Calendar: 
Syntactic Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September/October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mo 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu 01 11-13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu 08 11-13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th 10 9-11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu 15 11-13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th 17 9-11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu 22 11-13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mo 18 9-13, 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16, 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu 19 9-13, 349B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-16, 349B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External and Internal Argument of the verb
Subject: position of the clause

• EA // S >> Spec/TP
• IA // DO (IA may also move to some Case related position; not discussed in detail here)

• Th-positions vs structural positions in the clause.
More on unaccusatives

2\textsuperscript{nd} crucial property of clauses containing unaccusatives: a \textit{structural} property

Case: No accusative Case in clauses containing an unaccusative verb

\textbf{Crucial hypothesis about Case:}
All explicit noun phrases have (= must have) a Case
Case is a universal property of the (morphosyntactic) computational component of the language faculty (FL), independently of its overt morphological realization (often residually present in the pronominal paradigm. Cfr. English, Italian ....).

In Principle & Parameters, a difference is made between two types of Case (a distinction preserved in current minimalist approach)

\textit{Structural Case} and Inherent Case
More on Case

**Structural Case:**
It is related to properties of functional heads in the clause structure (i.e. Tense, Agreement, and also other dedicated functional heads related to $v$)

**Inherent Case:**
It depends on properties of lexical heads (some Vs; N, A, some Ps)

As an illustration, see the following German examples:
- a Sie hilft ihm (dative)
  - she helps him$_{dat}$
- b Sie gedachte vergangener Freuden (genitive)
  - she remembers the past joy$_{gen}$
More on Case

Although Case is a central notion of traditional grammatical descriptions, the distinction between the two types of Case is made explicit for the first time in P&P (Chomsky 1981).

In the current minimalist approach Case is part of the Case-Agreement system; it is one of the features entering the relation Agree (Chomsky 1995, 2002 and much subsequent work).

Structural Cases: Nominative and Accusative (in nominative/accusative languages)
More on Case: Structural Case and the relation *Agree*

**Structural Case: Nominative and Accusative** are the *structural* Cases. They can be interpreted as the expression of an agreement relation, called *Agree*, involving a *Probe* (head), carrying the relevant Case feature to be assigned/checked, and a *Goal*, the nominal expression actually carrying the active and sometimes visible Case feature:

```
Probe ............ Goal
```

Probes is higher than Goal; Probe c-commands Goal.

Cfr: post-verbal subject:

```
TP
  T
    DP/EA
```

Ex: Parleranno i ragazzi  // Parlerò io
will talk  the boys  // will talk I
Nominative and Accusative

**Nominative:**

a. through *Agree* of (finite) T with DP in a lower position in the clause structure  
   (Cfr.: post-verbal subject illustrated in previous slide)

b. if DP(EA) moves into Spec of the *Probe* head (T), nominative is expressed in the preverbal subject position (with agreement, if the language expresses agreement features) (cfr.Spec/AgrS - Spec/T, ho 3):  
   >>> *Agree* + raising of DP

**Accusative:**

a. through *Agree* between DP IA/direct object of V with *Probe* v, in turn in Agree with a dedicated functional head external to vP, which we will refer to as Acc/active voice

Structural Case is the manifestation of an agreement relation
Nominative and Agree

**Agree**

Structural Case is realized in Spec-Head relation if DP moves in the Spec position of the *Probe-head* with which the agreement is established.

**Nominative:**
Ex: preverbal subject:

I ragazzi parleranno /Io parlerò
the boys will talk. / I will speak
Accusative and *Agree*

**Accusative:**

- Both nominative and accusative show a **dissociation** between Case and Th-role.
- Cfr. the case of *expletives* (for nominative) and the so called *ECM/Raising to object* contexts (for accusative).

- *Il semble que...../* It seems that.... (expletive)
- *I believe[John/him to be a genius]* (ECM)

  Hence, they are not semantic Cases related to lexical properties, but just the manifestation of properties of the morphosyntactic structure.

