Josep Alba-Salas

Subject Control into Nominals in Romance

Abstract

This article examines subject control into nominals, i.e. cases where a verb's subject controls the highest argument of an event noun in complement position. Building upon Jackendoff and Culicover's (2005) Simpler Syntax framework and their analysis of control, I argue that cases of obligatory control into nominals in Spanish, Catalan and Italian, unlike cases of apparent non-obligatory control, involve a formal control relationship on a par with control into infinitivals and gerunds. Unlike non-obligatory control verbs, verbs that show obligatory subject control into nominals license an event complement linked to the noun predicate, binding its highest argument in Conceptual Structure. The analysis provides a descriptive typology and a formal analysis of each verb class, explaining some puzzling properties of *verb + event noun* structures. Moreover, the analysis supports Jackendoff and Culicover's claim that predicates selecting voluntary action complements show obligatory control, but that there are other sources of obligatory control.[1]

1. Introduction and overview

This paper focuses on control into nominals in Spanish, Catalan and Italian. The analysis pays special attention to the lexical properties of the control verb, as well as the parallels and differences with control into infinitivals and gerunds.

[1] Thanks are due to Igor Mel'čuk, Jouni Rostila and, above all, an anonymous reviewer for many important comments and suggestions on this paper or earlier versions thereof. Of course, all remaining errors and omissions are my sole responsibility.

1.1 The problem of control: A brief look at the literature

Accounts of control fall in two major groups. On the one hand, we have those studies that view control primarily as a syntactic phenomenon, with semantics playing only a secondary or minor role (e.g. Rosenbaum 1967; Chomsky 1981; Bresnan 1982; Larson 1991; Martin 1996; O'Neil 1997; Hornstein 1999; Manzini & Roussou 2000; Gomes Pires 2001; Polinsky & Potsdam 2002; Boeckx & Hornstein 2003). On the other hand, we have those accounts that emphasize the importance of lexical semantics (e.g. Jackendoff 1972; Williams 1985; Sag & Pollard 1991; Van Valin & LaPolla 1997; Culicover & Jackendoff 2001; Jackendoff & Culicover 2003; 2005).

Within this second approach, Jackendoff and Culicover (2003; 2005) have recently claimed that argument structure or conceptual structure determines not only the contrast between obligatory and non-obligatory control, but also controller choice, at least in English.[2] Jackendoff and Culicover argue that predicates (verbs, nouns and adjectives) that select infinitival and gerundive complements designating voluntary actions show obligatory control. Moreover, Jackendoff and Culicover claim that in cases of obligatory control the controller is determined by the thematic roles that the control predicate assigns to its arguments. Specifically, the controller is always the argument to which the control predicate assigns the role of actor for the event designated by its action complement. These claims constitute the basis of their Unique Control of Actional Complements Hypothesis (Jackendoff & Culicover 2005: 427):

(1) Unique Control of Actional Complements (UCAC) Hypothesis
Infinitival and gerundive complements that are selected by their head to be of the semantic type Voluntary Action have unique [i.e. obligatory] control. The unique controller is the character to which the head assigns the role of actor for that action—whatever its syntactic position.

[2] Jackendoff and Culicover use the term *unique control* to refer to what has been traditionally called obligatory control, subdividing cases of non-obligatory control into two types: free and nearly free. Since their two-way distinction of non-obligatory control is not crucial here, in what follows I use the traditional terms *obligatory* and *non-obligatory* control.

The example in (2), taken from Jackendoff and Culicover (2003: 525), illustrates the UCAC Hypothesis. As (a) shows, the verb *urge* is only compatible with voluntary actions such as *dance with Jeff*, but not with states and non-voluntary events like *be six years old* and *grow taller*.[3] *Urge*, then, selects only actional complements. As predicted by the UCAC Hypothesis, this verb shows obligatory control (b). Thus, in (2) the dancer can only be Norbert (following Jackendoff & Culicover 2003; 2005, I note coreference options with subscript coindexing and indicate the possibility of a generic antecedent, i.e. arbitrary control, with the subscript *GEN*). The choice of *Norbert* as the controller follows from the meaning of *urge*, which can be informally characterized as involving an event where '*x* (Miriam, in our example) encourages *y* (Norbert) so that *y* performs action *z* (the dancing)'. The corresponding Conceptual Structure is shown in (3), using a simplified version of Jackendoff and Culicover's formal notation. Technicalities aside, what matters here is that *urge*-type verbs license two arguments: *x* (mapped onto the subject) and *y* (linked to the direct object). Moreover, *urge*-type verbs also select an actional complement (*x ACT*). The highest argument of this complement is a variable (α) bound by *y*, as indicated by the superscript. Simply put, *urge* shows object control because it assigns the role of actor for its action complement to its direct object.[4]

(2) a. Miriam urged Norbert to **dance with Jeff/*be six years old/*grow taller**.
b. Miriam$_{\mathbf{i}}$ urged Norbert$_{\mathbf{j}}$ [to $_{\mathbf{j/*i/*i+j/*GEN}}$dance with Jeff].

[3] Voluntary actions can be distinguished from other events because they can appear in the imperative (ia), and they accept adverbials like *voluntarily* and *on purpose* (ib) (examples based on Jackendoff & Culicover 2005: 428).

(i) a. *Dance with Jeff!* **Voluntary actions**
b. *Roberta danced with Jeff voluntarily*.

cf. (ii) a. **Grow taller!* **Non-voluntary actions and states**
b. **Roberta grew taller voluntarily*.

[4] According to Jackendoff and Culicover, there are at least five classes of predicates showing obligatory control: verbs of intention (e.g. *intend*, *decide* and *persuade*), verbs of obligation (e.g. *order*, *instruct*, *vow*, *guarantee* and *promise*), predicates indicating an ability (e.g. *can* and the adjective *able*), verbs indicating normativity (e.g. *remember to* and *forget to*), certain verbs of communication (e.g. *request*), adjectives such as *rude*, and force-dynamic predicates (e.g. *force*, *help*, *assist*, *hinder*, *pressure*, *discourage*, *permit* and *allow*). The verb *urge* belongs to this last group.

(3) *X CS* Y^{α} *[α ACT]*

Unlike *urge*-type predicates, verbs like *talk* select situational complements, so they are compatible with both actions and states (4a). As (4b) illustrates, *talk*-type verbs show non-obligatory control. Hence, the dancer(s) here can be Miriam alone, Norbert alone, Miriam and Norbert together, or some generic antecedent (example from Jackendoff & Culicover 2003: 525).

(4) a. Miriam talked to Norbert about **dancing with Jeff/being six years old/ growing taller**.
b. Miriam$_{\mathbf{i}}$ talked to Norbert$_{\mathbf{j}}$ [about $_{\mathbf{i/j/i+j/GEN}}$dancing with Jeff].

As Jackendoff and Culicover note, the UCAC Hypothesis does not entail that all cases of obligatory control must necessarily involve verbs that select actional complements. In fact, their proposal is consistent with the existence of certain experiencer verbs that take situational complements but also show obligatory control, including *hope*, *wish*, *remind* and *strike*, among others (5) (example from Jackendoff & Culicover 2005: 464).

(5) a. Judy$_{\mathbf{j}}$ thinks that Henry$_{\mathbf{i}}$ hopes/wishes to $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*GEN}}$redeem himself/*herself/ *oneself/*myself.
b. Judy$_{\mathbf{j}}$ reminds Henry$_{\mathbf{i}}$ of $_{\mathbf{i/*j}}$being much younger.
c. Judy$_{\mathbf{j}}$ strikes Henry$_{\mathbf{i}}$ as $_{\mathbf{j/*i}}$being much younger.

The conclusion, then, is that whereas all verbs selecting actional complements show obligatory control (by the UCAC Hypothesis), certain verbs selecting situational complements (the *hope*-type) also show obligatory control.[5]

[5] According to Jackendoff and Culicover, the only partial exception to the generalization that verbs selecting actional complements show obligatory control involves verbs that take infinitival indirect questions as complements, such as *ask* and *tell*. As (i) illustrates, the complements of these verbs express voluntary actions and require their controller to be the recipient of the answer (*Fred*), as predicted by the UCAC Hypothesis. However, as (i) shows, *ask* and *tell* also allow generic control. This additional option has no explanation in Jackendoff and Culicover's proposal, as they themselves acknowledge.

(i) a. Sally$_{\mathbf{j}}$ told Fred$_{\mathbf{i}}$ how to $_{\mathbf{i/GEN/*j}}$defend himself/oneself/*herself.
b. Fred$_{\mathbf{i}}$ asked Sally$_{\mathbf{j}}$ how to $_{\mathbf{i/GEN/*j}}$defend himself/oneself/*herself.
(Examples based on Jackendoff & Culicover 2005: 464)

In Jackendoff and Culicover's proposal, control is a relationship stated over Conceptual Structure (**CS**), where syntactically implicit arguments are explicit and thematic roles are structurally represented. This proposal allows us to account for cases like (6), where there is no overt syntactic dependent that can serve as a controller (example from Jackendoff & Culicover 2005: 418).

(6) How about [taking a swim together]? [controller = speaker + hearer]

As Jackendoff and Culicover note, examples like (6) argue against a purely syntactic account of control. This argument is further strengthened by two facts. First, the same syntactic configuration can be associated with different controller choice, as in (7). Second, the same controller can appear in different syntactic configurations, as in (8) (examples from Jackendoff & Culicover 2003: 520).

(7) a. John$_{\mathbf{i}}$ persuaded Sarah$_{\mathbf{j}}$ [to $_{\mathbf{j/*i}}$dance].
b. John$_{\mathbf{i}}$ promised Sarah$_{\mathbf{j}}$ [to $_{\mathbf{i/*j}}$dance].

(8) a. Bill ordered **Fred$_{\mathbf{i}}$** [to $_{\mathbf{i}}$leave immediately].
b. **Fred$_{\mathbf{i}}$**'s order from Bill [to $_{\mathbf{i}}$leave immediately]

Although Jackendoff and Culicover provide compelling evidence for the role of argument structure, control phenomena are not entirely reducible to lexical semantics. In fact, as some have argued, lexical semantics cannot account for control in adjunct clauses like (9), which show obligatory control even though (by definition) they are not selected by the matrix predicate (e.g. Hornstein 1999; Boeckx & Hornstein 2003; cf. Brody 1999; Manzini & Roussou 2000; Landau 2003). The obvious conclusion, then, is that a comprehensive account of control must incorporate both semantic and syntactic factors (as well as discourse and pragmatic considerations).

(9) John$_{\mathbf{i}}$ saw Mary$_{\mathbf{j}}$ [before $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*i+j/*GEN}}$leaving the party].

Most studies on control focus on cases where the controlled predicate is an infinitive or a gerund, treating cases involving nouns only in passing, if at all (Rosenbaum 1967; Postal 1969; Chomsky 1970; Williams 1980;

Bresnan 1982; Sag & Pollard 1991; Clements 1992; Rooryck 1992; Chomsky & Lasnik 1993; Hornstein 1999; Manzini & Roussou 2000; Narcross 2000; Culicover & Jackendoff 2001; Gomes Pires 2001; Martin 2001; Boeckx & Hornstein 2003; Jackendoff & Culicover 2003; 2005; and Landau 2003, among others). The few studies that have actually examined control with nominals have focused almost exclusively on control within an NP into either subcategorized-for infinitivals (10) or adjunct purpose clauses (11) (e.g. Safir 1987; Grimshaw 1990; Alexiadou 2001; Ogawa 2001). The standard view appears to be that cases like (10) and (11) involve a formal control relationship, but there is no agreement as to whether the controller is a CS element or the actual event denoted by the noun predicate (see Postal 1974; Williams 1980; 1985; Lasnik 1988; Jackendoff 1985; Grimshaw 1990; Van Hout & Roeper 1998; Alexiadou 2001; Ogawa 2001; Boeckx & Hornstein 2003; Jackendoff & Culicover 2003; 2005, among others).

(10) a. John$_{\mathbf{i}}$'s attempt [to $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*GEN}}$leave on time]
b. the attempt [to $_{\mathbf{i/GEN}}$leave on time]

(11) a. the Roman$_{\mathbf{i}}$'s destruction of the city [(in order) to $_{\mathbf{i/GEN}}$prove a point]
b. the $_{\mathbf{i}}$translation of the book [(in order) to $_{\mathbf{i/GEN}}$make it available to a wider readership]

Unlike control within an NP, control into nominals has received virtually no attention. As (12) illustrates, control into nominals involves cases where a verb apparently controls the highest argument of its noun complement.

(12) Kathy$_{\mathbf{i}}$ promised Ted [a $_{\mathbf{i}}$hug]. (Jackendoff & Culicover 2003: 553)

Even in the context of the recent controversy between syntactocentric and semantic-based approaches to control, where cases like (12) have been mentioned in support of either approach, they have only been treated in passing (e.g. Culicover & Jackendoff 2001; Boeckx & Hornstein 2003; Jackendoff & Culicover 2003; 2005). A case in point is Jackendoff and Culicover (2003; 2005). Acknowledging their lack of a comprehensive account of control into nominals, Jackendoff and Culicover limit their very brief discussion to noting two differences with respect to control into in-

finitivals. First, controlled nouns allow all their arguments, not just their agents, to be satisfied nonlocally, contrary to what we find with infinitivals (13). Second, controlled infinitives and morphologically related nouns sometimes show quite different coreference options (14). Presumably, the implication is that control into nominals may not involve the same mechanisms as control into infinitivals or gerunds, so they should be treated differently.

(13) Kathy$_i$ promised Ted$_j$ [to $_i$hug ***(him$_j$)**].

(14) a. Bill$_i$ expected [**to $_i$attempt** [to $_i$shoot himself$_i$]].
b. Bill$_i$ expected [**an $_{j \neq i}$attempt** [to $_j$shoot him$_i$]].

