Raising/control, argument composition, negation

Ling 567
February 18, 2014

Overview

- Raising/control
- Argument composition
- Negation
- Lab 7 overview

Raising v. control (review)

- Embedded clause is missing its subject

- Subject or object (or PP-obj) of matrix clause (controller) is interpreted as subject of embedded clause.

- If the controller is not a semantic argument of the matrix clause: RAISING

- If the controller is a semantic argument of the matrix clause: CONTROL

- Raising correlates with syntactic restrictions of the embedded verb being “passed up” to the controller.

- Only subjects can be controllees (but cf. argument composition)

Raising v. control in the Matrix

- Both mediated through HOOK.XARG of embedded clause
- Controller linked or not to matrix verb's key relation, as appropriate
- ERG: Expletive matching handled via subtypes of *index*; idioms handled separately
- Icelandic-style case matching constraints could be added

A raising type in the Matrix

```
ditrans-first-arg-raising-lex-item := basic-three-arg &
   [ ARG-ST < [ LOCAL.CONT.HOOK.INDEX #ind1 ],
              [ LOCAL.CONT.HOOK.INDEX ref-ind & #ind2 ],
              [ LOCAL.CONT.HOOK [ XARG #ind1,
                                  LTOP #larg ] ] >,
  SYNSEM [ LOCAL.CONT.HCONS <! qeq & [ HARG #harg,
                                       LARG #larg ] !>,
           LKEYS.KEYREL [ ARG1 #ind2,
                          ARG2 #harg ] ] ].
```

A control type in the Matrix

```
trans-first-arg-control-lex-item := basic-two-arg &
   [ ARG-ST < [ LOCAL.CONT.HOOK.INDEX ref-ind & #ind ],
                    [ LOCAL.CONT.HOOK [ XARG #ind,
                                        LTOP #larg ] ] >,
     SYNSEM [ LOCAL.CONT.HCONS <! qeq & [ HARG #harg,
                                          LARG #larg ] !>,
              LKEYS.KEYREL [ ARG1 #ind,
                             ARG2 #harg ] ] ].
```

Argument composition

- Sometimes the matrix verb seems to “take over” all of the arguments of the embedded complement

- Case in point: Basque auxiliaries, which agree with up to three arguments of the verb

- Another case in point: S O Aux V order in Dutch embedded clauses

- Word order consequences: Dependents are ordered with respect to the matrix verb

Argument composition in the Matrix

```
arg-comp-aux := aux-lex & basic-two-arg &
  [ SYNSEM.LOCAL [ CAT.VAL [ SPR < >,
                             SPEC < >,
                             COMPS < #comps . #vcomps >,
                             SUBJ < #subj > ],
                   CONT.HOOK.XARG #xarg ],
  ARG-ST < #subj &
           [ LOCAL [ CAT [ HEAD noun,
                           VAL [ SUBJ < >, SPR < >, COMPS < > ] ],
                     CONT.HOOK.INDEX #xarg ] ],
           #comps &
           [ LIGHT +,
             LOCAL [ CAT [ VAL [ SUBJ < [ ] >,
                                 COMPS #vcomps ],
                           HEAD verb & [ AUX - ] ],
                     CONT.HOOK.XARG #xarg ] ] > ].
```

Sentential negation

- Semantically, a scopal adverb
- ARG1 of the neg_rel qeqs the LBL of the verb (or non-verbal predicate)
- Syntactically: V/VP/S adverb, verbal inflection, negative auxiliary, selected complement (of aux/lexical verb), others?
- The customization system should be pretty thorough on negation now, but we're interested in what it's not covering

Negation: What you'll need to do

- Check the syntax and semantics of what's currently in your grammar
- Understand what your sources say about how negation works
- If negation is broken, post to GoPost for help fixing it

Overview

- Raising/control
- Argument composition
- Negation
- Lab 7 overview