Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, **Vol 25, December 2025, pp. 1655-1670**
DOI: 10.15738/kjell.25..202512.1655

KOREAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

ISSN: 1598-1398 / e-ISSN 2586-7474

http://journal.kasell.or.kr

Pseudo-Passives as Control Constructions*

Kwang-sup Kim (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Received: October 16, 2025
Revised: December 9, 2025
Accepted: December 15, 2025

Kim, Kwang-sup
Professor, Dept. of English
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
Tel: 031-330-4294
E-mail: kwangsup@hufs.ac.kr

*This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF-2025S1A5A2A01007637) and the research fund (2025) of Hankuk University of Foreign Studies. I am grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions.

ABSTRACT

Kim, Kwang-sup. 2025. Pseudo-passives as control constructions. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 25, 1655-1670.

The pseudo-passive is characterized by a gap in the complement position of a preposition, with the filler of that gap appearing in subject position. This peculiar syntactic pattern follows if prepositions, like verbs, exhibit a shell structure consisting of a light preposition p^* and a lexical category P. The light preposition p^*, like the light verb v^*, is responsible for Case assignment. Being a bound morpheme, it merges with either P or the preceding verb at PF. This study claims that if it merges with the preceding verb, it fails to assign Case, leaving the complement of P Caseless, and the Caseless DP inside the PP is controlled by the subject. The pseudo-passive is subject to a distinctive semantic condition: it does not describe an event, but rather a property or characteristic of the subject. This follows if the subject is assigned a Character Role by the adjectival passive morpheme *-en* or by T. On this view, the subject is base-generated either in Spec of adjectival passive *-en* or in Spec-T, and it establishes a Form–Copy relation with the Caseless DP inside the PP. In short, the pseudo-passive is analyzed as a control construction.

KEYWORDS

pseudo-passive, control, shell structure, light preposition, Form-Copy

1. Introduction

It is well-known that an argument cannot be assigned Case twice. However, pseudo-passives are quite peculiar in that the subject DP is associated with the complement position of a preposition: that is, the same DP is associated with two Case positions: SPEC-T and the complement position of a preposition.

(1) a. The hat was sat upon.
b. These carpets have never been walked on.

A plausible approach to this peculiarity is to argue that in (1a), *sit upon* forms a constituent through reanalysis, and as result, *the hat* is the complement of *sit upon*, not *upon* (Riemsdijk 1978, Hornstein and Weinberg 1981, Kayne 1984, Radford 1988).[1]

(2) a. [was [sat [upon the hat]]]: Reanalysis
b. [was [[sat upon] the hat]]: Passivization
c. [the hat was [[sat upon] ~~the hat~~]]

If this approach is correct, it is predicted that *sit upon* must be a constituent in the active as well as in the passive. However, there are insurmountable pieces of evidence that it cannot be a constituent in the active (Postal 1986, Koster 1987, and Baltin and Postal 1996). For instance, in the active counterpart of (1a), *the hat* cannot be conjoined with the contrastive coordinator *not ... but*, as shown in (3a-b). This is unexpected because objects can be conjoined with it, as illustrated in (4a-b).

(3) a. John sat upon the chair.
b. *John sat upon not the chair but the hat.[2]
(4) a. John bought a chair.
b. John bought not a chair but a hat.

This suggests that *the hat* is not the complement of *sat upon* in (3a): that is, (3a) must be analyzed as (6), not as (5).

(5) *John [[$_V$ sat upon] the chair].
(6) John sat [$_{PP}$ upon a hat].

We are now in a dilemma. If we assume that (1a) is analyzed as (2c), we can explain why *the hat* can undergo passivization. That is, if *sit upon* is a verbal complex, it is not surprising that (1a) is grammatical. However, it cannot be a constituent in the active counterpart, as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (3b).[3] This is puzzling,

[1] Another possibility is that *sit upon* is generated as a single constituent in the lexicon, as Bresnan (1982) suggests.
[2] The corresponding pseudo-passive sentence is well-formed.

(i) Not the chair but the hat was sat upon.

[3] The grammaticality of (3b) can be explained as follows. Let us first consider why (4b) is grammatical. The conjoined

given that there is parallelism between the verbal passive and its active counterpart.

This paper explores the possibility of resolving this dilemma by proposing that (i) PP patterns like VP and (ii) pseudo passives are control constructions. More specifically, it will be argued that prepositions, like verbs and nouns, have shell structure, consisting of a light preposition p^* and a lexical category P. The light preposition p^* serves as the Case-assigning head. Since it is a bound morpheme, it must attach either to P or to the preceding verb at PF. When it attaches to the verb, Case assignment does not take place, leaving the complement of P without Case.