Outside the control literature, the view that control into nominals can be treated on a par with control into VP complements has been proposed by some Japanese linguists working on light verb constructions with *suru* 'do' (Terada 1990; Matsumoto 1992; 1996; Miyamoto 1999). These linguists have claimed that some light *suru* constructions involve a formal binding relationship between the subject of *suru* and the subject of its noun complement. This possibility is illustrated in (15), where the subject of *suru* (*Taroo*) is obligatorily coreferential with the subject of the nominal *ryookoo* 'travel' (example from Miyamoto 1999: 68). Although the details vary across authors, the basic proposal is that light *suru* is an obligatory subject control verb that selects an agentive subject and an event complement. This event is linked to an open complement position filled by the noun predicate, whose subject is bound by the agent of *suru*.

(15) Taroo$_i$ ga Tokyo ni [$_i$**ryokoo**] o suru.
Taro NOM Tokyo to travel ACC do
'Taro travels to Tokyo.'

More recently, Alba-Salas (2002; 2004) has claimed that light verb constructions with 'do/make' in Romance, like their Japanese counterparts, also involve a formal control relationship between the subject of the light verb and the agent of its noun complement, as illustrated in the Catalan example in (16).

(16) La Mònica$_{\mathbf{i}}$ (li) farà [**una** $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*GEN}}$**trucada**] a l'Eva.[6]
the Mònica to-her will-make a phone-call to the-Eva
'Mònica will give Eva a call.'

1.2 The present study

Building upon previous research, the present study focuses on control into nominals in Catalan, Italian and Spanish, using evidence from both heavy and light verb constructions. The paper examines apparent cases of obligatory and non-obligatory control in an attempt to elucidate the distinction between verbs allowing each option. The claim is that verbs that show obligatory subject control into nominals—just like 'traditional' control verbs—select an event complement linked to the noun predicate in complement position, binding the highest argument of the nominal. By contrast, verbs that show what appears to be non-obligatory control are 'ordinary' heavy verbs that assign a theme role and do not bind the highest argument of their noun complement. As we will see below, the data examined here are consistent with the UCAC Hypothesis, suggesting a fundamental continuity between control into nominals and control into infinitivals and gerunds.

The proposals developed below address three puzzling properties of structures with event nouns in complement position. First, why is the agent of the noun predicate obligatorily coreferential with the surface subject of certain verbs, as in (16) above and (17) below, but not of other verbs, as in (18) and (19)? (For the sake of consistency, throughout this paper I use Catalan examples to illustrate Romance patterns.)

(17) El comitè$_{\mathbf{i}}$ procedí a una $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*GEN}}$votació sobre el pressupost.
the committee proceeded to a vote on the budget
'The committee proceeded to a vote on the budget.'

(18) La Mònica$_{\mathbf{i}}$ recorda la $_{\mathbf{i/j/GEN}}$trucada (del Pere$_{\mathbf{j}}$) a l'Eva.
the Mònica remembers the phone-call of-the Pere to the-Eva
'Mònica remembers the/Pere's phone call to Eva.'

[6] Doubling of the dative clitic *li* 'to him/her' in Catalan is preferred in non-standard (oral) varieties.

(19) El comitè$_{i}$ va prometre una $_{i/j/GEN}$investigació sobre l'escàndol.
the committee PST promise an investigation about the-scandal
'The committee promised an investigation into the scandal.'

Second, why do verbs like Catalan *prometre* 'promise' show obligatory subject coreference with infinitives, as in (20), but not with nouns, as in (19) above?

(20) El comitè$_{i}$ va prometre $_{i/*j/*GEN}$investigar l'escàndol.
the committee PST promise investigate the-scandal
'The committee promised to investigate the scandal.'

Third, why can the prepositional complement in structures like (16) be analyzed either as being inside the NP headed by the event noun or as a direct syntactic dependent of the verb, whereas in cases like (17) only the first option is possible? As the examples below show, this contrast is evident in the fact that in cases like (16) we can cliticize *a l'Eva* 'to Eva' alone or the entire *event noun + prepositional complement* sequence (21), whereas in (18) only the last option is available (22).

(21) a. El Pau **li** farà la trucada. [li = a l'Eva]
the Pau to-her will-make the phone-call
'Pau will give her a call.'
b. El Pau **la** farà. [la = la trucada a l'Eva]
the Pau it will-make
'Pau will make it.'

(22) a. *El Pau **li** recorda la trucada.
the Pau to-her remembers the phone-call
'*Pau remembers the call to her.' [impossible with intended meaning]
[OK with irrelevant meaning of 'Pau reminds her of the call'.]
b. El Pau **la** recorda.
the Pau it remembers
'Pau remembers it.'

As we will see below, the first puzzle is solved if we assume that obligatory coreference cases like (16) and (17), unlike (18) and (19), involve a formal control relationship on a par with control into infinitives and gerunds, and that this contrast follows from the different lexical properties of the verbs

involved. To solve the second puzzle I will propose that verbs like Catalan *prometre* come in two variants: as control verbs that subcategorize for infinitival complements, and as 'ordinary' heavy verbs licensing theme objects. Finally, I will argue that we can solve our third puzzle—the double analysis of the prepositional complement in (16)—if we assume that this complement can be licensed either by the event noun (in which case the complement appears inside its NP projection) or by the control verb itself (in which case it is a direct syntactic dependent of the verb).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 offers a descriptive typology of verbs that show obligatory subject coreference with event nouns vis-à-vis those that do not. Section 3 provides an account of this contrast. Section 4 focuses on the double analysis found in cases like (16). Finally, section 5 summarizes the conclusions.

2. A descriptive typology of *verb + event noun* structures in Romance

There are two basic types of verbs that can occur with event nouns in complement position in Catalan, Spanish and Italian: those that show obligatory coreference between their subject and the highest argument of the noun predicate, and those that do not. I turn to each class in the next two subsections.

2.1 Verbs showing obligatory coreference

Romance verbs that show obligatory coreference between their subject and the highest argument of the event noun include two subtypes: verbs like Catalan *començar* 'begin', which also show obligatory subject control into infinitivals or gerunds, and light verbs such as Catalan *fer* 'do/make'. These two subtypes are what we can descriptively call *COMENÇAR*- and light *FER*-type verbs (note the use of capitals to refer to Pan-Romance forms, which are arbitrarily based on their Catalan realization).

2.1.1 *COMENÇAR* ('begin')-type verbs

COMENÇAR-type verbs include those listed in (23) and (24). These verbs combine with both nouns and infinitives (or gerunds, in the case of Catalan

and Spanish *continuar* 'continue'). The verbs in (24) introduce the embedded predicate with a preposition regardless of its categorial identity. By contrast, with the verbs in (23) the embedded predicate is realized as a direct object if it is a nominal, but it is typically introduced by a preposition if it is an infinitive or gerund (examples to follow below).[7]

(23) a. *Cat.* **acabar (de)** 'finish', **començar (a)** 'begin', **continuar** 'continue', **intentar** 'attempt', **provar (de)** 'try'
b. *Spa.* **acabar (de)** 'finish', **comenzar (a)** 'begin', **continuar** 'continue', **empezar (a)** 'begin', **intentar** 'attempt', **terminar (de)** 'finish'
c. *Ita.* **cercare (di)** 'try', **cominciare (a)** 'begin', **continuare (a)** 'continue', **finire (di)** 'finish', **incominciare (a)** 'begin', **provare (a)** 'try', **tentare (di)** 'attempt'

(24) a. **'devote oneself (to)'**: *Cat.* dedicar-se (a), *Spa.* dedicarse (a), *Ita.* dedicarsi (a)
b. **'proceed (to)'**: *Cat.* procedir (a), *Spa.* proceder (a), *Ita.* procedere (a)

As the Catalan examples in (25) and (26) illustrate, these verbs show obligatory subject coreference with both nominals and infinitivals (or gerunds). In fact, as (27) shows, the noun complement of these verbs cannot have its own agent distinct from the verb's subject.

(25) Espanya$_i$ començà a $_{i/*j/*GEN}$**evacuar** la zona / $_{i/*j/*GEN}$**l'evacuació**
Spain began to evacuate the area the-evacuation
de la zona.
of the area
'Spain began to evacuate the area/the evacuation of the area.'

(26) L'Eva$_i$ es dedica a $_{i/*j/*GEN}$**falsificar** / **la** $_{i/*j/*GEN}$**falsificació** de
the-Eva REF devotes to forge / the forgery of
passaports.
passports
'Eva forges passports (for a living).'

[7] Most verbs in (23) show clitic climbing and other restructuring effects, whereas those in (24) do not (see Aissen & Perlmutter 1976; Napoli 1981; Rizzi 1982; Burzio 1986; Rosen 1987; Picallo 1990; Kayne 1991; Terzi 1996, among others). *COMENÇAR* and *CONTINUAR* are also raising verbs (Rizzi 1982; Burzio 1986).

(27) a. Espanya$_{\mathbf{i}}$ començà $_{\mathbf{i/*j}}$l'evacuació de la zona
Spain began the-evacuation of the area

(*per part d'Israel$_{\mathbf{j}}$).
by part of-Israel
'Spain began the evacuation of the area (*by Israel).'

b. El comitè$_{\mathbf{i}}$ procedí a dues $_{\mathbf{i/*j/}}$votacions consecutives
the committee proceeded to two votes consecutive

sobre el pressupost **(*per part del president$_{\mathbf{j}}$)**.
on the budget by part of-the president
'The committee proceeded to two consecutive votes on the budget (*by the president).'

As (28) illustrates, the verbs *ACABAR (DE)* 'finish', *DEDICAR-SE (A)* 'devote oneself (to)' and *PROCEDIR (A)* 'proceed (to)' are incompatible with states and non-voluntary actions, regardless of the categorial identity of their complements. The observation that these three Romance verbs select only voluntary actions and show obligatory control is consistent with the UCAC Hypothesis.

(28) a. *L'Eva es dedica a **tenir vint anys/semblar intel.ligent/**
the-Eva REF devotes to have twenty years/seem intelligent

perdre la por/tenir sort.
lose the fear/have luck
lit. 'Eva is 20 years old/seems intelligent/looses her fear (for a living).'

b. *L'Eva es dedica a l'**alegria**/**amor**/la **pèrdua** de la por.[8]
the-Eva REF devotes to the-happiness/love/the loss of the fear
lit. 'Eva devotes herself to happiness/love/the loss of fear (for a living).'

On the other hand, *INTENTAR* 'try', *PROVAR* 'try/attempt', *CONTINUAR* 'continue' and *COMENÇAR* 'begin' itself are compatible with infinitives designating non-voluntary actions and states (29) (cf. note 20), although

[8] Unlike *perdre* 'lose', verbs such as *tenir* 'have' and *semblar* 'seem' in the (a) examples lack the corresponding nominalizations **tinguda* and **semblada*. Hence, in the (b) examples I use nouns like 'happiness' and 'love' to illustrate the incompatibility of the control verb with state nominals.

they still reject state nouns (30). As we can see, structures with nouns fall within the scope of the UCAC Hypothesis, but structures with infinitival or gerundive complements do not, echoing the situation of *hope*-type verbs in English (cf. (5) in section 1.1). As in the case of *hope*-type verbs, it is important to emphasize that the behavior of *INTENTAR*, *PROVAR*, *CONTINUAR* and *COMENÇAR* does not contradict Jackendoff and Culicover's proposal, which does not preclude verbs selecting situational complements from showing obligatory control.

(29) a. L'Eva intentava **perdre la por/tenir sort/semblar intel.ligent/**
the-Eva tried lose the fear/have luck/seem intelligent

***tenir vint anys.**
have twenty years
lit. 'Eva tried to lose her fear/be lucky/seem intelligent/be twenty.'

b. L'Eva començà a perdre la por/tenir sort/?semblar intel.ligent/
the-Eva began to lose the fear/have luck/seem intelligent

***tenir vint anys.**[9]
have twenty years
lit. 'Eva started losing her fear/being lucky/seeming intelligent/being twenty years old.'

(30) a. *L'Eva intentava l'**alegria/amor**/la **pèrdua** de la por.
the-Eva tried the-happiness/love/the loss of the fear
lit. 'Eva tried/attempted happiness/love/the loss of her fear.'

b. *L'Eva començà l'**alegria/amor**/la **pèrdua** de la por.
the-Eva began the-happiness/love/the loss of the fear
lit. 'Eva began happiness/love/the loss of her fear.'

2.1.2 Light *FER* ('do/make')-type verbs

Traditionally, light verbs have been characterized as semantically defective predicates with impoverished or even empty argument structures. The assumption is that these verbs must combine with a noun predicate to license the arguments of the clause (e.g. Jespersen 1954; Gross 1981;

[9] I thank an anonymous reviewer for this example.

Cattell 1984; Mirto 1986; Grimshaw & Mester 1988; Dubinsky 1990; La Fauci 1997; Alonso Ramos 2004). For clarity, here I distinguish light verbs from other verbs using two criteria based on Alonso Ramos (1998; 2004) and Alba-Salas (2002; 2004), among others. First, light verbs combine with noun predicates designating actions or states such as *examination*, *call* and *fear*, as opposed to common nouns or non-event nouns like *car* or *rabbit*.[10] Second, light verbs appear in constructions (hereafter Light Verb Constructions or LVCs) whose semantic argument structure is determined by the noun predicate, but whose syntactic structure is determined by the verb.

One of the most common light verbs in Romance is *FER* 'do/make' (Catalan *fer*, Italian *fare*, Spanish *hacer*). This verb is homophonous with both heavy (31) and causative *FER* 'make' (32).

(31) L'Eva (li) **farà** un pastís d'aniversari a l'Ali.
the-Eva to-him will-make a cake of-birthday to the-Ali
'Eva will make Ali a birthday cake.'

(32) L'Eva (li) **farà** estudiar francès a l'Ali.
the-Eva to-him will-make study French to the-Ali
'Eva will make Ali study French.'

As (33) illustrates, light *FER* combines with action nouns such as Catalan *trucada* 'phone call', *promesa* 'promise' and *viatge* 'travel'. These are what we can descriptively call *FER UNA TRUCADA* 'make a call'-type LVCs (Alba-Salas 2002).

(33) La Mònica farà un viatge / una promesa / una trucada a l'Eva.
the Mònica will-make a travel a promise a call to the-Eva
'Mònica will take a trip / make a promise / give Eva a call.'

