

WILLIAM D. DAVIES AND STANLEY DUBINSKY

LOOKING OUT OVER THE HORIZON

1. THE GENESIS OF THIS BOOK

Raising and control have been central concerns of generative syntax since the 1960s and continue to be an empirical focus of every comprehensive model that has come along since. The analysis of these constructions in each framework has typically relied crucially on the most fundamental assumptions underlying that framework. Thus, raising and control continue to provide an excellent window into generative models of syntax, and a useful tool for measuring the validity of their claims. In the 40 years since the publication of Rosenbaum (1967) and the 33 years since the publication of Postal (1974), attention to these constructions has persevered through each significant paradigm shift in generative syntax. Interest in these constructions has also broadened (from an initial focus on English and French) to include analyses of similar (or apparently similar) grammatical phenomena in a wide range of languages. Most recently, interest in raising and control has once again surged with the rise of the Minimalist Program. At the same time, some of the most recent analyses venture into relatively underexplored languages and/or grammatical phenomena. Concerned as we are with empirical results informing theoretical paradigms, we think that renewed attention to these two constructions, combined with an expanding empirical basis for analysis, makes this a particularly appropriate time to produce a book that gathers in one place some of the more interesting work being done on the topic at this time.

The chapters in this book represent, for the most part, a selection of the papers and posters presented at a workshop titled ‘New Horizons in the Grammar of Raising and Control’, which was supported in part by a National Science Foundation grant and which took place at Harvard University as part of the 2005 LSA Linguistic Institute. The agenda for this workshop was a deeper exploration into the analysis of raising and control, and was set in part by the presentations and public discussion held at a January 2005 symposium at the LSA annual meeting. The aim of that January 2005 symposium was to articulate a set of research questions to be addressed at the July 2005 workshop. Issues arising from the January panel included the following:

1. What are the empirical properties of raising and control? How can each be clearly identified, or has the question become irrelevant? With the movement theory of control proposed by Hornstein (1999), and adopted in subsequent work (e.g. Boeckx and Hornstein 2003, 2004, 2005; Polinsky and Potsdam 2002, 2003),

the ‘base-generated’ analysis of copy raising (Potsdam and Runner 2001) and others, for some (but by no means all), the line between raising and control has become less and less prominent. Is the distinction empirically motivated or simply an artifact of terminology inherited from a rich history of work in generative linguistics?

2. What constructions (besides the canonical ones) might be subject to a raising or control analysis? What constructions that have been treated as raising or control might turn out not to be so? Raising or control have been posited for cases (such as Japanese) in which the complement is finite and has an overt complementizer. Backward control (in which the controllee rather than the controller is overt) has been posited for Tsez and Malagasy (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002, 2003). It has been observed that control, but not raising, is possible in nominalizations. Possessor–possessee relations expressed outside of the NP have been characterized as possessor raising (and sometimes possessor control).
3. Besides the core class of obligatory control (OC), what classes of control must be recognized? What is the relation of partial control, arbitrary control, and more generally non-obligatory control (NOC) to the canonical cases (Landau 2000; Jackendoff and Culicover 2003)? In some cases, the control and raising label has also been applied to constructions in which the controlled nominal or target of raising is overt (i.e. copy raising). In many instances copy raising combines with issues of finiteness or possessor raising. In other cases, the relation between the controller and controllee is not local (i.e. super-equi or long-distance control).
4. What are the syntactic attributes of raising and control? What part does tense, or finiteness, or clausal completeness play in restricting their distribution? How are restrictions on the controllee and raisee (e.g. the fact that they must be complement subjects) determined? And what is the role of semantics in these determinations?

Workshop proposals were encouraged to address these and other relevant issues, and proposers were encouraged to bring new empirical data, especially from understudied languages, into focus.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE CONTENTS

This volume presents 13 out of the 22 papers and posters that were part of the workshop, plus one invited chapter that was not presented there. The book opens with a section of three papers on raising. Sichel examines the grammatical characteristics of nominals in Hebrew and provides evidence that some nominals may best be analyzed as instances of raising, dramatically contradicting the conventional wisdom that DPs are not a domain in which raising can occur. Hirsch and Wexler report on a series of experiments designed to reveal children’s knowledge