

Assignment 8

I.1. Consider the following facts from German and English.

- (1) a. German
- i. *(Es) wurde getanzt
it was danced
'There was dancing.'
 - ii. *(Es) wurde bis spät in die Nacht getrunken
it was till late in the night drunk
'There was drinking till late in the night.'
 - iii. *Es wurde diesen Roman von vielen Studenten gelesen
it was this-Acc novel by many students read
 - iv. *(Es) wurde dieser Roman von vielen Studenten gelesen
it was this-Nom novel by many students read
'This novel was read by many students.'
 - v. Dieser Roman wurde (*es) von vielen Studenten gelesen
this-Nom novel was it by many students read
'This novel was read by many students.'
- b. English
- i. * was arrested John.
 - ii. *It was arrested John.
 - iii. There were several men arrested yesterday.
 - iv. */???[That the conclusion was false] was believed.
 - v. It was believed [that the conclusion was false].
 - vi. *There was believed [that the conclusion was false].

Provide an explanation for the above pattern of grammaticality. Your explanation should extend to a hypothesis about differences between English and German from which the above differences between English and German would follow (Keep in mind that German is a V2 language).

I.2. Next consider the following Hindi-Urdu data. Note that the passive auxiliary in Hindi-Urdu is *jaa/ga* 'go' and not *ho* 'be'.

- (2) a. *dekh* 'see'
- i. Active:
Vijay Dawood-ko bazaar-me dekh-egaa
Vijay-Nom Dawood-Acc market-in see-will
'Vijay will see Dawood in the market.'

ii. Passive 1:

Dawood-ko (Vijaya-dwaaraa) bazaar-me dekhaa gayaa
Dawood-Acc Vijaya-by market-in seen was

‘Dawood was seen by Vijaya in the market.’

iii. Passive 2:

Dawood (Vijaya-dwaaraa) bazaar-me dekhaa gayaa
Dawood-Nom Vijaya-by market-in seen was

‘Dawood was seen by Vijaya in the market.’

b. *hās* ‘laugh’

i. Active:

Yunus zor-se hās-egaa
Yunus loudly laugh-will

‘Yunus will laugh loudly.’

ii. Passive 1:

*Yunus-ko hāsaa gayaa
Yunus-Acc laughed was

iii. Passive 2:

*Yunus hāsaa gayaa
Yunus-Nom laughed was

iv. Passive 3:

Yunus-dwaaraa zor-se hāsaa gayaa
Yunus-by loudly laughed was

‘*It was laughed loudly by Yunus.’

c. *ubal* ‘boil_{intransitive}’

i. Active:

paanii ubal rahaa hai
water boil -ing is

‘The water is boiling.’

ii. Passive 1:

*paanii-ko ubl-aa gayaa
water-Acc boiled was

iii. Passive 2:

*paanii ubl-aa gayaa
water-Nom boiled was

iv. Passive 3:

*paanii-dwaaraa ubl-aa gayaa
water-by boiled was

Provide a theoretical characterization of the differences between passives in Hindi-Urdu and English. Further provide a characterization of why the passive behaves differently with the three classes of predicates shown above. For simplicity, you can assume that the Hindi-Urdu predicates in question have the same syntactic properties as the corresponding English predicates.

II.1 Consider the following facts from Ukrainian.

- (3) a. Stadion buv zbudovanyj v 1948 roc'i.
 stadium.MSg be.Pst build.Part.Nom.MSg in 1948
 'The stadium was built in 1948.'
- b. Stadion bulo zbudovano v 1948 roc'i.
 stadium.MSg be.Pst.Neut build.Part.Neut in 1948
 'The stadium was built in 1948.'

Even though the subject in (3) is not overtly specified for case, we can conclude that in (3a), the subject is in the nominative while in (3b) it is in the accusative. This is because with feminine NPs the case distinctions are clearly visible.

- (4) a. Cerkvu/*Cerkva bulo zbudovano v 1640 roc'i.
 church.F.Acc/*church.F.Nom be.Pst.Neut build.Part.Neut in 1948
 'The church was built in 1640.'
- b. Cerkva/*Cerkvu bula zbudovana v 1640 roc'i.
 church.F.Nom/*church.F.Acc be.Pst.F build.Part.FSg in 1948
 'The church was built in 1640.'

Consider also the following contrasts:

- (5) behavior as complement of *want*:
- a. Vin xot'iv (buty) poslanyj tudy.
 he.Nom wanted to.be sent.Part.MSg there
 'He wanted to be sent there.'
- b. *Vin xot'iv (buty) poslano tudy.
 he.Nom wanted to.be sent.Part.Neut there
 'He wanted to be sent there.'
- (6) Genitive of Negation typically appears only on objects: objects of negated verbs appear with genitive case.
- a. Cerkvy ne bulo zbudovano.
 church.Gen Neg be.Pst.Neut build.Part.Neut
 'The church was not built.'
- b. Cerkva/*Cerkvy ne bula zbudovana.
 church.Nom/church.Gen Neg be.Pst.F build.Part.F
 'The church was not built.'

Construct a hypothesis that accounts for the above data using the framework that we have developed in class. Try to identify the locus of variation between Ukrainian and English.

II.2 Consider now the following facts from German.

(7) (*praise* in German assigns accusative to its object.)

- a. Ich wurde gelobt.
I was/became praised
'I was praised.'
- b. *Mich/Mir wurde gelobt.
I.Acc/I.Dat was/became praised
- c. *Es wurde mich/mir gelobt.
it was I/Acc/I.Dat praised.

(8) (*help* in German assigns dative to its object.)

- a. *Ich wurde geholfen.
I was/became helped
'I was helped.'
- b. Mir wurde geholfen.
I.Dat was/became helped
'I was helped.'
- c. Es wurde mir geholfen.
it was me helped
'I was helped.'

Extend your hypothesis for Ukrainian and English to cover German.

III. Compare the structure for the resultative construction that you adopted in the last assignment with the structure proposed in Embick (2004). Discuss the empirical and theoretical motivations for and against the two structures. You are welcome to bring in additional data not considered by Levin and Rappaport-Hovav and Embick as part of your argument.