Conflation and Flavors of v in the Agent/ECM Correlation
Yuki Ito (UMD)

Pesetsky (92) notes two classes of exceptions to the generalization that agentive verbs do not allow ECM (the Agent/ECM Correlation). This paper argues that the two classes of exceptions can be uniformly treated as causatives. Building on Ito's (2014) analysis of the *wager*-class verbs and adopting the l-syntactic approach (e.g. Hale and Keyser 93, Mateu 12), the ECM possibility with these verbs is attributed to the position the root occupies in the structure.

The first class of exceptions: The contrast between the *believe*-class and the *wager*-class verbs led Pesetsky (92) to formulate the Agent/ECM Correlation:

(1) Mary {believed/considered/*wagered/*said/*claimed/*yelled} Bill to have read the book.

(2) Agent/ECM Correlation: If α assigns the θ-role Agent, α Case-marks β only if α θ-marks β

P eschewed directly referring to ECM because there is a class of agentive verbs that allow ECM:

(3) a. Congress declared March to be National Syntax Month.
    b. The king decreed March 1992 to have 32 days.
    c. The judge ruled Bill to be competent to stand trial.   (Pesetsky 92:21)

The narrow scope possibility establishes that these are indeed cases of ECM:

(4) a. The Oyster Council declared no month to be an Oyster Month that does not have an *r* in it.
    b. The judge ruled only Sue to have cause for action.   (Pesetsky 92:21)

P suggests that these cases involve double θ-marking of the infinitival subject, and extends the analysis to *estimate* (Postal 74):

(5) a. Sue estimated Bill's weight to be 150 lbs.   (6) a. Sue estimated Bill's weight.
    b. *Sue estimated Bill to weigh 150 lbs.   b. *Sue estimated Bill.

Analysis: I propose that the impression of double θ-marking is an illusion, stemming from the fact that these sentences are instances of resultatives such as *John hammered the metal flat*. The resultatives literature has argued that the thematic relation of the object to the means-describing verb is not part of the semantics of resultatives (Kayne 85, Hoekstra 88, McIntyre 04, Kratzer 05, Williams 08). By analyzing the *declare*-class verbs as resultatives, the apparent double θ-marking comes for free via this extrasemantic inference. **Support** comes from nominalization. Since Chomsky (70), ECM is known to disallow nominalization (**John's belief/believing of Mary to have left*) while resultatives allow nominalization:

(7) a. The watering of tulips flat is a criminal offence in Holland. (Carrier and Randall 92:201)
    b. Kim's hammering of the metal flat   (Borer 13:108)

We observe that the *declare*-class verbs allow nominalization:

(8) a. Congress' declaration of March to be National Syntax Month
    b. ?The king's decree of March 1992 to have 32 days
    c. ?The judge's ruling of Bill to be competent to stand trial

The resultative analysis can **also extend** to the *endorse*-class verbs discussed by Myler (12):

(9) a. I choose John to lead the expedition.   b. He selected Mary to teach theology.
    c. She designated Bill to be the store manager from now on.

(10) a. My choice of John to lead the expedition   b. His selection of Mary to teach theology
    c. Her designation of Bill to be the store manager from now on
    d. My enthusiastic endorsement of Chris Barden to become Minnesota's next Attorney
        General   (Myler 12:109)

This class of verbs is agentive and allows nominalization. Because these verbs can embed infinitives with eventive predicates, M rules out the possibility of ECM. At the same time, since Kayne (83) object control is known to disallow nominalization (**Mary's compulsion of her*

husband to quit his job). For this reason, M leaves this class of verbs as a puzzle. However, there has been a sporadic suggestion that verbs of nomination with nominial complements (e.g. *The queen appointed her lover treasurer of the realm*) are ECM verbs (Stowell 89, Matushansky 08), and Wurmbrand (14) recently shows that ECM infinitives can host future modality and thereby eventive predicates. Then, this class can be analyzed as resultatives involving future ECM. The resultative analysis allows us **a unified treatment of the two classes of exceptions**. The other class of exceptions is causative verbs (*show*, *demonstrate*, *prove*, *reveal*):

(11) {Sue deftly/The horrible weather last summer} showed the Greenhouse Effect to be even
more pernicious than previously thought.   (Pesetsky 92:20-21)

Resultatives are causative sentences built on verbs that are not lexically causative. Hence, the two classes of exceptions can be subsumed under the single umbrella of causatives. Indeed, Bošković (97) observes that when *show*-class verbs are put in a context that forces unambiguously agentive interpretation, ECM becomes degraded (?**For your homework, prove the Case Filter to hold at LF* cf. *For your homework, prove that the Case Filter holds at LF*). This confirms that the causative structure is the key in the possibility of infinitival ECM.

Explaining the ECM possibility: Ito (14) shows that the ECM subject of the *wager*-class verbs can receive Case without A′-movement and ascribes the contrast in (1) to Richards' (10) distinctness condition *$<\alpha,\alpha>$. Specifically, he proposes that the *wager*-class verbs select an infinitival complement with a Case-related projection FP that embeds TP. On the assumption that F(P) and D(P) count as nondistinct, the configuration gives rise to a distinctness violation:

optional A-movement

(12) [$_{vP}$ Mary v [$_{AgroP}$ Agr$_O$ [$_{VP}$ wager [$_{FP}$ F^0 [$_{TP}$ Bill to have read the book]]]]]
Case Case

Postulation of FP is motivated by the fact that for nominal complements the *wager*-class verbs exhibit a selectional property that is different from the *believe*-class (Moulton 08):

(13) a. {Pinchwife does not believe/*Fred said} the rumor that Horner is impotent.
 b. {Consider/*We never thought} the idea that vitamin supplements in pregnancy lead to
    healthy babies.
 c. {Rita held the/*?He yelled his} belief that Jesus will return again.

While agentive verbs have this FP-selection requirement, the common l-syntactic analysis of resultatives introduces the root in such a way that it will not select arguments (*conflation*, Mateu 12), to capture the phenomenon of non-subcategorized objects (*I tore the buttons off the shirt*/*I locked him in the cellar*). Thus, FP is not selected in resultatives. TP is merged as the complement to v$_{CAUS}$; hence distinctness violations do not arise:

(14) [$_{VoiceP}$ Congress Voice [$_{vP}$ [$_{vCAUSE}$ √declare v$_{CAUSE}$] [$_{TP}$ March to be National Syntax M]]]]]

On the other hand, the *wager*-class verbs show the signature properties of *incorporation* such as cognate objects (*John thought a thought*/*He claimed an outrageous claim*/*She whispered a nasty whisper* cf. *dance a dance*). This suggests that the root is merged as the complement of v$_{DO}$, selecting FP (the root taking a complement is not necessary here; the point is that the root partakes in (at least semantic) selection unlike in the conflation structure):

(15) [$_{VoiceP}$ Mary Voice [$_{vP}$ v$_{DO}$ [$_{\sqrt{}P}$ √wager [$_{FP}$ F^0 [$_{TP}$ Bill to have read the book]]]]]]

Postulation of v$_{DO}$ explains Bošković's above observation as a case of contextual allosemy: compatibility with both agent and causer subjects indicates that the root is underspecified for agentivity with this class of verbs; the root is interpreted as agentive in the context of v$_{DO}$.

Ito 14 Raising to object in *wager*/*assure*-class verbs, *SL*. **Myler 12** Light verbs, hidden relatives, and control: the case of derived nominals, *SinSpeC*. **Pesetsky 92** Zero syntax part 2.