Today’s topics and goals

• Raising vs. Control
  ▶ Basics of Case assignment
  ▶ Raising vs. control properties based one:
    #1  Position of the gap
    #2  Idiom preservation
    #3  Expletive subjects
    #4  Thematic restrictions
    #5  Reconstruction
Recall: Case filter and Case assignment

Case Filter

*\([\text{NP}_{[-\text{Case}]})\) (i.e. NPs must be assigned Case).

(1) a. **Nom case assignment**

```
TP
  
NP  T'
    
  T_{FIN}  VP
    
  NOM      ...
```

b. **Acc case assignment**

```
VP
  
V_{trans}  NP
    
  ACC
```
Recall: Case filter and Case assignment

Case Filter

*[[NP_{–Case}]] (i.e. NPs must be assigned Case).

(1)  

a. **nom case assignment**

```
TP
  NP
    T_FIN
    NOM
  T'
    VP
    ... 
```

b. **acc case assignment**

```
VP
  V_{trans}
  ACC
  NP
```

**nom case assignment**

**acc case assignment**
Raising

- Raising to the subject position:

  (2)  
  a. \([_{TP} \text{It seems }_{CP} \text{ that }_{Sue} \text{ knows Marathi}].\)  
  b. \(\ast_{[_{TP} \text{Sue seems }_{CP} \text{ that }_{_} \text{ knows Marathi}].}\)

  (3)  
  a. \(\ast_{[_{TP} \text{It seems }_{TP} \text{ Sue to know Marathi}].}\)  
  b. \([_{TP} \text{Sue seems }_{TP} \text{ to know Marathi}].\)

  Why raising is obligatory in (3):\(^1\)

\(^1\)Why is it prohibited in (2)?
• Raising to the subject position:

(2)  
  a. \([_{TP} \text{It seems } [_{CP} \text{that } \textbf{Sue} \text{ knows Marathi}]]\).  
  b. \(*[_{TP} \text{Sue seems } [_{CP} \text{ that } \underline{\_} \text{ knows Marathi}]]\).  

(3)  
  a. \(*[_{TP} \text{It seems } [_{TP} \text{Sue to know Marathi}]]\).  
  b. \([_{TP} \text{Sue seems } [_{TP} \underline{\_} \text{ to know Marathi}]]\).  

▶ Why raising is obligatory in (3):¹

¹Why is it prohibited in (2)?
Raising

- Raising to the subject position:

  (2)  
  a. \([_{TP} \text{It seems } _{CP} \text{that } \text{Sue knows Marathi}]\).
  b. \(*[_{TP} \text{Sue seems } _{CP} \text{that } \_ \text{knows Marathi}]\).

  (3)  
  a. \(*[_{TP} \text{It seems } _{TP} \text{Sue to know Marathi}]\).
  b. \([_{TP} \text{Sue seems } _{TP} \text{to know Marathi}]\).

  Why raising is obligatory in (3):\(^1\)

---

\(1\) Why is it prohibited in (2)?
Raising

• Raising to the subject position:

(2)  a. \([TP \text{ It seems } [CP \text{ that } \textbf{Sue} \text{ knows Marathi}]].\)

b. \(*[TP \text{ Sue seems } [CP \text{ that } \underline{\text{——}} \text{ knows Marathi}]].\)

(3)  a. \(*[TP \text{ It seems } [TP \text{ Sue to know Marathi}]].\)

b. \([TP \text{ Sue seems } [TP \underline{\text{——}} \text{ to know Marathi}]].\)

➤ Why raising is obligatory in (3):\(^1\) no Case assignment in Spec-TP if clause is infinitival.

\(^1\)Why is it prohibited in (2)?
• Raising and case assignment in (3b):

(3b′) \[\text{[TP } \text{Sue seems [TP ___ to know Marathi]]}.\]

▶ Nonfinite T is unable to assign Case to Sue, which would then cause the derivation to violate the Case Filter.