[10] In some definitions in the literature (e.g. Alba-Salas 2002; 2004), light verbs can also combine with predicates other than nouns, such as adjectives or infinitivals. For simplicity, here I adopt a narrower definition specifying that the predicate complement of the light verb is a noun, but this categorial restriction is not critical to my proposal. What is important is that light verbs combine with nouns designating actions or states, as opposed to common nouns like *car* or *rabbit*.

In *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs the event noun is always the direct object of light *FER*. As (34) shows, this property is corroborated by the fact that this nominal can appear in participial absolute (a) and participial adjective constructions with *FER* (b), and (in the case of Catalan and Italian), that it can also be pronominalized with the partitive clitic *en/ne* 'of it' (c) (La Fauci 1980; 1996; 1997; La Fauci & Mirto 1985; Mirto 1986; Di Sciullo & Rosen 1990; Cicalese 1995; Štichauer 2000; Alonso Ramos 1998; 2004; Alba-Salas 2002; 2004; cf. Giry-Schneider 1984; 1987; Gross 1989 and Danlos 1992, among others, for French).

(34) a. **Feta la trucada**, va marxar tothom.
made the call PST leave everyone
'The phone call having been made, everyone left.'
b. **les (dues) trucades fetes** ahir des d'aquest número
the two calls made yesterday from of-this number
'the (two) calls made yesterday from this number'
c. De trucades, la Mònica **n'** ha fetes tres.
of calls the Mònica PRT has made three
'Calls, Mònica has made three (of them).'

FER UNA TRUCADA-type LVCs must not be confused with structures like (35), which we can descriptively call *FER POR* 'make fear'-type constructions (Alba-Salas 2002; 2004). First, unlike *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs, *FER POR*-type constructions involve nouns designating physical or emotional states, rather than action nominals. As (36) shows, these state nominals—unlike their action counterparts in *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs—are mass nouns, so they are typically incompatible with determiners or quantifiers and cannot be pluralized (cf. (34)).[11]

(35) El Mark li fa por/fàstic a l'Ali.
the Mark to-him makes fear/disgust to Ali
'Mark frightens/disgusts Ali.'

(36) *El Mark li fa **dues** por**s**/fàstic**s** a l'Ali.
the Mark to-him makes two fears/disgusts to Ali

[11] In Modern Spanish *FER POR*-type structures are expressed with *dar* 'give' (e.g. *dar miedo/asco* 'frighten/disgust), although there is at least one case with *hacer* 'make': *hacer ilusión* 'cause excitement'.

Second, unlike the verb found in *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs, the verb in *FER POR*-type structures has a causative meaning that can be paraphrased with 'cause' or 'provoke'. Thus, for example, (35) can be paraphrased as 'Mark **causes** Ali to have fear/disgust' (Alba-Salas 2002; 2004; Alonso Ramos 2004; cf. Gross 1981 and Giry-Schneider 1984; 1987, for French). As Alba-Salas (2002; 2004) argues, this last contrast indicates that *FER UNA TRUCADA*- and *FER POR*-type structures involve two different, yet homophonous, variants of *FER*. On the one hand, *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs involve a non-causative variant that combines with action nouns (*light FER*, hereafter). On the other hand, *FER POR* constructions involve a causative variant that combines with state nouns. This *causative FER* is the same verb found in causatives with infinitives, such as (32) above.

Our focus here is on light *FER*, not on its causative counterpart. As many have pointed out, the subject of light *FER* is obligatorily coreferential with the highest argument of the event nominal in complement position (e.g. Gross 1976; Giry-Schneider 1978b; 1987; La Fauci 1980; Mirto 1986). This property is illustrated in (37).

(37) La Mònica$_{\mathbf{i}}$ (li) farà una $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*GEN}}$trucada (*del Pere$_{\mathbf{j}}$) a l'Eva.[12]
the Mònica to-her will-make a call of-the Pere to the-Eva
'Mònica will give Eva a call (*by/from Pere).'

As Alba-Salas (2002; 2004) notes, *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs require an animate subject. This requirement is illustrated in the Italian LVC in (38). As (39) shows, this animacy requirement is exclusive to the LVC, since the morphologically related verb *cadere* 'fall' and the noun *caduta* itself are compatible with inanimate subjects.[13]

[12] The PP *del Pere* is only possible with the interpretation of 'Mònica will make the call to Eva **that Pere should have made/that Pere usually makes**'. See note 23 for an account of this alternative interpretation.

[13] An anonymous reviewer notes that Catalan structures with *fer* plus event nouns like *caiguda* 'fall', *baixada* 'descent' and *puja/pujada* 'rise' allow certain inanimate subjects, as in (i). However, as (ii) shows, the event nouns in these structures—unlike their counterparts in *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs—must be obligatorily modified with an adjective or a prepositional phrase, and they resist quantification, at least for some native speakers. These restrictions suggest that cases like (i) are not *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs, so their compatibility with inanimate subjects is irrelevant. It is

(38) **Gianni/#il muro di Berlino** ha fatto una caduta ieri.
Gianni/the wall of Berlin has made a fall yesterday
'Gianni/the Berlin Wall fell down yesterday.'

(39) a. **Gianni/il muro di Berlino** è caduto ieri.
Gianni/the wall of Berlin is fallen yesterday
'Gianni/the Berlin Wall fell down yesterday.'
b. la caduta **di Gianni/del muro di Berlino**
the fall of Gianni/of-the wall of Berlin
'Gianni's fall/the fall of the Berlin Wall'

Although LVCs like *fare una caduta* 'fall' are typically understood as involving involuntary events, they can also be interpreted as deliberate actions. As (40) shows, this is evidenced by the possibility of forming an imperative and adding adverbials such as 'voluntarily' or 'on purpose' (see note 3).

(40) a. Gianni ha fatto una caduta **di proposito** per fare ridere i bambini.
Gianni has done a fall on purpose to make laugh the children
'Gianni fell down on purpose to make the children laugh.'

---

important to note, though, that the existence of an animacy requirement in *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs is not crucial here. For a discussion of other apparent counter-examples to the animacy restriction found in *FER UNA TRUCADA*-type LVCs, see Alba-Salas (2004).

(i) Els preus han fet una caiguda/pujada/baixada espectacular/en picat.
the prices have made a fall/rise/descent spectacular/in diving
'Prices have experienced a spectacular/tremendous fall/increase/decrease.'

(ii) a. ??Els preus han fet una caiguda/pujada/baixada. [with non-exclamative intonation]
the prices have made a fall/rise/descent
'Prices have experienced a fall/increase/decrease.'
b. ??Els preus han fet **dues caigudes/pujades/baixades**.
the prices have made two falls/rises/descents
'Prices have experienced several/two falls/increases/decreases.'

cf. Ita. c. Eva ha fatto **due cadute**.
Eva has made two falls
'Eva feel down twice.'

b. Dai, Gianni, **fa'** un'altra caduta!
come-on Gianni do an-other fall
'Come on, Gianni, fall down again!'

Examples like (39) and (40) show that the event nouns selected by light *FER* designate potentially voluntary actions. This situation is consistent with the claim that LVCs with *FER* involve obligatory control, as predicted by the UCAC Hypothesis.

Besides *FER*, there are other light verbs in Romance that select nouns designating voluntary actions and show obligatory subject control. A partial list is given below for Spanish (41), Italian (42), and Catalan (43), together with a few examples of their use in typical LVCs.

(41) **asestar** 'give' (*asestar un golpe* 'hit'), **cometer** 'commit' (*cometer un asesinato* 'commit murder'), **dar** 'give' (*dar una bofetada* 'slap')[14], **echar** 'throw'(*echar una mirada* 'take a look'), **lanzar** 'launch' (*lanzar un ataque* 'launch an attack'), **llevar a cabo** 'carry out' (*llevar a cabo una privatización* 'privatize'), **meter** 'put' (*meter un golpe* 'hit'), **pegar** 'give' (*pegar una patada* 'kick'), **realizar** 'carry out' (*realizar unas declaraciones* 'make some remarks'), **soltar** 'let out' (*soltar una bofetada* 'slap')

(42) **affibiare** 'give' (*affibiare un morso* 'bite'), **commettere** 'commit' (*commettere un'aggressione* 'commit an assault'), **dare** 'give' (*dare un calcio* 'kick'), **effettuare** 'carry out' (*effettuare una riforma* 'reform'), **lanciare** 'launch' (*lanciare un attacco* 'launch an attack'), **operare** 'make'(*operare un cambiamento* 'make a change')

(43) **efectuar** 'do' (*efectuar un ingrés* 'make a deposit'), **donar** 'give' (*donar una bufetada* 'slap'), **dur a terme** 'conduct' (*dur a terme un reforma* 'reform'),

[14] Spanish *dar* 'give' can appear with state nouns (i). The same is true of its Catalan and Italian counterparts (*donar* and *dare*, respectively), though to a lesser extent. However, this *DONAR* is not the same variant found with action nouns (Alonso Ramos 1998; 2004; Alba-Salas 2002; 2004). In fact, unlike the *DONAR* found in Romance LVCs such as 'give a kiss' or 'give a slap', the *DONAR* in (i) is a causative variant that can be paraphrased with 'cause' or 'provoke'. Thus, for example, (i) can be paraphrased as 'Spiders cause Monica to have fear/be afraid' (cf. Spa. *Mónica le da un beso a Eva* 'Mónica gives Eva a kiss' → '*Mónica causes Eva to have a kiss').

(i) A Mónica le dan miedo las arañas.
to Monica to-her give fear the spiders
'Spiders frighten Monica.'

exercir 'exert' (*exercir influència* 'exert influence'), **fotre** 'give' (*fotre un mastegot* 'smack'), **plantar** 'give' (*plantar un petó* 'kiss'), **realitzar** 'carry out' (*realitzar un canvi* 'make a change')

2.2 Verbs that do not show obligatory subject coreference

Verbs that do not show obligatory coreference between their subject and the highest argument of an event noun in complement position include two subtypes: 'ordinary' (i.e. non-control) verbs like *DESCRIURE* 'describe'; and certain verbs that otherwise show obligatory subject control with infinitivals, such as *VOLER* 'want' and *PROMETRE* 'promise'.

2.2.1 Non-control verbs (*DESCRIURE*-type verbs)

Verbs that do not show control with infinitives or gerunds can and often do take event nouns as their complements, either as direct objects—e.g. Catalan *descriure* 'describe', *criticar* 'criticize' and *esmentar* 'mention'—or as prepositional obliques, e.g. Catalan *burlar-se (de)* 'mock' and *queixar-se (de)* 'complain (about)'. As (44) and (45) illustrate, *DESCRIURE*-type verbs do not show obligatory control into nominals. In fact, the event noun that combines with them can license its own agent distinct from the subject of the verb (44), contrary to what we saw with the *COMENÇAR* and light *FER* class (cf. (27) and (37)). When the event noun does not license an agent, we have the broad coreference options found in cases of non-obligatory control with infinitivals, cf. (4). For example, in (45) the caller could be Pau, another person mentioned elsewhere in the discourse, or a generic antecedent.

(44) El Pau$_{\mathbf{i}}$ esmentà una $_{\mathbf{i/j/GEN}}$inversió de 300 euros (de/per part de
the Pau mentioned an investment of 300 euros of/by part of

l'Ali$_{\mathbf{j}}$).
the-Ali
'Pau mentioned a 300-euro investment (by Ali).'

(45) El Pau$_{\mathbf{i}}$ descrivia/es queixava d'una $_{\mathbf{i/j/GEN}}$trucada a l'Eva.
the Pau described/REF complained of-a call to the-Eva
'Pau was describing/complaining about a call to Eva.'

DESCRIURE-type verbs are compatible with both action nouns, as in (44) and (45), and state nominals, as in (46).

(46) L'Eva descrivia/es burlava de l'**alegria**$_{\mathbf{j}}$/les **esperances**$_{\mathbf{j}}$ del Pau$_{\mathbf{j}}$.
the Eva described/REF mocked of the-happiness/the hopes of-the Pau
'Eva was describing/mocking Pau's happiness/hopes.'

2.2.2 *PROMETRE* ('promise')-type verbs

PROMETRE-type verbs take obligatorily controlled infinitival complements, e.g.

(47) a. L'Eva$_{\mathbf{i}}$ (ens$_{\mathbf{j}}$) va prometre $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*GEN}}$investigar l'escàndol/crear
the-Eva to-us PST promise investigate the-scandal/create

una comissió.
a commission
'Eva promised (us) to investigate the scandal/create a commission.'

b. L'Eva$_{\mathbf{i}}$ vol/desitja $_{\mathbf{i/*j/*GEN}}$investigar l'escàndol /crear una
the-Eva wants/wishes investigate the-scandal create a

comissió.
commission
'Eva wants/wishes to investigate the scandal/create a commission.'

PROMETRE-type verbs include those listed in (48) and (49). As (50) illustrates, *RECORDAR* 'remember', *OBLIDAR-SE* 'forget', *PENSAR* 'think' and *PROMETRE* itself in (48) select actional complements. By contrast, *VOLER* 'want', *DESITJAR* 'wish' and *ESPERAR* 'hope' in (49) take situational infinitivals (51). Again, this behavior is consistent with Jackendoff and Culicover's claims.

(48) a. **'promise'**: *Cat.* prometre, *Ita.* promettere, *Spa.* prometer
b. **'remember'**: *Cat.* recordar-se (de), *Ita.* ricordarsi (di), *Spa.* recordar & acordarse (de)
c. **'forget'**: *Cat.* oblidar-se (de), *Ita.* dimenticarsi (di), *Spa.* olvidar & olvidarse (de)
d. **'think (about)'**: *Cat.* pensar (en/a), *Ita.* pensare (di/su), *Spa.* pensar (en/sobre)

(49) a. **'want'**: *Cat.* voler, *Ita.* volere, *Spa.* querer
b. **'wish'**: *Cat.* desitjar, *Ita.* desiderare, *Spa.* desear
c. **'hope'**: *Cat.* esperar, *Ita.* sperare (di), *Spa.* esperar

(50) L'Eva es va oblidar de/ens va prometre **córrer la marató** /
the-Eva REF PST forget of to-us PST promise run the marathon

ballar amb tu / *tenir vint anys / ??semblar intel.ligent.
dance with you have twenty years seem intelligent
lit. 'Eva forgot about/promised us to run the marathon/dance with you/be twenty years old/seem intelligent.'

