

account which does not conflate the case marking of PRO and the controller; third, it was shown that partial control is more than [person] control, covering [number] and [gender] as well; and fourth, partial control is not subject-oriented but can be exercised by any matrix argument, provided the infinitive is of the right type. On all these points, the present analysis provides a complete, straightforward account of the data.

SUMMARY

- PC is a subtype of OC ($OC = PC \cup EC$).
- PC-complements: Factive, propositional, desiderative and interrogative; EC-complements: Aspectual, modal and implicative.
- The PC Generalization: In tensed complements, PRO inherits all phi-features from the controller, including semantic plurality, but not necessarily semantic singularity.
- T-Agr raises to C in tensed clauses.
- Semantic plurality is an optional feature on functional heads.
- Where F is a matrix functional head:
PC = Agree (F,T-Agr); EC = Agree (F,PRO).
- Subject control across an object is exempt from the MLC thanks to the Principle of Minimal Compliance.

CHAPTER 3

OBLIGATORY AND NON-OBLIGATORY CONTROL

INTRODUCTION

In chapter 2 we capitalized on a distinction within the category of Obligatory Control (OC), namely that between Exhaustive and Partial Control. In this chapter we turn our attention to the distinction between Obligatory and Non-Obligatory Control. Specifically, we will address the following questions:

- (1) a. Distribution: *Where* do OC and NOC obtain?
- b. Explanation: *Why* do OC and NOC obtain where they do?

In a nutshell, the answer to (1a) will be: OC obtains when the infinitive is in its base position (VP-internal), NOC obtains when it is displaced (VP-external). The answer to (1b) will be: Because OC creates a syntactic relation that is sensitive to islands, whereas NOC involves a logophoric relation that is indifferent to islands.

As a probe into these questions, we will consider in detail the properties of a construction with a long history in generative grammar - The Super-Equi construction. As it turns out, an in-depth investigation of Super-Equi sheds interesting light on the interaction of control with argument structure and extraposition. The investigation will yield some novel generalizations that were not captured before.

The Super-Equi construction poses a non-trivial challenge to any syntactic account of control - the challenge of locality. To appreciate the problem, consider the following paradigm:

- (2) a. Mary knew that it disturbed John [PRO to perjure himself / *herself].
- b. Mary knew that it damaged John [PRO to perjure himself / herself].
- c. Mary knew that [PRO perjuring himself / herself] disturbed John.
- d. Mary knew that [PRO perjuring himself / herself] damaged John.

In each sentence of (2), there are two potential controllers for PRO - *John* or *Mary* - the first of which is contained in the clause immediately dominating the infinitive,

the second of which is higher up. A quick look at the data reveals that the choice of controller is sensitive to two parameters: The kind of predicate that governs the infinitive, and the syntactic position of the infinitive. Notice that in the structure standardly called "extraposition", *Mary* cannot control PRO in (2a), but can do so in (2b) (though local control is more natural; see section 2 for discussion). However, this contrast is neutralized when the infinitive is in subject position, as in (2c,d).

Surprising as it may seem, the paradigm in (2) has never been considered *in its entirety*; as will be shown in section 6, existing accounts of Super-Equi fail to explain at least one of its members. Explaining this paradigm is the main goal of this chapter; that is, combining the notion of control developed in chapter 2 with natural assumptions about the argument structure of different predicates and the syntax of extraposition, in a way which produces the peculiar pattern of locality in (2). By the end of the road, we will obtain a fuller picture of the variety of ways in which control interfaces with other grammatical processes.

This chapter is organized as follows: Section 1.1 states the empirical challenge facing any adequate theory of Super-Equi, in terms as neutral as possible: Two generalizations are formulated concerning the interaction of control with the semantic class of the predicate governing the infinitive and the infinitive's position. Some crosslinguistic evidence, presented in section 1.2, suggests that the above generalizations are not limited to English, and may be universal. An analysis is developed in section 2, incorporating the proposal that extraposition is driven by a PF constraint; LF, however, may interpret the copy at the base position ("reconstruction"). I further propose a characterization of obligatory control (OC) as a relation holding between an infinitive *in-situ* and a local controller. This descriptive generalization, yet to be derived, covers all the relevant cases of OC, considerably simplifying earlier statements.

In section 3 I explore some surprising configurational predictions this analysis makes: Correlations between extraction and non-local (i.e., long-distance or arbitrary) control support the idea that OC is linked to infinitives *in-situ* and NOC to displaced infinitives (subjects or extraposed). In section 4 I discuss some apparent problems which turn out, upon closer analysis, to be harmless to the present proposal. Section 4.1 discusses OC out of inalienably possessed nouns and section 4.2 shows that apparent OC into sentential subjects is a lexically governed phenomenon orthogonal to control.