▶ To avoid that, Sue raises to the subject position of the embedding clause, where nom can be assigned.
Raising and case assignment in (3b):

\[(3b') \quad [\text{TP } \textbf{Sue} \text{ seems } [\text{TP } \_ \text{ to know Marathi}]].\]

- Nonfinite T is unable to assign Case to \textit{Sue}, which would then cause the derivation to violate the Case Filter.
- To avoid that, \textit{Sue} raises to the subject position of the embedding clause, where \textit{nom} can be assigned.
Raising vs. control

• Compare (3b) with the linearly similar (4).

(3b) \[\text{TP Sue seems [TP ___ to know Marathi]}\].

(4) Sue tried ___ to know Marathi.

• Goal: distinguish between these two constructions.

(5) a. *Same Hypothesis*: seem and try sentences are derived in the same way.

b. *Not-the-same Hypothesis*: seem and try sentences are not derived in the same way.
Raising vs. control

• Compare (3b) with the linearly similar (4).

  (3b) \[ \text{TP Sue seems [TP } \underline{\text{__}} \text{ to know Marathi}]. \]

  (4) Sue tried \underline{\text{__}} to know Marathi.

• **Goal:** distinguish between these two constructions.

(5) a. *Same Hypothesis:* seem and try sentences are derived in the same way.

   b. *Not-the-same Hypothesis:* seem and try sentences are not derived in the same way.
• Properties:
  #1 Position of the gap
  #2 Idiom preservation
  #3 Expletive subjects
  #4 Thematic restrictions
  #5 Reconstruction
Property #1: Position of the gap

(6)  

a. A Maria parece ter visto a Ana.  
   the Maria seems have.INF see.PTC the Ana  
   ‘Maria seems to have seen Ana.’  

b. * A Ana parece a Maria ter visto.  
   the Ana seems the Maria have.INF see.PTC  
   Lit.: ‘Ana seems Maria to have seen.’

(7)  

a. A Maria tentou ver a Ana.  
   the Maria tried see.INF the Ana  
   ‘Maria tried to see Ana.’  

b. * A Ana tentou a Maria ver.  
   the Ana seems the Maria see.INF  
   Lit.: ‘Ana tried Maria to see.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
Property #1: Position of the gap

(6)  a. A Maria parece ter visto a Ana. 
the Maria seems have.INF see.PTC the Ana 
‘Maria seems to have seen Ana.’

   b. * A Ana parece a Maria ter visto. 
      the Ana seems the Maria have.INF see.PTC
Lit.: ‘Ana seems Maria to have seen.’

(7)  a. A Maria tentou ver a Ana. 
the Maria tried see.INF the Ana 
‘Maria tried to see Ana.’

   b. * A Ana tentou a Maria ver. 
      the Ana seems the Maria see.INF
Lit.: ‘Ana tried Maria to see.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
Property #1: Position of the gap

(6)  a. A Maria parece ter visto a Ana. the Maria seems have.INF see.PTC the Ana ‘Maria seems to have seen Ana.’

b. * A Ana parece a Maria ter visto. the Ana seems the Maria have.INF see.PTC Lit.: ‘Ana seems Maria to have seen.’

(7)  a. A Maria tentou ver a Ana. the Maria tried see.INF the Ana ‘Maria tried to see Ana.’

b. * A Ana tentou a Maria ver. the Ana seems the Maria see.INF Lit.: ‘Ana tried Maria to see.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
Property #1: Position of the gap

(6)  
  a.  A Maria parece ter visto a Ana. the Maria seems have.INF see.PTC the Ana  
      ‘Maria seems to have seen Ana.’
  b.  * A Ana parece a Maria ter visto. the Ana seems the Maria have.INF see.PTC  
      Lit.: ‘Ana seems Maria to have seen.’