(51) L'Eva vol **córrer / ballar / tenir vint anys / semblar intel.ligent**.
the-Eva wants run dance have twenty years seem intelligent
'Eva wants to run/dance/be twenty years old/seem intelligent.'

PROMETRE-type verbs can also combine with noun predicates. Interestingly enough, the contrast in selectional requirements found with infinitivals is neutralized with nominals. Thus, all the verbs in (48) and (49) are compatible with both voluntary action nominals (52) and state nouns (53) .

(52) a. L'Eva$_{\mathbf{i}}$ ens$_{\mathbf{j}}$ va prometre una $_{\mathbf{i/k/j/GEN}}$investigació de l'escàndol /
the-Eva to-us PST promised an investigation of the-scandal

la creació d'una comissió.
the creation of-a commission
'Eva promised us an investigation of the scandal/the creation of a commission.'

b. L'Eva$_{\mathbf{i}}$ vol/desitja una $_{\mathbf{j/GEN/?i}}$investigació de l'escàndol / la
the-Eva wants/wishes an investigation of the-scandal the

$_{\mathbf{j/GEN/?i}}$creació d'una comissió.
creation of-a commission
'Eva wants/is hoping for an investigation of the scandal/the creation of a commission.'

(53) a. El president ens va prometre **alegria**, **pau** i **esperança**.
the-president to-us PST promise happiness peace and hope
'The president promised us happiness, peace and hope.'

b. L'Eva només vol **alegria** i **esperança** / l'**amor**
the-Eva only wants happiness and hope the-love

d'en Joan.
of-the Joan
'Eva only wants hope and happiness/Joan's love.'

As (52) above also illustrates, *PROMETRE*-type verbs do not show obligatory coreference between their subject and the highest argument of the event noun. In fact, similar to what we saw with *DESCRIURE*-type verbs, here the noun predicate can license its own agent (typically a *by*-phrase) distinct from the verb's subject (54).

(54) a. L'Eva ens va prometre una ¡investigació de l'escàndol /
the-Eva to-us PST promise an investigation of the-scandal

la ¡creació d'una comissió **per part del govern**$_{i}$.
the creation of-a commission by part of-the government
'Eva promised us an investigation of the scandal/the creation of a commission by the government.'

b. L'Eva vol/desitja una ¡investigació de l'escàndol / la ¡creació
the-Eva wants/wishes an investigation of the-scandal the creation

d'una comissió **per part del govern**$_{i}$.
of-a commission by part of-the government
'Eva wants/is hoping for an investigation of the scandal/the creation of a commission by the government.'

3. Towards an account of subject control into nominals

In what follows I develop an explanatory account of the facts above. I start with a brief introduction to my theoretical framework.

3.1 Framework

My analysis is couched in Jackendoff and Culicover's (2005) Simpler Syntax framework. As Jackendoff and Culicover explain, Simpler Syntax concurs in many respects with HPSG, LFG, Relational Grammar,

Construction Grammar and other generative frameworks, departing from some basic tenets of GB and Minimalism.

The formal technology of Simpler Syntax is based on constraints, rather than derivations. There are no 'hidden levels' of syntax related to overt syntax by movement, insertion and deletion. Whereas GB/Minimalism assumes that the syntax-semantics interface is both maximally simple (so that meaning maps transparently into syntactic structure) and maximally uniform (so that the same meaning always maps onto the same syntactic structure), Simpler Syntax proposes a more flexible syntax-semantic interface. Abandoning interface uniformity leads to a radical simplification of syntax, which is (re)conceived as the minimal structure necessary to mediate between semantics and phonology. Simpler Syntax also rejects the GB/Minimalist view that syntax is the source of all combinatorial complexity. Instead, it proposes that phonology, syntax and semantics are independent generative components, each creating its own type of combinatorial complexity. Besides these three parallel components, the grammar also involves a crosscutting division into phrasal and morphological departments, plus interface principles between the various components. The lexicon is not separate from grammar. Instead, it cuts across phonology, syntax and semantics.

In Jackendoff and Culicover's framework, meaning is formally represented at the level of Conceptual Structure or CS. Like syntax, CS involves a hierarchical combinatorial structure composed of discreet elements. It encodes such distinctions as the type-token distinction, the categories in terms of which the world is understood, and the relations among various individuals and categories. However, CS is not just a kind of (narrow) syntax. Instead, it has multiple tiers, so there is no direct one-to-one relationship between the syntactic and conceptual hierarchies. CS constituents belong to one of the major ontological types, such as Archi-Object, Situation, Property, Location or Time, among others (cf. Pustejovsky 1995). There are potentially five parts to the internal structure of each constituent: (i) a set of aspectual features which, in the case of Situations, distinguish between states, processes, and completive events, and which, in the case of Archi-Objects, distinguish between count (Object), mass (Substance), and aggregate (including Plural); (ii) a set of referential features such as the type/token distinction and (in)definiteness; (iii) a function of zero arguments (e.g. in the case of typical common

nouns) to (probably) three arguments (e.g. in the case of *give*); (iv) the arguments of the function, which are themselves typed constituents; and (v) modifiers of the constituents such as those expressed by adjectives and by place, time, and manner adverbials (modifiers also being typed constituents).

The formal representation of CS is illustrated in (55), taken from Jackendoff and Culicover (2005: 154). Capitals in (b) stand for the meaning of a word, which can be further decomposed into primitives along the lines proposed in Jackendoff (1990; 2002).

(55) a. [FUNCTION (ARG_1, … ARG_i); MOD_1, … MOD_m,; $FEATURE_1$, … $FEATURE_n$]
b. Pat might eat some green apples on Thursday.
[$_{Situation}$ MIGHT ([$_{Situation}$ EAT ([$_{Object}$ PAT], [$_{Object}$ APPLE; [$_{Property}$ GREEN]; INDEF PLUR]; [$_{Time}$ THURSDAY]]

Similar to LFG, Relational Grammar and other frameworks, Simpler Syntax claims that Grammatical Functions (GFs) such as subject, direct object, indirect object and obliques constitute an independent dimension or tier intervening between semantic structure and phrase structure representation. The GF-tier permits the grammar to manipulate the status of syntactic arguments irrespective of their semantic status and syntactic position. GFs are mapped onto thematic roles through a thematic hierarchy (actor/agent > patient/ undergoer/beneficiary > non-patient theme > other)[15] and a parallel hierarchy of direct GFs (subject > direct object > indirect object)[16]. The mapping mechanism takes the highest-ranked theta role and matches it to the highest-ranked GF (i.e. the subject), working its way down the two hierarchies in parallel until it runs out of arguments.[17]

[15] As Jackendoff and Culicover note, their particular thematic hierarchy does not cover everything, but it eliminates many problems faced by other thematic hierarchies proposed in the literature.

[16] Jackendoff and Culicover limit the GF hierarchy to direct NP arguments, i.e. the subject, the direct object and the indirect object. The mapping of obliques onto the corresponding theta roles is lexically determined.

[17] The thematic hierarchy does not apply to all combinations of theta-roles. For example, the GF mapping of stimulus-experiencer pairs with verbs such a *fear* vs. *frighten* is stipulated by the corresponding lexical entries, since it is not predictable (i).

(i) a. John fears sincerity. [experiencer subject and stimulus object]

Like other theories, and unlike GB/Minimalism, Simpler Syntax allows for the possibility that syntactic licensing may not be concomitant with semantic role assignment. In the canonical case a grammatical function is doubly linked to both a semantic argument and a syntactic dependent. However, a grammatical function can also be licensed by a semantic argument alone (as in the case of the controlled subject in *to err is human*, which is only present at CS, but not in the syntax), or by a syntactic argument alone (as in the case of the dummy subject of ***it****'s raining*). Moreover, a phrase can be a semantic argument of one clause but have a grammatical function in another, as is the case of raised NPs in examples like ***John*** *seems to play well*.

In Simpler Syntax lexical items are long-term memory associations of a piece of phonology, a piece of syntax, and a piece of semantics. In addition to a lexical item's overt content, lexical entries may include contextual features in any of the three domains, including selectional restrictions (in the CS domain), subcategorization features (in syntax), and phonological environment (in phonology). 'Lexical insertion' involves simultaneously inserting the three parts of a lexical item, along with the indices or association lines that establish the connections among them.

Since the syntactic category of an argument is not entirely predictable from semantics, individual predicates can specify the categories of their arguments. Arguments may be optional in two senses: they may be semantically optional, as is the case with the object of *swallow*, or they may be semantically obligatory but syntactically omissible, as is the case with the object of *eat* (the contrast is evident in the fact that although the object is omissible in both cases, as in *he swallowed/ate (the food)*, the sentence *he swallowed, but he didn't swallow anything* is possible, whereas **he ate, but he didn't eat anything* is not).

Consistent with Jackendoff and Culicover's previous work (cf. section 1.1), in Simpler Syntax control is a relation stated over the level of Conceptual Structure, not over syntactic structure. In cases of obligatory control into infinitival (or gerundive) VPs such as *Pat tried* ***to sneeze*** the semantic argument that would normally be destined for subject position in the embedded clause is a bound variable, rather than an invisible NP in the syntax (i.e. PRO). The realization of controlled complements follows from

---

b. Sincerity frightens John. [stimulus subject and experiencer object]

a principle that applies to clauses whose Conceptual Structure includes a bound variable α corresponding to the highest-ranked grammatical function, allowing such clauses to be realized as an infinitival (or gerundive) VP. This principle is formalized in (56), adapted from Jackendoff and Culicover (2005: 194).[18] The effect of (56) is that all the other grammatical functions get expressed within the VP in the normal way, but the S node, the tense, and the subject are absent.

(56) $[F\ldots\ \alpha_i, \ldots]_k \Leftrightarrow [GF_i\ (> \ldots)]_k \Leftrightarrow [_{VP}\ \textit{to/ing}\ V\ldots]_k$

The formal representation of a simple control structure like *Pat tried to sneeze* is illustrated in (57), taken from Jackendoff and Culicover (2005: 195). The representation involves three tiers: a semantic tier (i.e. CS, which corresponds to the top row), a GF-tier (second row), and a syntactic tier (third row). The control relation is captured at the level of CS by having the argument of the control verb (*Pat*) bind the sole argument of the controlled infinitival (the variable α), as indicated by superscripting. The representation involves two clauses, each of which is assigned to a different GF-tier. The matrix clause is assigned to the GF-tier noted with subscript 1, whereas the embedded clause is assigned to the GF-tier marked with subscript 3. Because the semantic argument of *sneeze* is a bound variable, the principle in (56) licenses the embedded clause as a subjectless infinitival. Note that each NP argument in CS is linked to a grammatical function in the GF-tier, as indicated by coindexing and the association lines. The grammatical function corresponding to *Pat* (GF_2) is linked to the syntactic tier. Since this GF is the only (and thus also the highest) GF in the matrix clause, *Pat* is realized as the subject of *try*. By contrast, the grammatical function corresponding to the bound variable (GF_4) is not linked to the syntactic tier, so it is not realized syntactically.

[18] The formulation given by Jackendoff and Culicover includes additional material relevant to non-obligatory control. For simplicity, this material is excluded from (56).

(57) [TRY (PAT_2^{α}, ([SNEEZE (α_4)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF_2]$_1$ [GF_4]$_3$

NP_2 V_1+past [$_{VP}$ to V_3]$_3$

Pat tried to sneeze

In what follows I extend this analysis to cases of obligatory control into nominals in Romance. As we will see, my proposal assumes that event nouns, like verbs and other predicates, license GFs. I also assume that all the arguments of noun predicates are semantically obligatory but optionally expressed in the syntax. Like the direct object of *eat* and similar verbs, the arguments of event nouns always appear in CS, but they do not need to be linked to the syntactic tier.[19]

3.2 Analysis

As we have just seen, event nouns can appear as complements of light verbs like *FER*, verbs that show obligatory control into infinitivals or gerunds, and ordinary (i.e. non-control) verbs such as *DESCRIURE*. Light *FER*-type verbs and a subset of verbs that show obligatory control into infinitivals or gerunds (the *COMENÇAR* class) show obligatory coreference between their subject and the highest argument of the event noun. By contrast, *DESCRIURE*-type verbs and another subset of verbs that show obligatory control into infinitivals (the *PROMETRE* class) do not require their subject to be obligatorily coreferential with the highest argument of

[19] Although this is not critical to my argumentation, I further assume that event nouns license the same types of GFs licensed by verbs, including subjects, direct objects, indirect objects and obliques—an assumption based on unpublished work by Carol Rosen. Under this assumption, the fact that the arguments of event nouns in Romance are uniformly realized as prepositional phrases, rather than the 'direct' NPs found with verbs, follows from morphological realization rules. Specifically, the different realizations follow from case assignment contrasts that are sensitive to the categorial identity of the licensing predicate and which apply in syntax, rather than in the GF-tier. The claim that event nouns can license (GF)-subjects provides an advantage in our analysis of control into nominals: preserving the generalization that, as Boecks and Hornstein (2003) note, controllees are always 'downstairs' subjects with no apparent thematic restrictions.

their noun complement. According to my analysis, this contrast indicates that *COMENÇAR*- and light *FER*-type verbs—unlike *DESCRIURE*- and *PROMETRE*-type verbs—show obligatory subject control into nominals on a par with control into infinitivals and gerunds.

To accommodate for the possibility of control into nominals in Romance we only need a slight revision of the principle in (56) above: allowing controlled complements to be either VPs headed by an infinitival or gerund (the canonical case) or NPs headed by an event noun. This minor revision is formalized in (58) using Jackendoff and Culicover's notation.