Section 5.1 returns to the OC Generalization stated in section 2 and derives it from the theory of control developed in chapter 2 - in essence, an adaptation of Borer's (1989) "Anaphoric Agr" idea within Chomsky's (1998) theory of phases and Agree. Sections 5.2 argues that the basic distributional properties of OC cannot be reduced to the Binding Condition A; seven independent arguments are presented to this effect. In section 5.3 I turn to NOC and argue that it is a case of logophoric anaphora in the sense of Reinhart & Reuland (1993) - that is, an anaphoric Agr that fails to be syntactically licensed. Alternative theories, which take PRO in NOC to be pronominal, overgenerate structures that are correctly ruled out under the present

proposal. Finally, section 6 is a critical review of the literature on Super-Equi, pointing out where various proposals meet or fail to meet the empirical challenges posed by this phenomenon.

1. SUPER-EQUI: THE DATA

1.1. *The Problem*

The first to note and analyse Super-Equi was Grinder (1970), who also named the construction. Grinder observed that in examples like (3), the understood subject of the bracketed nonfinite clause is coreferential with an NP (italicized below) which bears no unique syntactic relation to it, and can be indefinitely remote:

- (3) a. *Eric* insisted that it would be ridiculous [to call for help].
- b. That [covering themselves with mud] disturbed *Spiro* amused *Dick*.

Grinder proposed a rule of Super Equi-NP Deletion which deletes the subject of the nonfinite clause under identity with a commanding NP. He further suggested to collapse this rule with the local rule of Equi-NP Deletion (Rosenbaum 1967), applying in control of complement clauses. The empirical content of his proposal resides in the characterization of the restrictions on the application of the rule. These can be seen in the following paradigm cited by Grinder:

- (4) a. John said that making a fool of herself in public disturbed Sue.
- b. John said that making a fool of himself in public disturbed Sue.
- c. John said that it disturbed Sue to make a fool of herself in public.
- d. * John said that it disturbed Sue to make a fool of himself in public.

To facilitate discussion, let us refer to cases where the controller occurs in the clause immediately dominating the PRO-containing infinitive/gerund as *local control*, and cases where it does not *long-distance (LD) control*. Let us further refer to the nonfinite clause in (4a,b) as in *intraposition* and in (4c,d) as in *extraposition*, taking these terms as strictly descriptive labels at the moment. Then Grinder's facts amount to the observation that if a local controller is available then it is obligatory in extraposition but optional in intraposition.¹

For nearly 30 years now, this asymmetry was taken to constitute the fundamental empirical challenge facing any theory of Super-Equi. That is, the challenge was to formalize a locality principle that would be restrictive enough to rule out LD-control

¹ For some speakers (4d) improves if the matrix tense is modal (*would, might*, etc.). Yet for other speakers the example remains bad (as reported by Kuno (1975, ex.33b), Clements (1975, ex.15b), and Chierchia & Jacobson (1986, ex.21b)). Crosslinguistic data (see section 1.2) reflect a similar tendency in some but not all languages; hence, I will assume that the modal effect is secondary. However, to avoid controversy, I will use only past tense in this kind of example. In section 5.3 I return to a possible source for this effect.

in extraposition with a potential local controller (4d) but not too stringent to rule it out in extraposition without a potential local controller (3a) or in intraposition ((3b) and (4b)). In section 6 I show that quite a few theories of control in generative grammar fail to account for Grinder's facts. However, the starting point of the present account is a critique on the generality of Grinder's own observations.

It turns out that Grinder's paradigm is misleadingly partial; and that once the full paradigm is considered, the line between LD and local control ceases to correspond to the line between intraposition and extraposition. The relevant factor is the semantic class of the predicate governing the infinitive. The following examples present the full paradigm:

- (5) a. Mary knew that it was painful to John [PRO to perjure himself / *herself].
- b. Mary knew that it was harmful to John [PRO to perjure himself / herself].
- c. Mary knew that [PRO to perjure himself / herself] would be painful to John.
- d. Mary knew that [PRO to perjure himself / herself] would be harmful to John.

- (6) a. Mary thought that it pleased John [PRO to speak his / *her mind].
- b. Mary thought that it helped John [PRO to speak his / her mind].
- c. Mary thought that [PRO to speak his / her mind] would please John.
- d. Mary thought that [PRO to speak his / her mind] would help John.

- (7) a. Mary thought that it was a relief to John [PRO to take care of himself / *herself].
- b. Mary thought that it was a help to John [PRO to take care of himself / herself].
- c. Mary thought that [PRO to take care of himself / herself] would be a relief to John
- d. Mary thought that [PRO to take care of himself / herself] would be a help to John

The property that *painful/please/relief* have in common but which *harmful/help/a help* lack is that of being psychological. By that we simply mean that statements like "X is painful to Y" carry certain psychological entailments with respect to the mental state of Y, whereas statements like "X is harmful to Y" carry no such entailments.

Two comments are in order: The (b) cases above trigger a residual garden-path effect, giving rise to some difficulty under the LD-control reading. There is a principled parsing source for this effect, which in fact supports the analysis developed below; I discuss it in section 3. Crucially, though, speakers easily recover

Elements of Control

Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions

Landau, I.

2000, IX, 215 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-0-7923-6620-1