

Approaches to control phenomena handout 6

5.4 Obligatory control and morphological case: Icelandic and Basque

Icelandic quirky case (displaying properties of both structural and inherent case: lexically determined, θ -role assignment, but not frozen for A-movement, needs agreement relation with ϕ -complete head, case not changed under passivization) in raising and control constructions: quirky case preserved under raising, but not under control.

(78) *Icelandic:*

- a. Mönnunum/*Mennirnir virðist báðum hafa verið hjálpað
*Men-the.DAT/*NOM seems both.DAT have been helped.DFLT*
'The men seem to have both been helped'
(Sigurðsson 2008)
- b. Hann/*Honum vonast til að verða bjargað af fjallinu
*He.NOM/*DAT hopes for to be rescued.DFLT of the-mountain*
'He hopes to be rescued from the mountain'
(Andrews 1990, reproduced in Bobaljik and Landau 2009)

(79) *Icelandic:*

- a. Strákunum er talið (hafa
The-boys.MASC.PL. DAT. is.SG believed.DFLT to-have
verið) bjargað
been rescued.DFLT
'The boys are believed to have been rescued'
(Andrews 1990, reproduced in Bobaljik and Landau 2009)
- b. Strákarnir vonast til að verða hjálpað/*hjálpaðir/*hjálpuðum
*The-boys.NOM hope for to be helped.DFLT/*PL.NOM/*PL.DAT*
'The boys hope to be helped'
(Sigurðsson 1991, reproduced in Bobaljik and Landau 2009)

Raising in (79a): quirky DP agrees with the two passives, inactive only after agreeing with the ϕ -complete finite T.

Control: movement to the matrix vP triggered by θ -properties. A given quirky case is tied to a specific θ -role. Assumption: assigning an additional θ -role obliterates the original quirky case. Two patterns in matrix: structural case or (if the matrix predicate assigns quirky case) another quirky case form.

(88) *Icelandic (Sigurðsson 2008):*

Hana langar ekki til að vera kalt
Her.ACC longs not for to be cold.DFLT
'She doesn't want to be (feeling) cold'

Same account for embedded clauses with floating quantifiers/secondary predicates (agreeing in case and ϕ -features with the DP they are associated with): difference in case bw matrix and embedded clause: additional θ -role assignment.

If PRO can be assigned case why no overt subject in embedded clause? No local ϕ -complete probe, case of embedded subject not valued.

- (91) *Icelandic* (Boeckx and Hornstein 2006a):
- a. **Jón** vonast til að leiðast ekki **einum**
Jon.NOM hopes to to be-bored not alone.DAT
 ‘Jon hopes not to be bored alone’
 - b. **Bjarna** langaði ekki til að leiðast **einum**
Bjarni.ACC wanted not to to be-bored alone.DAT
 ‘Bjarni wanted not to be bored alone’

Transmission of the case of the controller sometimes possible, different patterns. Structural ACC easier than quirky ACC, quirky DAT marginal, quirky GEN impossible. No transmission if quirky case assigned in embedded clause (competing morphological strategies: default NOM or long distance case copying).

Basque: case dependent on the number of arguments: ABS (ERG) ((DAT))

- (99) a. Jon etxera joan da
Jon.ABS house.ALL go AUX.3ABS
 ‘John has gone home’
- b. Jonek ogia erosi du
Jon.ERG bread.DET.ABS buy AUX.3ABS.3ERG
 ‘John has bought bread’
- c. Nik Mariari oparia eman diot
I.ERG Mary.DAT present.DET.ABS give AUX.3ABS.3DAT.1ERG
 ‘I have given the present to Mary’

In (100) Jon ERG in embedded clause, another θ -role in matrix clause, previous case specification obliterated.

- (100) Jon_i [\emptyset _i Mariari ogia ematen]
Jon.ABS Mary.DAT bread.DET.ABS give.NOMIN.INN
 saiatu da
try AUX.3ABS
 ‘John has tried to give bread to Mary’

The minimal distance principle:

- (103) a. John said that Mary tried [PRO to wash herself/-himself]
 b. John persuaded Mary [PRO to wash herself/-himself]

Problems: *promise* and control shift

- (106) John promised Mary [PRO to wash himself]
 (107) a. John asked Mary [PRO to shave herself/-himself]
 b. John asked Mary [PRO to be allowed to shave himself/-herself]

promise: not uniformly deemed acceptable, acquired late, if at all; an extra layer of structure in *promise*-type verbs (= No c-command → no intervention? *Mary* as the complement of a null preposition)

(110) [John vowed/committed [_{PP} to Mary] [_t to wash himself]]
 ↑—————OK—————↓

Further support:

(111) John's promise to/*of Mary to leave

(112) I did not promise this to Mary

- (114) a. Who_i did you **persuade** *t_i* to leave the party?
 b. *Who_i did you **promise** *t_i* to leave the party?
 c. *Who_i did you **give** *t_i* a book?

- (115) a. You **persuaded** *t_i* to leave [the party every man that you met]_i
 b. *You **promised** *t_i* to leave [the party every man that you met]_i
 c. *You **gave** *t_i* a book [every man that you met]_i

- (116) a. John **persuaded** Mary₁ to go to the party undressed₁
 b. *John **promised** Mary₁ to go to the party undressed₁
 c. *John **gave** Mary₁ a book undressed₁

Secondary predication in (116): PPs cannot be subjects; acquisition: null prepositions difficult to pin down.

