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.

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.

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.
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))

In (100) Jon ERG in embedded clause, another 0-role in matrix clause, previous case specification obliterated.

The minimal distance principle:

John promised Mary [PRO to wash 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)
Further support:

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

(112) I did not promise this to Mary

(114) a. Who, did you persuade tJ to leave the party?

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

(116) a. John persuaded Mary, to go to the party undressed,
b. *John promised Mary, to go to the party undressed,
c. *John gave Mary, a book undressed

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

Control shift: also underlying PPs.

(125) [John asked [prP 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], decided [PRO1,4k to meet at 6]]

(138) [John, proposed to Mary, [PRO1,4k 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: commitative 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 [PRO1,4 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] hoped [to meet with the president]] → the presence of an overt commitative 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] decided [to [pro [t] 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, hates [t to meet *pro* committative angry]]
    b. [John, wants [t to meet *pro* committative ready for all contingencies]]

Inverse partial control: pp. 188-189.

Split control: based on Fujii (2006): three mood particles in Japanes in obligatory control constructions: (i) intentive 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. Committative DP for the second conjunct? ‘+’ as a commitative preposition is not an intervener (*promise*).

(167) \[\text{MoodP} [\alpha + \beta] [\text{Mood}^- \rightarrow(y)oo \ TP]]\]

(168) a. [vp [\alpha + \beta] [v\ V\ \ldots [\text{MoodP} [\alpha + \beta] [\text{Mood}^- \rightarrow(y)oo \ TP]]]]
    b. [vp [\alpha \ V\ \ldots [\text{MoodP} [\alpha + \beta] [\text{Mood}^- \rightarrow(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*/her, washing herself] delighted Mary,]
    b. John, said that [[pro/lim, 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 [pro₁ to leave]

What excludes (21b)?

(24) *John₁ kissed Mary without him₁ getting embarrassed
(25) John₁ kissed Mary₂ without pro₂ 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, said that [[pro, 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.