Problem 2: Why do verbs selecting non-finite complements differ w.r.t. what kind of controllers can occur?

(2) a. John tried to dance. (subject)
    b. John appeared to dance. (subject)

(3) a. John persuaded Peter to dance. (object)
    b. John expects Peter to dance. (object)

(4) a. * It tried to rain. (subject)
    b. * It appeared to rain. (subject)

(5) a. * John persuaded it to rain. (object)
    b. John expects it to rain. (object)

The empirical challenge of non-finite constructions

In non-finite constructions, the subject of the embedded verb is not expressed as a locally realized dependent.

Problem 1: What is interpreted to be the subject of the non-finite verb?

(1) a. John tried to dance. (subject)
    b. John promised Peter to dance. (subject)
    c. John persuaded Peter to dance. (object)

Classifying non-finite complements

Verbs selecting non-finite complements can be classified according to:

- their orientation (subject, direct or indirect object):

  What is interpreted to be the subject of the non-finite complement?

- the nature of the relationship of the embedding verb to the controller:

  Is the controller an argument of the embedding verb?
Empirical basis of classification

I. Orientation: Determined by interpretation of embedded infinitive.

II. Relationship: embedding verb $\leftrightarrow$ controller

Raising verbs only mediate the requirement of the complement:

1. If the embedded verb requires a non-referential (= dummy) subject, so does the raising verb:

   (6) a. It rains.
   b. * God rains.

   (7) a. It seems to rain.
   b. * God seems to rain.

   (8) a. * It wants to rain.
   b. * God wants to rain.

The same holds when a dummy subject is permitted:

   (9) a. There is a dragon in the wood.
   b. Hobbs is a dragon in the wood.

   (10) a. There seems to be a dragon in the wood.
   b. Hobbs seems to be a dragon in the wood.

   (11) a. * There wants to be a dragon in the wood.
   b. Hobbs wants to be a dragon in the wood.

2. If the embedded verb permits a clausal subject, so does the raising verb:


   (13) a. That Sarah dances seems to fascinate John.
   b. Sarah seems to fascinate John.

   b. Sarah wants to fascinate John.

3. If the embedded verb has a subject with an idiomatic interpretation, so does it when selected by a raising verb:

   (15) The cat is out of the bag.
   (16) The cat seems to be out of the bag.
   (17) % The cat wants to be out of the bag.

4. In languages where subjectless constructions exist, raising verbs can embed such subjectless complements:

   (18) a. Dort scheint getanzt zu werden.  
        there seems danced to be
        ‘People seem to dance over there.’
    b. Ihm scheint zu frieren.  
        him seems to freeze
        ‘He seems to freeze.’

   (19) a. * Dort versucht getanzt zu werden.  
        there tries danced to be
    b. * Ihm versucht zu frieren.  
        him tries to freeze
5. passivization of the non-finite complement results in a paraphrase

(20) a. John seems to read a book.
b. The book seems to be read by John.

(21) a. John wants to read a book.
b. % The book wants to be read by John.
Raising as a widespread phenomenon
Complements of other categories

Not only VP but also AP complements are possible complements of raising verbs like seem or appears:

(22) John seems/appears intelligent.
(23) John seems/appears to be intelligent.

Object oriented raising verbs

Raising as a widespread phenomenon
More on AP complements

Such AP complements behave parallel to the VP complements of raising verbs, e.g., with respect to clausal subjects:

(24) a. That he came to her wedding is tasteless.
    b. John is tasteless.
(25) a. That he came to her wedding seems to be tasteless.
    b. John seems to be tasteless.
(26) a. That he came to her wedding seems tasteless.
    b. John seems tasteless.
(27) a. *That he came to her wedding wants to be tasteless.
    b. John wants to be tasteless.

Capturing the generalization behind raising

Raising Principle (Pollard and Sag 1994, p. 140)

Let $E$ be a lexical entry whose SUBCAT list $L$ contains an element $X$ not specified as expletive.

Then $X$ is lexically assigned no semantic role in the content of $E$ if and only if $L$ also contains a (nonsubject) $Y$ [SUBCAT $< X$].
Interesting classes of raising verbs I

Copula be + predicative XP:

(28) John is ugly.  (AP complement)

E.g., non-referential subjects of AP complements are possible:

(29) It is likely that John sings tonight.

Certain modal verbs + VP[bse]:

(30) John may/must/shall run.
(31) It may/must/shall rain.

Interesting classes of raising verbs II

Tense auxiliaries:

(32) is + gerund
   a. John is running home.
   b. It is raining.

(33) will + base form:
   a. John will run home.
   b. It will rain.

(34) have + past-participle:
   a. John has run home.
   b. It has rained.

Arguing for status of to as separate syntactic element

In coordination contexts to can select a phrase:

(36) John seems [to [come and go]] as he pleases.

The alternative analysis

(37) John seems [[to come] and [go]] as he pleases.

is implausible since the verb form of the coordination is neither only determined by the first conjunct nor always to-infinitive if one is present:

(38) * John seems [[go] and [to come]]

The infitival marker to

(35) a. John will laugh / *to laugh / *laughed / *laughing.
   b. John has *laugh / *to laugh / laughed / *laughing.
   c. John is *laugh / *to laugh / *laughed / *laughing.
   d. John seems *laugh / to laugh / *laughed / *laughing.

What is the status of the infinitival marker to? Is it
– part of the morphology of the infinitive, or
– a separate syntactic element?
What kind of an element is to? A raising verb!

(39) John seems to run.
(40) It seems to rain.

A sample raising analysis:

\[ It \text{ seems to rain} \]

Analysis of: It seems to rain

Analysis of: *It wants to rain
The Passive: subject-to-subject raising

(41) a. John has stolen the ring.
    b. The ring was stolen.

Past and Passive Participles
A lexical rule to express the generalization
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