- In contrast, inherent Cases are assigned by lexical heads (directly) in combination with a Th-role, as illustrated earlier.
Case, Prepositions and Agree

• We have seen that:
  • Structural Case derives from the relation Agree, with Case features/heads naturally located in the clause functional structure (DP-related positions).
  • The DP in Agree relation may move into the specifier position of the Probe head if such head has the property of attracting movement (as in movement to Spec/TP discussed). The movement triggering feature is sometimes referred to as EPP feature.

• P:
  • Given the strict relation between Case and P(reposition), it is natural to assume that prepositions (at least some, light ones, e.g. a, di in Italian i.e. dative, genitive, on by see later) may also be part of the clause functional structure (following Kayne’s 2004 insight). A computational mechanism quite widespread in grammar.

With P further moving as a head to a higher head position in pre-positional languages when DP moves to its Spec.
Back to unaccusatives

The crucial lexical property of unaccusatives:

- Reduced verb phrase: Lack of the v layer.
  From which the following two consequences:
  - No External Argument
  - No Accusative (in sentences containing verbs of this class)
Comparing unaccusatives and passives: The EA

The EA: missing or optional?

- The enemy has sunk the boat
- The boat sank
- The boat has been sunk ___ (by the enemy)

- Il nemico ha affondato la nave
- La nave è affondata ___
- La nave è stata affondata ___ dal nemico

The external argument –EA appears to be missing in two very different ways in passives and in unaccusatives (and raising verbs discussed earlier, which are a particular instance of an unaccusative verb).
Comparing unaccusatives and passives: The EA

• In passives it is only optionally silent/non-realized. In fact, it is present in the interpretation:
  It can remain silent implicit or
  It can be explicitly realized through a by-phrase

• In unaccusatives, it is absent as a lexically property, as discussed.

• Crucial difference between passive and unaccusatives: Presence vs absence of the external argument/EA
Comparing unaccusatives and passives: Accusative Case

*Accusative is missing in both passive and unaccusatives, but for different reasons*

- In passive it is as a consequence of the presence of passive voice/morphology whereby accusative is unavailable for the IA

- In unaccusatives it is a consequence of their defining lexical property: lack of v. See previous discussion
Zooming on lack of accusative in passive

- **Active**: Acc >> part of active voice >> Accusative to IA(O) through the relation Agree (see previous slide repeated here):
  - (avere/have)
  - ... 
  - Acc
  - vP
  - DP/EA
  - v
  - V
  - DP/IA

- **Passive**: Lack of accusative in passive is a consequence of the passive voice/morphology of which a crucial component is >> by
  - (essere/be).
  - by
  - vP
  - DP/EA
  - v
  - VP
  - V
  - DP/IA

- **Crucial property**: by does not establish the Agree relation with with v (in contrast with Acc, the relevant component of the active voice). ‘v’ inactive, no Case for the DP/IA.
Passive, nominative Case and UTAH

• **Passive and Nominative Case**

Due to presence of passive voice/morphology, *by*, the IA has no Accusative Case in passives

Rather, it receives *nominative* (under *Agree*), and moves (can move) to Spec/TP, i.e. it is the subject of the clause:

Io/Mario sarò/à interrogato < 1\textsuperscript{st}, pers, sing/ Mario>
I/Mario will be questioned

• **Crucial property of passive sentences:**

the Th-interpretation of the subject of the sentence with passive morphology is the same as the interpretation of the IA of a sentence with active morphology containing the same verb.