(7)  
  a.  A Maria tentou ver a Ana. the Maria tried see.INF the Ana  
      ‘Maria tried to see Ana.’
  b.  * A Ana tentou a Maria ver. the Ana seems the Maria see.INF  
      Lit.: ‘Ana tried Maria to see.’

Which hypothesis do these data support? Same hypothesis
Property #2: Idiom preservation

(8) \textit{Subject idiom in Brazilian Portuguese}

\text{A} \ cobra \ vai \ fumar.  
\text{the snake goes smoke.\textsc{inf}}

\begin{itemize}
  \item i. ‘The snake will smoke.’ \ \textit{literal}
  \item ii. ‘Things are going to get really messed up.’ \ \textit{idiomatic}
\end{itemize}
(9) A cobra parece ____ estar fumando.  
the snake seems ____ be-INF smoke.GER

   i. ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’  
      literal

   ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’  
       idiomatic

(10) A cobra tentou ____ fumar.  
the snake tried ____ smoke-INF

   i. ✓ ‘The snake attempted to engage in smoking.’  
      literal

   ii. # ‘There was an attempt for things to get really messed up.’  
       idiomatic

➤ Which hypothesis do these data support?
(9) A cobra parece __ estar __ fumando.
the snake seems __ be.INF smoke.GER

i. ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’

ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’

(10) A cobra tentou __ fumar.
the snake tried __ smoke.INF

i. ✓ ‘The snake attempted to engage in smoking.’

ii. # ‘There was an attempt for things to get really messed up.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
A cobra parece estar fumando.

the snake seems be.INF smoke.GER

i. ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’
ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’

A cobra tentou fumar.

the snake tried smoke.INF

i. ✓ ‘The snake attempted to engage in smoking.’
ii. # ‘There was an attempt for things to get really messed up.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(9) A cobra parece __ estar fumando.
the snake seems __ be.\text{INF} smoke.\text{GER}

i. ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’ \textit{literal}
ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’ \textit{idiomatic}

(10) A cobra tentou __ fumar.
the snake tried __ smoke.\text{INF}

i. ✓ ‘The snake attempted to engage in smoking.’ \textit{literal}
ii. # ‘There was an attempt for things to get really messed up.’ \textit{idiomatic}

Which hypothesis do these data support? Not-the-same hypothesis
Compare:

(C10) A cobra tentou __ fumar.
the snake tried __ smoke.INF

i. ✓ ‘The snake attempted to engage in smoking.’ literal

ii. # ‘There was an attempt for things to get really messed up.’ idiomatic

(C11) A cobra tentou __ capturar __ um rato.
the snake tried __ capture.INF a __ mouse

‘The snake tried to capture a mouse.’

▶ The ill-formedness of (10) (under the idiomatic reading) cannot be ungrammatical because of the combination between *a cobra* and *tentar.*
• Compare:

(10) A cobra tentou ___ fumar.
    the snake tried ___ smoke.INF
    i. √ ‘The snake attempted to engage in smoking.’ literal
    ii. # ‘There was an attempt for things to get really messed up.’ idiomatic

(11) A cobra tentou ___ capturar ___ um rato.
    the snake tried ___ capture.INF a ___ mouse
    ‘The snake tried to capture a mouse.’

▶ The ill-formedness of (10) (under the idiomatic reading) cannot be ungrammatical because of the combination between a cobra and tentar.
Property #3: Expletive subjects

(12) Null expletive subject in Brazilian Portuguese

\[ \text{pro}_{\text{EXPL}} \text{ vai} \quad \text{chover} \quad \text{amanhã.} \]

\[ \text{go.FUT rain.INF tomorrow} \]

‘It is going to rain tomorrow.’
(13) $pro_{EXPL}$ parece estar chovendo.  
seems be.ING rain.GER  
‘It seems to be raining.’

(14) *$pro_{EXPL}$ tentou chover.  
tried be.ING rain.INF  
Lit.: ‘It tried to rain.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(13) \( pro_{\text{EXPL}} \) parece estar chovendo.
    seems be.ING rain.GER
    ‘It seems to be raining.’