(7) a. [-en [$_{VP}$ sit [p^* [PP upon the hat]]]]: p^*-to-*sit*-movement at PF
b. [-en [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ p^* sit] [~~p^*~~ [PP upon the hat]]]]

This study argues that the Caseless DP *the hat* does not undergo raising but is instead deleted under identity with the closest antecedent. The pseudo-passive is constrained by a unique semantic condition: instead of denoting an event, it expresses a property of the subject. This can be derived if the subject receives a Character Role from either the adjectival passive morpheme *-en* or from T. Under this view, the subject is base-generated in Spec of *-en* or Spec-T and enters into a Form-Copy relation with the Caseless DP inside the PP.[4]

(8) a. [the hat -en [sit [p^* [PP upon the hat]]]]: p^*-to-*sit*-movement at PF
b. [the hat -en [[p^* sit] [~~p^*~~ [PP upon the hat]]]]: Form-Copy
c. [the hat -en [[p^* sit] [~~p^*~~ [PP upon <the hat>]]]]

Thus, the pseudo-passive is treated as a type of control construction.[5]

2. Problems with the Reanalysis Approach to the Pseudo-Passive

There are many idiomatic expressions that contain a preposition and permit passivization. The idiom *take advantage of* is a case in point. If we assume that the idiom is simply a word consisting of three morphemes, we

expression involving negation *not a chair but a hat* must not occur in a theta position, and this problem can be resolved if it undergoes extraposition, as illustrated in (ia-b).

(i) a. He bought not a chair but a hat: Extraposition
b. He [[bought t_i] [not a chair but a hat]$_i$]

However, (3b) is not well-formed because the complement of a preposition cannot be extraposed.

(ii) a. John sat upon not the chair but the hat: *Extraposition
b. John [[sat [upon t_i]] [not the chair but the hat]$_i$]

As noted by Ross (1967) and Drummond et al (2010), Preposition stranding is possible under leftward A′-movement, but not under rightward A′-movement. In short, the ungrammaticality of (3b) suggests that the preposition is not a part of the verbal complex, but rather the sentence-final constituent is the complement of the preposition in the active sentence.

[4] See section 4.2 for a detailed discussion of the operation 'Form Copy.'

[5] More precisely, it will be argued that it cannot but be a control construction because the Caseless P-complement cannot undergo A-movement across p^*P in the narrow syntax.

can explain why passivization is permitted although the object appears to be the complement of the preposition *of*. This section examines whether we can extend this approach to the pseudo-passive, concluding that the reanalysis approach is not a viable option.

2.1 Two Possible Ways of Generating Passive Idioms

Sentence (9) has two corresponding passive constructions, as shown in (10a-b).

(9) John took advantage of Mary's honesty.
(10) a. Mary's honesty was taken advantage of.
b. Advantage was taken of Mary's honesty.

This phenomenon can be resolved if we assume that there are two ways of deriving the idiom *take advantage of*. Let us first assume that *take advantage of* is a word, not a phrase.

(11) $[_V [_V [_V$ take$] [_N$ advantage$]] [_P$ of$]]$

If it is a verb, as in (11), it is not surprising that (10a) is grammatical. Chomsky (1995) proposes that transitive verbs are composed of the light verb v* plus their corresponding intransitive verb. In this analysis, the verbal projection of (9) is represented as (12).

(12) $[_{v*P}$ John $v^* [_{VP} [_V [_V [_V$ take$]$ advantage$]$ of$]$ Mary's honesty$]]$

In this representation, the light verb v^* assigns accusative Case to *Mary's honesty* and an external theta role to *John*. I assume that the covert light verb v^* is replaced by the passive morpheme *-en* in the passive counterpart, as illustrated in (13).

(13) $[_{vP}$ en $[_{VP} [_V [_V [_V$ take$]$ advantage$]$ of$]$ Mary's honesty$]$ by John$]$

The passive morpheme *-en* licenses the *by*-phrase but cannot assign Case to *Mary's honesty*. If so, it is quite straightforward why *Mary's honesty* can be preposed in (10a). If *take advantage of* is a constituent, the preposition *of* cannot assign Case to *Mary's honesty*. Furthermore, if the VP *$[_{VP} [_V$ take advantage of$]$ Mary's honesty$]]$* merges with the passive morpheme *-en* rather than with the light verb v^*, *Mary's honesty* cannot be assigned Case. That is, in (14a) *Mary's honesty* occurs in a Caseless position, and it needs to move to a position where it can be assigned Case. As shown in (14b-c), the SPEC-T position is available, and so it moves to the SPEC-T.

(14) a. $[_{VoiceP}$ en $[_{VP} [_V$ take advantage of$]$ Mary's honesty$]]$: Merger with *be* and T
b. [T [be $[_{VoiceP}$ en $[_{VP} [_V$ take advantage of$]$ Mary's honesty$]]]]$: Raising to the SPEC-T
c. [Mary's honesty T [be $[_{VoiceP}$ en $[_{VP} [_V$ take advantage of$]$ ~~Mary's honesty~~$]]]]$

Let us now assume that *take advantage* is a VP, and the preposition *of* is not part of the phrasal idiom, as illustrated in (15a). In this case *advantage* is in a non-Case position when the VP is merged with the passive morpheme *-en*.

(15) a. [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ take [$_{DP}$ advantage]] of Mary's honesty]: Merge with the passive morpheme *-en*
b. [$_{VoiceP}$ en [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ take [$_{DP}$ advantage]] of Mary's honesty]]: Merger with *be* and T
c. [T [be [$_{VoiceP}$ en [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ take [$_{DP}$ advantage]] of Mary's honesty]]]]: Raising to the SPEC-T
d. [Advantage T [be [$_{VoiceP}$ en [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ take ~~[$_{DP}$ advantage]~~] of Mary's honesty]]]]

On the other hand, *Mary's honesty* is in a Case position since it is the complement of the preposition *of*. Hence *advantage* moves to the SPEC-T position.

We have seen that the idiom *take advantage of* permits either the direct object or the prepositional object to passivize, depending on whether or not the preposition *of* is part of the idiom. There are two other types of idioms. For instance, *cast doubt on* allows only the object DP to passivize, and *lose sight of* allows only the prepositional object to passivize.

(16) a. Doubt was cast on his motives.
b. *His motives were cast doubt on.
(17) a. *Sight was lost of our goal.
b. Our goal was lost sight of.

This suggests that *cast doubt on* is a phrasal idiom, whereas *lose sight of* is a lexical idiom. In other words, *cast doubt* is a constituent, but *cast doubt on* is not, and *lose sight of* is a constituent, but *lose sight* is not.

(18) a. [$_{VP}$ cast [$_{DP}$ doubt]] on his motives
b. *[$_{V}$ [$_{V}$ cast doubt] on] his motives
(19) a. [$_{V}$ [$_{V}$ lose sight] of] our goal
b. *[$_{VP}$ lose [$_{DP}$ sight]] of our goal

To summarize this section, the prepositional passive is permitted when the preposition is a part of a word-level idiom.

2.2 Extension to the Pseudo-Passive

With the above discussion in mind, let us attempt to account for the passives in (20a-b) while assuming that *sleep in* and *walk on* are constituents.

(20) a. This bed was slept in by Napoleon.
b. These carpets have never been walked on.

As mentioned briefly above, there are two possible approaches. According to the first approach, *sleep* merges with *in* in the lexicon (Bresnan 1995). The second approach assumes that they undergo reanalysis in the course of the syntactic derivation (Riemsdijk 1978, Hornstein and Weinberg 1981, Kayne 1984, Radford 1988).

(21) a. [sleep [in this bed]]: Reanalysis
b. [[sleep in] [~~in~~ this bed]]

Both approaches share the claim that *sleep in* is a constituent in the passive sentence. The most serious problem with this proposal is that *sleep in* and *walk on* do not form constituents in actives (Postal 1986, Koster1987, Baltin and Postal 1996). We have seen from (4b), repeated here as (22a), that *sit upon* is not a constituent in the active. The DP conjoined with the contrastive coordinator *not ... but* can occur in the verbal object position, as illustrated in (22b).

(22) a. *John sat upon not the chair but the hat.
b. John bought not the chair but the hat.

If *sit upon* were a constituent, (22a) would be grammatical. The ungrammaticality of (22a) suggests that *upon* must form a constituent with a DP, not with the verb *sit*. Given that *sit upon* is not a constituent in the active—if *upon* is a transitive preposition, it is puzzling that (1a), rewritten here as (23), is grammatical.

(23) The hat was sat upon.

There are many other examples in support of the claim that in the pseudo-passive, V and P appear to form a constituent, but in the corresponding active, they do not. For instance, an adverb can intervene between V and P in the active, whereas it cannot in the pseudo-passive.

(24) a. The lawyer will go thoroughly over the contract.
b. *The contract will be gone thoroughly over by the lawyer.
b'. The contract will be thoroughly gone over by the lawyer.
(25) a. They spoke angrily to John.
b. *John was spoken angrily to.
c. John was spoken to. (Chomsky 1981, p. 123)

Gapping shows the same point. As shown in (26a-b), both an active verb and a passive verb can be elided.

(26) a. Frank called Sandra and Arthur _____ Louise.
b. Sandra was called by Frank and Louise by Arthur.

Interestingly, *talk to* cannot appear as a gap in the active, whereas it can in the pseudo-passive

(27) a. Frank talked to Sandra and Arthur _____ *(to) Louise.
b. Sandra was talked to by Frank and Louise (*to) by Arthur.

While discussing passivization of idioms, we have assumed that if an idiom is phrasal in the active, it is also phrasal in the passive, and if it is lexical in the active, it is also lexical in the passive. In the case of pseudo-passives, however, there is no parallelism between the active and the pseudo-passive with regard to constituency. This is quite puzzling under the proposal that V and P form a constituent in the pseudo-passive. The subsequent sections are devoted to resolving this puzzle.[6]

[6] Drummond and Kush (2015) try to support the reanalysis approach by making use of covert raising-to-object.

