Landau's chapter 1: OC/NOC

Obligatory Control _(=antecedence relation)

1.

The OC signature
In a control construction $[\ldots X_i \ldots [_S PRO_i \ldots] \ldots]$, where X controls the PRO subject of the clause S:
a. The controller(s) X must be (a) co-dependent(s) of S.
b. PRO (or part of it) must be interpreted as a bound variable.

¥ ˙7Ua Vf]X[Yˉl b]j Yfg]hm̈DfYgg"ˉ5``ˉf][\hgˉfYgYfj YX"ˉH\]gˉWċbhŸbhˉ]gˉYl Ẉ XYXˉŹfca ˉci fˉ7fYUh]j Y
7ca a cbgˉ`]WˉbgY"ˉ: cfˉa cfYˉ]bŹ́cfa Uh]cbžˉgYY ˉ\hhd. ##cWk "a ]h'YXi #ĄY`d#ZUe!ZU]f!i gY#"

(The rest is NOC)

NOTE: (1) is NOT a theory, but a heuristic, as Landau himself points out!

-The Controller is represented as X and not just as a DP, to include implicit arguments.

-"X is co-dependent" of S: X is an argument or adjunct of a predicate in which S is an argument or adjunct. (clausemate)

-"Part of it" to include partial control

Practice! The following are excluded as OC by (1). Why?

arbitrary control:

2. * Mary hates [PROarb to nominate oneself].

long-distance control:

3. * Mary$_i$ realized that John hated [PRO$_i$ to nominate herself].

non-c-commanding control:

4. * Mary's$_i$ colleagues hated [PRO$_i$ to nominate herself].

Let's build up towards something else that (1a) captures.

Remember VP ellipsis:

5. Mary likes her brother and Susan does ~~like her brother~~ too

Do you see an ambiguity in (5)?

6a. Mary$_i$….. and Susan$_k$ likes her$_i$ brother strict r.

 b. Mary$_i$….. and Susan$_k$ liker her$_k$ brother sloppy r.

Now look at VP-ellipsis of an OC infinitive:

7. Sue is eager to be on time and Katie is too

strict reading? sloppy? both?
what would each reading be?

8. Sue$_i$ expects [PRO$_i$ to be on time] and
 Katie$_k$ does ~~expect [PRO~~$_{k/*i}$ ~~to be on time]~~ too
 Sloppy reading only!
 How does (1a) capture this?
 X and S must be co-dependents!

What about 1b?

"PRO (or part of it) must be interpreted as a bound variable".

Background: What is the ambiguity in (9):

9. Only I did my homework

10a. I am the only x such that x did my homework

strict reading

b. I am the only x such that x did x's homework

bound variable reading

Now look at (11):

11. Only Peter claimed that he was the winner

strict reading of *he*:
Peter = Only *x* [*x* claimed Peter is the winner].

bound variable reading *he*:
Peter = Only *x* [*x* claimed *x* is the winner].

12a. Peter claimed that he (Peter) won, Jane claimed that she (Jane) won and Roy claimed that he (Roy) won.
   b. Peter, Jane and Roy claimed that Peter won the game.

The overt pronoun has both readings.

13. Only Peter claimed [PRO to be the winner]

Look again at the contexts:

12a. Peter claimed that he (Peter) won, Jane claimed that she (Jane) won and Roy claimed that he (Roy) won.

   b. Peter, Jane and Roy claimed that Peter won the game.

PRO has the bound variable reading only!

All this was OC into IPs that were complements of verbs. What about into adjuncts? Here are some:

14a. Bill$_i$ called us [before/after/while/without PRO$_i$ visiting his aunt].

  b. Mary$_i$ grew up [PRO$_i$ to be a famous actress].
  c. The ship$_i$ sank, [only PRO$_i$ to be dredged up again].
  d. Max$_i$ works hard [PRO$_i$ to stay out of jail].
  e. Mary$_i$ smiled [PRO$_i$ to think what a fool she had been].

