

**What to expect:**

**I. Constituency**

**II. C-Command**

**III. Theta theory**

→ unergative vs. unaccusative verbs

→ drawing tree structures for unergative, unaccusative, and transitive constructions indicating all movements

→ UTAH and constructions posing problems for UTAH, e.g. the passive

--> Using various tests to determine whether a given verb assigns a theta-role to its specifier or complement, e.g. the expletive test and the idiom-chunk test:

*There seems to be a problem*

*The cat seems to be out of the bag*

*John believes there to be a problem*

*John believes the cat to be out of the bag*

*\*John believes there*

*\*John believes the cat*

**IV. Case theory meets theta-theory:** the correlation between the presence vs. absence of the external (agent) theta-role and the presence vs. absence of accusative case (Burzio's Generalization).

*In this light: do we expect unaccusatives to be able to passivize? Why not? In some languages unergatives can form passives. Is that something we can in principle expect given our theory?*

*Suppose you found a language where the object in the passive construction still retained the accusative case. Would this be a problem for BG? Why? That is, in North Russian, for example the following would be ok:*

(1) *Him was killed* (Good in North Russian)

**V. Case: Why do NPs need case? [the Case Filter]**

Why are the following sentences grammatical/ ungrammatical.

- (24) \* *It was eaten the donut by John*
- (25) \* *The donut was eaten John*
- (26) \* *It seems John to be tired*
- (27) *John seems to be tired*
- (28) \**John to fail all his classes would be unthinkable*
- (29) *For John to fail all his classes would be unthinkable*
- (30) *To fail all one's classes would be unthinkable*
- (31) \**John tried everyone to leave*
- (32) *John tried for everyone to leave*
- (33) \* *John's destruction his opponent's arguments*
- (34) *John's destruction of his opponent's arguments*
- (35) *John's understanding (of) his opponent's arguments [surprised me]*

Can you explain why the following sentence in (1) is grammatical while (2) is ungrammatical:

- (1) *Homer seems to be late*
- (2) \**Homer seems that is late*

**Some problems for Case theory. Consider the following data from Russian. Assume that the subject that is in the DATIVE case is still in Spec TP in Russian. What problem does this pose for our view of Case, especially for what was said concerning the case assigned by the T?**

- (1) *Mne nravitsja tort*  
*I-dat like cake*  
*I like cake*

- (2) *Mne nuzhna kniga*  
*I-dat need book*  
*I need a book*