Raising and control

« Raising » and « control » phenomena are relevant for the analysis of 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 conidex 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. *Il 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 canot 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 tomorow
        b. It is likely to rain

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

Ruwet N. Syntax and human eperince, 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.