*Assuming UTAH >> IA in Spec/TP is a consequence of movement.*
Comparing Active and Passive: Moving to Spec/TP

Active:

- EA to Spec/TP: TP/Nom ....... avere ... /Acc...[prt pass ... [vP DP(EA/S) v [VP V DP(IA/O)]]

Passive:

- IA to Spec/TP: TP/Nom........essere ...by [prt pass [vP(DP(EA/S))v [VP V DP(IA/O)]]

Questions:
1. Why never in active IA to Spec/TP?
2. Why only in passive?
3. IA to Spec/TP directly or with a different derivation than the one indicated above?
Focusing on Q1

In clauses with the Active voice

\[
\text{DP(EA)} \rightarrow \text{vP} \rightarrow \text{v} \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{V} \rightarrow \text{DP(IA/O)}
\]
Answering Q1

Direct movement of DP(IA) across the DP(EA) toward subject position (Spec/TP) is an impossible derivation as it violates the locality of syntactic derivations:

Relativized Minimality/RM (Rizzi 1990, 2004):

\[ \text{X} \quad \text{Z} \quad \text{Y} \]

Where Z and X are position of the same type that share relevant features (e.g. DP positions-A positions in the case at issue). Z is thus an *Intervener*, where, X c-commands Z, and Z c-commands Y: *hierarchical intervention*.

DP/EA intervenes in the displacement of DP/IA into the subject position, also a DP position.
Q2 - Q3

2. Why only in passive?
3. IA to Spec/TP directly or with a different derivation?

Rephrasing Q2 and Q3 in a single question:

What makes it possible for the IA to become the subject of the clause in sentences with passive voice/morphology?

As this is generally impossible, under locality considerations, due to intervention of DP/EA, as just seen.
Deriving passive
Locality issue in standard/direct derivation of passive

Note that there is no similar problem with unaccusatives due to lack of external argument.
Zooming on *by* as (a component of) the passive voice.
The Case of the EA.

Recap:

- In sentences with the passive voice the whole argument structure of a given (transitive) verb is present. I.e. the whole vP.

- v is however inactive due to lack of Acc, the active voice; it is inactive as an effect of the passive voice.

- As indicated, *by* is present instead of Acc, as the expression of (part of) the passive voice (Collins 2005)
Zooming on *by* as (a component of) the passive voice. The Case of the EA.

**Crucial property:** in passive clauses the role of the DP introduced by ‘*by*’ is (the same as) the Th-role of the EA of *v* (no difference in this respect between active and passive sentences).

- Assume *by* to be an ‘expletive preposition’: it assigns (structural) Case, but it does not assign any Th-role.

- As (part of) the passive voice, *by* (differently from Acc) does not enter in Agree with *v*.
- As a preposition, however, *by* is a Case assigner

- *By* assigns Case to the EA in Spec/vP.
On DP/IA to Spec/TP:
Movement of a verbal chunk/’smuggling’ in the derivation of passive 1 (adapating Collins 2005)

---

**Diagram:**

- TP
- _
- pass
- **by** vP
- DP(EA)
- V
- V DP(IA)

*Pass and BY components of the passive voice. Heads with movement attracting property*
On DP/IA to Spec/TP: Movement of a verbal chunk in the derivation of passive 2. The crucial step: no *Intervention*.

The book is read <the book> by Mary.
Comparing passive and unaccusatives in conclusion

• In both passive clauses and clauses with unaccusatives movement of the IA into the subject/Spec-TP position occurs in a legitimate way:
  • \textit{In both cases there is no intervention of the EA.}
• \textbf{However, this is due to different reasons:}
  • in unaccusatives the EA is absent as a lexical property
  • in passive clauses the EA is present (as implicit argument or as a \textit{by}-phrase), but it does not intervene due to previous movement of a chunk of verb phrase above it.
  • This movement (\textit{smuggling}) is triggered by a component of the passive voice, which includes preposition \textit{by}, attracting the verbal chunk into its specifier. The possibility of such movement is the primary effect of the presence of passive voice/morphology.

