

Landau's chapter 1: OC/NOC

Obligatory Control (=antecedence relation)

1.

The OC signature

In a control construction [... X_i ... [_S PRO_i ...] ...], 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[Y`I b]j Yfg]mDfYgg"5`f][\hg`fYgYfj YX""H\]g`WbYbh]g`YI W X YX`Zfca `ci f`7fYU]j Y
7ca a cbg`]WbgY"": cf`a cfY`]bZcfa U]cbz`gY` \hd. ##cVk "a]h`YXi #^Y`d#ZJe! ZJ]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 [PRO_{arb} 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 likes 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.

In context (12a): (11) is false on the bound variable reading of 'he' and true on the strict reading

In context (12b): (11) is true on the bound variable reading of 'he' and false on the strict reading

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 thinks 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

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.