3. Shell-Structure and p*-Raising Approach

This section argues that the peculiar syntactic properties of pseudo-passives follow if (i) prepositions, like verbs, display shell structure, consisting of p* and P, and (ii) it is not P but p* that undergoes reanalysis. According to the VP-shell approach initiated by Larson (1988), verbs consist of more than one head. For instance, the transitive verb *close* consists of the light verb v* and *close*, and the former is responsible for external theta role assignment and accusative Case assignment.

(28) John closed the door.
(29) [$_{v*P}$ John v* [$_{VP}$ close the door]]

Larson (2014) claims that every lexical category has shell structure and arguments are base-generated within the projection of each lexical category. According to this shell structure approach, (30) is represented as (31).

(30) John is in the bed.
(31) [$_{p*P}$ John p* [$_{PP}$ in the bed]]

In (30), the preposition *in* is used as a main predicate. Let us now consider the case where *in* is used as the complement of another predicate, such as *sleep*. This study argues that in this context, p* can optionally raise to the predicate, as illustrated in (33).

(32) John slept in this bed.
(33) a. [$_{VP}$ sleep [p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]: Raising of p* to *sleep* at PF.
b. [$_{VP}$ [$_{V}$ p* sleep] [~~p*~~ [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]

This means that the reanalysis approach is on the right track, but it is not *in* but p* that undergoes reanalysis. The light preposition p* is a bound morpheme, and it merges with either P or the selecting V. If p* merges with *in*, the head of the resulting constituent is p* and it is adjacent to *this bed*. Hence, Case assignment is permitted.

(34) a. [p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]: Merge of p* with *in*
b. [$_{p*P}$ [$_{p*}$ p* in] [$_{PP}$ ~~in~~ this bed]]

By contrast, if p* merges with *sleep*, as in (33b), the resulting constituent is labeled as V, not as p*. In this configuration, p* cannot assign Case to *this bed*; the former cannot be adjacent to the latter. This proposal is based on the assumption that in English, Case assignment, especially accusative Case assignment, is subject to the Adjacency Condition (Chomsky 1986).[7]

[7] Let us consider whether the nominative Case marker T, as well as the accusative Case markers v* and p*, is subject to the Case Adjacency Condition. *There*-constructions appear to run counter to the Adjacency Condition. Given that T assigns nominative Case to the postcopular DP, the Adjacency Condition is violated in *there*-constructions.

(i) a. There are three boys sick.
b. There arrived three boys from Atlanta.

In sum, when p^* raises to the verb, the complement of P cannot receive Case; when no p^*-to-V raising occurs, the complement of P can receive Case. This amounts to saying that p^*-to-V raising may occur in the passive but not in the active. If p^*raises to V in the active sentence such as (35a), *this bed* cannot be assigned Case at all, as neither v^* nor p^* can assign Case to *this bed*.

(35) a. [John v^* [$_{VP}$ sleep [p^* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]: p^*-to-V Raising
b. [John v^* [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ p^* sleep] [~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]

As a result, the active representation (35b) is ill-formed. By contrast, in the pseudo-passive sentence, the Case problem can be resolved. In fact, there are two ways to resolve the Case problem when the complement of *in* is left Caseless. One is to raise *this bed* to SPEC-T, as illustrated in (36a-b).

(36) a. [was [$_{VoiceP}$ en [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]]: Raising
b. [$_{TP}$ this bed was [$_{VoiceP}$ en [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in ~~this bed~~]]]]]

The other is to delete the Caseless copy under identity with its controller, assuming that the pseudo-passive is a control construction. If the passive morpheme *-en* is adjectival, it can assign a theta role—a Character role, and so *this bed* can be base-generated in SPEC-*en*. In this context, the copy of *this bed* inside PP can be deleted under identity with the copy in SPEC-*en*.

(37) a. [en$_{Adj(ectival)}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]: External Merge with *the bed*
b. [this bed en$_{Adj(ectival)}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]: Deletion Under Identity
c. [this bed en$_{Adj(ectival)}$ [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in <this bed>]]]]

The remainder of this section shows that the second possibility is correct: that is, the pseudo-passive not a raising but a control construction.

Before leaving this section, let us compare the traditional reanalysis approach with the revised version advocated here. One advantage of the traditional reanalysis approach is that it accounts for the contrast between (38a) and (38b). Specifically, it explains why *spoken* and *to* must be adjacent in the pseudo-passive: the single constituent *speak to* must be formed, as shown in (39). Since reanalysis requires adjacency, *angrily* cannot appear in (38b).

(38) a. They spoke (angrily) to John.
b. John was spoken (*angrily) to.
(39) [$_{VoiceP}$ en [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ speak to] ~~to~~ John]]

The postcopular DP has the following two characteristics: it must be adjacent to either the copula or the unaccusative verb, and it is assigned accusative Case, especially in the colloquial speech.

(ii) a. Who can play Hamlet?
b. There's him (and Tom).
b'. ??There's he (and Tom).