• In both passive clauses and clauses with unaccusatives \textbf{Accusative Case is not present} in the structure.
• The property that passives and un accusatives share is the unavailability – though for different reasons – of Accusative Case in the structures containing them.
Comparing passive and causatives

Basic background on syntactic causatives:

**Italian:**

a. Il direttore ha fatto **scrivere** il giornalista
   the director has made write the journalist

b. Il direttore ha fatto **scrivere l’articolo** al capo-redattore
   the director has made write the article to the managing editor

   (fare a/French faire à)

c. Il direttore ha fatto **scrivere l’articolo** dal capo-redattore
   the director has made write the article by the managing editor

   (fare da/French faire par)

**English:**

I made John run

>> bare infinitive
Types of expression of causative meaning

Expressions of causative meaning:

i. **causative expressions (with light verb, v):**
   
   *f*are *fre*ddo (lit: make-cold)

ii. **verbs with a causative meaning (lexical causatives):**
   
   *divertire-amuse* (far ridere-make laugh; rendere contenti-make happy ...; silent cause incorporated in V: Incorporated caus can be overt on some lexical causatives in Japanese, see below)

iii. **causatives constructions:**
   
   syntactic causatives involving an overt causative voice triggering a number of morhosyntactic processes (such as distribution of Case and displacement see following slides).
   
   The causative voice can be lexicalized in the form of a verb (Romance/It: *fare* English: *make*, see examples of the preceding slide)
Types of expression of causative meaning

or in the form of an affix (the latter sometimes referred to as morphological causatives), as in e.g. Japanese V+ *sase*:

```
Taroo-ga Hanako-o ik-ase-ta
Taroo-Nom Hanako-Acc go-ase-PST
“Taroo made Hanako go”
```

(Like in the case of Italian *divertire*, Japanese also has a lexical causative with overt incorporation of the causative morpheme; cfr. the verb *niow-ase* >> *smell* = E: *hint at*; It: *far capire, dare sentore*:

```
Taroo-ga zisyoku-o niow-ase-ta
Taroo-Nom resignation-Acc smell-ase-ta
“Taroo hinted at resignation” (Lit: Taroo made resignation smell)
```

(from Harley 2008)
Comparing passive and syntactic causatives

Both involve movement of a chunk of the verb phrase.

Subsequent extraction of DP/IA is always involved in passive, and in the causative passive as well (si-causative, involving smuggling, to be discussed later on). It does not occur in active causatives.

Crucial property overtly visible in Italian/Romace type causatives:

*Movement of verbal chunk is overtly visible/audible in causatives*
Movement of verbal chunk is overt in Italian/Romance type causatives

(Maria) farà mangiare il gelato al bambino
Maria will make eat the ice cream to the kid

(Belletti 2017), in line with classical analyses of Romance causatives in terms of VP preposing such as in particular Kayne 1975, Rouveret & Vergnaud 1980, Zubizarreta 1985, Burzio 1986
Types of causatives:
Zooming on the main features of the analysis. *Fare- a*

*Fare* as a (semi-)functional verb/v, selected by the causative voice

Ex: Maria. *farà mangiare il gelato al bambino*

Maria will make eat the ice cream to the kid
And *Fare - da*

Expletive preposition *by* in the selective spine of the causative voice

Maria farà mangiare il gelato dal bambino

*Maria will make eat the ice cream by the kid*

As for *fare-da*, in the lack of preposition *a* with its induced interpretation, expletive *by* is inserted in the functional verbal projection. By being in the functional selective spine of the causative voice, it gets a causative/agentive meaning. Whence the more ‘agentive’ interpretation of *by*-phrase in *fare-da* causatives.
And Si-causative passive

Si:
the reflexive/impersonal marker is attributed the Initiator role of the semifunctional verb fare

Il bambino si fa pettinare dalla mamma
the child SI-cl makes comb by the mother
‘the child makes himself comb by the mother’
And also *get-causative* passive
Make like Fare (with no to)

Mary made the kid eat the ice cream

Maria will make the kid eat the ice cream

Movement of chunk of verb phrase/mingling
The attracting voice: Causative

- **Caus Parameter:** *Caus* may have different movement attracting property:
  - English-type causatives - the attracted phrase is DP (/EA)
  - Italian/Romance-type causatives - the attracted phrase is vP(-chunk)