Zaid "Carlos" Galvez
Collaborators: Drew Knochenhauer

Syntax assignment 18

A
Currently, our grammar cannot account for sentences like the following:

(1) Justine liked to skateboard to class
(3) We might like to have seen that video

Our grammar cannot generate these sentences as a *to* seems to occur after a verb. Currently, *to* can only be generated by a T-bar; a T-bar cannot have a verb daughter that will occur before *to*, nor can its mother, TP, have a verb daughter that will occur before *to*. It is impossible to generate a string where a verb occurs before a *to*. Consider the following tree:

B
This can be remedied by the following rules:

V-bar → V T-bar$_{[+to]}$
T-bar → T$_{[+to]}$ VP

Consider the following trees:

The subcategorizations for the words *hate* and *like* is thus:

Like, V, [_(T-bar$_{[+to]}$)$_1$], <AG, TH$_1$>

Hate, V, [_(T-bar$_{[+to]}$)$_1$], <AG, TH$_1$>

C
The above rules, however, do not seem to account for the following sentence accurately:

(4) Justine hated to be criticized by her dad

Where Justine is the agent, as she is doing the hating. Notice that passive transformation has applied; this is evident by the presence of *by her dad* and *be criticized*, both forms which occur mainly or only in passive transformations. However, undoing the transformation, going backwards, gives the deep structure form:

(4') Her dad hated to criticize Justine

Where the dad is now the agent doing the hating. Justine thus loses her position as an agent; (4) and (4'), then, have a difference in semantic relationships. This cannot be, as the semantic relationships in the deep structure must remain the same in the surface—Justine cannot lose her place as the agent no matter what rules may be applied to the deep structure.

This is also apparent in (5) and (5'):

(5) We might like to be seen by everyone
(5') Everyone might like to see us

D
The rules given above are inadequate for accounting for our deep structure. To remedy this, consider the following juxtapositions:

(4) Justine hated to be criticized by her dad
(6) Justine$_q$ hated for her dad to criticize her$_q$

Where Justine remains the agent doing the hating. Notice that, upon the movement of *her dad* to the end of the sentence, the deletion of *for*

(6e) Justine hated for ~~her dad~~ to be criticize her by her dad
     Justine hated ~~for~~ to be criticized by her dad
(4) Justine hated to be criticized by her dad

(7e) We might like for ~~everyone~~ to be see by everyone
     We might like ~~for~~ to be seen by everyone
 (5) We might like to be seen by everyone

Notice that no passive transformation occurs in the following sentence, and for a *for* to exist, another DP must be present. It could be said, then, that in deep structure there is another DP, and in surface forms that DP must be deleted:

(1e) Justine liked ~~for DP~~ to skateboard to class
(1) Justine liked to skateboard to class

 In addition to this, consider the following sentences:

(1) Justine liked to skateboard to class
(1') Justine liked for Sally to skateboard to class
(1'') Justine$_j$ liked for her$_s$ to skateboard to class

Where her$_s$ is Sally.

(1''') *Justine$_j$ liked ~~for her$_s$~~ to skateboard to class

Where the information of Sally is lost and results in ungrammaticality

But:

(1e') *Justine$_j$ liked for her$_j$ to skateboard to class

Where her$_j$ is Justine and results in ungrammaticality.

This transformation, then, must delete the DP within the complementizer, and it is only deleted when it coindexes with the agent DP. If the DP within the complementizer does not coindex with the appropriate antecedent, it is not deleted, as in (1''). The transformation is as follows; it may not apply when the DP has a different antecedents.

This transformation can be seen at work on the following sentences. Passive tranformation must be changed to not apply when it is a pronoun that has a coindex within the world of the sentence. Otherwise:

(4') *Justine$_j$ hated to be criticized by her$_j$

Considering this change, Passive is unordered with our new transformation; however, it must be halved and must now occur in parts, to allow for *for* to delete even without a DP present:

The subcategorizations of our verbs must change:

Like, V, [_CP$_1$], <AG, TH$_1$>

Hate, V, [_CP$_1$], <AG, TH$_1$>

E
This transformation does account for the ungrammaticality of the following sentences:

(8) *Did you hate <u>for you</u> to be doing the homework at midnight?
(9) *They would like <u>for them</u> to have seen that video

Where our transformation, obligatory, would force the underlined items to be deleted to form

(8') Did you hate to be doing the homework at midnight?
(9') They would like to have seen that video

And accounts for the grammaticality of the following sentence:

(10) Justine$_j$ liked for <u>her$_q$</u> to skateboard to class

Where the underlined item may not be deleted as *her$_q$* refers to someone who is not Justine$_j$.

The initial analysis using phrase structure rules could not account for the nuances present in this analysis as it does not discriminate between *her$_q$* and *her$_j$*, where *her$_q$* is not Justine and *her$_j$* is Justine. The transformation hangs on this essential fact.