Raising and Control

Ingredients of analysis (as presented in Carnie text):

- **Theta-roles / Theta Criterion:**
  Requirement that predicates have exactly the right number of semantic arguments in the same clause (at D-structure)

- **Abstract Case:**
  Requirement that NPs be in (or move to) one of a few specified positions:
  - Specifier of finite T [for nominative case]
  - Complement to V [for accusative case]
  [Other possibilities are not relevant for control / raising]

- **EPP (“Extended Projection Principle”):**
  Requirement that sentences have a subject

**Four cases:**
- Subject-to-subject raising
- Subject-to-object raising
- Subject control
- Object control

1.1. **Subject-to-subject raising**

(1) John is likely to leave.

- theta-grid for *(be) likely*:
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  \text{proposition} \\
  \text{j}
  \end{array}
  \]

- theta-grid for *leave*:
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  \text{Agent} \\
  \text{i}
  \end{array}
  \]

- D-structure:
  
  \[
  [ \_\_\_\text{spec is likely [John to leave]} |_{TP2} ] |_{TP1}
  \]

  - Theta-role of *is likely* is assigned to *John to leave* is in TP1
  - Theta-role of *leave* is assigned to *John*
    \Rightarrow Theta Criterion is satisfied
  - BUT: *John* is in the specifier of the non-finite TP2 \Rightarrow can’t get case
  - AND: the EPP is not satisfied (the sentence has no subject)
John moves to Spec TP1 at S-structure:

\[ \text{TP1} \]

- John gets nominative case from the finite T in TP1
- EPP is satisfied (since John is the subject)

1.2. **Subject-to-Object Raising [a.k.a. ECM]**

(4) I want Jean to dance.

- theta-grid for dance:
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c}
  \text{Agent} & j \\
  \end{array}
  \]

- theta-grid for want:
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c}
  \text{experiencer} & \text{proposition} \\
  i & k \\
  \end{array}
  \]

- D-structure:
  
  \[ \text{TP1} \]

- Theta-role of dance is assigned to Jean in TP2
- Theta roles of want are assigned to I and Jean to dance in TP1
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{Theta criterion is satisfied} \]
- I gets nominative case in the spec of TP1
- EPP is satisfied by I
- BUT: Jean has no case

Jean moves to the complement of V at S-structure:

(6) I want Jean\[ \_j\_ \] to dance\[ \_j_ \] TP2 \[ \_j_ \] TP1

Jean gets accusative case as complement of want

1.3. **Subject Control**

(7) Jean is reluctant to leave.

- theta-grid for leave:
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c}
  \text{Agent} & j \\
  \end{array}
  \]

- theta-grid for (is) reluctant:
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c|c}
  \text{experiencer} & \text{proposition} \\
  i & k \\
  \end{array}
  \]
D-structure:

(8)  \[ \text{Jean is reluctant} \ [\text{PROj to leave}]_{TP2} \]_{TP1}  
    - Theta-role of \textit{leave} is assigned to \textit{PRO} in TP2  
    - Theta-roles of \textit{is reluctant} are assigned to \textit{Jean} and \textit{PRO to leave} in TP1  
      \rightarrow \text{Theta-criterion is satisfied}  
    - \textit{Jean} gets nominative case in spec of TP1  
    - \textit{PRO} doesn’t need case (by stipulation)  
    - EPP is satisfied by \textit{Jean}  

[no movement triggered]

1.4. \textbf{Object Control}

(9)  Jean persuaded Robert to leave.  
    - Theta-grid for \textit{persuade}:  
      \[
      \begin{array}{ccc}
      \text{Agent} & \text{theme} & \text{proposition} \\
      i & m & k \\
      \end{array}
      \]
    - theta-grid for \textit{leave}:  
      \[
      \begin{array}{c}
      \text{Agent} \\
      i \\
      \end{array}
      \]
    - D-structure:  
      (10)  \[ \text{Jean persuaded Robert} \ [\text{PROj to leave}]_{TP2} \]_{TP1}  
        - Theta-role of \textit{leave} is assigned to \textit{PRO} in TP2  
        - Theta roles of \textit{persuade} are assigned to \textit{Jean}, \textit{Robert}, and \textit{PRO to leave} in TP1  
          \rightarrow \text{Theta-criterion is satisfied}  
        - \textit{Jean} gets nominative case in spec of TP1  
        - \textit{Robert} gets nominative case as complement of \textit{V} in TP1  
        - \textit{PRO} doesn’t need case  

[no movement triggered]

2. \textbf{Tests for Raising vs. Control}

2.1. \textit{Subject-to-subject raising}

- Allows idiomatic readings:  
  (11)  The shit is likely to hit the fan.  
- Allows extraposition:  
  (12)  It is likely that Jean will be mad.
2.2. **Subject-to-object raising**

- Allows idiomatic readings:

(13) Sue wants the shit to hit the fan.

2.3. **Subject control**

- Does not allow idiomatic readings:

(14) # The shit wants to hit the fan.

(15) # The shit is reluctant to hit the fan.

- Does not allow extraposition:

(16) * It is reluctant that Sue will be mad.

2.4. **Object control**

- Does not allow idiomatic readings:

(17) # Sue persuaded the shit to hit the fan.

3. **Exercises (in-class)**

- Problem 1 (p. 277)
- Problem 2 (trees and derivations)