**The syntax of finite and non-finite clauses**

**Levels of representation: DS, SS, and Logical Form**

(1) LF is the level of linguistic interpretation at which all grammatical structure relevant to semantic interpretation is provided. (Hornstein, 1995:3)

(2) LF is the phrase marker derived from S-structure by applications of „Move α”, branches with respect to PF and is input to rules of interpretation. (Hornstein, 1995:4)

A GB-style grammar, very different from Minimalist theories.

T-model:

(3) DS
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(+ Lexicon, filters: X’-theory, Projection Principle, θ-theory, Case Theory, etc.)

The Minimalist Program: virtual conceptual necessity, UG has only two grammatical levels, LF and PF, Natural language sentences: a pairing of sound and meaning. PF: interfaces with the perceptual-articulatory (PA) system, LF: interfaces with the conceptual-intentional (CI) system. DS and SS do not exist. Full interpretation, feature checking.
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**Some data**

(5) *Peter saw Mary.*

S(P, M)

(6) *Peter saw everyone.*

∀x (H(x) → S(P, x)) for all x it is the case that if x is human then Peter saw x

(7) *Peter saw someone.*

∃x (H(x) & S(P, x)) there is an x such that x is human and Peter saw x

(8) *Everyone saw someone.* ambiguous

∀x (H(x) → (∃y (H(y) & S(x, y)))) for every person x there is some person y such that x saw y

∃y (H(y) & (∀x (H(x) → S(x, y)))) there is some specific person y, such that for every person x x saw y

The difference is in the scope of the operators: ∀ >> ∃ vs. ∃ >> ∀

→ the linear order of words in a sentence does not always faithfully represent certain semantic properties of the sentence.

Hungarian:

(9) Többször is meghívtam mindenkit. ambiguity in the postverbal field

several times invited-SG1 everyone-ACC

’I invited everyone several times.’

többször is >> mindenkit OR mindenkit >> többször is

(10) Többször is mindenkit meghívtam. többször is >> mindenkit

(11) Mindenkit többször is meghívtam. mindenkit >> többször is

In the preverbal field quantifiers appear in the order defined by the scope properties of the sentence. “Hungarian wears its LF on its sleeve.” (in the preverbal field)

What is overt movement in Hungarian takes place in a covert form in English: Logical Form. Typological differences between languages reduce to timing (at the LF level grammars are identical: poverty of stimulus argument for semantics, no/very limited data for fixing LF parameters). The satisfaction of semantic ends may or may not happen by overt syntactic means.

**Some further arguments for assuming the existence of LF (**based on Hornstein, 1995)**:**

1. **Wh-movement (locality effects observed even in wh-in-situ languages): adjunct/argument, subject/object asymmetry**

(12a) (?) Which car did John wonder how to fix?

(12b) \*How did John wonder which car to fix?

(13a) Which car did John say that Bill fixed?

(13b) \*Which mechanic did John say that fixed the car?

(14) Ni xiang-zhidao Lisi zeme mai-le sheme

you wonder Lisi how buy-ASP what

What is x that you wonder how Lisi bought x

(How do you wonder what Lisi bought: excluded)

1. **Superiority (similar restrictions in multiple questions):**

(15a) *I wonder who bought what.*

(15b) *\*I wonder what who bought.*

Romanian:

(16a) *Cine ce cumpara?* (Who what buys)

(16b) \**Ce cine cumpara?*

1. **Cross over effects**

(19) \**Whoi did hei give a book to ti*Strong cross over

(20) \**Whoi did hisi mother give a book to ti*Weak cross over

(21) A variable must be free in the domain of its operator.

(22) A variable cannot serve as the antecedent of a pronoun on its left.

(22) \**Hei gave everyonei a book.*

(23) \**Hisi mother gave everyonei  a book.*

1. **Expletive replacement at LF: effect on the scope of quantifiers**

(29a) *There will not be many students present at the talk.*

(29b) *Many students will not be present at the talk.*

(30a) *There are often some students late for the lecture.*

(30b) *Some students are often late for the lecture.*

1. **Passivization also affects quantifier scope**

(31a) Everybody in this room speaks two languages.

(31b) Two languages are spoken by everybody in this room.

1. **Quantifiers**

(32a) *At least one person expects every candidate to win.*

(32b) *At least one person expects (that) every candidate will win.*

**Topicalization and focusing (full quote from Haegeman 2012:19)**

“While focalization (21a) gives rise to weak crossover (WCO; cf. Lasnik and Stowell

1991 ), this is not the case for topicalization (21b).

(21) a. \* Giannii suai madre ha sempre apprezzato.

Gianni his- fsg mother have-3 sg always appreciate- part-msg

‘ Gianni his mother has always appreciated.’

b. Giannii, suai madre loi ha sempre apprezzato.

Gianni his- fsg mother him have-3 sg always appreciate- part-msg

‘Gianni, his mother has always appreciated.’

Th e same contrast is pointed out for English by Culicover ( 1991a : 37), who gives the

following examples:

(22) a. \* Robini hisi mother really appreciates. (Culicover 1991a : 37 (122a))

b. Robini, hisi mother really appreciates. (Culicover 1991a : 37, (121a))

Different operators in the structures.
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