The syntax of embedded clauses

1. Exceptional and small clauses

1) *I think* [*(that) she loves chocolate*]   EMBEDDED FINITE CLAUSES
   I believe [*(that) she loves chocolate*]
   I wonder [*if she loves chocolate*]

2) *I believe* [*her to love chocolate*]   EXCEPTIONAL CLAUSE
   *I believe for her to love chocolate.

3) *I consider* [*her intelligent*]   SMALL CLAUSE
   *I consider for her intelligent.

The subjects of the non-finite and verbless clauses have accusative case. Where does it come from? Infinitival *to* is not a case assigner, it is not even present in (3). When there is an accusative subject in an ordinary infinitival clause, there is also a prepositional complementiser present:

4) *For the horse to win the race would be a miracle.*

The verb *believe* can assign case (transitivity). **Exceptional Case-marking (ECM)**: the case-assigner is not within the clause. Accusative case is assigned through government (up to a certain point). CP is a barrier, but government is possible through IP, non-finite IP is not a barrier, since its head is not a case-assigner, case-assignment from the outside is possible to avoid a Case Filter violation, if the main verb (or the C head) is able to assign case (when *believe* is passivized, case is no longer available, as expected: *He was believed to be intelligent*). The non-finite (!!!) clause following *believe* is exceptional, not a CP, but an IP.

Small clauses: visible agreement in some languages (French), there is an IP/AgrP in the structure (real clause structure with a subject and a predicate), but no tense vP/TP.

2. Raising and Control

5) *Tim seems to be tall.*
   Robin wants to be rich.

6) *It seems Tim is tall.*
   *It wants Robin is rich.

7) **Tim seems Tina to be tall.*
   Robin wants Tina to be rich.

Extended Projection Principle (EPP): every clause must have a subject.
The subject of non-finite clauses: not pronounced but interpreted (subject theta-roles!).
Different types of unpronounced subjects in the sentences above:

- PRO: two independent theta-roles, two different DPs → **control**: *want, promise, ask*

- trace: one theta-role, one DP → **raising**: *seem, appear,* similar pattern with certain adjectives like *likely*

Locality conditions on movement:

8) *The builder seemed to be unlikely to be considered to be very skilled.*
   *The builder seemed that the electrician believed to be incompetent.

Movement goes step by step, from subject position to subject position in every clause.
Relativized Minimality (Rizzi, 1990): a moving element cannot move over the top of a like element.

PRO: only in the subject position of non-finite clauses. Cannot appear in positions with Nominative or Accusative Case. PRO needs Null Case. Clauses with PRO are CPs, they need a barrier from outside Case assignment. Object and subject control: *ask* vs. *promise*.

3. The Gerund

9) *The doctors were worried about* [*the patients's* (*obstinately*) *refusing the medicine*]
   *[the refusing the medicine]
   [*the refusing of the medicine*]

10) *his refusing the medicine*
    his having refused the medicine

Gerund: between nominal and verbal status. *–ing*: a nominalizing head, taking a VP/vP complement and turning it into a noun. It can enter into a structure at various points, but when it enters the structure directly above the VP, there will be no case-assigning light verb, so the insertion of *of* will be needed. When the agent appears, there is a vP, there is case as well. OK with a perfect vP as well.