This suggests that T is not likely to assign Case to the postcopular DP, and instead, the adjacent verb assigns Case to it.

However, the approach fails to explain why *speak* and *to* must not undergo reanalysis in the active sentence.

(40) *[$_{VoiceP}$ v [$_{VP}$ [$_{V}$ speak to] ~~to~~ John]]

There is no inherent reason why they could not be reanalyzed, but in fact they must not, as demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of (41).

(41) John spoke to Mary, and Tom ____ *(to) Susie.

Another potential problem with the traditional reanalysis approach is that the pseudo-passive respects the Principle of Compositionality. If the main verb and the adjacent preposition truly formed a constituent via reanalysis, they would be expected to yield an idiomatic reading. For instance, the new verb *sleep in* can be created when *in* undergoes reanalysis. Since word formation does not have to observe the Principle of Compositionality, it is unexpected that the newly created verb is interpreted compositionally.

(42) a. [sleep [in this bed]]: Reanalysis
b. [[$_{V}$ sleep in] [~~in~~ this bed]]

By contrast, the p*-raising approach offers a principled account of (i) why p*-to-*speak* movement must occur in the passive but must not occur in the active and (ii) why the pseudo-passive obeys the Principle of Compositionality. If p*-movement does not apply in the passive structure (43), *John* receives Case, and consequently a well-formed passive cannot be derived.

(43) Passive Structure
[$_{VoiceP}$ en [$_{VP}$ speak [p* [to John]]]]: *(p*-to-*speak* movement)

Conversely, if p* moves to *speak* in the active structure (44), *John* cannot be assigned Case, and thus a well-formed active cannot be generated.

(44) Active Structure
[$_{VoiceP}$ Tom v* [$_{VP}$ speak [p* [to John]]]]: *p*-to-*speak* movement

The p*-raising approach also correctly predicts that the pseudo-passive yields a compositional reading, since only a functional head undergoes reanalysis.

(45) a. [sleep [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]: p*-to-*sleep* movement
b. [[p* sleep] [$_{p*P}$ ~~p*~~ [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]

In short, the p*-raising approach is empirically superior to the traditional reanalysis approach.

4. Semantic Condition on the Pseudo-Passive: The Characterization Condition

The pseudo-passive is constrained by a unique semantic requirement: it denotes not an event, but a characteristic of the subject. This section shows that this semantic requirement arises from the fact that the subject is assigned a theta role called Character from either the adjectival passive morpheme *-en* or T.

4.1 Affectedness Condition

The pseudo-passive is subject to a semantic constraint that does not apply to the verbal passive, namely the affectedness condition: it must describe a resultant state of the subject. If the Theme is affected by an event, it can be characterized in terms of that event. A well-formed pseudo-passive arises when it describes a property of the Theme argument that results from the event. For example, in (46a), the sitting event can affect the shape of the hat, which can thus be construed as a property of the hat. In this case, the pseudo-passive is permitted. By contrast, in (47a) the sitting event cannot affect the tree and therefore cannot constitute a property of the tree. Accordingly, the corresponding pseudo-passive in (47b) is ill-formed.

(46) a. John sat upon the hat.
b. The hat was sat upon.
(47) a. John sat under the tree.
b. *The tree was sat under.

The same point is shown by (48a-b). If someone sleeps in a bed, the event assigns a new property to the bed in the sense that it is now a used one. By contrast, when someone sleeps beside a bed, the bed is not affected and so it is not assigned a new property. Therefore, there is a contrast in acceptability between (48b) and (49b).

(48) a. John slept in this bed.
b. This bed has been slept in.
(49) a. John slept beside this bed.
b. ??This bed has been slept beside.

This point is corroborated by (50-51).

(50) a. We have not walked on the street.
b. *The street has not been walked on.
(51) a. We have not walked on the street covered with snow.
b. The street [covered with snow] has not been walked on.

A walking event typically does not affect a street and therefore cannot assign it a new property. However, if the street is covered with snow, walking on it will have an effect, thereby assigning a new property to the street. Consequently, (51b) is well-formed, whereas (50b) is not.

The Affectedness Condition discussed thus far follows if the pseudo-passive is generated when the passive *-en* in this construction is not a verbal passive morpheme but an adjectival passive morpheme. If the VP in (52a) merges with adjectival *-en*, they compositionally assign the Character Role that controls the Theme argument of

in. To sum up, if p^* raises to *sleep*, the complement of P is left Caseless, and the pseudo-passive is generated when the morpheme *-en* assigns a Character Role, as illustrated in (52b-c).

(52) a. [$_{VP}$ [p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in X]]]: Merge with Adjectival *-en*
b. [$_{VoiceP}$ en_{Adj} [$_{VP}$ [p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in X]]]]: Merge with Y and Assignment of the Character Role
c. [$_{VoiceP}$ Y en_{Adj} [$_{VP}$ [p^* sleep] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$_{PP}$ in X]]]]

In this representation, X and Y must be anaphorically related: that is, X must be deleted under identity with Y. This means that the pseudo-passive is a control construction.

