Approaches to control phenomena
handout 3

Control as movement

Chapter 3: Basic properties of the movement theory of control

John seemed to kiss Mary/John tried to kiss Mary.

Null hypothesis: uniform analysis unless strong reasons against it. Same grammatical device: A-movement? Incorrectness has to be be demonstrated.

GB: D-structure vs. Minimalism: strong reasons not necessarily valid any more.

Controlled PRO as a trace of A-movement: configurational, phonetic and interpretive propertiesof control can be deduced, PRO can be dispensed with.

History: more emphasis on semantic difference → proposal for different derivational profiles.

(2) a. [John$_1$ seemed [t_1 to kiss Mary]] A-movement with coindexation
b. [John$_1$ tried [PRO$_1$ to kiss Mary]] PRO and binding

Alternative:

(3) [John$_1$ tried [t_1 to kiss Mary]] difference between (2a) and (3): θ-roles

GB: contructions not theoretical primitives but epiphenomena resulting form the interaction of more basic operations (Move α). *Wh*-questions/relative clauses: A'-movement (without the claim that they are the same); passive/raising: A-movement; differences follow from other components (θ-theory). Is it possible to eliminate the exceptional theoretical status of the control construction? Not as long as we have a DS component in our grammar where all lexical-insertion operations precede all movement transformations.

Advantage: semantic differences derived:

(8) a. There seems to be someone kissing Mary
b. *There tried to be someone kissing Mary

(9) a. The cat seems to be out of the bag (idiomatic interpretation: OK)
b. The cat tried to be out of the bag (idiomatic interpretation: *)

(10) a. The doctor seemed to examine Mary ~ Mary seemed to be examined by the doctor
b. The doctor tried to examine Mary ≠ Mary tried to be examined by the doctor
(no voice transparency, Mary becomes the thematic subject of *try*)

"Retaining the clumsy construction sensitivity of the control module in a principles-and-parameters model seemed a reasonable price to pay."

The architecture of the model changes → reconsideration of the null hypothesis.

Lexical insertion/θ-role assignment and movement can be freely interspersed.

(16) What did Mary say that John saw

(17) a. *Merger of* 'saw' *and* 'what' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[saw what]
b. *Merger of T:*
[T [saw what]]
c. *Merger of* 'John' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[John [T [saw what]]]
d. *Merger of* 'that'*:*
[that [John [T [saw what]]]]
e. *Movement of* 'what':
[what$_i$ [that [John [T [saw t_i]]]]]
f. *Merger of* 'say' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[say [what$_i$ [that [John [T [saw t_i]]]]]]
g. *Merger of T:*
[T [say [what$_i$ [that [John [T [saw t_i]]]]]]]
h. *Merger of* 'Mary' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[Mary [T [say [what$_i$ [that [John [T [saw t_i]]]]]]]]
i. *Merger of C:*
[C [Mary [T [say [what$_i$ [that [John [T [saw t_i]]]]]]]]]
j. *Movement of* 'what':
[what [C [Mary [T [say [what$_i$ [that [John [T [saw t_i]]]]]]]]]]
Movement as a composite operation including Merge/Movement as Internal Merge: same mechanism for θ-role assignment? → Empirical question (see also (8)-(10).
Chomsky (2004): thematic information must be discharged via external merge, dropping DS does not automatically lead to the Movement Theory of Control (MTC).

(18) John tried to kiss Mary

(19) a. *Merger of* 'kiss' *and* 'Mary' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[kiss Mary]
b. *Merger of T:*
[T [kiss Mary]]
c. *Merger of* 'John' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[John [T [kiss Mary]]]
d. *Merger of C:*
[C [John [T [kiss Mary]]]]
e. *Merger of* 'tried' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[tried [C [John [T [kiss Mary]]]]]
f. *Merger of T:*
[T [tried [C [John [T [kiss Mary]]]]]]
g. *Movement of* 'John' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[John$_i$ [T [tried [C [t_i [T [kiss Mary]]]]]]]

Controlled PROs as A-movement traces: all the distinctive properties of OC control accounted for.

