

February 20, 2009

SUMMARY & OVERVIEW

1. Raising & Control: A Description

- subject-to-**subject** raising and control
 - (1) a. Barnett seemed to understand the formula.
b. Barnett tried to understand the formula.
- subject-to-**object** raising and control
 - (2) a. Barnett believed the doctor to have examined Tilman.
b. Barnett persuaded the doctor to examine Tilman.
- five core distinguishing **properties**
 - (3) a. *thematic roles*
b. *embedded passive*
c. *selectional restrictions*
d. *pleonastic/expletive subjects*
e. *interpretation of idiom chunks*
- **ambiguities**: problems with the distinction or different verbs?
 - (4) The street sweeper began to work.
 - (5) a. The street sweeper began to work, once we replaced the spark plugs.
b. The street sweeper began to work, as soon as he got to the park.
 - (6) a. Rain threatened. / Rain threatened to fall.
b. Sandra threatened that she would leave. / Sandra threatened to leave.
 - (7) a. The boy promises to be a gifted musician.
b. The boy promised to pick up a quart of milk on the way home.
- a **third** construction — or: more than a 'mere problem' (?)
 - (8) a. She wanted them to be nice.
b. She wanted to be nice.
 - (9) a. Barnett would prefer the doctor to examine Tilman.
b. Barnett would prefer to examine Tilman.
 - (10) a. Terry wants very much for Ashley to arrive on time.
b. The administration would prefer for all staff to agree on the issue.

2. A Brief History of Generative Syntactic Theorizing, Part 1: The 60s & 70s

- the ‘**linguistic revolution**’: *Syntactic Structures* (Chomsky 1957)

- Robert B. Lees (‘Review of *Syntactic Structures*’; *Language* 33.3: 375–408, 1957):

[*Syntactic Structures* is] one of the first serious attempts on the part of a linguist to construct within the tradition of theory-construction a comprehensive theory of language which may be understood in the same sense that a chemical, biological theory is ordinarily understood by experts in those fields. It is not a mere reorganization of the data into a new kind of library catalog, nor another speculative philosophy about the nature of Man and Language, but a rather rigorous explanation of our intuitions about language in terms of an overt axiom system, the theorems derivable from it, explicit results which may be compared with new data and other intuitions, all based plainly on an overt theory of the internal structure of languages. [Up to that point], the field of descriptive and structural linguistics [was] ... oriented towards ... providing linguistics with the mechanical procedure for discovering the correct grammar of any given language. (pp. 377–378)

- now: to account for how a language makes “infinite use of finite means” (the observation going back to Humboldt 1836; see esp. Chomsky 1955/1975, 1965)

- **Standard Theory**: The *Aspects*-Model (Chomsky 1965)

- *conceptually*: ‘descriptive and explanatory adequacy’ (cf. Chomsky 1955/1975)
- *phrase structure*: generates constituent structure of linguistic expressions
- *lexicon*: lexical insertion rules yield constituency resulting in Deep Structure
- *transformations*: insertion, movement, deletion rules deriving Surface Structure

- | | | |
|---------|--|--------------------------|
| (11) a. | [_{NP} [it] [_S Barnett understand the formula]] seem | <i>Deep Structure</i> |
| b. | [_{NP} [it] [_S for Barnett to understand the formula]] seem | <i>Comp. Insertion</i> |
| c. | [_{NP} it] seem [_S for Barnett to understand the formula] | <i>Extraposition</i> |
| d. | [_{NP} Barnett] seem [_S for to understand the formula] | <i>Pronoun Replacem.</i> |
| e. | [_{NP} Barnett] seem [_S to understand the formula] | <i>Comp. Deletion</i> |
| (12) a. | Barnett try [_S [_{NP} Barnett] understand the formula] | <i>Deep Structure</i> |
| b. | Barnett try [_S for [_{NP} Barnett] to understand the formula] | <i>Comp. Insertion</i> |
| c. | Barnett try [_S for to understand the formula] | <i>Equi NP Deletion</i> |
| e. | Barnett try [_S to understand the formula] | <i>Comp. Deletion</i> |

- **Extended Standard Theory** (EST; Chomsky 1973)

- *conceptually*: move towards lexicalism, no category-changing transformations
- *transformations*: reducing the number to attain maximally general conditions

- | | | |
|---------|---|--------------------------|
| (13) a. | it seemed [_S COMP Barnett to understand the formula] | <i>Deep Structure</i> |
| b. | Barnett seemed to understand the formula. | <i>It-Replacement</i> |
| (14) a. | [_{NP} Δ] seem [_S Barnett to understand the formula] | <i>Deep Structure</i> |
| b. | Barnett seemed to understand the formula. | <i>(Subject) Raising</i> |
| (15) a. | Barnett tried to understand the formula. | |
| b. | Barnett tried [Barnett to understand the formula] | <i>(no need anymore)</i> |
| c. | Barnett tried [PRO to understand the formula] | <i>Controlled PRO</i> |

3. A Brief History of Generative Syntactic Theorizing, Part 2: The Late 1970s

- **Revised Extended Standard Theory** (REST; Chomsky & Lasnik 1977)

- *conceptually*: clear emphasis on ‘explanatory adequacy’ and ‘universality’
- *implementation*: different mapping relations between base and components
- *attempt*: make transformations as general as possible → optional, not strict rules

(16) <i>Mapping from:</i>	<i>to:</i>	<i>is mediated by:</i>
Base	DS	X-bar theory
Lexicon	DS	subcategorization features
DS	SS	structure preservation
SS	UP (PF)	filters
SS	LF	rules of construal and quantifier interpretation

