

## What Seems to Every Experiencer to Be Bound by It

English *seems*, and related verbs such as *looks* and *sounds*, display certain asymmetries with regards to binding facts of the experiencer argument of *seems*, which can be explained if small clause complements of *seems* must always move up from their underlying position. This conclusion is further supported when English is compared to Hebrew, where independent movement of some experiencers results in a different pattern.

First, an experiencer phrase can freely appear either before or after a full complement clause in English. In cases where the experiencer comes first, a quantifier within it can bind a variable within the clausal complement, but not when the order is reversed:

- 1a. John seems [<sub>PP</sub> to every man<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>IP</sub> to be angry at him<sub>i</sub>].
- 1b. \* John seems [<sub>IP</sub> to be angry at him<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>PP</sub> to every man<sub>i</sub>].

However, when *seems* has a small clause complement, then the binding facts are different. Many speakers find sentences where the experiencer precedes the small clause considerably degraded:

- 2a. % John seems [<sub>PP</sub> to me] [<sub>IP</sub> angry].
- 2b. John seems [<sub>PP</sub> angry] [<sub>IP</sub> to me].

Even more strikingly, even those who accept sentence (2a) find it impossible to have a quantifier in a *to*-phrase bind a variable in these cases:

- 3. \* John seems [<sub>PP</sub> to every man<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>SC</sub> angry at him<sub>i</sub>].

These facts stand in striking contrast to corresponding verbs in Hebrew. In Hebrew, pronominal and universally quantified experiencers must precede the small clause:

- 4a. Yossi nirʔe [<sub>PP</sub> li] [<sub>SC</sub> koʔes].  
Yossi seems to-me angry.
- 4b. \* Yossi nirʔe [<sub>SC</sub> koʔes] [<sub>PP</sub> li].  
Yossi seems angry to-me.

And, unlike in English, there is no problem when the quantified experiencer binds a variable within the small clause:

- 5. Yossi nirʔe [<sub>PP</sub> le-kol adam<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>SC</sub> koʔes alav<sub>i</sub>].  
Yossi seems to-every man<sub>i</sub> angry at-him<sub>i</sub>.

It is possible to explain these data by assuming that the small clause complements must undergo a movement that IP/CP complements of *seems* do not undertake (following similar proposals by Koster (1994) and Matushansky(2002)). In English, if the small clause first raises above the experiencer, both the resulting word order and the variable

binding facts are explained by remnant movement of the functional projection below the SC to a higher position, resulting in the structure in (6), where there is no c-command relationship between the experiencer and the small clause (note: I am making no claim as to when the subject raises out of the SC):

6. \* ...<sub>[VP seems [<sub>FuncP</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> to every man<sub>i</sub>] t<sub>j</sub>]<sub>k</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> John angry at him<sub>i</sub>]<sub>j</sub> t<sub>k</sub>]</sub>

Full clausal complements, however, do not undergo the first movement and therefore remain in c-command relationship with the experiencer.

In Hebrew, on the other hand, the movement of the pronominal and universally quantifier experiencers to a higher position seems necessary by an independent process (as indicated by (4)). This movement, which is unavailable to English experiencers, will therefore result in a c-commanding relationship:

7. ...<sub>[VP nir?e [<sub>PP</sub> le-kol adam<sub>i</sub>]<sub>j</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> Yossi ko?es alav<sub>i</sub>]<sub>k</sub> t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>k</sub>]</sub>

### References:

- Koster, J. (1994) Predicate incorporation and the word order of Dutch. In *Paths toward Universal Grammar. Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*, G. Cinque, J. Koster, J.-Y. Pollock, L. Rizzi, R. Zanuttini (eds.) 255-276. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP.
- Matushansky, O (2002) Tipping the Scales: The Syntax of Scalarity in the Complement of Seem. *Syntax* 5:219-276.