(58) $[\text{F}\ldots\ \alpha_i, \ldots]_k \Leftrightarrow [\text{GF}_i\ (> \ldots)]_k \Leftrightarrow [_{\text{VP}}\ \text{V}\textit{inf/ger}\ldots]_k\ /[_{\text{NP}}\ \text{N}\ldots]_k$

Another minor adjustment needed to handle obligatory control into nominals is revising the formulation of the UCAC Hypothesis so as to include complements headed by noun predicates, rather than just infinitives and gerunds (59), cf. (1).

(59) Unique Control of Actional Complements (UCAC) Hypothesis [Revised]
Infinitival, gerundive **and nominal complements** that are selected by their head to be of the semantic type Voluntary Action have obligatory control. The unique controller is the character to which the head assigns the role of actor for that action—whatever its syntactic position.

As we saw earlier, the correlation between selectional requirements and control options predicted by the UCAC Hypothesis is borne out in structures with event nouns. In fact, the class of verbs that shows obligatory control into nominals (the *COMENÇAR*- and light *FER*-types) is only compatible with nouns designating voluntary actions (or potentially voluntary actions, as in the case of Italian *fare una caduta* 'fall'). By contrast, those verbs that do not show obligatory control into nominals (the *DESCRIURE* and *PROMETRE* class) do not select actional nouns.

Unlike cases of control into nominals, the cases of control into infinitivals and gerunds examined here do not always fall within the scope of the UCAC Hypothesis. On the one hand, certain *COMENÇAR*-type verbs (*ACABAR (DE)* 'finish', *DEDICAR-SE (A)* 'devote oneself (to)' and *PROCEDIR (A)* 'proceed (to)'), as well as some *PROMETRE*-type verbs (*PROMETRE* 'promise', *RECORDAR* 'remember', *OBLIDAR-SE (DE)*

'forget' and *PENSAR* 'think') do select actional VP complements and show obligatory control. On the other hand, the remaining *COMENÇAR*-type verbs (*COMENÇAR* 'begin', *INTENTAR* 'try', *PROVAR (DE)* 'attempt' and *CONTINUAR* 'continue') and *PROMETRE*-type verbs (*VOLER* 'want', *DESITJAR* 'wish' and *ESPERAR* 'hope') take situational VP complements but show obligatory control into infinitivals or gerunds.[20]

As we have repeatedly noted, the different control patterns found with both VP and NP complements do not invalidate Jackendoff and Culicover's proposals, which do not exclude other sources of obligatory control besides

[20] Within this second group, the case of *INTENTAR* and *PROVAR (DE)* is probably more complex. Indeed, the fact that these verbs are compatible with both actions and states probably follows from coercion, not from the claim that they actually selects situational complements. Coercion involves the conventionalized omission of semantic material in syntactic expression. As Jackendoff and Culicover (2003; 2005) explain, one type of coercion relevant to control structures is the 'bring about'-type. This type is found with control verbs that are compatible with non-voluntary situations, e.g. *Hilary plan/intends that Ben come along to the party*. According to Jackendoff and Culicover, verbs like *plan* and *intend* semantically select voluntary action complements but syntactically subcategorize for a broader range of complements. This mismatch creates a conflict in composing the meaning, so the principle of coercion steps in, reinterpreting the complement as the action of bringing about a situation, i.e. *Hilary intends* ***to bring it about*** *that Ben comes along the party* (implicit material in boldface). It is possible that Romance *INTENTAR* and *PROVAR (DE)*—like *plan* and *intend*—also select actional complements but can appear with non-voluntary actions and states through the 'bring about' coercion, so that cases like *l'Eva intentava semblar intel.ligent* 'Eva tried to seem intelligent', for example, are reinterpreted as *l'Eva intentava* ***actuar amb la intenció de*** *semblar intel.ligent* 'Eva tried to **act with the intention of** seeming intelligent'. Unlike *INTENTAR* and *PROVAR (DE)*, the other Romance verbs included in the second group (*VOLER*, *DESITJAR*, *ESPERAR* and *CONTINUAR*) do license situational, rather than actional, complements. Hence, coercion is not relevant to structures with these verbs. This claim is corroborated by the observation that the infinitival or gerundive complements of *VOLER*, *DESITJAR*, *ESPERAR* and *CONTINUAR* may designate situations that cannot be brought about by voluntary actions, as in *l'Eva volia/desitjava/esperava* ***tenir vint anys/que l'any vinent fos 1492*** 'Eva wanted/wished/hoped to be twenty years old/for next year to be 1492'. By contrast, the complements of *INTENTAR* and *PROVAR (DE)* seem to be restricted to situations that can be voluntarily brought about—a prerequisite for the 'bring about' coercion to apply, cf. *#l'Eva intentava tenir vint anys/que l'any vinent fos 1492* '#Eva tried to be twenty years old/for next year to be 1492'. Despite this qualification, for simplicity throughout the paper I include *INTENTAR* and *PROVAR (DE)* among the verbs that select situational complements.

being a selected actional complement. In fact, the data examined here are consistent with the generalization that whereas all verbs selecting actional complements show obligatory control, some verbs selecting situational (infinitival or gerundive) complements also show obligatory control. Capitalizing on this asymmetrical implicational relationship, we can minimize redundancy in the lexicon by positing a general lexical rule specifying that, by default, heads selecting actional complements automatically bind the highest argument of the embedded action (with the controller being the argument to which these predicates assign the role of actor for that action). Obligatory control verbs that deviate from this default pattern would be marked as such in the lexicon. Thus, for example, the Conceptual Structure of verbs like *VOLER*, *DESITJAR* and *ESPERAR* would specify that these verbs select situational complements but still bind the highest argument of their infinitival complement.

In the next two subsections I elaborate on my analysis of each verb class.

3.2.1 Verbs that do not show obligatory control into nominals (*DESCRIURE*- and *PROMETRE*-types)

Verbs that do not show obligatory control into nominals license a theme and do not bind the highest argument of the nominal in complement position. As we already know, these predicates include *DESCRIURE*- and *PROMISE*-type verbs. Let us consider each one in turn.

The prototypical entry for *DESCRIURE*-type verbs is illustrated in (60). As we can see, this verb licenses an agent and a theme, each linked to a Grammatical Function. The agent is realized as the subject, and the theme is a direct object or (in the case of verbs like Catalan *parlar* 'talk') a prepositional oblique.

(60) *DESCRIURE*-TYPE (Agent$_1$, Theme$_2$, …)

GF$_1$	>	GF$_2$
NP$_1$		NP$_2$/[$_{PP2}$ NP$_2$]

When *DESCRIURE*-type verbs occur with event nouns in direct object position, as in Catalan *la Mònica descrivia la* ***trucada*** *del Pere a l'Eva* 'Mònica was describing Pere's **call** to Eva', this nominal heads the NP theme, just as in cases where the object is a non-event noun, e.g. Catalan *la Mònica descrivia* ***la seva casa*** 'Mònica was describing **her house**'. The corresponding representation is illustrated in (61). Technicalities aside, what matters here is that *DESCRIURE* licenses an agent subject (*Mònica*) and a theme object (the NP headed by the event noun). Inside the NP headed by the event noun (NP_3) we find the two arguments licensed by the nominal: *Pere* (the agent) and *Eva* (the goal), both realized as prepositional phrases. Since *Mònica* does not bind *Pere*, (61) does not involve a formal control relationship.

(61) [DESCRIURE (MÒNICA$_2$, ([TRUCADA (PERE$_4$, EVA$_5$)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF$_2$ > GF$_3$]$_1$ [GF$_4$ > GF$_5$]$_3$

NP$_2$ V$_1$+ past [$_{NP}$ N$_3$ [$_{PP4}$ NP$_4$] [$_{PP5}$ NP$_5$]]$_3$

la Mònica descrivia la trucada del Pere a l'Eva

As we saw in (45), heavy verb constructions where the event noun does not license an overt subject allow different coreference options, echoing cases of non-obligatory control with infinitivals and gerunds. For example, in Catalan *la Mònica descrivia una trucada a l'Eva* 'Mònica was describing a call to Eva', the caller could be Mònica herself, a generic antecedent or someone else mentioned previously in the discourse. Such cases have the same representation as (61). The only difference is that here the agent is not syntactically expressed. The corresponding representation is given in (62), where *CALLER* stands for the contextually-determined agent of the event of calling (Mònica or someone else). The claim is that the caller licensed by *trucada* in CS is a specific person that is not expressed overtly because the GF associated with this argument (GF_4) is not linked to syntax. In other words, the caller is an implicit argument recoverable only from the context

provided by discourse and/or pragmatics, not through a formal control relationship.[21]

(62) [DESCRIURE (MÒNICA$_2$, ([TRUCADA (*CALLER*$_4$, EVA$_5$)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF$_2$ > GF$_3$]$_1$ [GF$_4$ > GF$_5$]$_3$

NP$_2$ V$_1$+past [$_{NP}$ N$_3$ [$_{PP5}$ NP$_5$]]$_3$

la Mònica descrivia la trucada a l'Eva

Let us now turn to *PROMETRE*-type verbs. As we saw in section 2, these verbs show obligatory control with infinitivals (47), but not with nominals (52). The contrast follows from the assumption that *PROMETRE*-type verbs have a double subcategorization frame: as subject control verbs selecting infinitival complements, and as ordinary *DESCRIURE*-type verbs that combine with nominals, including common nouns (as in *l'Eva ens va prometre un* ***llibre*** 'Eva promised us a **book**' or *l'Eva vol un* ***llibre*** 'Eva wants a **book**') and also event nominals (as in *l'Eva ens va prometre la* ***creació*** *d'una comissió* 'Eva promised us the **creation** of a commission').

The control variant has the entry in (63). This variant licenses two arguments. The first one is an actor (e.g. in the case of *PROMETRE* itself) or an experiencer (e.g. in the case of *RECORDAR* 'remember', *OBLIDAR-SE* 'forget', *PENSAR* 'think', *VOLER* 'want', *DESITJAR* 'wish' and *ESPERAR* 'hope'). The second argument is an event of the actional type (in the case of *PROMETRE*, *RECORDAR*, *OBLIDAR-SE* and *PENSAR*) or of the situational type (in the case of *VOLER*, *DESITJAR* and *ESPERAR*). The agent or experiencer is realized as the subject of the control verb, and it binds the highest argument of the event (α) in Conceptual Structure. As we saw in the English example in (57), the Grammatical Function associated with the bound variable (GF_4) is not linked to the syntax tier, so it is not syntactically expressed.

[21] Postulating a definite implicit argument here is not an ad-hoc solution, since—as Jackendoff and Culicover (2005) note—this type of arguments is also needed for cases such as *he knows* and *he forgot* (i.e. *he knows/forgot* ***it***). In GB/Minimalist terms, this implicit argument would correspond to *pro* (cf. Hornstein's (1999) analysis of non-obligatory control with infinitivals).

(63) [*PROMETRE*-type$_{CONTROL}$ (Actor/Experiencer$_2^{\alpha}$, ([Event (α_4,>…)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF$_2$]$_1$ [GF$_4$]$_3$

NP$_2$ V$_1$ [$_{VP}$ V$_{inf3}$]$_3$

Given the entry in (63), a simple example of control with infinitivals like *l'Eva promet crear una comissió* 'Eva promises to create a commission' would have the representation in (64), which is just like the *try* example in (57).

(64) [PROMETRE (EVA$_2^{\alpha}$, ([CREAR (α_4, COMISSIÓ$_5$)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF$_2$]$_1$ [GF$_4$ > GF$_5$]$_3$

NP$_2$ V$_1$ [$_{VP}$ V$_{inf3}$ NP$_5$]$_3$

L'Eva promet crear una comissió

The non-control variant of *PROMETRE*-type verbs licenses a theme (or another traditional theta role), rather than an event complement, and there is no binding relationship in CS:

(65) *PROMETRE*-type$_{HEAVY}$ (Agent/Experiencer$_1$, Theme$_2$, …)

GF$_1$ > GF$_2$

NP$_1$ NP$_2$/[$_{PP2}$ NP$_2$]

Hence, cases with event nouns like *l'Eva promet la creació d'una comissió* 'Eva promises the creation of a commission' are ordinary heavy verb constructions with the same basic representation as the *DESCRIURE* structure in (62). Hence, the event nominal and all its arguments (including its implicit agent) appear inside the NP headed by the noun predicate. As in (62), coreference options between the subject of *PROMETRE* and the agent of the event nominal are determined by the pragmatic or discourse context, not by a formal control relationship. The absence of control explains why the event nominal can license an overt agent, as in *l'Eva promet la creació*

d'una comissió ***per part del professorat*** 'Eva promises the creation of a commission **by the faculty**'.

3.2.2 Verbs that show obligatory control into nominals (*COMENÇAR*- and light *FER*-types)

Unlike the verbs above, verbs that show obligatory control into nominals—the *COMENÇAR*- and light *FER*-types—license an event complement linked to the noun predicate, binding its highest argument in Conceptual Structure. Moreover, *COMENÇAR*- and light *FER*-type verbs optionally license an 'extra' Grammatical Function that is linked to an NP in the syntactic tier, but not to any argument in Conceptual Structure (cf. 3.1). As we will see below, the role of this semantically unlinked GF is to license the NP (or the PP) where the event nominal and its arguments are realized syntactically. It is important to note that positing semantically unlinked GFs for these verbs is not an ad-hoc solution, since such GFs are independently needed to handle subject raising (e.g. *John seems to study hard*), structures with dummy subjects (e.g. *it rains*) and raising to object or ECM constructions (e.g. *Sue believes Fred to like Sam*), among others (see Jackendoff and Culicover 2005 for details). Licensing a semantically unlinked GF is thus an important, though not exclusive property of verbs that show obligatory subject control into nominals. In fact, what uniquely characterizes these verbs is that they select (i) an event complement realized as a noun and (ii) an actor that binds the highest argument of the event noun.

