John is kicked

D-structure + V→T

kicked assigns theme \( \theta \)-role

\(-en_j = kicked\)

\(-en_j \) takes Agent role

D-struc: \( \emptyset \) pst be kicked\( _j \) John\( _i \)

kick

No accusative case, no agent role
John is kicked

S-structure

*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

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

D-structure + V→T
Theme and Loc θ-roles assigned
-en_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 that Donnie will have been seeing Marie.
John did not kick Mary
Part II

Problems
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 Jan (“John”) receives no θ-role from sanble (“seem”). If this is right, then (b) Jan sanble li pati would be a violation of the θ criterion unless Jan moved to the matrix subject position, leaving 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 θ-criterion. At D-structure, when the θ criterion applies, there is only one NP present in the lower clause (Jan). The pronoun(trace) li appears only after movement and after the θ-criterion applies.
1. Tewa is Head final:
   \[ X' \rightarrow (\text{WP}) \ X \quad \text{Comp} \]
   \[ XP \rightarrow (\text{WP}) \ X' \quad \text{Spec} \]
   \[ X' \rightarrow (\text{WP}) \ X' \quad \text{Adj} \]

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 \_j 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

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

Since John MOVES into subject position of \textit{appear} he gets no theta role from it.

D-struc: \( \emptyset_{\text{pst}} \) is likely \([\text{CP } [\text{John}]_i \text{ to be leaving }]_j \)

be likely

```
prop \text{position}
\hline
\text{CP} \\
j
```

leave

```
\text{Agent} \\
\hline
\text{DP} \\
i
```