Approaches to control phenomena
handout 5


5 Empirical challenges and solutions (continued)

5.2.1 Relativizing A-movement

Persuade-type verbs: “movement for θ-reasons in (20a) provides an escape hatch for ‘John’ to enter into φ-agreement relations later in the derivation.” C cannot block θ-related movement (either due to the different θ-role, or too short movement (one θ-role per clause))

\[
\begin{align*}
(20) \text{a. } & [\text{VP John, persuaded}_{\theta} [\text{CP C}_{\phi} [\text{TP t} \text{ to kiss Mary}]]] \text{OK} \\
\text{b. } & [\text{Presp } -en_{\theta} [\text{VP John, persuaded}_{\theta} [\text{CP C } [\text{TP t} \text{ to kiss Mary}]]]] \text{OK}
\end{align*}
\]

Impersonal passives in German:

\[
\begin{align*}
(24) \text{German (Kiss 2005):} \\
\text{a. } & \text{Der Mann wurde zu tanzen gewünscht} \text{ The man PASS.AUX.3SG to dance wished} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Es wurde gewünscht zu tanzen} \text{ It PASS.AUX.3SG wished to dance}
\end{align*}
\]

Problem 1: the interpretation of (24b): the implicit argument of matrix V controls the external argument of the embedded V.

Problem 2: a raising verb can take an impersonal passive as a complement (vs. passivized subject control)

\[
\begin{align*}
(25) \text{German (Kiss 2005):} \\
\text{a. } & \text{Es wurde gewünscht getanzt zu werden} \text{ It PASS.AUX.3SG wished danced to PASS.AUX.INF} \\
\text{‘Somebody wished to dance’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Es scheint getanzt zu werden} \text{ It seems danced to PASS.AUX.INF} \\
\text{‘It seems that someone is dancing’}
\end{align*}
\]

Once we have a proper analysis of impersonal passives in German, the Visser’s Generalization account can apply here as well.

Baker, Johnson and Roberts (1989): passive morpheme a clitic with the external θ-role of the predicate, doubled by a by-phrase or an empty category: IMPersonal. Difference bw German and English in Case licensing possibilities of passive morpheme: English IMP can be licensed by structural ACC, German IMP by structural or inherent case.

\[
\begin{align*}
(24a): & \left[\text{VP IMP } _{\phi} -en_{\theta} [\text{VP wished } [\text{CP C}_{\phi} [\text{TP [the man]_{\phi} to dance]}}]\right] \\
(28) & \left[\text{VP IMP } _{\phi} -en_{\theta} [\text{VP wished } [\text{CP C}_{\phi} [\text{TP [the man]_{\phi} to dance]]]}\right]
\end{align*}
\]

Without IMP movement for θ-purposes is not blocked, but the overt DP is realized as a by-phrase.
Problems for (25a): expletive cannot be assigned matrix \( \theta \)-role, IMP with inherent case inert. Inserting another IMP in matrix does not work either, expletive receives no case due to intervening C.

BP hyper-raising and passive in finite control:

(35) \[ [\text{TP} \text{to} \text{EPP} \text{be}] [\text{VP} \text{be}] [\text{VP} \text{danced}]] \]

(36) \[ [\text{TP} \text{it} \text{to} \text{EPP} \text{seems}] [\text{CP} \text{it} \text{seems} \text{to} \text{be}] [\text{VP} \text{danced}]] \]

Correlation bw movement of embedded subject and mvt of embedded clause: subject can move for \( \phi \)-agreement only if the clause cannot move (seem, turn out/end up vs say).

Say: embedded C blocks \( \phi \)-related movement, its projection can move.

Seem, finish: what makes embedded C inert? English experiencers in raising do not block mvt (Mary seems to him to be nice) Experiencers: inherent case.