Let us start by considering the lexical entry of *COMENÇAR*-type verbs. Like the control variant of *PROMETRE* (as opposed to heavy *PROMETRE*), *COMENÇAR*-type verbs also select an event complement and bind the highest argument of this complement. The difference is that *COMENÇAR*-type verbs subcategorize for both infinitivals (or gerunds, in the case of Catalan and Spanish *CONTINUAR* 'continue') **and** nominals. If the event complement is a noun, it belongs to the voluntary action type. If it is an infinitive (or a gerund), the complement belongs to either the actional type (in the case of *ACABAR*, *PROCEDIR (A)* and *DEDICAR-SE (A)*) or the situational type (in the case of *COMENÇAR*, *CONTINUAR*, *PROVAR* and *INTENTAR*, cf. note 20). The corresponding entry is illustrated in (66). This is just like the entry of control *PROMETRE* in (63), but with two

differences. First, the event complement is realized as either an NP or a VP. Second, if the controlled event is realized as a noun, it is linked to the 'extra' semantically unlinked Grammatical Function licensed by the control verb (GF_3).

(66) [COMENÇAR ($Agent_2^{\alpha}$, ([Event (α_4, …)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF_2 > GF_3]$_1$ [GF_4]$_3$

NP_2 V_1 [$_{NP3}$ N_3]/[$_{PP3}$ [$_{VP3}$ V_{inf3}]

The entry in (66) will differ slightly depending on each specific *COMENÇAR*-type verb. There are two basic parameters of variation. The first one is whether the VP complement is of the actional type (the default option) or the situational type. The second difference involves the exact realization of the event complement. Thus, the lexical entries of *PROCEDIR (A)* and *DEDICAR-SE (A)* specify that their event complement is uniformly realized as an oblique introduced by Romance *A* 'to', regardless of its categorial identity (cf. *l'ONU va procedir a evacuar la zona/a l'evacuació de la zona* 'the UN proceeded to evacuate the area/to an evacuation of the area'). On the other hand, the entries of other *COMENÇAR*-type verbs specify that their event complement is realized either as an oblique (in the case of infinitivals or gerunds, as in *l'ONU va començar a evacuar la zona* 'the UN began to evacuate the area') or as a direct object (in the case of nominals, as in *l'ONU va començar l'evacuació de la zona* 'the UN began the evacuation of the area'). Since the preposition introducing the controlled infinitive or gerund varies with each *COMENÇAR*-type verb (e.g. *a* 'to' in the case of Catalan *començar*, and *de* 'of' for *acabar*), the entry will also need to specify the exact choice of preposition.

The representation of cases involving controlled infinitivals or gerunds is illustrated in (67), which corresponds to *l'ONU va començar a evacuar la zona* 'the UN began to evacuate the area'. This representation is just like the control *PROMETRE* structure in (64) above, only that the controlled infinitive is realized as a PP introduced by *a* 'to'. [22]

[22] As is well known, infinitival and gerundive constructions with Romance *COMENÇAR* and other control verbs show so-called restructuring, whereby the

(67) [COMENÇAR (ONU_2^{α}, ([EVACUAR (α_4, $ZONA_5$)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF_2]$_1$			[GF_4 >	GF_5]$_3$
NP_2	V_1 + past	[$_{PP}$ [$_{VP3}$ V_{inf3}		NP_5]]$_3$
L'ONU	va començar	a evacuar		la zona

The representation of cases with nominals is illustrated in (68), which corresponds to *l'ONU va començar l'evacuació de la zona* 'the UN began the evacuation of the area'. This example is just like (67), with three minor differences. First, the controlled event is linked to an NP headed by the nominal *evacuació* 'evacuation'. Second, this NP is associated with the semantically unlinked Grammatical Function licensed by *COMENÇAR*-type verbs (GF_3). Third, the theme of the event noun (*zona* 'area') is realized as a prepositional complement, rather than as a direct object, since the arguments of Romance nominals—unlike those of verbs—must always be introduced by a preposition (cf. note 19).

(68) [COMENÇAR (ONU_2^{α}, ([EVACUACIÓ (α_4, $ZONA_5$)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF_2 >		GF_3]$_1$	[GF_4 >	GF_5]$_3$
NP_2	V_1 + past	[$_{NP}$ N_3		[$_{PP5}$ NP_5]]$_3$
L'ONU	va començar	l'evacuació		de la zona

Now we can turn to *FER* and the other light verbs discussed in section 2.1.2. Like *COMENÇAR*-type predicates, these light verbs select event complements and bind the highest argument of this complement. There are only four minor differences with respect to the *COMENÇAR* class. First, verbs like light *FER* select only voluntary action complements, rather than

---

arguments of the embedded infinitive or gerund can also be analyzed as direct syntactic dependents of the control verb (see note 7). In the framework adopted here restructuring would follow from the assumption that the verbs involved optionally license semantically unlinked GFs, so that the arguments of the infinitive or gerund can be realized as their direct syntactic dependents. Since an account of restructuring is not critical to my analysis of subject control into nominals, I do not elaborate this proposal any further.

situations. Second, these actional complements are always realized as nouns, not as infinitivals or gerunds. Third, the event noun of these verbs is uniformly realized as a direct object, rather than as an oblique. Fourth, light verbs have relatively impoverished Conceptual Structures with respect to other predicates, since they are semantically bleached.

Abstracting away from the different degrees of semantic bleaching found across the verbs studied here, light verbs of the *FER*-type have the general entry shown in (69). These verbs license a 'bleached-out' actor, i.e. an animate entity that can (potentially) bring about an event (cf. (38)). What is important is that this actor binds the highest argument of the event complement, just like 'traditional' subject control verbs.

(69) [LIGHT VERB (Actor$_2^{\alpha}$, ([Event (α_4, …)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF$_2$ > GF$_3$]$_1$ [GF$_4$]$_3$

NP$_2$ V$_1$ [$_{NP}$ N$_3$]$_3$

Given the entry in (69), a simple light verb construction like *la Mònica va fer una trucada a l'Eva* 'Monica gave Eva a call' would have the representation in (70) (cf. section 4). This representation involves the same control configuration as the *COMENÇAR* structure in (68). The analysis is consistent with recent accounts of certain light verb constructions in Japanese and Romance, where the subject of the light verb binds the highest argument of the event noun in complement position (e.g. Matsumoto 1996; Miyamoto 1999; Alba-Salas 2002; see section 1.1).[23]

[23] As we saw in note 12, examples like *La Mònica farà una trucada* ***del Pere*** *a l'Eva* are only possible with the reading of 'Mònica will make the call to Eva **that Pere should have made/that Pere usually makes**'. Under my analysis, this interpretation corresponds to a control structure where *Mònica* still binds the agent of the noun predicate, just as in (70). The difference is that here the event noun also licenses a possessor adjunct (*Pere*) inside its NP. In (70), this adjunct would be linked to a PP inside NP$_3$.

(70) [FER (MÒNICA$_2^{\alpha}$, ([TRUCADA (α_4, EVA$_5$)]$_3$)]$_1$

[GF$_2$ > GF$_3$]$_1$ [GF$_4$ > GF$_5$]$_3$

NP$_2$ V$_1$ + past [$_{NP}$ N$_3$ [$_{PP5}$ [NP$_5$]]$_3$

La Mònica va fer una trucada a l'Eva

The account above differs substantially from Di Sciullo and Rosen's (1990) analysis of *FER* light verb constructions in Romance. Building upon Grimshaw (1990), Di Sciullo and Rosen argue that obligatory subject coreference in *FER* light verb constructions results from the assumption that in these structures the surface subject is actually licensed by the light verb, since the external argument of the noun predicate is lexically suppressed. To account for cases where the nominal licenses its own agent distinct from the matrix subject (e.g. *la Mònica descrivia la trucada* ***de l'Ali*** *a l'Eva* 'Mònica described **Ali's** call to Eva), we would presumably have to claim that the highest argument of event nominals is lexically suppressed only with certain verbs (the light *FER* and *COMENÇAR* types), but not with others (non-control verbs and *PROMETRE*-type verbs). Such an analysis misses a key generalization captured by my proposal: verbs in the *COMENÇAR* and light *FER* class, unlike *DESCRIURE*- and *PROMETRE*-type verbs, must 'share' the highest argument of the event noun because they involve obligatory subject control into nominals. In my proposal, then, there is no need for construction-specific mechanisms to either guarantee argument-sharing or lexically suppress the highest argument of the noun predicate.

The analysis above also differs from Jackendoff and Culicover's (2005) account of light verb constructions. Building upon Jun (2003; cited in 2005: 223), Jackendoff and Culicover claim that in light verb constructions like English *take a walk* the Conceptual Structure of the event nominal, instead of serving as a semantic argument of the light verb, is unified with the CS of the verb as a whole. The composite CS has an argument structure that reflects the common arguments of the verb and the nominal, allowing for the possibility that the nominal may also license extra material not present in the light verb. According to Jackendoff and Culicover, light verbs license no meaning of their own—they license only syntax and phonology. Their sole role in the semantics is to "provide a

frame that can be aligned with the meaning of the nominal, so that the syntactic argument structures of the nominal and the light verb can be pooled to form a common semantic structure" (2005: 224–225). As Jackendoff and Culicover note, this unification analysis must assume that light verbs are semantically vacuous because if the light verb contributed any semantic content to the light verb construction, the unified CS would have segments mapped simultaneously to two lexical items. This situation would violate a lexicalization constraint requiring that, given a CS to be expressed, every segment of it must be licensed by exactly one lexical item.

The unification analysis proposed by Jackendoff and Culicover seems appropriate for light verbs that are in fact semantically vacuous, as is the case, for example, of Romance *TENIR* 'have' in cases like *l'Eva té por* 'Eva has fear/is afraid' (cf. Mirto 1990; Alba-Salas 2002). However, the assumption that light verbs necessarily license no meaning of their own contradicts the observation that light verbs fall in a continuum of semantic defectiveness, with some verbs being capable of imposing certain semantic restrictions (Kearns 1989; Di Sciullo & Rosen 1990; Pelletier 1990; Kim 1994; Butt 1995; Matsumoto 1996; Miyamoto 1999; Alonso Ramos 1998; Alba-Salas 2002). For example, as Alonso Ramos (1998; 2004) shows, light verbs like Spanish *gozar (de)* 'enjoy' can only combine with nominals designating positive states, as in *gozar de buena salud/mucha popularidad* 'enjoy good health/a lot of popularity', cf. **gozar de mala salud/odio* lit. 'enjoy bad health/hatred'. Conversely, the light verb *cometer* 'commit', which has a clearly negative denotation, only accepts nouns designating errors (e.g. *equivocación* 'mistake'), crimes (e.g. *robo* 'theft'), bad deeds (e.g. *pecado* 'sin') or certain infelicitous actions (e.g. *desliz* 'faux-pas'), but not nouns designating positive events, such as **cometer un acierto/milagro /matrimonio* lit. 'commit a good decision/miracle/marriage' (examples from Alonso Ramos 1998: 177–179). A similar situation is found with the light verbs considered here. For example, whereas Italian *effettuare* 'do', Spanish *realizar* 'carry out' and Catalan *plantar* 'give' require truly agentive subjects, the subject of light *FER* is potentially agentive, though not always interpreted as bringing about a voluntary action (cf. Italian *fare/*effettuare una caduta* 'fall', see section 2.1.2). Unlike Jackendoff and Culicover's proposal, my analysis recognizes different degrees of semantic defectiveness in light verbs, but it does not critically hinge on the assumption that such verbs must be devoid of any lexical meaning.

4. The double analysis of prepositional complements

As we saw in section 1.2, one of the puzzles posed by Romance structures with event nouns involves the syntactic status of certain prepositional complements. The phenomenon was first noted by linguists working on French light verb constructions (Gross 1976; Giry-Schneider 1978a; 1978b; 1987), and it is known in the literature as the *double analyse* or double analysis.

The *double analyse* is typically found in light verb constructions like (71).

(71) a. La Mònica i l'Ester (li) van fer una trucada a l'Eva.
the Mònica and the-Ester to-her PST make a call to the-Eva
'Mònica and Ester gave Eva a call.'

b. L'Eva va fer un parell de viatges a Austràlia.
the-Eva PST make a couple of trips to/in Australia
'Eva took a couple of trips to/in Australia.'

c. L'Eva va fer/realitzar una investigació sobre/de l'incident.
the-Eva PST make/conduct an investigation about/of the-incident
'Eva did/conducted an investigation about/of the incident.'

As (72) illustrates, in these light verb constructions we can cliticize the entire *event noun + prepositional complement* sequence (a), the event noun without the prepositional complement (b), or the prepositional complement alone (c). These options indicate that the prepositional complement can be analyzed either as being inside the NP headed by the event noun (73) or as a direct syntactic dependent of the light verb (74).[24]

(72) a. [**Aquella trucada a l'Eva**] **la** van fer la Mònica i l'Ester.
that call to the-Eva it PST make the Mònica and the-Ester
lit. 'That call to Eva Mònica and Ester made it.'

[24] Besides pronominalization, another test for the *double analyse* that has been traditionally used in the literature is movement or clefting (e.g. *És [a l'Eva] que la Mònica va fer una trucada* 'it is [Eva] who Mònica gave a call'). However, as Alba-Salas (2002) shows, clefting is not a reliable diagnostic. The same is true of cliticization with *en/ne* 'of it' in Catalan and Italian. In fact, only pronominalization with direct and indirect object clitics and (in the case of Catalan and Italian) adverbial *hi/ci* 'there' are reliable tests.

b. [**Aquella trucada**] **la** van fer **[a l'Eva]**, no al Pere.
that call it PST made to the-Eva not to-thePere
'That call they made to Eva, not to Pere.'

c. [**A l'Eva**] **li** van fer **[aquella trucada]** sense avisar-la
to the-Eva to-her PST make that call without warn-her

abans.
before
'They gave Eva that call without warning her beforehand.'

(73) La Mònica i l'Ester van fer **[**$_{NP}$ aquella trucada **[**a l'Eva**]]**.

(74) La Mònica i l'Ester van fer **[**$_{NP}$ aquella trucada**]** a l'Eva.