Configurational properties: standard properties of traces of A-movement.
a) OC PRO requires an antecedent
b) Its antecedent must c-command it
c) Its antecedent must be local
d) It cannot appear in case-marked positions
No two subspecies of A-chains: under the MTC A-chains are uniformly associated with one case position (no caseless chain headed by PRO required).

Interpretive properties
e) PRO gets a sloppy interpretation under ellipsis: tracks with rasing constructions: *John seems cooperative and Bill does, too* – same type of dependency?; exact account ellipsis-related question)

f) It cannot have split antecedents: *one trace for two DPs in one and the same position

g) It has an obligatory *de se* interpretation in "unfortunate" contexts
(32) a. [[The unfortunate]1 expects [PRO1 to get a medal]]
(#Although he doesn't expect himself to get a medal)
b. [[The unfortunate]1 expects [that he1 should get a medal]]
(Although he doesn't expect himself to get a medal)

h) It must receive a bound interpretation when linked to an only-DP

(34) John expected to kiss Mary

(35) a. *Applications of merge:*
[to kiss Mary]

b. *Merger of* 'John' **+** *assignment of "kisser" θ-role:*
[John$^{\text{kisser}}$ to kiss Mary]
c. *Applications of merge:*
[T expected [John$^{\text{kisser}}$ to kiss Mary]]

d. *Movement of* 'John' **+** *assignment of "expecter" θ-role:*

[John$_1$ $^{\text{expecter+kisser}}$ T expected [t_1 to kiss Mary]]

(36) John (λx [x expected x kiss Mary])

Complex monadic predicates: inherently reflexive semantics (also A-movement?)
Interpretatition of multiple thematic positions *within* a chain (cf. [32a], and [34]) vs. multiple thematic positions in a dependency relation *across* chains (cf. [32b]).

LFs:
(37) a. [The unfortunate] (λx [x expected x to win a medal])
(38) a. [The unfortunate] (λx [x expected that he should win a medal])

Intra-chain "binding" is restricted to *de se* and bound readings as it involves complex monadic predicates, as opposed to inter-chain binding. Only a single expression "binding" two θ-positions yields a necessarily *de se* reading (Not only *de se* in [Every soldier]$_1$ expected that he$_1$ would kiss Mary)

Phonetic properties: PRO as a primitive lexical formative: lack of phonetic content non-explainable. Sematic property: variable. PRO/NP-trace: violate the Inclusiveness Condition (banning the creation of new objects in the course of the syntactic computation) → copy theory of movement.

(41) John hoped to see Mary

(42) a. *Applications of merge:*
[T hoped [John to see Mary]]

b. *Copying and merger of* 'John' **+** *θ-assignment:*
[John[1] [T hoped [John[1] to see Mary]]]
c. *Deletion of the lower copy in the phonological component:*
[John[1] [T hoped [John[1] to kiss Mary]]]

Copy-theory of movement: not the same as Equi-deletion!
(43) a. Everyone wants to win
b. Everyone wants everyone to win

(44) a. [Everyone[1] T wants [everyone[1] to win]]
b. [Everyone[2] T wants [everyone[1] to win]]

Chapter 4: Empirical advantages
A) Morphological invisibility: PRO blocking sandhi-phenomena (*wanna*-contraction)

Who do you **wanna** banish from the room?

*Who do you **wanna** vanish from the room?

[John$_1$ is **going** t_1 **to** kiss Mary]→John is **gonna** kiss Mary

Jaeggli 1980: case-marked elements block contraction, caseless elements do not. (!PRO with Case?)

