Movement Theory of Control and CP-infinitives in Polish

Jacek Witkoś (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań)

Study of Control as a syntactic and semantic phenomenon has gained momentum within the framework of the minimalist approach to syntax. Especially two recent approaches to control have been in competition: the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) and the Agreement Theory of Control (ATC). This presentation primarily deals with two aspects of control into CP-infinitives in Polish: the alleged difficulty that Movement Theory of Control faces with control into CP-infinitives introduced by a lexical complementiser or a Wh-phrase and case-agreement with predicative adjectives in this type of control:

(1)   a.   Maria modliła się żeby zdać egzamin.

              Maria prayed REFL so-that to-pass exam

              'Maria prayed to pass the exam.'

     b.   Maria pyta gdzie kupić ser?

              Maria asks where to-buy cheese

              'Maria is asking where to buy cheese?'

We will be arguing in favour of the approach to control resting on MTC proposed and developed in Hornstein (1999, 2000, 2003, 2005), Boeckx and Hornstein (2003, 2004, 2006a-b) and Bowers (2005). We will show that an empirically successful account of control into CP-infinitives in Polish rests on the strategy of 'double access', namely, the domain of the CP-infinitive must be accessed independently for the raising of the 'controller' from the embedded subject position and, again, for agreement with predicative adjectives. In order to facilitate this access, we propose a pivotal modification in the definition of the verbal phase:

(2)   Every maximal verbal projection (VB Phrase) is a phase only when saturated with all of its arguments.

We take a maximal verbal projection to be vP in unergative and transitive constructions:

($[_{vP} ... v [_{VP} ... V ...]]$)

or VP in unaccusative constructions.

Such double access can account for both Obligatory Control properties of these constructions and optionality in case-agreement with the predicative adjective. The approach to control based on movement can account for these facts on the basis of the following assumptions:

(3)   Predicative adjective agreement in control:

     a.   only T can be a [+multiple] Probe;

     b.   OC PRO (t_{NP}) carries no case;

     c.   the predicative adjective appears in Instrumental as a default option.

This solution does not seem to be open to the analysis of control based on Agree, as in Landau (2000, 2003, 2004, 2006) and Bondaruk (2004, 2006), which contains a comprehensive discussion of control constructions in Polish. In the final section an additional bonus from adopting the MTC view of control is presented, namely the compatibility of both control relations and long distance Genitive case checking under negation in Polish. These merits, in and of themselves, do not mean that MTC is superior to ATC. They only go on to show that both approaches seem to linger in a state of equilibrium and Control in *żeby*-infinitives in Polish cannot tip this scale in favour of either theory.

References

Błaszczak, J. (2001). Covert movement and the Genitive of Negation in Polish. Linguistics in Potsdam 15.

Boeckx, C and Grohmann, K. (2006). Putting phases in perspective. Ms. Harvard University and University of Cyprus.

Boeckx, C. and Hornstein, N. (2003). Reply to 'Control is not movement'. Linguistic Inquiry 34: 269-280.

Boeckx, C. and Hornstein, N. (2004). Movement under control. Linguistic Inquiry 35: 431-452.

Boeckx, C. and Hornstein, N. (2006a). The virtues of control as movement. Syntax 9: 118-130.

Boeckx, C. and Hornstein, N. (2006b). (2006b). Control in Icelandic and theories of control. Linguistic Inquiry 37: 591-606.

Bondaruk, A. (2004). PRO and Control in English, Irish and Polish: a minimalist analysis. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

Bondaruk, A. (2005). Restructuring in Polish: a phase-based analysis. Paper presented at the 6th Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages in Potsdam, December 2005.

Bondaruk, A. (2006). Minimalist approaches to Control: A critical overview. Research in Lanuguage 4: 91-126.

Bowers, J. (2005). On reducing Obligatory Control to movement. Ms. Cornell University.

Castillo, J. C. Drury, J. E. and Grohmann, K.(1999). Merge over Move and the Extended Projection Principle. University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics 8: 63-103.

Chomsky, N. (1986). Barriers. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995). The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1998/2000). Minimalist inquiries. In Step by step: Essays in honour of Howard Lasnik. R. Martin, D. Michaels & Uriagereka, J. (eds.) 89-156. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1999/2001). Derivation by Phase. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18.

Chomsky, N. (2001). Beyond explanatory adequacy. Ms. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Chomsky, N. (2005). On phases. Ms. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Chomsky, N. (2006). Approaching UG from below. Ms. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Hiraiwa. (2001). Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 40: 67-80.

Hornstein, N. (1999). Movement and control. Linguistic Inquiry 30: 69-96.

Hornstein, N. (2000). Move! A minimalist theory of construal. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Hornstein, N. (2003). On Control. In R. Hendric (ed.), Minimalist syntax. Oxford: Blackwell. 6-81.

Hornstein, N. (2005). A short note on NOC. University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics.

Kayne, R. (2002). PRO and move paper In S.D. Epstein and T. S. Seely (eds.), Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program. Oxford: Blackwell. 133-166.

Landau. I. (2000). Elements of control. Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Landau. I. (2003). Movement out of control. Linguistic Inquiry 34: 471-498.

Landau, I. (2004). Movement-resistent aspects of Control. Ms. Ben-Gurion University.

Landau, I. (2006). Severing the distribution of PRO from case. Syntax 9: 153-170.

Legate, J. (2003). Some interface properties of the phase. Ms. University of Harvard.

McGinnis, M. (1998). Locality in A-movement. Doctoral dissertation MIT, Cambridge Mas. MITWPiL.

McGinnis, M. (2004). Lethal ambiguity. Linguistic Inquiry 35. 47–95.

Przepiórkowski, A. (1999). Case assignment and the complement/adjunct dichotomy. A non configurational constraint-based approach. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Tuebingen.

Przepiórkowski, A. (2000). Long distance Genitive of Negation in Polish. Journal of Slavic Linguistics 8: 119-158.

Rizzi, L. (1990). Relativised Minimality. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Rodrigues, C. (2004). Impoverished morphology and movement out of case domains. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.

Rodrigues, C. (2007). Agreement and flotation in Partial and Inverse Partial Control Configurations. Ms. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Tajsner, P. (1990). Case marking in English and Polish: a government and binding study. Ph.D. dissertation, Adam Mickieiwcz University, Poznań.

Willim, E. (1990). On case marking in Polish. Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics 25: 204-220.