Unlike these light verb constructions, heavy verb structures such as (75) lack a *double analyse*. In fact, here we can only pronominalize the event noun and the prepositional complement as a single constituent. The prepositional complement, then, is not a direct syntactic dependent of the verb.[25]

[25] As Bach and Horn (1976) first noted, a few heavy verb constructions do show a double analysis. This possibility is illustrated in (i), based on Bach and Horn (1976: 283). As (ii) shows, here we can pronominalize *his first five books* alone (a) or together with *about Nixon* (b). Thus, (i) can have two analyses: one where *about Nixon* is a direct syntactic dependent of *write*; and another one where the prepositional complement is inside the NP headed by *books*. As Bach and Horn also note, the two structures are associated with different interpretations, due to a quantifier scope ambiguity. In (iia), where *about Nixon* is not under the scope of the quantifier, we are talking about the first five books that John ever wrote, which happened to be all about Nixon. By contrast, in (iib), where the quantifier has scope over the entire NP *books about Nixon*, we are talking about the first five books about Nixon that John wrote, even if they were his sixteenth through twentieth books. As (iii) illustrates, this syntactic and semantic ambiguity is not found with most other heavy verbs (example from Bach & Horn 1976: 282).

(i) John wrote his first five books about Nixon.
(ii) a. John wrote **them** [about Nixon].
b. John wrote **them**.
(iii) a. John destroyed his first five books about Nixon.
b. *John destroyed **them** [about Nixon].
c. John destroyed **them**.

The semantic ambiguity that Bach and Horn noted in the case of *write* is also found in light verb constructions with a *double analyse*. In (iv), for example, we could be talking

(75) a. [Aquella trucada a l'Eva] la Mònica no **la** recordava.
that call to the-Eva the Mònica not it remembered
'That call to Eva Mònica didn't remember.'
b. *[Aquella trucada] la Mònica no **la** recordava [a l'Eva].
that call the Mònica not it remembered to the-Eva
lit. 'That call, Mònica didn't remember it to Eva.'
c. *[A l'Eva] la Mònica no **li** recordava [aquella trucada].
to the-Eva the Mònica not to-her remembered that call
lit. 'To Eva Mònica didn't remember that call.' [impossible with intended meaning)

Structures where *COMENÇAR*- and *PROMETRE*-type verbs combine with event nouns also lack a *double analyse* (76), even though, as we have repeatedly noted, many of these control verbs show restructuring with infinitivals or gerunds (cf. notes 7 and 22).

(76) a. [Aquella trucada a l'Eva] **la** va començar a les vuit.
that call to the-Eva it PST began at the eight
'That call to Eva she began at eight o'clock.'
b. *[Aquella trucada] **la** va començar [a l'Eva].
that call it PST begin to the-Eva
lit. 'That call, she began it to Eva.'
c. *[A l'Eva] **li** va començar [aquella trucada].
to the-Eva to-her PST begin that call
lit. 'To Eva she began that call to her.'

In Catalan and Italian the lack of a *double analyse* with *COMENÇAR*- and *PROMETRE*-type verbs is also corroborated by adverbial cliticization. Consider the example in (77). Here the complement *a Angola* 'in/to Angola' is ambiguous: it can be a locative licensed by *començar* (≈ 'the army began an evacuation of the wounded, and they began it in Angola') or

---

about the first five trips that Mònica ever took, which happened to be all to Australia (ivb) or the first five trips to Australia that Mònica took, even if there might have been other previous trips elsewhere (ivc). My claim is that the ambiguity found with heavy verbs like *write* stems from the same factors that account for the *double analyse* in light verb constructions (see below for an account).

(iv) a. La Mònica va fer els seus cinc primer viatges a Australia.
'Mònica took her first five trips to/in Australia.'
b. La Mònica va fer [els seus cinc primer viatges] [a Australia].
c. La Mònica va fer [els seus cinc primer viatges a Australia].

a directional licensed by *evacuació* 'evacuation' (≈ 'the army began an evacuation of the wounded, who were evacuated to Angola').[26] As (78) shows, when we pronominalize *a Angola* with the adverbial clitic *hi* 'there', we only have the locative reading. The structure lacks a directional reading because *hi* can only target the direct syntactic dependent of a verb, and the directional complement licensed by *evacuació* is inside the NP headed by the event noun. This situation contrasts with what we find in constructions like (79), where the control verb takes an infinitival, rather than a nominal, complement. As we can see, (79)—unlike (78)—is still ambiguous between a directional and a locational reading. The ambiguity confirms that in the infinitival construction, contrary to what we saw in (78), *a Angola* can be analyzed as a direct syntactic dependent of either the infinitive or the control verb—a defining property of restructuring.

(77) L'ONU començà l'evacuació dels ferits a Angola.
the-UN began the-evacuation of-the wounded to/in Angola
'The UN began the evacuation of the wounded **to/in** Angola.'

(78) L'ONU **hi** començà l'evacuació dels ferits.
the-UN there began the-evacuation of-the wounded
'The UN began the evacuation of the wounded there [= **in/*to** Angola].'

(79) L'ONU **hi** començà a evacuar els ferits.
the-UN there began to evacuate the wounded
'The UN began to evacuate the wounded there [= **in/to** Angola].'

Although light verb constructions typically show a *double analyse*, not all of them do. In fact, certain prepositional complements in these structures cannot be analyzed as direct syntactic dependents of the light verb. For example, in (80) the complement specifying the amount of the payment (*de 300 euros* 'of 300 euros') can only be analyzed as being inside the maximal projection of the event noun. By contrast, the other prepositional

[26] The ambiguity is due to the polysemy of the preposition *a* in Catalan, which is both directional ('to') and locative ('in/at'). The example in (77) also has a third interpretation where *a Angola* is a locative licensed by the event noun, roughly paraphraseable as 'the army began an evacuation of the wounded—an evacuation that took place in Angola'. I am ignoring this third option for simplicity.

complement (the dative *a l'Enric* 'to Enric') shows a double analysis. This contrast is evidenced by the pronominalization facts in (81).[27]

(80) L'Eva va fer un pagament de 300 euros a l'Enric.
the-Eva PST make a payment of 300 euros to the-Enric
'Eva made a payment of 300 euros to Enric.'

(81) a. [Aquell pagament de 300 euros a l'Enric] **el** va fer l'Eva.
that payment of 300 euros to the-Enric it PST make the-Eva
'That payment of 300 euros to Enric Eva made.'
b. [Aquell pagament de 300 euros] **l'hi** va fer [a l'Enric].
that payment of 300 euros it-to-him PST make to the-Enric
lit. 'That payment of 300 euros she made to Enric.'
c. *[Aquell pagament a l'Enric] **el** va fer [de 300 euros].
that payment to the-Enric it PST make of 300 euros
lit. 'That payment to Enric she made of 300 euros.'
d. *[Aquell pagament] **el** va fer [de 300 euros] [a l'Enric].
that payment it PST make of 300 euros to the-Enric
lit. 'That payment she made of 300 euros to Enric.'

We can account for the *double analyse* if we assume that the prepositional complement(s) showing this structural ambiguity can be licensed either by the event noun (in which case the complement appears inside its NP projection) or by the verb itself (in which case it is a direct syntactic dependent of this verb). Unlike restructuring, then, the *double analyse* is an illusion. In fact, the semantic arguments of the event noun always appear inside its maximal projection, as represented in (70) above. The representation where the prepositional complement is a direct dependent of the verb is shown in (82).

[27] I thank an anonymous reviewer for providing example (80) and suggesting the gist of the analysis developed below. The formal implementation of the analysis and all comparisons with other proposals reflect my own contributions.

(82) a. L'Eva va fer [una investigació] [de/sobre l'incident]. [cf. (71c)]
'Eva did an investigation of/about the incident.'

b. [FER (EVA$_2^{\alpha}$, ([INVESTIGACIÓ (α_4, β_5)]$_3$); [DE (INCIDENT$_5^{\beta}$)]]$_1$

[GF$_2$ > GF$_3$ GF$_5$]$_1$ [GF$_4$ > GF$_5$]$_3$

[NP$_2$ V$_1$ + past NP$_3$ [$_{PP5}$ [NP$_5$]]$_1$

L'Eva va fer una investigació de/sobre l'incident

In (82) *de/sobre l'incident* 'of/about the incident' is an adjunct licensed by the light verb at CS. This 'about' complement is a semantic modifier of the event designated by the light verb, i.e. 'the event of *x* (Eva) bringing about action *y* (an investigation)'. The 'about' complement is interpreted as being coreferential with the unspecified theme argument of the event noun (the object of the investigation) through variable binding. The claim is that at CS the event noun *investigació* 'investigation' licenses an unspecified theme as a variable (β_5) bound by the 'about' complement of light *FER*. Again, this claim capitalizes on the assumption that all the arguments of nominals, unlike those of verbs, are semantically obligatory but syntactically optional, so the unspecified theme of *investigació* is present at the level of CS but is not linked to the syntactic tier (see 3.1).

The same analysis applies to other types of prepositional complements found in light verb constructions, including directional or locative complements like *l'Eva va fer un viatge* ***a Austràlia*** 'Eva took a trip **to/in Austràlia**' and goals or benefactives such as *la Mònica va fer una trucada* ***a l'Eva*** 'Mònica gave **Eva** a call', among others. As in the case of 'about' adjuncts, such complements can be licensed by the light verb because they are semantically compatible with the general event designated by this verb.

This proposal explains why in examples like *l'Eva va fer un pagament de 300 euros a l'Enric* 'Eva made a payment of 300 euros to Enric' in (80) only the dative complement *a l'Enric* 'to Enric', but not *de 300 euros* 'of 300 euros', is subject to a *double analyse*, cf. (81). The contrast stems from the fact that whereas the dative can be licensed by either the event noun or the light verb, the amount associated with the financial transaction designated by *pagament* 'payment' can only be a

semantic argument of this nominal. In fact, *de 300 euros* cannot be licensed by light *FER* because the very general event designated by the light verb is semantically incompatible with such a modifier (whereas we can *bring about an action* ***somewhere***, ***about something*** or ***for someone's benefit***, we cannot #*bring about an action* ***of a certain amount of money***).[28]

My proposal differs from other accounts of the *double analyse*, where the prepositional complement is a semantic argument of the event noun even when it behaves as a direct syntactic dependent of the light verb (Mirto 1986; Alba-Salas 2002; 2004; cf. Abeillé 1988). In Mirto's (1986)

[28] For simplicity, the discussion above assumes that when the prepositional complement is a direct syntactic dependent of the light verb, it is formally licensed by this verb directly. However, my proposal is also compatible with other options. For example, the dative complement in *la Mònica va fer una trucada* ***a l'Eva*** 'Mònica gave **Eva** a call' could be licensed by a special Construction in the technical sense proposed by Goldberg (1995) (for clarity, I use a capital *C* to refer to this specialized use of the term *construction*). Specifically, this complement could be licensed by the same purpose Construction that Jackendoff (1990), Goldberg (1995), and Jackendoff and Culicover (2005) posit for cases such as *John baked a cake/fixed a drink for Bill*. As these linguists note, verbs such as *bake* and *fix* differ from true ditransitives like *give* and *send* in that they do not select three arguments (for example, whereas one cannot give something without giving it to someone, one can bake something without the inherent intent of doing it for someone else's benefit). According to Goldberg, Jackendoff and Culicover, *bake* and *fix* are inherently two-argument verbs, so their indirect objects are not their semantic arguments. Instead, their datives are semantic constituents of a conventionalized purpose modifier that could be informally stated as 'with the purpose of *x* (e.g. the cake) benefiting NP' (in the case of *for*-datives) or 'with the purpose of NP receiving *x* (e.g. the ball)' (in the case of *to*-datives). These constituents are installed in indirect object position by a special VP Construction that is sensitive to the semantics of the verb. Building upon this analysis, we could claim that the indirect object of *FER* and other light verbs that are not inherently ditransitive (e.g. Catalan *realitzar* 'do' and Spanish *efectuar* 'carry out) are licensed by a purpose (*to*-dative) Construction. Under this proposal, the *double analyse* of examples like *la Mònica va fer una trucada* ***a l'Eva*** would stem from the fact that the dative complement can be licensed by the event noun (in which case it appears inside the NP headed by the noun) or by the purpose Construction (in which case it is a direct syntactic dependent of the light verb). Nothing in my analysis critically hinges on the precise mechanism(s) licensing these dative complements and other *double analyse* complements as direct syntactic dependents of the light verb. What matters here is that, regardless of whether they are licensed by a special Construction or by the light verb directly, when these complements can be analyzed as direct syntactic dependents of the verb, they are not semantic arguments of the event noun.

Relational Grammar (RG) account, the two structures associated with the *double analyse* derive from a single underlying representation where the event nominal and its prepositional complement appear inside an embedded clause. If no special syntactic process applies, the sentence shows the same surface constituent structure. The representations where the event noun and its complement are each direct dependents of the light verb are derived via one of two alternative mechanisms that split the *noun + complement* sequence into two separate constituents. One option is for the event noun alone to be raised into the matrix clause, leaving the complement inside the complex NP. The other option involves Clause Union, which collapses the originally biclausal structure into a single clause, so that both the event noun and its complement become direct syntactic dependents of the light verb. This proposal does not explain what motivates Raising and Clause Union in the first place, so it must rely on ad-hoc stipulations to explain why some structures, but not others, show a *double analyse* (Alba-Salas 2002). More importantly, the proposal does not explain why in cases like *l'Eva va fer un pagament de 300 euros a l'Enric* 'Eva made a payment of 300 euros to Enric' in (80) only one of the prepositional complements can be analyzed as a direct syntactic dependent of the light verb.

