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John is kicked

D-structure + V → T

kicked assigns theme θ-role

kick + en_j = kicked

-en_j takes Agent role

D-struc: ∅ pst be kicked_j John_i

kick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP_j</td>
<td>DP_i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No accusative case, no agent role
John is kicked

John gets nominative case checked, EPP satisfied
Has the rice been eaten?

D-struc + V $\rightarrow$ T

Theme $\theta$-role assigned

$-en_j$ takes Agent role
Has the rice been eaten?

S-structure

*the rice* gets nominative case

\[ \text{V} \rightarrow \text{T}, \text{T} \rightarrow \text{C} \]
The money was hidden in the drawer

D-structure + V→T
Theme and Loc θ-roles assigned
-en\text{j} takes Agent role
No accusative case
The money was hidden in the drawer

S-structure

*The money* gets nominative case
... to have been kissed

D-structure + V→T
-en_j takes Agent role
No accusative case
... to have been kissed

intermediate

*Donny* gets no case

EPP
... to have been kissed

S-structure

Donny gets nominative case

EPP
It is likely ...
John did not kick Mary
Haitian Creole

1. According to the glosses in the data the Haitian (a) and (b) sentences are paraphrases just as the English sentences are. This suggests that \textit{Jan} (“John”) receives no $\theta$-role from \textit{sanble} (“seem”). If this is right, then (b) \textit{Jan sanble li pati} would be a violation of the $\theta$ criterion unless \textit{Jan} moved to the matrix subject position, leaving \textit{li} behind as a trace.

2. Sentence (c) shows that the pronoun/trace must be realized as a pronoun. This is something that distinguishes Haitian Creole from English: Traces (at least some traces) must be pronounced.

3. If our movement account is right, example (b) is not a violation of the $\theta$-criterion. At D-structure, when the $\theta$ criterion applies, there is only one NP present in the lower clause (\textit{Jan}). The pronoun/trace \textit{li} appears only after movement and after the $\theta$-criterion applies.
1. Tewa is Head final:
   \[ X' \rightarrow (WP) X \quad \text{Comp} \]
   \[ XP \rightarrow (WP) X' \quad \text{Spec} \]
   \[ X' \rightarrow (WP) X' \quad \text{Adj} \]

2. Affix lowering assumed.
1. c & d: Theme assumed to move to spec of TP to get case. Agent role absorbed.

2. Optional Agent treated as an adjunct like the *by-phrase* in English.
Impersonals

1. The two impersonal passives share the following properties. They are both missing their agents and the themes are both in Accusative case (Ukrainian Cervku, Kannada Ramma).

2. This suggests that in these languages, unlike English, the passive affix does not rob a verb of the ability to assign accusative case.

3. Therefore, what characterizes the passive in these languages is that it absorbs the Agent role.
Stump the grammar

1. *It seems [CP Sonny to love Cher.]
   As subject of a nonfinite clause, Sonny does not get nominative case checked. Case filter violation.

2. *Bill$_i$ was bitten$_j$ the dog$_k$,

   Since there are no traces shown here I am assuming we are considering a derivation on which there was no movement. There are two problems. First, Bill in subject position gets no $\theta$-role, as shown in the $\theta$ grid. Second, the affix *en* robs the verb of the ability to check accusative case, so the dog does not have its case checked. Thus, we have both a $\theta$-criterion violation and a Case filter violation.
3. Donny is likely that \([\text{CP} t \text{ left.}]\)

   The same case feature can’t be checked twice. *Donny* gets its
   nominative case checked once in the finite clause and again as
   subject of the finite matrix clause. We have been calling such cases
   cases of unmotivated movement in class. This is actually a more
   general idea than no-checking-twice.

4. * It seems \([\text{CP} \text{ Donny to be likely that } t_i \text{ was happy.}]\)

   This is a case filter violation. As subject of the finite T *was*, Donny
   gets nominative case in the lower clause, so there is no need for more
   movement. It has just moved unnecessarily. Notice that it actually
   doesn’t get its case feature checked twice, but it’s still bad. The
   reason is that the case Filter requires that the DP *end up* in a case
   position at S-structure, and that isn’t the case for the NP *Donnie*. It
   ends up as subject of the nonfinite clause *Donnie to be likely.*
Raising theta grid

John$_i$ is likely $[_{\text{CP}} t \text{ to be leaving}]_j$

Since John MOVES into subject position of *appear* he gets no theta role from it.

D-struc: $\emptyset_{\text{pst}} \text{ is likely } [_{\text{CP}} \text{ John to be leaving } ]$

be likely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>