

## RAISING IN DP REVISITED

### 1. ON THE ABSENCE OF RAISING

The absence of raising in DP has figured prominently in syntactic theory ever since Chomsky (1970). As is well known, English has nominal counterparts to control configurations (1) though apparently no (non-gerund) nominal counterparts to raising and exceptional case marking (ECM) with infinitives (2):

- (1) a. John<sub>i</sub> refused/promised [PRO<sub>i</sub> to leave]
- b. John<sub>i</sub>'s refusal/promise [PRO<sub>i</sub> to leave]
- (2) a. John<sub>i</sub> appeared/was certain [ t<sub>i</sub> to be on time]
- b. \*John<sub>i</sub>'s appearance/certainty [ t<sub>i</sub> to be on time]
- c. We wanted [Mary to arrive on time]
- d. \*Our desire [of Mary to arrive on time]
- e. Our desire [for Mary to arrive on time]

The restriction against raising in DP has contributed to theories about various subcomponents in the grammar. Beginning with the lexicalist hypothesis, the development of GB has often proceeded comparatively, clauses vs. noun phrases, or verbs vs. nouns, with the categorical contrast with respect to raising and ECM playing a role in the development of government, the ECP, and ECM (Kayne 1984); inherent vs. structural case marking (Chomsky 1986a); and theories of argument–structure, complementation, and C-selection (Abney 1987; Grimshaw 1990). The claim made in Chomsky (1970) that the input to nominalization cannot be derived by transformation left open the possibility that a post-nominalization A-movement operation produces (2b). Expanding the empirical paradigm to include the restriction on ECM (2d), Kayne (1984) argues that both (2b) and (2d) derive from the deficiency of N° (vs. V°) with respect to exceptional government of the subject of the embedded IP, resulting in a Case Filter violation in the latter and an ECP violation in the former. Focusing on predicted similarities between noun phrases and clauses, and broadening the empirical context to include raising in gerund DPs (*John's being certainllikely to be late*), Abney (1987) argues that raising in gerunds attests to a VP within DP and that N° (unlike V°)

does not select reduced clausal complements (a prerequisite for both raising and ECM) or impose a subject requirement (a prerequisite for A-movement). In the spirit of Kayne's proposal, Abney's treatment invokes a single factor (absence of V°), but implies a double violation, raising now being excluded due to both the unavailability of nominal IP complements *and* inactive EPP. Similarly, Chomsky (1986) treats the ungrammaticality of raising as stemming from two independent violations: the restriction of Case-assignment by N° to its arguments ('inherent Case') and an independent semantic requirement that A-moved DP must be 'affected'.

Judging from the heterogeneity of accounts given for (2), and persistent lack of clarity regarding the ultimate source of violation – the source position within IP, the target position spec DP, or both – it appears that the restriction was never, in fact, fully understood. And despite its centrality to syntactic theory, the empirical claim has gone virtually unchallenged since Postal (1974). Postal (1974) argued that alternations such as those in (3), with infinitive and gerund complements to N°, support Raising-to-Subject in noun phrases.<sup>1</sup> Yet unlike raising in IP, the construction in noun phrases fails to produce grammatical results with standard diagnostics such as expletive and idiom chunk movement, in (4):

- (3) a. the tendency [for John to leave]
- b. John<sub>i</sub>'s tendency [t<sub>i</sub> to leave]
- c. the likelihood [of Nixon's winning]
- d. Nixon<sub>i</sub>'s likelihood [of t<sub>i</sub> winning]
- (4) a. \*there's tendency to be a problem
- b. \*its tendency to rain in June
- c. \*its tendency to annoy me that Jane is late
- d. \*its likelihood of raining/of annoying me that Jane is late
- e. \*the shit's tendency to hit the fan in these situations
- f. \*the shit's likelihood of hitting the fan in these situations

While it is no doubt conceivable that the theoretical tools provided by GB were not sufficiently restrictive to produce a conclusive understanding of the restriction, it is equally possible that facts regarding its ungrammaticality in English DPs with infinitives are insufficient, on their own, to fully determine its analysis. I argue here that in fact, contrary to the expectation for a universal restriction raised by the proposals mentioned above, raising in DP from infinitives does exist. Hebrew DPs headed by nonderived nouns such as 'chances', 'tendency', 'opportunity', denoting, roughly, modality or degrees of certainty with respect to the eventuality denoted by the embedded infinitive, exhibit the range of effects typically found in clausal raising constructions.<sup>2</sup> As shown below, they differ systematically from uncontroversial nominal counterparts to control predicates in (5) and (6)<sup>3</sup>: