On control

Jan-Wouter Zwart
University of Groningen

Whinter Symposium on the occasion
of Radek Šimík's dissertation defense
Groningen, February 11, 2011

Propositional analysis of control complements

(1)   John tried [to win the race]   *obligatory control* ('anaphoric')

(2)   [To win the race] will be easy   *nonobligatory control* ('pronominal')

(3)   **try** (<u>John</u>, *X*)   *X* = to win the race
        win (<u>*Y*</u>, the race)   *Y* = empty noun phrase ('PRO')

(4)   Theta Criterion: one-on-one mapping of NPs to semantic roles
        > <u>*Y*</u> cannot be *John*

(5)   Government/Binding-theory: PRO fills a slot in the ontological table of noun phrases

ANAPHORIC	PRONOMINAL	OVERT	COVERT
+	+	✗	PRO
+	–	anaphor	NP-trace
–	+	pronoun	*pro*
–	–	R-expression	Wh-trace

(6) The picture in (5) is blown up in the minimalist framework, because of the copy theory of movement (any trace can be a copy of any kind of noun phrase, even of PRO/*pro*)

(7) Šimík (2011:247): propositional vs. property analysis of control (> Chierchia 1987/1989)

(8) Property analysis: X in (3) (*to win the race*) is an unsaturated event
- no subject
- no proposition
- controlled
  - can be tried/expected/wanted/asked/promised/etc. (entails a **responsible** person) (Farkas 1988)
  - is performed (entails a **performer**)
  - is **ascribed** to the performer by the responsible
        (John asked Mary [to leave])   performer: Mary
                                              responsible: John
                                              ascription: John to Mary

Special properties of PRO

(9) *PRO is always a subject*
John expected PRO to be elected
*John expected the voters to elect PRO

(10)   *PRO is always empty*
(11)   *PRO can have an implicit antecedent* ('nonobligatory control', cf. (2))
NB if the antecedent can be implicit > PRO always has an antecedent

(12)   *PRO can have a split antecedent*
John proposed to Mary PRO to go out together

(13)   *PRO can take varying antecedents depending on voice/modality*
Jan vroeg Piet [PRO op de kleintjes te (mogen) passen
(John asked Pete to (be allowed to) take care of the kids)
>   *mogen*: controller = Jan, no *mogen*: controller = Piet

Jan beloofde Piet [PRO op de kleintjes te (mogen) passen
(John promised Pete to (be allowed to) take care of the kids)
>   *mogen*: controller = Piet, no *mogen*: controller = Jan

(14)   *PRO is invariably <u>de se</u>*
The unfortunate expects (himself/PRO) to get a medal
himself = de se/de re   (de re: the person he reads about in the paper, not
PRO = de se/*de re   knowing it is actually him)

(15)   *PRO is invariably <u>sloppy</u>*
Dulles expected (himself/PRO) to arrest everyone Angleton did
himself = sloppy/strict   (strict: ... Angleton expected **him** to arrest)
PRO = sloppy/*strict

(16)   *PRO does not induce weak-crossover effect (PRO-gate)*
Who$_i$ did [(PRO/$^{??}$his)$_i$ getting his car fixed] upset t_i

(17)   PRO as a **construction-specific** designated grammatical-function **empty** category is inherently suspect

(18)   Immediate consequences if PRO just does not exist
a.   (9) always a subject: (roughly) property = proposition minus subject
b.   (10) always empty: follows
c.   (11) obligatory (implicit) antecedent: property has a performer
d.   (12) split antecedent: performer may be a collection of arguments
            (responsible ≠ performer; cf. object control)
e.   (13) controller shift: does not follow immediately, but see below
f.   (14)/(15) de se/sloppy interpretation: "follows in a way that hardly requires any comment"
            (Chierchia)
g.   (16) PRO-gate: follows immediately if PRO is not there

(19)   NB, the special properties of PRO tell us that PRO cannot be a product of PF/Spell-Out

More reason for thinking there is no PRO

(20)   How is PRO introduced in the structure?

a. Is PRO in the Numeration?
   > Not likely, because the special properties of PRO are a function of the control configuration
   cf. John expected [PRO_i to be elected t_i]
       The people expected [PRO to elect Bill]

b. Bottom-up derivation: why merge PRO rather than a full NP?

c. Top-down derivation: why merge PRO only at one exact point (unlike, say, anaphors) ?

d. How does PRO fare in restructuring contexts ?
   > Restructuring with ECM: object shift
       ...   dat Jan *hem de afwas* niet heeft zien *doen*   (*hem* is external argument of *doen*)
           that John him the dishes not has seen do

       ...   dat Jan *PRO de afwas* niet heeft proberen *te doen*
           that John PRO the dishes not has tried to do
   > PRO can't be an object, then why should it undergo object shift ?
   > but without object shift, you would reverse the argument order

e. Layered derivations: arguably clusters (and even infinitives) are outputs of separate derivations
       ...   dat Jan de afwas niet { heeft { proberen { te doen }}}
   > NPs base-generated in GF-positions, thematic roles interpreted as NP-V dependencies
   > possibly: control is a performer-property relation without mediation by PRO

Evidence for PRO

(21)   *Case agreement* (Andrews 1982)
       Eg   vonast til að PRO vanta   ekki   **einan**   efni   í   ritgerðina
       I:NOM hope   C   C   lack$_{SU=ACC}$ not   alone:ACC material   for the.thesis

(22)   *Binding*
       [PRO to love **oneself**] is important
       [PRO to love **himself**] is important to Bill

(23)   *Subject orientation*
       [PRO to leave **together**] would cause a scandal

(24)   *Subject obviation* (Postma 1984)
       Lubbers   beloofde   Mitterand [PRO **diens** kinderen   op te (*mogen) zoeken]
       Lubbers   promised   Mitterand   his$_{SOBV}$ kids   to (be allowed to) visit
       > *diens* can only be bound by the nonsubject *Mitterand*
           >   without *mogen*: PRO controlled by *Lubbers*, *diens* bound by *Mitterand*, no problem
           >   with *mogen*: PRO controlled by *Mitterand*, *diens* bound by *Mitterand/PRO* violates
               obviation requirement (but only if there is a subject PRO)

How to fix them

(25)   *Binding/subject orientation also in gerunds/nominalizations* (Chierchia)
       Loving oneself/himself was important (to Bill)
       Leaving together would cause a scandal

[Het zichzelf liefhebben] is belangrijk

> nominalizations typically resist subjects
Het (*bevers) dammen bouwen
the beavers dams build:INF

(26)　*Local dependency*
　　　The anaphor spells out a higher order dependency (subject-'predicate')
　　　> all that is needed is that the infinitive is marked as dependent in this sense

(27)　*Case agreement*
　　　> Unclear

Controller switch

(28)　*Components of control*
- responsible ①
- ascribing ②
- performer ③

(29)　Lubbers　beloofde　Mitterand　<u>de kinderen　op te zoeken</u>
　　　　①③ ←————　　　　　　　　　　　　　*event*
　　　　　②

(30)　*Effect of voice/modality*
　　　blocks event-performer association (**deponent**)
- performer > undergoer ④

(31)　Lubbers　beloofde　Mitterand　<u>de kinderen　op te mogen zoeken</u>
　　　　①————————→ ④　　　　　　　*event*$_{DEP}$
　　　　　　②

(32)　*diens* is a distal possessive > refers to 'off-center' participants
　　　> the 'object control' ascription puts the object in the center with the subject

(33)　Control switch phenomenon hard to describe under a movement theory of control
　　　(where PRO = NP-trace; Hornstein 1999)

References

Andrews, Avery. 1982. The representation of case in Modern Icelandic. In Bresnan, ed., *The mental representation of grammatical relations*. MIT Press. ● Chierchia, Gennaro. 1987/1989. Anaphora and attitudes *de se*. In Bartsch et al, eds., *Semantics and contextual expression*, 1-32, Dordrecht: Foris ● Farkas, Donka. 1988. On obligatory control. *L&P* 11, 27-58 ● Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *LI* 30, 69-96 ● Postma, Gertjan. 1984. The Dutch pronoun *diens*: distribution and reference properties. *LIN 1984*, 147-157 ●

Department of Linguistics, PO Box 716, Groningen
c.j.w.zwart@rug.nl ● www.let.rug.nl/zwart