

Raising and control

« Raising » and « control » phenomena are relevant for the analysis of auxiliaries, non finite complements and predicative adjectives. In HPSG, both raising and control verbs take non finite VP complements ; the distinction is that :

- Control verbs assign a semantic role to all their syntactic arguments ;
- Raising verbs do not assign a semantic role to the subject of their non finite complement (the raising principle)
- Raising verbs share the SYNSEM features of their subject or object with the subject of their non finite complement
- Control verbs conindex their subject or object with the subject of their non finite complement

1. Raising verbs with non finite complements

Bresnan 1982, Ruwet 1991, Pollard and Sag 1994.

Raising verbs do not assign a semantic role to their subject or their object. Subject raising verbs are *appear, continue, stop, seem...* Object raising verbs are *expect, hear, let, see...*

The raising principle

The analysis can be extended to auxiliaries, which are analysed as subject raising verb, and all argument raising in Romance (see chapter Complex predicates) ; HPSG account of NICE properties

The arguments against a movement analysis are as follows :

- The « raising » verbs does not take a sentential complement (only *appear, seem* do) :

- (1) a. It continues to rain.
b. It stopped raining.
c. *It stopped that i trains
d. *It continues that i trains.

- The « raised » subject does not need to have nominative case ; it keeps its quirky case in Icelandic.

- The « raised » subject can be verbal, so should not move to receive case (That it rains does not seem to bother her.)

2. Control verbs with non finite complements

I follow Pollard and Sag 1991, 1994 for a semantic based analysis of control verbs. The distinction between subject control and object control verbs depends on the semantic class of the verb :

- object-control verbs are order and influence predicates (*convince, permit, forbid, force, order, persuade, tell...*) ; the objet can be an NP or PP complement ;
- others are subject-control verbs : commitment (*promise, try..*), communication (*confess,*), epistemic (*believe, forget, remember, think...*), psy (*love hate...*)...

- (2) a Paul forces Mary-i to leave-i.
b Paul-i promise Mary to leave-i.
c Paul-i hates to wait-i on line.

Ambiguous verbs :

- (3) Paul-i proposes to Mary-j to leave-i/j.

Distinction with arbitrary control : *Running is good for the health.*

3. Predicative constructions

3.1 Verbs with a predicative complement

Verbs with a predicative complement are intransitive (*be, seem, become, remain....*) or transitive (*consider, find, expect, make....*). The predicative complement can be nominal, prepositional or verbal :

- (4) John is President/ stupid/ on holidays.

Such constructions allow for unlike coordination (see chapter on Coordination).

I assume the special constituency of Romance predicative constructions (which allow for clitic climbing) will be in the Complex predicate chapter.

The arguments against a small clause analysis are as follows :

- The verb cannot take a sentential complement (*except consider, expect...*)
- (5) a John is / gets / becomes sick
b * It is / gets / becomes that John is sick
- (6) a Paul regards Mary as crazy
b * Paul regards that Mary is crazy
- When it does, the predicative construction does not behave like the one with a sentential complement
- (6) We consider Lou a friend / Lou to be a friend / that Lou is a friend
- (7) a We consider Lou a friend
b * What we consider is Lou a friend

- (8) a We consider that Lou is a friend
 b What we consider is that Lou is a friend

- The adjective's « subject » is a syntactic object :

- (9) a We consider him /* he guilty
 b We consider that he/*him is guilty
 c He was proved guilty (by the jury)

- The verb may select the category of the predicate complement : *prove* does not take a PP predicate, *get*, *expect* does not take a NP predicate

- (10) a They expect that man (to be) dead by tomorrow
 b They expect that island (to be) off the route
 c They expect that island *(to be) a good vacation spot

- (11) John got political / * a success

- (12) a I proved the theorem (to be) false
 b I proved the weapon *(to be) in his possession.

The difference with identity sentences, with a saturated complement will be discussed (Van Eynde 2015)

- (13) The problem is to be on time/ that we are late.

3.2. Raising and control adjectives

Adjectives with a non finite complément

Raising adjectives (*likely*....) do not assign a semantic role to their subject, contrary to « control » adjectives (*eager*...)

- (13) a. Paul is likely to come tomorrow
 b. It is likely to rain

- (14) a. Paul is eager to come
 b. *It is eager to rain

Ruwet N. Syntax and human experience, U Chicago Press

Van Eynde F. (2015). *Predicative constructions. From the Fregean to a Montagovian treatment*. Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism, Stanford CA: CSLI Publications.