- ‘Control’: a rule of construal (distinction: obligatory vs. non-obligatory control)

- (17) a. $[_{NP} \text{Barnett}]_i$ seemed $[_S [_{NP} e]_i \text{ to } [_{VP} \text{understand the formula}]]$ *RtoS only*
 b. Barnett believed $[_S [_{NP} \text{the doctor}] \text{ to } [_{VP} \text{have examined Tilman}]]$ *– no RtoO*

- (18) a. I don’t know $[_S [_{NP} e] \text{ to say}]$ *index $[_{NP} e] = PRO$*
 b. $[_S [_{NP} e] \text{ to say}]$ often depends on the situation *from SS to LF*

- (19) a. Barnett tried $[_S [_{NP} e] \text{ to understand the formula}]$ *index $[_{NP} e] = PRO$*
 b. Barnett persuaded the doctor $[_S [_{NP} e] \text{ to examine Tilman}]$ *via coindexation*

- ‘Equi’: *want = believe* (OC) selecting complementizer *for* (which may be deleted)

- (20) a. She wanted $[_S [_{NP} \text{them}] \text{ to } [_{VP} \text{be nice}]]$
 b. She_i wanted $[_S [_{NP} e]_i \text{ to be nice}]$
 c. Terry wants very much $[_S \text{for } [_S \text{Ashley to arrive on time}]]$

- (21) a. %Greg wants for himself to be nice. *no application of deletion*
 b. %Greg wants himself to be nice. *for-deletion only*
 c. *Greg wants for to be nice. *Equi NP-deletion only*
 d. Greg wants to be nice. *for-deletion and Equi NP-deletion*

- (22) a. *Greg believes for himself to be nice. *filter: *believe [S' for...]]*
 b. Greg believes himself to be nice.
 c. *Greg believes for to be nice. *filter: *believe [S' for...]]*
 d. *Greg believes to be nice. *no context for Equi NP-deletion*

- **alternative** frameworks: Relational Grammar, Lexical-Functional Grammar...

Time doesn’t allow a treatment of any of these approaches. But note that **RG** arose in the early 1970s, alongside EST; ST then took a different path: into (i) EST and (ii) RG. (Davies & Dubinsky not only discuss these alternative frameworks, they also offer a lot of discussion within mainstream theorizing and theoretical issues that thus arise.)

4. A Brief History of Generative Syntactic Theorizing, Part 3: 1980s & Beyond

- **Government-and-Binding Theory** (GB; Chomsky 1981, 1982, 1986a, 1986b)

- *modular approach to grammar*: semi-autonomous sub-systems that interact — in particular: Binding Theory, Bounding Theory, Case Theory, Control Theory, Government Theory, Theta Theory (subcategorization), X-bar Theory (PS rules)
- *transformational component*: reduced to one operation, 'Move- α ', plus restrictions
- *D-structure*: categorial component plus lexicon (θ -roles for subcategorization)
- *S-structure*: output of transformational component (restricted by Case Theory)
- *LF and PF*: mapping to interpretive output with deletion etc. (LF: very complex)

- (32) a. Barnett seemed to understand the formula. *as in REST plus EPP*
 b. It seemed that Barnett understood the formula. *plus late it-insertion*
 c. * It seemed Barnett to have understood the formula. *Case Filter violation*

- (33) a. Barnett believed (that) the doctor had examined Tilman. *S'-complement*
 b. Barnett believed the doctor to have examined Tilman. *infinitival S*
 c. Barnett believed him. *Case-marking V*

- (34) a. Barnett believed [_S (that) [_S [_{NP} the doctor] had examined Tilman]]
 b. DS: Barnett believed [_S' [_S [_{NP} the doctor] to have examined Tilman]]
 SS: Barnett believed [_S [_{NP} the doctor] to have examined Tilman]
 c. DS: Barnett believed [_{NP} e] [_S' [_S [_{NP} the doctor] to have examined Tilman]]
 SS: Barnett believed [_{NP} the doctor]_i [_S [_{NP} e]_i to have examined Tilman]

- (35) a. Terry wants (very much for) Ashley to arrive on time.
 b. DS: Terry wants [_S' for [_S [_{NP} Ashley] to arrive on time]]
 SS: Terry wants [_S [_{NP} Ashley] to arrive on time]
 c. SS: Terry wants [_S' for [_S [_{NP} Ashley] to arrive on time]]
 PF: Terry wants [_S' [_S [_{NP} Ashley] to arrive on time]]

- (36) a. Barnett_i tried [_S' [_S PRO_i to understand the formula]]
 b. [PRO to perjure oneself] would be unwise

- **Minimalist Program** (MP; Chomsky 1993, 1994, 1995, 2000 *et seq.*)

- milestones for raising/control analysis: Lasnik & Saito (1991), Runner (1995)

- (37) a. *Joan believes him_i to be a genius even more fervently than Bill_i does.
 b. Joan believes (that) he_i is a genius even more fervently than Bill_i does.

- (38) a. I believe very strongly that Tony is honest.
 b. *I believe very strongly Tony to be honest.
 c. *I believe very strongly Tony's assertion.
 d. I believe Tony very strongly to be honest.

- major issue I: role of empty categories in the grammar, esp. existence of PRO
- major issue II: status of θ -roles/Criterion, esp. with respect to (formal) features
- major issue III: structure-building transformational component: Merge & Move