

November 12/16, 2004

CLASSES 18-19: EXERCISES

COPULAR CONSTRUCTIONS

Adger (2003: 196-197): ex. 2

- copular **be** is analyzed as a light verb v
- it behaves **like auxiliaries** in that it moves to T in the absence of other finite elements
⇒ copular *be* may carry a strong inflectional feature [$uInfl$:] triggering movement to T
- NB: v may **not move to T** when a lexical verb has adjoined to it...

ELLIPSIS AND AUXILIARIES

Adger (2003: 197-198): ex. 3

- **Ptr approach is indeed problematic**: in the absence of auxiliaries in the first coordinate, the tense features are pronounced on v and the two v Ps are not “identical” (*more on identity!*)

ENGLISH HAVE

Adger (2003: 199-200): ex. 5

- there are **two haves**: (perfective) auxiliary *have* and (lexical) verb *have*

TREES

Adger (2003: 240): ex. 1

- **adjuncts can attach** to the left (4) or to the right (1, 4)
- the **structure of the double object construction** is still tricky
- remember to put **all features in the derivations**, in particular the “new ones”
⇒ case-features, all inflectional features (tense, aspect, phi), EPP ($[uN^*]$ on T), etc.

EXPLETIVES

Adger (2003: 240-241): ex. 4

- take copular *be* to sit in v : the subject stays in situ, *there* is Merged into SpecTP
⇒ there *doesn't* have phi-features, these always come from the “real” (thematic) subject

DITRANSITIVE PASSIVES

Adger (2003: 241): ex. 6

- passivization **promotes the thematic object** to the status of grammatical subject
- the only element that can be **passivized is the theme** (or so it seems)
⇒ goal/PP-object in ditransitives cannot be passivized
- since the **grammatical subject carries nominative**, the explanation might lie in case
⇒ P checks [acc] on the indirect object/goal argument (DP), so it can't (also) have [nom]
- an even better and **more elegant answer** is of course **intervention**
⇒ the theme-DP intervenes between T and the DP within the goal/PP-object