The syntax of embedded clauses

1. Exceptional and small clauses

   1) I think [(that) she loves chocolate]
      I believe [(that) she loves chocolate]
      I wonder [if she loves chocolate]

      EMBEDDED FINITE CLAUSES

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

      EXCEPTIONAL CLAUSE

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

      SMALL CLAUSE

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 patient’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.