Control shift: also underlying PPs.

(125) [John asked [_{PP} P Mary] [PRO to be allowed to leave]]

- (127) a. John promised Mary to leave
 b. *Mary was promised (by John) to leave

(128) Mary was promised (by John) to be allowed to leave

Partial and split control: controller and controllee seem to be semantically distinct.

(137) [[The chair]_i decided [PRO_{i+k} to meet at 6]]

(138) [John_i proposed to Mary_k [PRO_{i+k} to meet each other at 3]]

(137): controllee syntactically singular; (138): syntactically plural controllee

Difference bw exhaustive control and split/partial control: more cross-linguistic variation, lexical idiosyncrasies, non-uniform judgements for the latter.

Partial control: committative PP vs. Landau's [Mer] feature:

- (142) a. *The chair managed to meet at 6/apply together for the grant
 b. *[[The chair]_[-Mer] managed [PRO_[+Mer] to meet at 6/apply together for the grant]]

(143) *John hoped [PRO to sing alike/to be mutually supporting] → an embedded predicate with a plural subject is not enough, even when the verb is of the right type.

(149) [[The chair]_i hoped [*t*_i to meet with the president]] → the presence of an overt comitative eliminates the partial control reading. [Mer]? Partial control as exhaustive control.

- (151) a. *The chair met at 6
 b. The chair can only meet tomorrow

- (152) a. *The chair applied together for the grant
 b. The chair cannot apply together for the grant

Rodrigues (2007): the null pronoun that acts as a trigger for the plural reading is licensed by the modal. Complex DP analysis with overt DP moving leaving a *pro* stranded (fn42):

- (i) [pro DP]
 (ii) a. The chair decided to meet at 6
 b. [[The chair]_i decided [*t*_i to [[*pro t*_i] meet at 6]]]

- (153) a. John hates to meet angry
 b. John wants to meet ready for all contingencies

Secondary predication is clause-bound.

- (154) a. [John_i hates [*t*_i to meet *pro*_{comitative} angry]]
 b. [John_i wants [*t*_i to meet *pro*_{comitative} ready for all contingencies]]

Inverse partial control: pp. 188-189.

Split control: based on Fujii (2006): three mood particles in Japanese in obligatory control constructions: (i) intensitive marker for subject control; (ii) imperative marker for object control; (iii) exhortative marker for split control (164). Antecedents have to be in the same clause. Subject control in a two-DP argument structure unattested. Minimality effect? Role of MoodP: no case for the subject, coordination in exhortatives. Comitative DP for the second conjunct? ‘+’ as a comitative preposition is not an intervener (*promise*).

(167) [MoodP [α + β] [Mood' -(y)oo TP]]

(168) a. [VP [+ β] [V' V ... [MoodP [α [+ β]] [Mood' -(y)oo TP]]]]



b. [VP α [V' v [VP [+ β] [V' V ... [MoodP [α [+ β]] [Mood' -(y)oo TP]]]]]]



Non-obligatory control: not derived by movement. NOC empty category a null pronoun, OC vs. NOC as economy competition bw movement and pronominalization. NOC: in an island configuration. (Resumptive) pronouns used when movement fails.

- (18) a. John said that [[PRO_i/*her_i washing herself] delighted Mary_i]
 b. John_k said that [[pro_k/him_k washing himself] delighted Mary]

Mary can move → no pronominalization; John cannot move → pronominalization possible

“[S]tructures should not be classified as OC or NOC, for a given structure may allow OC or NOC. Rather, it is *relations* that are OC or NOC. [...] OC and NOC describe relations between nominal expressions, not selection/subcategorization relations between predicates and types of clausal complements.” (p.201)

Problems:

- (21) a. *John₁ persuaded Mary₂ [pro₂ to leave]
 b. John₁ persuaded Mary₂ [**pro**₁ to leave]

What excludes (21b)?

- (24) *John₁ kissed Mary without him₁ getting embarrassed
 (25) John₁ kissed Mary₂ without **pro**₂ getting embarrassed

What excludes (25)? OK with overt pronoun!

More than grammatical requirements are at issue: parsing. Structures not blocked by grammar, but not accepted by the parser. A parser prefers to treat a potential gap as a trace (vs. *pro*). When you can drop a PRO/trace, do so. A design feature of a parser that conforms to transparency which cannot be overridden by bigger memory space. Overt pronoun: the parser does not have to choose one of two empty categories.

(36) John_i said that [[pro_i washing himself] delighted Mary] → island, *pro* ok.

(18a): competition bw competing parsing demands: assigning interpretations to empty categories quickly vs. treating the empty category as a trace. No optionality if both antecedents on the left (31).

7 Some notes on semantic approaches to control

Locality in terms of selectional restrictions: same structural configuration may allow both OC and NOC (relational approach). Properties of adjunct control should be uniformly different.

8 The movement theory of control and the minimalist program

Shared properties of movement and obligatory control: locality (minimality effects and freezing effects), economy (merge over move for only subject antecedents in adjunct control constructions), copying.

MTC and MP: no D-structure, but argument DPs enter the derivation with θ -roles (no first-merge into non-thematic positions for arguments).

Inclusiveness: structural information should not be coded onto lexical formatives. PRO: needs a local, c-commanding, syntactic antecedent and can only be licensed within (tense- or φ) defective domains → grammatical licensing requirements. PRO as a lexical element: only description, not explanation.