[I don't **want** [[**PRO to** undress in public] to become standard practice]]→

*I don't **wanna** undress in public to become standard practice

B) Interclausal agreement
(5) [TP ego$_i$ sum [SC t_i bonus]] raising analysis of copular sentences

(6) *Latin* (Cecchetto and Oniga 2004):
a. [E**go** volo [PRO esse **bonus**]]
*I.**NOM** want to-be good.**NOM***
'I want to be good'
b. [Ego iubeo **te** [PRO esse **bonum**]]
*I.NOM order you.**ACC** to-be good.ACC*
'I command you to be good'
Also for φ-features such as gender (Italian and Brazilian Portuguese OC vs. NOC → different empty categories?)

C) Finite control

(17) *Brazilian Portuguese:*
O Jo˜ao disse que comprou um carro novo
The Jo˜ao said that bought a car new
'Jo˜ao said that he bought a new car'

(18) a. $[_{TP}\ T_{[N:u]/EPP}\ [_{vP}\ João_{[case:u]}$ buy- a new car]]
b. $[_{TP}\ João_{[case:u]}\ T_{\mathbf{[N:default]/\sout{EPP}}}\ [_{vP}\ t$ buy- a new car]]
c. $[_{vP}\ João_{[case:u]}$ said $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TP}\ t\ T_{[N:default]/\sout{EPP}}\ [_{vP}\ t$ buy- a new car]]]]
d. $[_{TP}\ T_{[P:u;\ N:u]/EPP}\ [_{vP}\ João_{[case:u]}$ said $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TP}\ t\ T_{[N:default]/\sout{EPP}}$ . . .]]]]
e. $[_{TP}\ João_{\mathbf{[case:NOM]}}\ T_{\mathbf{[P:default;\ N:default]/\sout{EPP}}}\ [_{vP}\ t$ said $[_{CP}$ that . . .]]]

Cross-linguistic rarity of construction: finiteness strongly correlates with φ-completeness.
φ-deficiency → porous domains → A-movement/control/raising possible

fn7: (i) *Kinande* (Mark Baker, personal communication):
Mo-tw-a-gan-ire eri-seny-a olukwi
AFF.1PS.T.refuse.EXT INF.chop.FV wood
'We refused to chop the wood'
(ii) *Kinande* (Mark Baker, personal communication):
a. Tu-li-nga mo-tw-a-na-gend-ire
1PS.be-if AFF.1PS.T.INDEED.go.EXT
'We seem to have left'
b. Ebitsungu bi-li-nga mo-by-a-huk-ir-w-e
potatoes.8 8.be-if AFF.8.T.cook.PASS.EXT
'The potatoes seem to have been cooked'

Hyper-raising:

(31) *Brazilian Portuguese* (Nunes 2008a):
a. [**Ningu´em** mexeu **um dedo** para me ajudar]
Nobody moved **a *finger*** *to me help*
'Nobody lifted a finger to help me'
b. *[**Ningu´em** disse [que a Maria mexeu **um dedo** para me ajudar]]
Nobody *said that the Maria moved* ***a finger*** *to me help*
'Nobody said that Maria didn't lift a finger to help me'

(32) *Brazilian Portuguese* (Nunes 2008a) (UNACCEPTABLE IN EUROPEAN PORTUGUESE!):
a. **[Ningu´em** disse [que ia mexer **um** dedo para me ajudar]]
Nobody *said that went move* ***a finger*** *to me help*
'Nobody said that he wasn't going to lift a finger to help me'
b. [**Ningu´em** parecia [que ia mexer **um dedo** para me ajudar]]
Nobody *seemed that went move* **a *finger*** *to me help*
'It seemed that nobody was going to lift a finger to help me'

(33) a. [TP nobody$_i$ [vP t_i said [CP that [TP t_i would [vP t_i lift a finger to help me]]]]]
b. [TP nobody$_i$ [vP seemed [CP that [TP t_i would [vP t_i lift a finger to help me]]]]]

Same island and intervention effects for A-movement/finite control/hyper-raising