BP matrix verbs like (36) assign inherent case to the head of their CP complement \( \rightarrow C \) inert for \( \phi \)-agreement purposes \( \rightarrow \) hyper-raising allowed

English: also inherent Case for that-clause in seem-sentences, but obligatory case assignment in finite clause (inherent case necessary but not sufficient)

Evidence for the inherent case claim:

1) in (44) CP is the argument of obviò, no inherent case \( \rightarrow C \) active
2) dummy preposition *de* (of) as the realization of inherent case optionally assigned by some impersonal predicates → C active only when *de* is not present (46)-(47), hyper-raising possible with *de*, clause can move when *de* is not present.

(44) **Brazilian Portuguese** (Nunes 2008a):

a. Parece óbvio que eles viajaram
   *Seems obvious that they traveled*
   ‘It seems obvious that they traveled’

b. Que eles viajaram parece óbvio
   *That they traveled seems obvious*
   ‘That they traveled seems obvious’

c. *Eles parecem óbvios que viajaram*
   *They seem obvious that traveled*
   ‘It seems obvious that they traveled’

(46) **Brazilian Portuguese** (Nunes 2008a):

a. É fácil/difícil *(de)esses professores elogiarem* os alunos
   *Is easy/difficult of these teachers* praise.3PL the students
   ‘It’s easy/hard for these teachers to praise the students’

b. *Esses professores são fáceis/difíceis*(de) elogiarem os alunos
   *These teachers are easy/difficult of praise.3PL the students*
   ‘These teachers often/rarely praise the students’

(47) **Brazilian Portuguese** (Nunes 2008a):

a. Ê bem provável/lamentável *(dos professores terem* elogiado
   *Is very probable/regrettable of the teachers have* 3PL praised
   o diretor
   *the director*

b. *Os professores são bem prováveis/lamentáveis de terem elogiado
   *The teachers are very probable/regrettable of have* 3PL praised
   o diretor
   *the director*
   ‘It is very likely/regrettable that the teachers praised the director’

Nominals and control
Control from within nominals is allowed in English, but raising into nominals is not (Culicover and Jackendoff 2001): semantics-based approach vs. MTC: implicit arguments in control: semantic/functional argument without NP in phrase structure.

(51) a. John’s attempt to leave

b. *John’s appearance to leave*

Potential arguments against semantics-based approaches: languages where raising and control into nominals coexist – contrast should be universal.

MTC: syntactic configurations involving control nominals and raising nominals can be different (A-movt for φ or θ)

Finite control into indicative noun-complement clauses in BP
Nominals in BP only assign inherent case. No \( \theta \)-role available in (52b).
Null subject is noun complement clause an expletive: *de* optional; null subject referential: *de* obligatory

Presence of *de* obligatory in (58): it signals a difference bw true complementation and predication, cf. (58).

Complementation: defective T, movement (59); without *de* (60): adjunct, embedded subject cannot move. Sideward movement? Chain reduction problems: copies not in a chain configuration (no c-command), deletion of copies can only operate on chains → linearization problems
(59) a. Applications of merge and move:
   CP = [that João T_{[N]} did this]
   N = affirmation

b. Merger between N and CP + inherent-case assignment:
   [affirmation [that João T_{[N]} did this] inherent case]

c. Movement of the embedded subject + θ-role assignment:
   [João" inherent case affirmation [that João T_{[N]} did this] inherent case]

   [affirmation [João" inherent case affirmation [that João T_{[N]} did this] inherent case]]

d. Movement of the head noun:11
   [affirmation [João inherent case affirmation [that João T_{[N]} did this] inherent case]]

e. Deletion of copies in the phonological component:
   [affirmation [João inherent case affirmation [that João T_{[N]} did this] inherent case]]

f. Realization of inherent case:
   [affirmation [de João] [de that did this]]

(60) a. Applications of merge and move:
   CP = [that João T_{[N]} did this]
   N = affirmation

b. Sideward movement (copy + merge) + θ-role assignment:
   CP = [that João T_{[N]} did this]
   NP = [João inherent case affirmation]

c. Adjunction of CP to NP:12
   [NP [NP Joao inherent case affirmation] [CP that João T_{[N]} did this]]

d. Movement of the head noun (see footnote 11):
   [affirmation [NP [NP João inherent case I] [CP that João T_{[N]} did this]]]