Do the OC properties cluster together again?
They do!

Arbitrary, long-distance, or non-c-commanding Control is out:

15. Mary$_i$ thought [that [our$_j$ son]$_k$ should apologize [after PRO$_{*i/*j/*arb/k}$ embarrassing *herself/*ourselves/*oneself/himself]].

Only sloppy reading under ellipsis:

16. Mark$_i$ trembled [PRO$_i$ to hear the results of the vote],

    and Beth$_j$ did ~~tremble [PRO~~$_{j/*i}$~~ to hear the results of the vote]~~ too

Bound variable reading? Compare the overt pronoun to PRO. pronoun: BV +S; PRO: only BV:

17a. Only Peter$_i$ laughs [after PRO$_i$ telling jokes].
  b. Only Peter$_i$ laughs [after he$_i$ tells jokes].

18a. Peter laughs after he (Peter) tells jokes, Jane laughs after she (Jane) tells jokes, and Roy laughs after he (Roy) tells jokes.
  b. Peter, Jane and Roy laugh after Peter tells jokes.

19a. BV: Peter = Only x [x laughs after x tells jokes]
  b. S: Peter = Only x [x laughs after Peter tells jokes].

OC:

-no arbitrary control

-no long distance control

-no non-commanding control

-only sloppy reading under VP-ellipsis

-only bound-variable reading with a quantificational controller

NOC, on the other hand:

-arbitrary control:

20. [PRO$_{arb}$ to be on time] is very important

-long-distance control:

21. Katie$_m$ thinks that it is believed that [PRO$_m$ introducing herself$_m$ properly] is important

-a non-c-commanding antecedent:

22. Mary$_k$'s brother believes that [PRO$_k$ introducing herself$_k$ properly] will prove to be crucial in her interviews

Both sloppy and strict readings in VP-ellipsis:

23. Katie things that introducing herself properly is important and Mary does too

24a. ….and Mary$_m$ believes that [PRO$_m$ introducing herself$_m$ properly] is important too   (sloppy)

 b. . ….and Mary$_m$ believes that [PRO$_k$ introducing herself$_k$ properly] is important   (strict)

-both strict and bound variable readings:

25. [Only Bill] expected that [[PRO reciting *The Tiger*] would impress Jane].

26a. BV: Bill = Only *x* [*x* expected that X's reciting *The Tiger*] would impress Jane].

b. Strict: Bill = Only *x* [*x* expected that Bill's reciting *The Tiger*] would impress Jane.

So when do we get OC and when do we get NOC?

Landau:

Syntactic determinants of OC vs. NOC

27a. The *position* of the clause (complement, subject or adjunct).

    b. The *category* of the clause (CP vs. NP/DP).

    c. The *finiteness* of the clause (its tense/agreement specifications).

(we will not look at b and c)

27a. *Configurational effects on control*
Complement clauses fall under OC; subject and adjoined (extraposed) clauses fall under NOC.

(adjunct clauses come in different types; we will not cover them in this class)

complement clause:

28. We$_i$ thought that John would help Mary$_j$

[PRO$_{j/*i}$ to expose herself/ *ourselves]

subject clause:

29. We$_i$ thought that [[PRO$_{j/i}$ to expose herself/ourselves]] would help Mary$_j$.

extraposed clause:

30. We$_i$ thought that it would help Mary$_j$ [PRO$_{j/i}$ to expose herself/ourselves].

So: OC in complement clauses
     NOC in subject clauses and extraposed clauses

But this is not yet an explanation. It is a demonstration of internalized patterns that we have managed to figured out.

The question of why what we call "OC properties" happen in complement clauses and why "NOC properties" are observed in subject and extraposed clauses is a very important one.

But it is a question for a different class!

References

- Landau, Idan. "Control in Generative Grammar: A Research Companion." Cambridge University Press, 2013.

MIT OpenCourseWare
http://ocw.mit.edu

24.902 / 24.932 Language and its Structure II: Syntax
Fall 2015