A. The puzzle

(1) a. It appears that John made bread.
   b. John appears to have made bread.
   c. * It appears John to have made bread

• What we want to explain: why (1c) is ungrammatical.
• This is puzzling if we consider that (1c) appears to just combine the pieces of the grammatical sentences (1a, 1b).

B. Where is John pronounced?

(2) a. It appears that John made bread.
   b. John appears to have made bread.

• Puzzle: these sentences seem to be synonymous and yet John is pronounced in different places.
  o How come? Hypothesis: what is the syntactic operation that allows some phrase to be pronounced at some position, even though it is interpreted in another position? _________________.¹
  o But if this hypothesis is tenable, we must determine whether John really can be interpreted in a position different from the one where it is pronounced.
    – The argument will come from semantic restrictions and idioms.

C. Semantic restrictions

(3) a. This gem appears to be shiny.
   b. * This gem appears to be good at mathematics.
(4) a. It appears that this gem is shiny.
   b. * It appears that this gem is good at mathematics.

⇒ Generalization: the thematic-role of the NP that is pronounced before a verb like appear comes from _________________.
  o As such, in sentences like (3a), the stone can get to the position where it is pronounced by _________________.

D. Idioms

• Recall what we learnt on pset #3 about Dutch word order and idioms:

(5) a. …dat Jan het book lest
    that Jan the book reads
   ‘…that Jan is reading the book.’

¹The particular instance of ________________ in sentences like (1c) is called raising, hence the title of the handout. But make no mistake: this is just a conventional name – we don’t want a brand new syntactic operation.
b. * . . . dat Jan * het book
   that Jan reads the book
   ‘...that Jan is reading the book.’

(6) . . . dat Jan * het podium * springt op de trampoline
   that Jan on the stage jumps on the trampoline
   ✓ ‘On the trampoline Loc, Jan jumps onto the stage Goal.’
   ✓ ‘On the stage Loc, Jan jumps up and down on the trampoline Loc.’
   ✗ ‘On the stage Loc, Jan jumps onto the trampoline Goal.’

(7) a. . . . dat Jan [ouwe koeien uit de sloot haalt]
   that Jan [old cows out the ditch hauls]
   ✓ ‘...that Jan hauls old cows out of the ditch’.
   ✓ ‘...that Jan is stirring up the past’.
   b. . . . dat Jan [ouwe koeien haalt uit de sloot]
   that Jan [old cows hauls out the ditch]
   ✓ ‘...that Jan hauls old cows out of the ditch’.
   ✗ ‘...that Jan is stirring up the past’.

⇒ Generalization: idioms must form a “cohesive unit”, a constituent at some point of the derivation.

• With this in mind, let’s go back to *appear*.

(8) a. The cat appears to be out of the bag.
   b. The shit finally appeared to have hit the fan.
   c. Close tabs appear to have been kept on the opposition.

  ○ Idioms here are preserved.
  ○ Hence, we have another argument to say that the NP that is pronounced before a verb like *appear* gets there via ____________.

E. But why is the NP before *appear* pronounced in one position, but interpreted in another position? In other words, why does it ____________?

  • Reason #1
    ○ We saw in class (Irish) and in the last pset (Q-float) that we want subjects to be base-generated inside the VP.
    ○ But we also want them to be pronounced in [Spec, TP].
      – The principle that guarantees this: ____________

  • Reason #2
    ○ But is ____________ enough?
    ○ Does it predict that the sentence below should be ☐ grammatical or ☐ ungrammatical?

(9) a. * It appears [John to make bread].
   b. 
      \[ \begin{array}{l}
         \text{TP} \\
         \text{John} \\
         \quad \text{to} \\
         \quad \text{VP} \\
         \quad \text{make} \\
         \quad \text{bread} \\
      \end{array} \]

\[ ^2 \text{NB: the trees here are simplified to reduce clutter. It's unadviseable to do the same on psets.} \]
Recall: similarity between Russian and English, despite the morphological difference.

(10) a. [VP čitaet knig-u ]
reads book-ACC
b. * [NP kritika knig-u ]
criticism book-ACC
c. * [AP dovolen obed ]
satisfied dinner.ACC

⇒ Generalization (as we saw in class):

(11) a. [VP reads the book ]

Now we can go back to why (9a) is ungrammatical.

(9a’) * It appears [John to make bread].
− (9a) is ungrammatical because of the violation of the ________________.

But what is the difference between the sentences below?

(12) a. It appears that [John made bread].
b. * It appears [John to make bread].

They seem to be structurally equivalent. Why is the ________________ satisfied in one but not the other?

(13) TP
John
[+PST] VP
made bread

(14) TP
John
to VP
make bread

What is the difference between (13) and (14)?

⇒ Generalization: ________________ is able to assign Case, but ________________ isn’t.

F. An extra puzzle (just for fun; not a topic in the course)

* Given what we just concluded, why are the sentences below puzzling?

(15) A (different?) species of raising in Brazilian Portuguese

a. O João parece que fez pão.
the João seems that did bread
'It seems that João made bread.'
b. A vaca parece que foi pro brejo
the cow seems that went to-the swamp
✓ 'It seems that the cow went to the swamp.'
✓ 'It seems that things went bad.'

3 Here, I used the Brazilian Portuguese verbs that correspond to seem, but I used appear in the English examples above. The reason is that English seem can also be used in constructions like John seems like he needs some rest, which introduce further complications, not relevant for our purposes here.

4 Why ’Brazilian Portuguese’ and not just ’Portuguese’? We believe there is good reason to think that these are not ”just dialects” of the same language, but that they are different languages. One (of many other) reason(s) to think this is that the sentences in (15), although perfectly fine for most speakers of BP, are actually ungrammatical for speakers of European Portuguese.
c. Os meninos parecem que já chegaram todos
   'It seems that all the boys have already arrived.'

   • This kind of structure is called *hyper-raising*. Can you guess why?