b. ? The DA proved [none of the defendants to be guilty] during any of the trials.  
c. ?\*The DA proved [that none of the defendants were guilty] during any of the trials.

[cf. Zidani-Eroglu 1997 for very similar arguments from Turkish ECM constructions.]

- Believe-class vs. Want-class (Bach 1977, Lasnik & Saito 1991)

- (13) a. ?Wendolene wants him to be a genius even more fervently than Wallace's mother does.  
b. ?\* Wendolene believes him to be a genius even more fervently than Wallace's mother does.

- (14) a. ??\* I wanted [those men to be fired] because of each other's statements.  
b. ? I believed [those men to be unreliable] because of each other's statements.

- (15) a. ??\* I wanted [none of the applicants to be hired] after reading any of the reports.  
b. ??I believed [none of the applicants to be qualified] after reading any of the reports.

- (16) a. ?\*I wanted very much [for those men to be fired] because of each other's statements.  
b. \* I wanted very much [for none of the applicants to be hired] after reading any of the reports.

- (17) \* Wallace was wanted to be a genius by Wendolene.

### **Antecedent Contained Deletion** (Hornstein 1994)

- (18) a. Wallace fed Gromit, and Wendolene did [<sub>VP</sub> e] too.  
b. Wallace fed Gromit, and Wendolene did [<sub>VP</sub> fed Gromit] too.

- (19) a. Wendolene kissed everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> e].  
b. ??? Wendolene kissed everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> kiss everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> e]].

- Quantifier Raising as means of escaping infinite regress problem (May 1985)

- (20) a. [everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> e]]<sub>i</sub> Wendolene kissed t<sub>i</sub>.  
 b. [everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> kissed t<sub>i</sub>]]<sub>i</sub> Wendolene kissed t<sub>i</sub>.

- Raising to AgrO as means of escaping infinite regress problem (Hornstein 1994)

- (21) a. Wendolene kissed everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> e].  
 b. Wendolene [<sub>AgrOP</sub>[everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> e]] kissed t<sub>i</sub>.]  
 c. Wendolene [<sub>AgrOP</sub>[everyone that Wallace did [<sub>VP</sub> kissed t<sub>i</sub>]] kissed t<sub>i</sub>.]

- (22) a. \* I expect [<sub>CP</sub> that [<sub>NP</sub> everyone you do] will visit Mary].  
 b. ? I expect [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> everyone you do] to visit Mary].

### Other Arguments for AgrOP

- Theoretical simplification allowed
- Object Shift and object scrambling processes