4.2 A Form Copy Approach to the Affectedness Condition

There are three main approaches to Control: the PRO-based approach, the Movement Theory of Control, and the Form-Copy Approach. According to the PRO-based approach, if an argument is assigned a theta role but remains Caseless, it is realized as a zero pronoun called PRO (Chomsky 1981, Landau 2000).

(53) $John_i$ tried [PRO_i to leave early]

By contrast, the Movement Theory of Control argues that raising and control are parallel, both involving movement (Hornstein 1999, 2001, 2009). The difference is that raising targets a non-theta position, whereas control targets a theta position.

(54) a. [v^* try [John to leave early]]: Movement of *John* to SPEC-v^*
b. [John v^* try [~~John~~ to leave early]]

Assuming that movement into a theta position is ruled out, Chomsky (2021) seeks to preserve Hornstein's insight by introducing the operation Form Copy. If movement occurs, two identical copies are generated. These copies are assigned the relation *Copy* via Form Copy, and as a result, the Caseless lower copy is deleted.

(55) a. T seem John to be smart: Raising
b. John T seem John to be smart: Form Copy
c. John T seem <John> to be smart

Chomsky goes on to argue that two identical copies can enter into a Form Copy relation even if they are not generated through movement. For example, there can be two copies of *John* in the numeration, and these can establish a Form Copy relation in a control construction.

(56) a. [T try [John to leave]]: External Merge of *John*
b. John T try [John to leave]: Form Copy
c. John T try [<John> to leave]

On this view, although movement into a theta position is disallowed, two syntactic copies may nonetheless form a Form Copy relation without movement.

While tentatively adopting the Form Copy approach, let us attempt to derive the pseudo-passive. If the passive morpheme *-en* is adjectival, it can assign a theta role—a Character role. As illustrated in (57), the copy of *this bed* in SPEC-*en* can establish a Form Copy relation with the copy in the complement position of *in*. As a result, the lower copy can be deleted at PF.

(57) a. [$_{VP}$ sleep [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]: Merge with *-en$_{Adj}$*
b. [en$_{Adj}$ [$_{VP}$ sleep [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]$_{(Character = Theme)}$: Merge with *this bed*
c. [$_{VoiceP}$ this bed $_{Character = Theme}$ [$_{Voice'}$ en$_{Adj}$ [$_{VP}$ sleep [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]]$_{(Character = Theme)}$:
p*-to-*sleep* Raising and Form Copy
d. [$_{VoiceP}$ this bed $_{Character = Theme}$ [$_{Voice'}$ en$_{Adj}$ [$_{VP}$ [p* sleep] [$_{p*P}$ ~~p*~~ [$_{PP}$ in <this bed>]]]]]$_{(Character = Theme)}$

The most important point is that *this bed* is associated with two theta roles—Character and Theme, which gives rise to the Affectedness Condition. Put differently, the pseudo-passive is a control construction, in which an argument is associated with two theta roles.

The fundamental question is why it must be a control construction. Notice that in (57b), *this bed* is inside p*P, which is a phase. A-movement out of p*P is not permitted. A'-movement out of it is permitted because a phrase with an operator feature can stop by the edge of a phase, which can be occupied by an operator.

(58) Which bed did you sleep in?
(59) a. [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in which bed]]: Movement into the edge of the phase edge
b. [which bed [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in ~~which bed~~]]]

By contrast, if a constituent contains no operator feature, it cannot stop by the edge of a phase. Therefore, A-movement out of p*P is prohibited.

(60) [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]: *A-movement of *this bed* in the narrow syntax

However, in (61b), the two copies of *this bed* can establish a Form-Copy relation because p* undergoes Raising to V at PF, and as a result, the phase p*P is elided.

(61) a. [$_{VoiceP}$ this bed $_{Character = Theme}$ [$_{Voice'}$ en$_{Adj}$ [$_{VP}$ sleep [$_{p*P}$ p* [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]]$_{(Character = Theme)}$:
p*-to-*sleep* Raising at PF
b. [$_{VoiceP}$ this bed $_{Character = Theme}$ [$_{Voice'}$ en$_{Adj}$ [$_{VP}$ [p* sleep] [$_{p*P}$ ~~p*~~ [$_{PP}$ in this bed]]]]]$_{(Character = Theme)}$:
Form-Copy at PF
c. [$_{VoiceP}$ this bed $_{Character = Theme}$ [$_{Voice'}$ en$_{Adj}$ [$_{VP}$ [p* sleep] [$_{p*P}$ ~~p*~~ [$_{PP}$ in <this bed>]]]]]$_{(Character = Theme)}$

The point is that A-movement occurs in the narrow syntax, whereas Form-Copy occurs at PF. Furthermore, p*-to-V movement applies at PF, eliminating the phasehood of p* there. Therefore, Form Copy is permitted, although raising is not. Consequently, the pseudo-passive can only be a control construction.