(14) * \( pro_{\text{EXPL}} \) tentou chover.
    tried be.ING rain.INF
    Lit.: ‘It tried to rain.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(13)  \( pro_{\text{EXPL}} \text{ parece} \ \text{estar} \ \text{chovendo}. \)
    seems  be.\text{ING}  rain.\text{GER}

    \text{‘It seems to be raining.’}

(14)  \* \( pro_{\text{EXPL}} \text{ tentou} \ \text{chover}. \)
    tried  be.\text{ING}  rain.\text{INF}

    Lit.: \text{‘It tried to rain.’}

➤ Which hypothesis do these data support?
(13) $\text{pro}_\text{EXPL} \text{ parece estar } \text{ chovendo.}$
    \hspace{1cm} seems \hspace{1cm} be.\text{ING} \hspace{1cm} \text{rain.GER}$
    ‘It seems to be raining.’

(14) * $\text{pro}_\text{EXPL} \text{ tentou chover.}$
    \hspace{1cm} tried \hspace{1cm} be.\text{ING} \hspace{1cm} \text{rain.INF}$
    Lit.: ‘It tried to rain.’

> Which hypothesis do these data support? Not-the-same hypothesis
Property #4: Thematic restrictions

(15) \{ A pedra / A criança \} rolou ladeira abaixo.
{ the stone / the child } rolled slope below
‘The stone/The child rolled down the slope.’
(16) { A pedra / A criança } parece ter rolado ladeira abaixo.
‘The stone/The child seems to have rolled down the slope.’

(17) { #A pedra / A criança } tentou rolar ladeira abaixo.
{ #the stone / the child } tried roll.lnf slope below
‘#The stone/The child tried rolled down the slope.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(16) \{ A pedra / A criança \} parece ter rolado ladeira abaixo.

‘The stone/The child seems to have rolled down the slope.’

(17) \{ #A pedra / A criança \} tentou rolar ladeira abaixo.

‘#The stone/The child tried rolled down the slope.’

Which hypothesis do these data support?
The stone/The child seems to have rolled down the slope.

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(16) \{ A pedra / A criança \} parece ter rolado ladeira abaixo.
    ‘The stone/The child seems to have rolled down the slope.’

(17) \{ #A pedra / A criança \} tentou rolar ladeira abaixo.
    ‘#The stone/The child tried rolled down the slope.’

Which hypothesis do these data support? Not-the-same hypothesis
The same diagnostic, but from passives:

(18) a. The doctor examined Robin.
    b. Robin was examined by the doctor.
• The same diagnostic, but from passives:

(18)  a. The doctor examined Robin.
     b. Robin was examined by the doctor.

• These sentences are synonymous.
(19)  a. The doctor *seems* to have examined Robin.
    b. Robin *seems* to have been examined by the doctor.

(20)  a. The doctor *tried* to examine Robin.
    b. Robin *tried* to be examined by the doctor.
(19)  
  a. The doctor *seems* to have examined Robin.
  b. Robin *seems* to have been examined by the doctor.

• These sentences are synonymous.

(20)  
  a. The doctor *tried* to examine Robin.
  b. Robin *tried* to be examined by the doctor.
(19) a. The doctor **seems** to have examined Robin.
    b. Robin **seems** to have been examined by the doctor.

• These sentences are synonymous.

(20) a. The doctor **tried** to examine Robin.
    b. Robin **tried** to be examined by the doctor.

• These sentences are *not* synonymous.
Property #5: Reconstruction

(21) Each other’s friends\(_k\) distracted John and Mary\(_k\).

- Side note: challenge introduced by psychological predicates (e.g. *distract, amuse*).
  - Usually: subject c-commands object throughout the derivation.
  - Psych predicates: in order to account for the binding facts in (21), the subject *each other’s friends* has to be c-commanded by the object *John and Mary*.
  - But: given Locality/Superiority how can *each other’s friends* move across *John and Mary*?
(21) Each other’s friends$_k$ distracted John and Mary$_k$.

