

Agree or Move? On Partial Control

Anna Snarska, Adam Mickiewicz University

1. Introduction

While in the history of generative grammar the distinction between Obligatory Control (OC) and Non-obligatory Control (NOC) has been high on the agenda for a long time, recently a fresh idea has been thrust into the limelight posing a real challenge to any theory of control (cf. Landau 2000). It has been proved that the relation between PRO and its controller is not always one of identity, that is the referent of PRO seems to include not only the syntactic antecedent but also other individuals salient in the context. Consequently, this phenomenon has come to be known as *partial control (PC)*.

- (1) (...) *one can already see how damaging the very existence of partial control is to the thesis “control is raising.” Simply put: there is no partial raising. (...) At the very least, Hornstein’s theory must make room for cases of OC that are not reducible to raising. But if that much is conceded, then the whole project of eliminating PRO and the control module is voided.*

(Landau 2003: 493)

2. Partial control as illuminated by Landau (2000) (syntactic vision)

2.1 Analysis

→ Bifurcation of the solution to OC: Partial control (PC) and Exhaustive control (EC):

- (2) a. John₁ wants [PRO₁₊ to meet in the morning]. PC

- b. Susan₁ forgot [PRO₁ to write a paper]. EC

(3) EC verbs:

- a. Implicative: *dare, manage, remember, force...*
b. Aspectual: *begin, start, continue, finish...*
c. Modal: *have, need, may, should ...*

PC verbs:

- a. Factive: *glad, sad, hate, like...*
b. Propositional: *believe, think, claim, deny...*
c. Desiderative: *want, prefer, arrange, hope, promise...*
d. Interrogative: *wonder, ask, understand, know...*

→ The split between PC and EC is anchored to the infinitival tense: PC verbs are [+tense] whereas EC verbs are [-tense]

- (4) a. *Yesterday, John managed to solve the problem tomorrow.
b. Yesterday, John wanted to solve the problem tomorrow.

→ T-to-C movement at work in tensed complements

(5) The remaining set of assumptions (Landau 2000: 62):

- a. DPs, including PRO, enter the derivation with valued ϕ -features.
b. Functional heads enter the derivation with unvalued ϕ -features.
c. Semantic Plurality (SP): +/- on DP, +/- \emptyset on functional heads.
d. Matching: \emptyset (i.e., no SP) and [-SP] are non-distinct on functional heads.
e. PRO and infinitival Agr are anaphoric.
f. PRO, being anaphoric, cannot value unvalued functional heads.

Technical implementation (reliance on the operation Agree of Chomsky 1999, 2000):

- (6) a. $[_{CP} F_{[\emptyset SP]} \dots DP_{[-SP]} \dots [_{CP} [_{TP} PRO_{[-SP]} [_{T} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]} [_{VP} t_{PRO} \dots]]]]]$ EC
 $[_{Agree1} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]}, PRO_{[-SP]}], [_{Agree2} F_{[-SP]}, DP_{[-SP]}], [_{Agree3} F_{[-SP]}, PRO_{[-SP]}]$
- b. $[_{CP} F_{[\emptyset SP]} \dots DP_{[-SP]} \dots [_{CP} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]+C} [_{TP} PRO_{[+SP]} [_{T} t_{T-Agr} [_{VP} t_{PRO} \dots]]]]]$ PC
 $[_{Agree1} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]}, PRO_{[+SP]}], [_{Agree2} F_{[-SP]}, DP_{[-SP]}], [_{Agree3} F_{[-SP]}, T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]}]$

2.2 Certain inelegancies of Landau's proposal

→ Hornstein (2003: 41): PC with the gerundive complements is troublesome since gerunds are deemed TPs, so they should be incapable of employing the PC mechanism which is inextricably linked to C but:

- (7) John₁ prefers [PRO₁₊ meeting at six].

→ Nominalizations of EC and PC verbs have the same behavior as their verbal counterparts (Dubinsky 2007):

- (8) a. *John's attempt to meet at noon
 b. *John's coercion of Arthur to meet at noon
 c. John's desire to meet at noon
 d. John's persuasion of Arthur to meet at noon

→ Landau's system fails to differentiate between the EC and PC reading of collective nouns:

- (9) a. The family₁ hopes [PRO₁ to gather at three]. EC
 b. The family₁ hopes [PRO₁₊ to gather at three]. PC¹
- (10) a. $[_{CP} F_{[\emptyset SP]} \dots DP_{[+SP]} \dots [_{CP} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]+C} [_{TP} PRO_{[+SP]} [_{T} t_{T-Agr} [_{VP} t_{PRO} \dots]]]]]$ PC
 $[_{Agree1} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]}, PRO_{[+SP]}], [_{Agree2} F_{[+SP]}, DP_{[+SP]}], [_{Agree3} F_{[+SP]}, T-Agr_{[+SP]}]$
- b. $[_{CP} F_{[\emptyset SP]} \dots DP_{[+SP]} \dots [_{CP} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]+C} [_{TP} PRO_{[+SP]} [_{T} t_{T-Agr} [_{VP} t_{PRO} \dots]]]]]$ EC
 $[_{Agree1} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]}, PRO_{[+SP]}], [_{Agree2} F_{[+SP]}, DP_{[+SP]}], [_{Agree3} F_{[+SP]}, T-Agr_{[+SP]}]$ ²

→ The lack of PC in adjuncts although they are [+tense]

¹ To be more precise, (8a) is an example of PC (*hope* is a PC verb). However, "some tokens of PC show identity between PRO and the controller, just like all tokens of EC do" (Landau, 2000: 3).

² Adopting basic tenets of Landau's theory, Bondaruk (2004) also faces the same problem in Polish EC and PC constructions. In her account PC relates to the binding of anaphoric Agr by a matrix functional head, in lieu of T-to-C movement.

- (i) Rodzina₁ ma nadzieję [PRO₁ zgrupować się o trzeciej] EC
 (ii) Rodzina₁ ma nadzieję [PRO₁₊ zgrupować się o trzeciej]. PC
 Family has hope to-gather REFL at three

And this is their common derivation:

- (iii) $[_{CP} F_{[\emptyset SP]} \dots DP_{[+SP]} \dots [_{TP} PRO_{[+SP]} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]} \dots]]$
 $[_{Agree1} T-Agr_{[\emptyset SP]}, PRO_{[+SP]}], [_{Agree2} F_{[+SP]}, DP_{[+SP]}]$ + binding of the embedded T-Agr by a matrix F (T-Agr inherits [+SP] from the matrix F).

- (11) a. *John saw Mary after/without meeting at six.
 b. *John saw Mary early (in order) to meet at Max's at six.
 c. John bought the chicken yesterday (in order) to eat it tomorrow.

→ EC/PC division seriously undermined (Rodrigues 2007):

- (12) a. I can't meet tomorrow. My daughter is getting married.
 b. *Yesterday I couldn't meet tomorrow. My daughter will be getting married.
 c. *I try to meet tomorrow, but I can guarantee that I'll be there.
 d. I can try to meet tomorrow, but I can't guarantee that I'll be there.

→ infinitives are tenseless: Wurmbrand (2007)

- (13) a. finite future: [PRES], [woll]
 Leo decided a week ago that he will go to the party (*yesterday).
 b. non-finite future: [ØPRES], [woll]
 Leo decided a week ago to go to the party yesterday.

- (14) a. [_{VP} John_j [_{VP} [_V decided [_{wollP} woll [_{VP} PRO_{j+} [_{V'} to leave]]]]]] PC
 b. [_{VP} John_j [_{VP} [_V tried [_{VP} PRO_j [_{V'} to leave]]]]] EC

→ Rodrigues (2007): PRO₁₊ is both syntactically and semantically singular.

- (15) a. A vítima quer se encontrar bêbada/*bêbadas/
 The victim-Fem.Sg wants-3Sg SE meet-Inf drunk-Fem.Sg/
 (PC) *bêbado/*bêbados
 *drunk-Fem.Pl/*drunk-Masc.Sg/*drunk-Masc.Pl (Portuguese)
 'The victim (semantically male) wants to meet (with somebody

else) drunk'

- b. A gente está cansados/cansadas
 we-Sg is-3Sg tired-Masc.Pl/tired-Fem.Pl
 'we, the girls, are tired' (Eur. Portuguese)

3. Incorporating PC into the Movement Theory of Control

3.1. Hornstein (2003) and his semantocentric account

(16) Meaning postulate for PC:

If 'DP Vs [_{TP} to VP]' then 'DP Vs [_{TP} DP and some contextually specified others to VP]'

- (17) a. John wants to meet at six.
 b. John wants John and some contextually specified others to meet at six.
 c. John wants [John to meet at six].

(18) John is a really busy professor. His days are filled with meetings, with students, deans, colleagues, lunch appointments, etc. Can you imagine?! Yesterday John met at 8 a.m., 9 a.m., 10 a.m., noon and 7 p.m. His wife told me, "John seems to be meeting all the time!"

