

Grammar Engineering

February 20, 2008

Raising, Control, Argument Composition

Overview

- Raising v. Control in the Matrix
- Argument composition
- Sentential negation
- Questions about lab

Raising v. Control: Review (1/2)

- Embedded clause is missing its subject.
- Subject or object (or PP-obj) of matrix clause (controller) is interpreted as subject of embedded clause.
- Controller not a semantic argument of matrix verb = raising
- Controller is a semantic argument of matrix verb = control

Raising v. Control: Review

- Raising correlates with syntactic restrictions of embedded verb being passed up to matrix controller
- Only subjects can be controllees (but cf argument composition)

Raising v. control in the Matrix

- Both mediated through HOOK feature XARG
- 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 ] ] ].
```

- NB: Neither of these specify the CAT of the complement.

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: Subj Obj Aux V in Dutch embedded clauses.
- Word order consequences: Dependents are ordered with respect to matrix verb.

Argument composition in the matrix

```
aux-verb-lex := basic-verb-lex &
  trans-first-arg-raising-lex-item &
[ SYNSEM.LOCAL [ CAT [ HEAD.MOD < >,
  VAL [ SPR < >,
  COMPS < #comps . #vcomps >,
  SUBJ < #subj >, SPEC < > ] ] ],
ARG-ST < #subj, #comps &
  [ LOCAL [ CONT.MSG no-msg,
  CAT [ HEAD verb,
  VAL [ COMPS #vcomps,
  SUBJ cons ]]]> ].
```

Sentential negation

- Semantically, a scopal adverb.
- ARG1 of the `neg_r_rel` qeqs the LBL of the verb
- Syntactically: V, VP, S adverb, verbal inflection, selected complement (of aux/main verb), ...?
- All possibilities I'm aware of are taken care of in the customization script

What you'll need to do

- Check the syntax and semantics of what's currently in your grammar.
- Understand how that part of your grammar works.
- If negation is broken, fix it (in consultation with me).

Overview

- Raising v. Control in the Matrix
- Argument composition
- Sentential negation
- Questions about lab