- Side note: challenge introduced by psychological predicates (e.g. *distract, amuse*).
  - Usually: subject c-commands object throughout the derivation.
  - Psych predicates: in order to account for the binding facts in (21), the subject *each other’s friends* has to be c-commanded by the object *John and Mary*.
  - But: given Locality/Superiority how can *each other’s friends* move across *John and Mary*?
(21) Each other’s friends\textsubscript{k} distracted John and Mary\textsubscript{k}.

- Side note: challenge introduced by psychological predicates (e.g. 
  distract, 
  amuse).
  - Usually: subject c-commands object throughout the derivation.
  - Psych predicates: in order to account for the binding facts in (21), the
    subject each other’s friends has to be c-commanded by the object
    John and Mary.
  - But: given Locality/Superiority how can each other’s friends move
    across John and Mary?
(21) Each other’s friends$_k$ distracted John and Mary$_k$.

- Side note: challenge introduced by psychological predicates (e.g. *distract, amuse*).
  - Usually: subject c-commands object throughout the derivation.
  - Psych predicates: in order to account for the binding facts in (21), the subject *each other’s friends* has to be c-commanded by the object *John and Mary*.
  - But: given Locality/Superiority how can *each other’s friends* move across *John and Mary*?
(22) Each other’s friends$_k$ seem to distract John and Mary$_k$. 

(23) Each other’s friends$_k$ tried to distract John and Mary$_k$.

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(22) Each other’s friends$_k$ **seem** to distract John and Mary$_k$.

(23) Each other’s friends$_k$ **tried** to distract John and Mary$_k$.

► Which hypothesis do these data support?
(22) Each other’s friends

seem to distract John and Mary.

(23) * Each other’s friends

tried to distract John and

Mary.

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(22) Each other’s friends\(k\) **seem** to distract John and Mary\(k\).

(23) * Each other’s friends\(k\) **tried** to distract John and Mary\(k\).

Which hypothesis do these data support?
(22) Each other’s friends$_k$ **seem** to distract John and Mary$_k$.

(23) * Each other’s friends$_k$ **tried** to distract John and Mary$_k$.

► Which hypothesis do these data support? Not-the-same hypothesis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same hypothesis</th>
<th>Not-the-same hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Position of the gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Idiom preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Expletive subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Thematic restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same hypothesis</td>
<td>Not-the-same hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Position of the gap</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Idiom preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Expletive subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Thematic restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Taking stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Same hypothesis</th>
<th>Not-the-same hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Position of the gap</td>
<td>🍀</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Idiom preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>🍀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Expletive subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>🍀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Thematic restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Taking stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Same hypothesis</th>
<th>Not-the-same hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Position of the gap</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Idiom preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Expletive subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Thematic restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Taking stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same hypothesis</th>
<th>Not-the-same hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Position of the gap</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Idiom preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Expletive subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Thematic restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Taking stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same hypothesis</th>
<th>Not-the-same hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Position of the gap</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Idiom preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Expletive subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Thematic restriction</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#2 Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.

#3 Expletives cannot be assigned a θ-role.

#4 θ-roles are assigned locally (provisionally: at least within the same clause).

#5 If α is pronounced in a position P, but interpreted at position Q (where P c-commands Q), α must have occupied Q in a previous step of the derivation.
# Premises

### #2 Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.

### #3 Expletives cannot be assigned a $\theta$-role.

### #4 $\theta$-roles are assigned locally (provisionally: at least within the same clause).

### #5 If $\alpha$ is pronounced in a position $P$, but interpreted at position $Q$ (where $P$ c-commands $Q$), $\alpha$ must have occupied $Q$ in a previous step of the derivation.
#2 Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.
#3 Expletives cannot be assigned a $\theta$-role.
#4 $\theta$-roles are assigned locally (provisionally: at least within the same clause).
#5 If $\alpha$ is pronounced in a position $P$, but interpreted at position $Q$ (where $P$ c-commands $Q$), $\alpha$ must have occupied $Q$ in a previous step of the derivation.
#2 Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.