Raising into nominals in Hebrew

(61) Hebrew (Sichel 2007):
   a. ha-nisayon Sel rina [le-hagi’a ba-zman]
      the-attempt of Rina to-arrive on-time
      ‘Rina’s attempt to arrive on time’

   b. ha-sikuyim Sel rina [le-hagi’a ba-zman]
      the-chances of Rina to-arrive on-time
      ‘Rina’s chances to arrive on time’

Evidence for ha-sikuyim being a raising noun:

(62) Hebrew (Sichel 2007):
   a. "[ha-nisayon Sel ha-te’oria lihiyot nexonot] hireg otanu
      the-attempt of the-theory to-be correct annoyed us

   b. [ha-sikuyim Sel ha-te’oria lihiyot nexona] kluSim le-maday
      the-chances of the-theory to-be correct.FEM.SG slim quite
      ‘The chances of the theory being correct are pretty slim’

(63) Hebrew (Sichel 2007):
   a. "[ha-nisayon Se ze likrot [Se-bibi yibaxer]] hitti’a otanu
      the-attempt of it to-happen that-Bibi will-be-elected surprised us

   b. [ha-sikuyim Se ze likrot [Se-bibi yibaxer]] tovim
      the-chances of it to-happen that-Bibi will-be-elected good
      ‘The chances of it happening that Bibi will be elected are good’
MTC account: θ-driven movement in (61a), ϕ-driven mvt in (61b) with no intervening elements with ϕ-features (no CP). Evidence for the lack of CP: negative concord: negative DPs have to be licensed by clause-mate negation. Same pattern in nominal constructions and ECM (= no CP):

(66) Hebrew (Sichel 2007):
   a. "[ha-nisayon Sel ha-kerax le-hiSaver be-macav ka-ze] hu tipSi
      the-attempt of the-ice to-break in-situations like-this is silly
   b. [ha-sikuyim Sel ha-kerax le-hiSaver be-macav ka-ze] kluSim
      the-chances of the-ice to-break in-situations like-this slim
      ‘The chances of the ice breaking in this kind of situation are slim’
      (idiomatic reading)

(67) Hebrew (Sichel 2007):
   lo he’emanti [ba-sikuyim/netiya Sel af talmid le-hitkonen]
   NEG believed-I-in the-chances/tendency of no student to-prepare
   ‘I didn’t believe in the tendencies/tendency of any student preparing’

(68) Hebrew (Sichel 2007):
   lo zaxarti [af talmid mitkonen]
   NEG remembered no student preparing
   ‘I didn’t remember any student preparing’

English
(69) John’s likelihood/probability of winning raising in English?
(70) John’s likelihood/probability to win

Of: inherent case rendering the C head inert. Why not available for expletives and idiom chunks?

(73) a. -its likelihood of raining/annoying me that Jane is late
   b. -the shit’s likelihood of hitting the fan in these situations
      (Sichel 2007)

(74) a. English:
   [DP 's [CP N C_inherent case [TP DP...]]]
   b. Hebrew:
   [N ... [TP DP...]]

The English N (= ϕ-feature bearer) induces a minimality effect for non-referential elements.

(75) a. -What headway do you wonder [how PRO to make t on this project]
   b. ?What project do you wonder [how PRO to make headway on t]
      (Rizzi 1990)

Referential elements: the subcategorizing noun functions as a predicate, not as an argument.

(76) a. The cat’s being out of the bag was a big problem for the government
      (idiomatic reading: *)
   b. The cat being out of the bag was a big problem for the government
      (idiomatic reading: OK)

(77) a. It’s its seeming that we would get a raise motivated everyone to work harder
   b. There’s ‘there’s someone here was surprising