Landau’s chapter 1: OC/NOC
Obligatory Control  (=antecedence relation)

1. 

*The OC signature*

In a control construction \[ \ldots X_i \ldots [S \text{ PRO}_i \ldots ] \ldots \], where \( X \) controls the \( \text{PRO} \) subject of the clause \( S \):

a. The controller(s) \( X \) must be (a) co-dependent(s) of \( S \).

b. \( \text{PRO} \) (or part of it) must be interpreted as a bound variable.

(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.

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\textsubscript{i} called us [before/after/while/without PRO\textsubscript{i} visiting his aunt].

b. Mary\textsubscript{i} grew up [PRO\textsubscript{i} to be a famous actress].

c. The ship\textsubscript{i} sank, [only PRO\textsubscript{i} to be dredged up again].

d. Max\textsubscript{i} works hard [PRO\textsubscript{i} to stay out of jail].

e. Mary\textsubscript{i} smiled [PRO\textsubscript{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\textsubscript{i} laughs [after PRO\textsubscript{i} telling jokes].
    b. Only Peter\textsubscript{i} laughs [after he\textsubscript{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. \([\text{PRO}_{\text{arb}} \text{ to be on time}] \) is very important

-long-distance control:

21. Katie_\text{m} thinks that it is believed that \([\text{PRO}_{\text{m}} \text{ introducing herself}_\text{m} \text{ properly}] \) is important
-a non-c-commanding antecedent:

22. Mary\textsubscript{k}’s brother believes that [PRO\textsubscript{k} introducing herself\textsubscript{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