#3 Expletives cannot be assigned a $\theta$-role.

#4 $\theta$-roles are assigned locally (provisionally: at least within the same clause).

#5 If $\alpha$ is pronounced in a position $P$, but interpreted at position $Q$ (where $P$ c-commands $Q$), $\alpha$ must have occupied $Q$ in a previous step of the derivation.
#2 Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.

(9) A cobra \textit{parece} \_ estar \_ fumando.  
the snake \textit{seems} \_ be.\textit{INF} smoke.\textit{GER}

i. ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’

ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’

(24) \textit{[TP seems [the snake to be smoking]]}.
Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.

(9) A cobra parece __ estar fumando.
the snake seems __ be-INF smoke.GER

i. ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’
ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’

(24) [TP seems [the snake to be smoking]].
Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.

(9) A cobra parece ___ estar fumando.
the snake seems ___ be.INF smoke.GER
  i.  ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’
  ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’

(24) [TP seems [the snake to be smoking]].
#2 Idioms must form a constituent at some point of the derivation.

(9) A cobra parece estar fumando.
the snake seems be.INF smoke.GER

  i. ✓ ‘The snake seems to be smoking.’
  ii. ✓ ‘It seems that things are going to get really messed up.’

(24) [TP the snake seems [the snake to be smoking]].
(10) A cobra **tentou** __ fumar.

the snake tried smoke-INF

i. ✓ ‘The snake wants to be smoking.’

ii. # ‘(Someone) wants that things get really messed up.’
A cobra tentou fumar.
the snake tried smoke.

i. ✓ ‘The snake wants to be smoking.’
ii. # ‘(Someone) wants that things get really messed up.’

• A cobra in (10) never forms a constituent with fumar, hence the lack of an idiomatic reading.

(25) The snake tried [ec to smoke]
#4 θ-roles are assigned locally (provisionally: at least within the same clause).

(16) { A pedra / A criança } parece ter rolado ladeira abaixo.
   { the stone / the child } seems have.INF roll.INF slope below
   ‘The stone/The child seems to have rolled down the slope.’

The thematic restrictions (or lack thereof) of the subject of a seem sentence come from the lower predicate, not from seem.

(26) [TP the stone/the child seems [the stone/the child to have rolled down the hill]].
θ-roles are assigned locally (provisionally: at least within the same clause).

\[ (16) \] \{ A pedra / A criança \} \textbf{parece} ter \text{ rolado} ladeira abaixo.  
\{ the stone / the child \} \textit{seems} \text{ have.\textsc{inf} roll.\textsc{inf} slope} \text{ below}  
‘The stone/The child seems to have rolled down the slope.’

The thematic restrictions (or lack thereof) of the subject of a \textit{seem} sentence come from the lower predicate, not from \textit{seem}.

\[ (26) \] \text{[TP the stone/the child seems [the stone/the child to have rolled down the hill]]}.  

θ-roles are assigned locally (provisionally: at least within the same clause).

(16) { A pedra / A criança } parece ter rolado ladeira abaixo.
{ the stone / the child } seems have.INF roll.INF slope below
‘The stone/The child seems to have rolled down the slope.’

► The thematic restrictions (or lack thereof) of the subject of a seem sentence come from the lower predicate, not from seem.

(26) [TP the stone/the child seems [the stone/the child to have rolled down the hill]].
(17) { #A pedra / A criança } tentou rolar ladeira abaixo. 
{ #the stone / the child } tried roll.\textsc{inf} slope below
‘#The stone/The child tried rolled down the slope.’
(17) \{ \#A pedra / A criança \} tentou rolar ladeira abaixo. 
\{ \#the stone / the child \} tried roll.INF slope below ‘#The stone/The child tried rolled down the slope.’