4.3 Affected Theme vs. Non-Affected Theme

Thus far, I have claimed that the subject of the pseudo-passive is assigned a Character role by the adjectival

passive morpheme *–en*. We have seen that the Character role is easily available when the Theme is affected, but it is not available when the Theme is not affected.[8] However, (62b) and (63b) show that the pseudo-passive is permitted if the passive describes the characteristic of the raised Theme although it is not affected.

(62) a. *This island was walked around by his father.
b. This island can be walked around in a day.
(63) a. *The hotel was stayed in by my sister.
b. The hotel can be stayed in by foreigners.[9]

Generally speaking, it is hard to get the reading that the sentence is about the characteristic of the subject when the Theme is not affected. In (62a) and (63a) *this island* and *the hotel* cannot be affected, and hence it is not surprising that they are not grammatical. However, (62b) and (63b) are well-formed although the Theme is not affected. It seems that the Character role can be assigned by a modal such as *can*. Sentence (64b) is about the characteristic of *the book*, although (64a) is not.

(64) a. This book was read by John.
b. This book can be read in a day.

This clearly shows that modals such as *can* can assign a Character role. In fact, Diesing (1992) proposes that even T can assign a property role when it takes an individual-level VP as its complement. Chomsky (2023) also suggests that T forms a secondary predication relation with the subject. I claim that if *can* assigns a Character role, a well-formed pseudo-passive can be generated. This means that even the verbal passive can be a source for the pseudo-passive with the help of a modal. In (62b) and (63b), the passive morpheme *-en* is not adjectival but verbal. However, a well-formed pseudo-passive can be generated if T or *can* assigns a Character Role that controls the closest argument. If *this island* is base-generated in SPEC-*can*, it can establish a Form-Copy relation with the copy of *this island* inside the PP.

(65) a. [$_{VP}$ walk [p* [around$_{(theme)}$ this island]]]: Merge with the Verbal Passive *-en*
b. [$_{VoiceP}$ -en [$_{VP}$ walk [p* [around$_{(theme)}$ this island]]]]: Merge with *be* and *can*
c. [can$_{(Character = Theme)}$ [$_{VP}$ be [$_{VoiceP}$ -en [$_{VP}$ walk [p* [around$_{(theme)}$ this island]]]]]]: Merge with *this island*
d. [this island can$_{(Character = Theme)}$ [$_{VP}$ be [$_{VoiceP}$ -en [$_{VP}$ walk [p* [around$_{(theme)}$ this island]]]]]]: p*-to-walk Movement and Form-Copy
e. [this island can$_{(Character = Theme)}$ [$_{VP}$ be [$_{VoiceP}$ -en [$_{VP}$ [p* walk] [~~p~~* [around$_{(theme)}$ <this island>]]]]]]

[8] This is reminiscent of the Affectedness Condition on preposing in passive nominals (Anderson 1977, 1979, 2005). Anderson generalizes that DP-preposing is permitted in passive nominals only if the Theme is affected.

(i) a. [destruction Carthage]: Preposing
b. [Carthage's [destruction ~~Carthage~~]]
(ii) a. [expression great relief]: Preposing
b. *[great relief's [expression ~~great relief~~]]

[9] Notice that a *by*-phrase can be licensed in the pseudo-passive, as shown in (63b). This seems to support the claim that the pseudo-passive can be verbal. However, see Bruening (2014) for a claim that even the adjectival passive permits a *by*-phrase.

Notice that in (65c), *this island* cannot undergo Raising even though *-en* is verbal, since it is inside the phase p^*P. However, it can be associated with the subject position via Form Copy. If p^* undergoes raising to *walk* at PF, it cannot assign Case to *this island*. Furthermore, p^*P is elided, so that it does not block establishing a Form-Copy relation between the copy in SPEC-*can* and the copy inside PP, as illustrated in (66a-b).

(66) a. [this island $can_{(Character = Theme)}$ [$_{VP}$ be [$_{VoiceP}$ -en [$_{VP}$ [p^* walk] [$_{p^*P}$ ~~p^*~~ [$around_{(theme)}$ <this island>]]]]]]: p^*P-Deletion and Form-Copy
b. [this island $can_{(Character = Theme)}$ [$_{VP}$ be [$_{VoiceP}$ -en [$_{VP}$ [p^* walk] [$_{PP}$ $around_{(theme)}$ <this island>]]]]]

I would like to reiterate that raising out of p^*P in the narrow syntax is not possible but Form-Copy is permitted when p^* raises to *walk* at PF.

4.4 Phase and Form Copy

Thus far, I have argued that p^* can undergo raising to V at PF, which permits a control construction. This section shows that a control construction can also be derived when the null C of an infinitival construction raises to V. It is usually known that raising predicates select TP-complements whereas control predicates select CP-complements (Landau 2000), as shown in (67a-b).

