the story so far...

trees are created by Merge, guided by selection, and the Projection Principle...

(1)  a. John imitated [a walrus] [for an hour]
     b. *John imitated [for an hour] [a walrus]

(2)  a. V
     VP
     PP
     V'  imitated
     NP  a walrus
     P   for
     NP  an hour

     b. *V
     VP
     NP  a walrus
     PP
     V'  imitated
     NP  for
     NP  an hour

Projection principle: anything selected by a head (complement) must be a sister to that head.

(3)  a. John painted [the table] [in an hour]
     b. *John painted [in an hour] [the table]
     c. The table was painted.

(4)  TP
     NP
     T'
     D  N  T
     the  table  was  painted

???

two possible moves:

- relax our theory of Selection¹:
  "The complement of V must be a sister of V, unless the verb is passive, in which case it can be in the specifier of TP"

- posit Movement²:

---
¹ also called the Wrong Theory.
² also called the Right Theory.
Extended Projection Principle (EPP): the specifier of TP must be filled.

How do we decide whether to posit movement, or to relax our theory of selection?
Resultatives

(6) I painted the table red  \(\approx \) 'I painted the table, and the table became red')

(7) a. *I painted the table sweaty \(\neq \)...and I became sweaty"
    b. *I talked to John embarrassed
    c. *I shouted hoarse

→ Resultatives must modify the \textit{object} of the verb.

what does "object" mean? "NP selected by the verb"?

(8) a. I shouted myself \textit{hoarse}
    b. We laughed him \textit{off the stage}
    c. *I shouted myself
    d. *We laughed him

...apparently not. Here the resultatives seem to modify NPs which are somehow selected by the resultatives themselves. 'object' has to be a name for a position in the tree.

(9) The table was painted red

What happened to the generalization? How can the resultative be modifying the subject here?

contrast the theories of the word order in (9):

- \textit{relaxing} our theory of selection: because the verb is passive, the NP selected by the verb is Merged in the specifier of TP.

- \textit{Movement}: the \textit{table} starts out as the complement of \textit{painted}, and moves to the specifier of TP:

(10) \[
\text{TP} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{T'} \quad \text{T} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{table} \quad \text{was} \quad \text{V'} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{AP} \quad \text{red} \quad \text{Painted}
\]

On the \textit{relaxing} theory, the behavior of \textit{red} in (9) is strange; normally resultatives can't modify the subject, but here it can. Moreover, we can't say that resultatives modify "whatever is selected by the verb", because of (8).

On the \textit{movement} theory, our story about resultatives is unchanged; they modify NPs which start out as objects.
Idioms

(11)  a.  John kicked the bucket
 b.  Bill bought the farm
 c.  Susan yawned in Technicolor
 d.  We're visiting the Big Apple
 e.  The cat is out of the bag

The underlined idioms have literal meanings, but also idiomatic meanings (*kicked the bucket*, *bought the farm* = "died", *yawned in Technicolor* = "vomited", *the Big Apple* = "New York City", *the cat is out of the bag* = "the secret is out").

Interesting condition on idioms; there are VP idioms (like (11a-c)) and NP idioms (like (11d)), and TP idioms (like (11e)), but no\(^3\) idioms that are nonconstituent strings of words:

(12)  a.  The armadillo bit John (not an idiom)
 b.  A llama spat at Mary (also not an idiom)
 c.  Puppies frolicked with Susan (still not an idiom...)

And yet, problem!

(13)  a.  The cat is out of the bag
 b.  The cat seems to be out of the bag
 c.  The cat seems to be likely to be out of the bag

\(^3\) this is an oversimplification. Consider expressions like *John cashed in his chips* (yet another way to say *John died*). What's the idiom here?