

# CONTENTS

PREFACE	viii
0. INTRODUCTION	1
1. THE NATURE OF SEEM CONSTRUCTIONS	5
1.1 Analysis I: The Complements of SEEM Verbs as Sentential Subjects	6
1.1.1 Rosenbaum 1967	6
1.1.1.1 Rosenbaum's System	6
1.1.1.2 Classification of <u>seem</u> , <u>appear</u> , <u>happen</u> and <u>turn out</u>	7
1.1.1.3 Analysis of <u>seem</u> , <u>appear</u> , <u>happen</u> and <u>turn out</u>	8
1.1.1.4 Criticism of the Analysis	10
1.1.2 Kiparsky/Kiparsky 1970	12
1.1.2.1 Kiparskys' Analysis of the SEEM Verbs	12
1.1.2.2 Criticism of the Kiparskys' Analysis	14
1.1.3 Öhring 1977	15
1.1.3.1 Öhring's Objection to the Kiparsky-Thesis	15
1.1.3.2 Öhring's Solution	18
1.1.3.3 Criticism of Öhring's Analysis	18
1.1.4 Summary	19
1.2 Analysis II: The SEEM Verbs as Psychological Predicates	21
1.2.1 Flip	21
1.2.1.1 Lakoff 1970	21
1.2.1.2 R.Lakoff 1968	23
1.2.1.3 Comments on Flip	24
1.2.2 Psych Movement	25
1.2.2.1 Postal 1970, 1971	25
1.2.2.2 Postal 1974	27
1.2.2.3 Comments on Psych Movement	30
1.2.3 Comparison of Analysis I and Analysis II	32
1.3 Analysis III: The Complements of SEEM Verbs as Sentential Objects	34
1.3.1 Kajita 1967, Culicover 1976 and Ruwet 1976a	34
1.3.1.1 Syntactic Tests	35
1.3.1.2 Conclusion	47
1.3.2 Emonds 1970	48

1.3.3	Bresnan 1972	52
1.3.3.1	Bresnan's Fixed Subject Constraint	52
1.3.3.2	Bresnan's Solution	55
1.3.3.3	Shortcoming of Bresnan's Solution	57
1.4	Summary	58
2.	ENGLISH SYSTEM OF PREDICATE SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTATION	62
2.1	Derivation of SEEM Constructions within REST	62
2.2	The Distribution of Sentential Complements	67
2.2.1	Extrapolation vs. Intraposition	67
2.2.1.1	Extrapolation	67
2.2.1.2	Intraposition	69
2.2.2	Lexicalist Argument	71
2.2.2.1	Chomsky 1970	72
2.2.2.2	Jackendoff 1977	74
2.2.3	Sentential Subjects	78
2.2.3.1	Fullest Extension of the Intraposition Premise: Koster 1978	78
2.2.3.2	A Counterargument to Intraposition and its Solution	81
	2.2.3.2.1 Higgins 1973	81
	2.2.3.2.2 Chomsky 1977	83
2.2.3.3	Derived Sentential Subjects within an Intra- position Framework	86
2.2.4	Conclusion	92
2.3	The Nominal Gap Hypothesis	93
2.3.1	The Insufficiency of Chomsky and Lasnik's 1977 and Jackendoff's 1977 Analyses	93
2.3.2	Control	95
2.3.2.1	Interpretation of S Final Sentential Subjects	96
	2.3.2.1.1 Derived Sentential Subjects	96
	2.3.2.1.2 Underlying Sentential Subjects	100
2.3.2.2	Interpretation of S Final Sentential Objects	102
	2.3.2.2.1 NA Complements	102
	2.3.2.2.2 Oblique Complements	103
2.3.3	<u>It</u> Insertion	106
2.4	Explanatory Power of the NGH	110
2.5	Conclusion	114

3.	THE NATURE OF SCHEINEN CONSTRUCTIONS	117
3.1	SCHEINEN + <u>daß</u> Clause	117
3.1.1	Definition of Class	117
3.1.2	Summary	122
3.2	SCHEINEN + Infinitival	125
3.2.1	Definition of Class	125
3.2.1.1	Bech 1955	125
3.2.1.2	Transformational Grammar	132
3.2.2	Derivation of SCHEINEN + Infinitival	134
3.2.2.1	NP-Movement	134
3.2.2.2	V-Raising	138
3.3	Summary	145
4.	GERMAN SYSTEM OF PREDICATE SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTATION	147
4.1	The Nominal Gap Hypothesis	147
4.1.1	Distribution of Sentential Subjects	147
4.1.2	Distribution of Sentential Objects	149
4.1.3	Lexical Redundancy and Control	151
4.1.3.1	Assigning the Syntactic Functions 'Subject' and 'Object' to Sentential Complements	151
4.1.3.2	<u>Es</u> Insertion	155
4.1.3.3	PP Complements	157
4.1.4	<u>Scheinen</u> and <u>heißen</u>	161
4.2	Explicative and Implicative Constructions	163
4.2.1	Bech 1955, 1957	163
4.2.2	Transformational Grammar	169
4.3	Other Sentence Variants	174
4.3.1	Topicalization	174
4.3.2	Right and Left Dislocation	177
4.3.3	Pseudo Clefting	178
4.3.4	<u>Scheinen</u> and <u>heißen</u>	179
4.4	Summary	180
5.	SUMMARY	186
6.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	189
7.	GERMAN SUMMARY	194