Similar limitations are found in Alba-Salas (2002; 2004)—an analysis that is also articulated within RG. According to Alba-Salas (2002; 2004), the *double analyse* arises from lexical properties of the light verb. Specifically, it arises because *FER* and similar light verbs have two variants: as subject control verbs, and as serializers. Both variants license the same array of arguments: a semantically bleached agent and an event linked to its nominal complement. The control variant maps the event onto an embedded clause headed by the event nominal and requires its subject to bind the subject of the noun predicate. By contrast, the serial variant maps the event onto a 'bare' predicate (the event nominal), and it inherits all the arguments of this inner predicate, including its subject. Because of the two subcategorization options, structures with light *FER* can be either biclausal or monoclausal. The biclausal structure involves subject control. Here the prepositional complement appears inside the embedded clause headed by the event noun. By contrast, the monoclausal structure involves serialization in Rosen's (1997) sense, so the verb and the event noun 'stack up' one after another under a single clause node. Here the prepositional complement is a direct syntactic dependent of the light verb. According to

Alba-Salas (2002; 2004), light verb constructions that lack a *double analyse* only have a subject control representation. The absence of a monoclausal structure follows from the assumption that the event nouns found in these light verb constructions select only control *FER*, but not its serial variant. The claim is that action nouns in Romance select both control and serial *FER* by default (hence the *double analyse*), but that certain nouns select only the control variant, so their prepositional complement must remain inside their maximal projection. This proposal has two limitations. The first one stems from the assumption that different event nouns select different variants of light *FER*. It is true that in light verb constructions the event noun seems to lexically select the light verb that combines with it (La Fauci 1980; Abeillé 1988; Danlos 1992; Gross 1996; Alonso Ramos 1998; 2004; Štichauer 2000; Alba-Salas 2002).[29] The problem is that the two putative variants of light *FER* differ in their subcategorization frame, but not in their semantic properties. Since there is no semantic contrast, we have no independent evidence to verify the claim that different nouns select one variant or the other. In fact, the distinction between both variants must be predicated on the basis of the presence or absence of a *double analyse*—the very empirical contrast that such a distinction is meant to explain. Hence, the account is circular. The second, more important limitation is that this account, like Mirto's, does not explain why in light verb constructions such as (80) only the dative complement, but not the other prepositional phrase, shows a *double analyse*. Again, the problem is that the proposal predicts that **all** the prepositional complements found in light verb constructions must either appear inside the maximal projection of the event noun or be direct dependents of the light verb.

5. Conclusions

This paper has focused on Romance structures involving a verb and an event noun in complement position. The analysis has addressed three

[29] This claim is corroborated by the fact that (i) the choice of verb may vary across languages, (ii) *light verb + event noun* combinations can vary diachronically within the same language, and (iii) at any synchronic stage of the language state nouns that are close in meaning and aspectual properties may combine with different verbs (see Alonso Ramos 1998; 2004; Alba-Salas 2002, among others).

puzzles posed by such structures. The first puzzle is why the agent of the event noun is obligatorily coreferential with the subject of verbs like *COMENÇAR* 'begin' and light *FER* 'do/make', but not of verbs like *PROMETRE* 'promise' and *DESCRIURE* 'describe'. The answer is that verbs like *COMENÇAR* and light *FER*, but not verbs like *DESCRIURE* and *PROMETRE*, show obligatory subject control into nominals, on a par with control into infinitivals and gerunds. The second puzzle is why verbs like *PROMETRE* show obligatory subject coreference with infinitives or gerunds, but not with event nominals. The solution is that *PROMETRE*-type verbs come in two variants: as control verbs that subcategorize for infinitival or gerundive complements, and as ordinary (i.e. non-control) verbs that combine with nominals. Finally, the third puzzle is why the prepositional complement in some of these *verb + event noun* structures can be analyzed as either appearing inside the NP headed by the event noun or as a direct syntactic dependent of the verb. The answer is that this double analysis arises because the complement can be licensed either by the event noun (in which case it appears inside the NP headed by the nominal) or by the verb itself (in which case the complement is a direct syntactic dependent of this verb).

According to my analysis, Romance verbs that show obligatory subject control into nominals—just like 'traditional' control verbs—select an event complement linked to the noun predicate in complement position, binding the highest argument of the nominal at the level of Conceptual Structure. By contrast, verbs that do not show obligatory control (including the non-control variant of *PROMETRE*-type predicates) are ordinary heavy verbs that assign a theme role to their noun complement and do not bind the highest argument of this nominal. The coreference options found with these verbs follow from pragmatic or discourse factors (i.e. the availability of antecedents in the surrounding context), not from a formal control relationship.

Following Jackendoff and Culicover (2003; 2005), my proposal has emphasized the role of lexical semantics in control patterns. The cases discussed here—including structures with both nominals and infinitivals or gerunds—are consistent with Jackendoff and Culicover's claim that predicates selecting voluntary action complements show obligatory control, but that certain verbs selecting situational complements can also show obligatory control. Capitalizing on this claim, I have proposed positing a

general lexical principle that automatically identifies verbs selecting voluntary action complements as involving obligatory control, leaving lexical marking only for verbs that deviate from this default pattern.

All in all, the analysis developed here suggests that verbs showing obligatory subject control differ in two important respects. Semantically, they differ as to whether they license a controlled event of the actional or the situational type. Syntactically, the difference is whether the control verb selects for an infinitive or gerund (in the case of the *PROMETRE* class), a nominal (in the case of light verbs), or both (in the case of *COMENÇAR*-type verbs). Aside from this categorial contrast, subject control into nominals is not essentially different from control into infinitivals or gerunds.

References

Abeillé, Anne (1988) Light verb constructions and extraction out of NP in Tree Adjoining Grammar. *Papers from the Regional Meetings, Chicago Linguistic Society* 24: 1–16.

Aissen, Judith & Permutter, David (1976) Clause reduction in Spanish. In Henry Thompson et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp. 1–30. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Alba-Salas, Josep (2002) *Light Verb Constructions in Romance: A Syntactic Analysis*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

—— (2004) *Fare* Light Verb Constructions and Italian causatives: understanding the differences. *Italian Journal of Linguistics / Rivista di Linguistica* 16: 183–223.

Alexiadou, Artemis (2001) *Functional Structure in Nominals: Nominalization and Ergativity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alonso Ramos, Margarita (1998) *Étude sémantico-syntaxique des constructions à verbe support*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Montreal.

—— (2004) *Las construcciones con verbo de apoyo*. Madrid: Visor Libros.

Bach, Emmon & Horn, George (1976) Remarks on 'Conditions on Transformations'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7: 265–361.

Boeckx, Cedric & Hornstein, Norbert (2003) Reply to 'Control is not movement'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 269–280.

Bresnan, Joan (1982) Control and complementation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 343–434.

Burzio, Luigi (1986) *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Cattell, Ray (1984) *Composite Predicates in English*. Orlando: Academic Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1970) Remarks on nominalizations. In Roderick A. Jacobs & Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, pp. 184–221. Waltham: Ginn.

—— (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Chomsky, Noam & Lasnik, Howard (1993) The theory of Principles and Parameters. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, pp. 506–569. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Cicalese, Anna (1995) L'analisi dei nomi operatori con il verbo *fare*. In Emilio D'Agostino (ed.), *Tra sintassi e semantica*, pp. 113–165. Napoli: Loffreddo.
Clements, J. Clancy (1992) Semantics of control, tense sequencing and disjoint reference. In Paul Hirschbühler & Konrad Koerner (eds.), pp. 45–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Culicover, Peter W. & Jackendoff, Ray (2001) Control is not movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 493–512.
Danlos, Laurence (1992) Support verb constructions: linguistic properties, representation, translation. *Journal of French Language Studies* 2: 1–32.
Di Sciullo, Anna Maria & Rosen, Sara Thomas (1990) Light and semi-light verb constructions. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrel & Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (eds.), pp. 109–125. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Dubinsky, Stanley (1990) Light verbs and predicate demotion in Japanese. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrel & Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (eds.), pp. 127–145. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Dziwirek, K., Farrell, P. & Mejias-Bikandi, E. (eds.) (1990) *Grammatical Relations: A Cross-theoretical Perspective*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Giry-Schneider, Jacqueline (1978a) Interprétation aspectuelle des constructions verbals à double analyse. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 2: 23–53.
—— (1978b) *Les nominalisations en français: l'opérateur 'faire' dans le lexique*. Geneva: Droz.
—— (1984) Le verbe causative *faire* dans ses constructions nominals. In Alain Guillet & Nunzio La Fauci (eds.), *Lexique-Grammaire des langues romanes: Actes du Premier Colloque Européen sur la Grammaire et le Lexique Comparés des Langues Romanes*, pp. 91–128. Ámsterdam: John Benjamins.
—— (1987) *Les prédicats nominaux en français: les phrases à verbe-support*. Geneva: Droz.
Goldberg, Adele (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Gomes Pires, Acrisio Magno (2001) *The Syntax of Gerunds and Infinitives: Subjects, Case and Control*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Maryland.
Grimshaw, Jane (1990) *Argument Structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Grimshaw, Jane & Mester, Armin (1988) Light verbs and (theta)-marking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 205–232.
Gross, Gaston (1989) *Les constructions converses du français*. Geneva: Droz.

Gross, Maurice (1976) Sur quelques groupes nominaux complexes. In Jean-Claude Chevalier & Maurice Gross (eds.), *Méthodes en grammaire française*, pp. 97–119. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.

—— (1981) Les bases empiriques de la notion de prédicat sémantique. *Langages* 15: 7–52.

—— (1996) Les verbes supports d'adjectifs et le passif. *Langages* 30: 8–18.

Hirschbühler, P. & Koerner, K. (eds.) (1992) *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hornstein, Norbert (1999) Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69–96.

Jackendoff, Ray (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

—— (1985) Believing and intending: two sides of the same coin. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 445–460.

—— (1990) *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

—— (2002) *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Jackendoff, Ray & Culicover, Peter W. (2003) The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79: 517–556.

Jackendoff, Ray & Culicover, Peter W. (2005) *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Jespersen, Otto (1954) *A Modern English Grammar*. New York: Barnes and Noble.

Kayne, Richard (1991) Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–686.

Kim, Sun Woong (1994) A study on the light verb construction in English and Korean. *Ohak Yonku/Language Research* 30: 137–159.

La Fauci, Nunzio (1980) Aspects du mouvement de *wh-*, verbes supports, double analyse, complétives au subjonctif en italien: pour une description compacte. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 4: 293–341.

—— (1996) Dépendance et intégration syntaxique, du point de vue non-linéaire. In Claude Muller (ed.), *Dépendence et intégration syntaxique: subordination, coordination, connexion*, pp. 211–220. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

—— (1997) Sulla struttura proposizionale delle costruzioni con nome predicativo e verbo-supporto. In Riccardo Ambrosini, Maria Bologna, Filippo Motta & Chatia Orlando (eds.), *Scríbthair a ainm n-agaim: Scritti in memoria di Enrico Campanile*, pp. 467–490. Pisa: Pacini.

La Fauci, Nunzio & Mirto, Ignazio (1985) Sulla complementarietà di *fare* causativo e *fare* supporto. *Linguistica e letteratura* 10: 27–45.

Landau, Idan (2003) Movement out of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 471–498.

Larson, Richard (1991) *Promise* and the theory of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 103–139.

Lasnik, Howard (1988) Subjects and the theta-criterion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 1–17.

Manzini, M. Rita & Roussou, Anna (2000) A Minimalist theory of A-movement and control. *Lingua* 110: 409–447.
Martin, Roger (1996) *A Minimalist Theory of PRO and Control*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
—— (2001) Null case and the distribution of PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 141–166.
Matsumoto, Yo (1992) *On the Wordhood of Complex Predicates in Japanese*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.
—— (1996) A syntactic account of light verb phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 5: 107–149.
Mirto, Ignazio (1986) *Relational Grammar: Clause Union, Lexique-grammaire: double analyse. Problematiche a confronto*. M.A. Thesis, Università degli Studi di Palermo.
—— (1990) Nouns as auxiliated predicates. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrel & Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (eds.), pp. 279–303. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Miyamoto, Tadao (1999) *The Light Verb Construction in Japanese: The Role of the Verbal Noun.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Napoli, Donna Jo (1981) Semantic interpretation vs. lexical governance: clitic climbing in Italian. *Language* 57: 841–887.
Narcross, Tara Lee (2000) *Infinitival Complementation in Selected Spanish Verbs of Influence: A Diachronic Investigation of Argument Structure and Surface Structure*. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University.
Ogawa, Yoshiki (2001) *A Unified Theory of Verbal and Nominal Projections*. New York: Oxford University Press.
O'Neil, John (1997) *Means of Control: Deriving the Properties of PRO in the Minimalist Program*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
Pelletier, Rosanne (1990) Light verbs in Telugu: a Clause Union analysis. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrel & Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (eds.), pp. 335–347. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Picallo, M. Carme (1990) Modal verbs in Catalan. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8: 285–312.
Polinsky, Maria & Postdam, Eric (2002) Backward control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 245–282.
Postal, Paul M. (1969) Anaphoric islands. In Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 205–235. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
—— (1974) *On Raising: One Rule of Grammar and Its Theoretical Implications*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Pustejovsky, James (1995) *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Rizzi, Luigi (1982) *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rooryck, Johan (1992) On the distinction between raising and control. In Paul Hirschbühler & Konrad Koerner (eds.), pp. 225–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Rosen, Carol (1987) Star means bad: a syntactic divertimento for Italianists. *Italica* 64: 443–476.
—— (1997) Auxiliation and serialization: on discerning the difference. In Alex Alsina, Joan Bresnan & Peter Sells (eds), *Complex Predicates*, pp. 175–202. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
Rosenbaum, Peter S. (1967) *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Safir, Ken (1987) The syntactic projection of lexical thematic structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 561–601.
Sag, Ivan & Pollard, Carl (1991) An integrated theory of complement control. *Language* 67: 63–113.
Štichauer, Pavel (2000) Su alcune construzioni con verbo supporto in italiano. *Linguistica Pragensia* 10: 37–50.
Terada, Michiko (1990) *Incorporation and Argument Structure in Japanese*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
Terzi, Arhonto (1996) Clitic climbing from finite clauses and tense raising. *Probus* 8: 273–295.
Van Hout, Angeliek & Roeper, Thomas (1998) Events and aspectual structure in derivational morphology. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 32: 175–220.
Van Valin, Robert & LaPolla, Randy (1997) *Syntax: Structure, Meaning, and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Williams, Edwin (1980) Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203–238.
—— (1985) PRO and subject of NP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 297–315.

Contact information:

Josep Alba-Salas
College of the Holy Cross
P.O. Box 138A
One College Street
Worcester, MA, 01610-2395
USA
e-mail: jalba(at-sign)holycross(dot)edu