- The stone/The child is not an argument of the lower predicate. Its \(\theta\)-role must be coming from try.

(27) The child/#The stone tried [ec to roll down the hill].
If $\alpha$ is pronounced in a position $P$, but interpreted at position $Q$ (where $P$ $c$-commands $Q$), $\alpha$ must have occupied $Q$ in a previous step of the derivation.

(22) Each other’s friends$_k$ seem to distract John and Mary$_k$.

(28) [TP each other’s friends seem [each other’s friends to distract John and Mary]].
If $\alpha$ is pronounced in a position $P$, but interpreted at position $Q$ (where $P$ c-commands $Q$), $\alpha$ must have occupied $Q$ in a previous step of the derivation.

(22) Each other’s friends$_k$ seem to distract John and Mary$_k$.

(28) $[_{TP \textbf{each other’s friends}} \textit{seem} [\textit{each other’s friends} \textit{to distract John and Mary}]]$. 
(23) * Each other’s friends$_k$ tried to distract John and Mary$_k$. 
(23)  * Each other’s friends$_k$ **tried** to distract John and Mary$_k$.

- *Each other’s friends* is never in the same clause as *distract John and Mary*, hence the impossibility of reconstruction.

(29)  **Each other’s friends** tried [*ec to distract John and Mary*].
(30) Sue seems to know Marathi.
Derivations

(30) Sue **seems** to know Marathi.

```
TP
  /   \
 DP  T'  
  \   /  \
   T  VP
      /   \
     V    TP
        /   \
       seems raising
          /   \
         T'  
           /   \
          T  
            /   \
           to VP
             /   \
            V  DP
             /   \
            know Marathi
```
• The movement of Sue from the subject position of the nonfinite TP to the subject position of the finite clause is called raising.
• Raising verbs: seem, likely, appear, etc.
• The movement of Sue from the subject position of the nonfinite TP to the subject position of the finite clause is called **raising**.

• Raising verbs: *seem, likely, appear*, etc.
(31) Sue tried to know Marathi.
• No explanation yet about the nature of $ec$, nor about how it is interpreted as the subject of $try$.

• Preview: Sue (subject of $try$) $controls$ $ec$, which we call $PRO$.

• Other control verbs: $want$, $decide$, $attempt$, $promise$, $convice$, etc.
• No explanation yet about the nature of \textit{ec}, nor about how it is interpreted as the subject of \textit{try}.

• Preview: \textit{Sue} (subject of \textit{try}) \textbf{controls} \textit{ec}, which we call \textit{PRO}.

• Other control verbs: \textit{want, decide, attempt, promise, convince, etc.}
• No explanation yet about the nature of \( ec \), nor about how it is interpreted as the subject of \( try \).
• Preview: \( Sue \) (subject of \( try \)) \textbf{controls} \( ec \), which we call \( PRO \).
• Other control verbs: \textit{want, decide, attempt, promise, convince}, etc.
**Exercise** Recall: a property we used to distinguish raising vs. control is the licensing of expletive subjects.

(13) \(pro_{\text{EXPL}} \text{parece estar chovendo.} \)  
\[\text{seems be.ING rain.GER} \]  
‘It seems to be raining.’

(14) \(*pro_{\text{EXPL}} \text{tentou chover.} \)  
\[\text{tried be.ING rain.INF} \]  
Lit.: ‘It tried to rain.’

Assuming that expletives are dummy elements that cannot bear a \(\theta\)-role, how can we explain the contrast between (13) and (14)?
Exercise  Explain why the sentences in (19) entail each other, but those in (20) don’t.

(19)  a. The doctor *seems* to have examined Robin.
          b. Robin *seems* to have been examined by the doctor.

(20)  a. The doctor *tried* to examine Robin.
          b. Robin *tried* to be examined by the doctor.
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