3.2. The move-and-strand approach (Rodrigues 2007)

→ PC results from movement plus stranding of the adjoined pronoun construed as an associate plural to a DP controller.

- (19) a. John wants [PRO₁₊ to meet in the morning].
 b. [_{TP} John [_{VP} {John} v [_{VP} wants [_{TP} {John} T-to [_{wollP} woll [_{VP} [_{DP} pro {John}] v [_{VP} [_{VP} meet] [_{PP} in the morning]]]]]]]].

4. Parasitic PC effects (PPCE) (Witkoś and Snarska 2007)

Run-of-the-mill PC into adjunct clauses impossible:

- (20) a. *John saw Mary after/without [PRO₁₊ meeting at six].
- b. *John saw Mary early (in order) [PRO₁₊ to meet at Max's at six].

PPCE: once adjunct control is coupled with PC in a complement clause, PC in the adjunct clause becomes licit:

- (21) As a leader of an illegal organization Peter wants to meet somewhere...
Yes, Peter wants to meet in the old barn so that/in order not to gather in a public place.

The existence of PPCE is problematic to Landau's theory: PC complements must be selected, and adjuncts are not.

There must be separate *wolIP* in the adjunct clause and a movement of the controller to the embedded [Spec,TP], stranding the collective *pro* in the scope of *woll*:

- (22) *?Peter wants to meet in a dark room so that to kiss each other.
- (23) PPCE accommodated under the Movement Theory of Control
 - a. [CP C_{SO} that [TP {DP Peter} T_{to} [wollP woll [vP [DP pro {Peter}] [vP [VP gather in a public place]]]]]
 - b. [DP pro [DP Peter]]

- c. [TP [DP Peter] T_{to} [wollP woll [vP [DP pro {DP Peter}] v [vP [VP meet] [PP in the old barn]]]]]
- d. [TP [TP [DP Peter] T [vP {DP Peter} v [vP wants [TP {DP Peter} T_{not} to [wollP woll [vP [DP pro {DP Peter}] v [vP [VP meet] [PP in the old barn]]]]]]]] [CP C_{SO} that [TP {DP Peter} T_{to} [wollP woll [vP [DP pro {Peter}] [vP gather in a public place]]]]]

- (24) The Parasitic PC Postulate:
Unselected *wolIP* licenses the associative *pro* on DP only when this licensing is subject to confirmation on the same DP by a selected *wolIP*.

5. Conclusions

Carefully and meticulously constructed Landau's account of PC within the Agree Theory of Control is not airtight. It is plagued by myriad problems, both conceptual and empirical. As such, it cannot constitute a compelling and potent argument against the Movement Theory of Control which can quite successfully handle all the relevant PC data. Obviously, the theoretical status of PC is still up in the air. However, the examination of both proposals points to the following: the Movement Theory of Control is definitely not inferior (if not superior) to the Agree Theory of Control, at least with respect to PC .

REFERENCES

- Barrie, M. and Pittman, C. 2004. Partial Control and the movement towards movement. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 22: 75-92.
- 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. 2006. The virtues of control as movement. *Syntax* 9: 118:130.
- Bondaruk, A. 2004. *PRO and Control in English, Irish and Polish: a minimalist analysis*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Bondaruk, A. 2006. Minimalist approaches to Control: A critical overview. *Research in Language* 4: 91-126.
- Bowers, J. 2005. On reducing Obligatory Control to movement. Ms. Cornell University.
- Chomsky, N. 1999. Derivation by phase. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In *Step by step: Essays in honor of Howard Lasnik*. R. Martin, D. Michaels & Uriagereka, J. (eds.) 89-156. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT press.
- Culicover, P. and Jackendoff, R. 2001. Control is not movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 493-511.
- Culicover, P. and Jackendoff, R. 2003. The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79: 517-556.
- 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 *Minimalist syntax*. R. Hendrick (ed.) 6-81. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hornstein, N. 2006. A short note on NOC. *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 14: 39-46.
- 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-resistant aspects of control. Ms. Ben Gurion University.
- Pires, A. 2001a. Clausal and TP-defective gerunds: control without tense. Ms. University of Maryland at College Park.
- Rodrigues, C. 2007. Agreement and flotation in partial and inverse partial control configurations. Ms. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Witkoś, J. and Snarska, A. 2007. On partial control and parasitic PC effects. Ms. Adam Mickiewicz University.
- Wurmbrand, S. 2003. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, S. 2007. Infinitives are tenseless. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 13.1: 407-420.