(67) a. John seemed [$_{TP}$ to leave early].
b. John tried [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ to leave early]].

Even though *seem* and *try* select a different complement, we can provide a uniform account for them under the Form-Copy approach, along with C-to-V movement. In (67a), *John* can undergo raising across TP, which is not a phase. The copy of *John* in SPEC-matrix T and the one in SPEC-*to* can establish a Form-Copy relation, since there is no phase boundary between them.

(68) a. T seem to [$_{TP}$ John [to leave early]]: Raising
b. [John T seem to [$_{TP}$ John [to leave early]]]: Form-Copy
c. [John T seem to [$_{TP}$ <John> [to leave early]]]

By contrast, (67b) cannot be generated via Raising for two reasons. First, according to Chomsky (2021), movement from a theta position to another theta position is not permitted. Second, A-movement out of a CP boundary is not possible due to the Phase Impenetrability Condition. For instance, in (69a), *John* cannot undergo movement across CP.

(69) a. [try [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ John to leave early]]]: External Merge with *John*
b. [John try [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ John to leave early]]]: Merge with T and Raising of *John* to SPEC-T
c. [John T [John try [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ John to leave early]]]]: C-to-*try* movement
d. [John T [John [C try] [$_{CP}$ ~~C~~ [$_{TP}$ John to leave early]]]]: Deletion of CP and Form-Copy
e. [John T [<John> [C try] ~~[$_{CP}$~~ ~~C~~ [$_{TP}$ <John> to leave early]]]]

However, it can bear a Form-Copy relation with the copy of *John* in the matrix clause. When the embedded null

C moves to *try* at PF, the CP boundary between the matrix subject and the embedded subject disappears. Therefore, the two subjects can enter into a Form Copy relation, as illustrated in (69c-e). The immediate question is what motivates C to move to *try*. I tentatively assume that non-finite null C is a clitic that requires a verbal host.

5. Conclusion

This paper has argued that the syntactic and semantic peculiarities of the pseudo-passive follow if (i) p^*-raising creates a structure in which the complement of a preposition is left Caseless, and (ii) the Caseless DP inside PP is deleted after forming a Form Copy relation with the DP that is assigned a Character Role. In fact, the pseudo-passive is not the only construction in which the object of a preposition is missing. The so-called pure object deletion construction also shows that the complement of a preposition can be absent, as illustrated in (70).

(70) a. Mary is pretty to look at.
b. The music is melodious to listen to. (Lasnik and Fiengo 1974: 535)

Although this construction differs from the pseudo-passive in that the verb does not appear in the passive form, it is likely that it constitutes another type of control construction involving p^*-raising. If it is a control construction, it is a case of adjunct control. However, I leave a full account of this construction for future research. To conclude, the complement position of a preposition can remain Caseless when p^* undergoes raising, and such raising gives rise to a control construction.

References

Anderson, M. 1977. NP Pre-posing in Noun Phrases. In *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society* 8, 12-21.

Anderson, M. 1979. *Noun Phrase Structure*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut.

Anderson, M. 2005. Affectedness. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, eds., *the Blackwell companion to syntax* vol 1, Blackwell.

Baltin, M. and P. M. Postal.1996. More on reanalysis hypotheses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 127-145.

Bresnan, J. 1995. Lexicality and Argument Structure. Paper presented at the Paris Syntax and Semantics Conference.

Bruening, B. 2014. Word Formation is Syntactic: Adjectival Passives in English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32, 363-422.

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris Publications.

Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 2021. Minimalism: Where Are We Now, and Where Can We Hope to Go? *Gengo Kenkyu* 160, 1-41.

Chomsky, N.2023. Language and the miracle creed. ms, University of Arizona/MIT. Available online at https://share.google/fsNd8NjBLPXjMKk8w

Diesing, M. 1992. *Indefinites*. MIT Press.

Drummond, A. and D. Kush. 2015. 'Reanalysis' as Raising to Object. *Syntax* 18, 425-463.

Drummond, A., N. Hornstein and H. Lasnik. 2010. A puzzle about P stranding and a possible solution. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41, 689-692.
Hornstein, N. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 69-96.
Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Blackwell.
Hornstein, N. 2009. *A Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge University Press.
Hornstein, N. and A. Weinberg. 1981. Case theory and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 55–91.
Kayne, R. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Foris Publications.
Koster, J.1987. *Domain and Dynasties: the Radical Autonomy of Syntax*. Foris Publications.
Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Kluwer.
Larson, R. K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335–391.
Larson, R. K. 2014. *On Shell Structure*. Routledge.
Lasnik, H. and R. Fiengo. 1974. Complement object deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 535–71.
Postal, P. M. 1986. *Studies of Passive Clauses*. State University of New York Press.
Radford, A. 1988. *Transformational Grammar: a first course*. Cambridge University Press.
Ross, J. R. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.
Riemsdijk, H. van. 1978. *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness: The Binding Nature of Prepositional Phrases*. Foris Publications.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

