

On Partial Control and Parasitic PC effects

While in the history of generative grammar the distinction between Obligatory Control and Non-obligatory Control 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, i.e. the referent of PRO seems to include the antecedent along with the other individuals salient in the context which are, however, syntactically singular.

Partial Control (PC), originally deemed bizarre, has not received much attention in the literature. However, as Landau demonstrates, it is not an uncommon option cross-linguistically.

Nowadays, one can observe a heated debate on whether control can be reduced to raising or is it best viewed as an instance of Agree. Landau (2000) asserts that the very fact of existence of PC is the deadliest blow to the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) as posited by Hornstein (1999, 2003). Why? The answer is obvious: there is no partial raising. A chunk of reference cannot be raised.

This presentation shows that the purported superiority of the Agree Theory of Control (ATC), postulated by Landau, is illusory. Ironically, it is the ATC that is plagued by a number of problems, both conceptual and empirical. It is proved that the existence of PC is not only innocuous to the MTC but also provides a strong argument in favor of it. As such, the MTC constitutes a viable alternative to the ATC.

I contribute to the Agree vs. Move debate on control by introducing a new observation about PC into adjunct clauses, or rather its specific subspecies that I call Parasitic PC effects (PPCE). The PPCE arise once adjunct control is coupled with PC in a complement clause. In such cases a parasitic PC reading is available within the adjunct clause:

- (1) 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.

This effect, if real, can have far-reaching consequences for the selection of the appropriate theory of PC. Obviously, the ATC has a problem predicting that such a parasitic version of this effect should hold. The adjunct clause in (1), as an island, cannot be accessed by the matrix probe T. Thus, Landau treats adjunct control as a subspecies of NOC. To account for these facts, I propose a solution framed within the theory of control based on Move. Adapting insights in Rodrigues (2007), I suggest that the licensing of the PC effect depends on the presence of the projection of non-selected *wolP* (in the sense of Wurmbbrand 2007) dominated by TP in the structure of the infinitive and the sideward movement of the DP controller from within the adjunct to the matrix. Crucially, the PC effect arises since the matrix controller originates in the adjunct clause as part of a complex DP which also contains a null associative plural pronoun adjoined to the DP controller. The DP, leaving the adjunct clause (sideward movement) on its way to the complement clause, strands the collective *pro* in the scope of *woll*, thus giving rise to PC. Furthermore, the associative *pro* in the adjunct clause can be licensed by the unselected *wolP* only when this licensing is subject to confirmation on the same DP by a selected *wolP* in the complement clause. The DP controller in the complement clause forms another complex DP in Spec, vP and once again it leaves the null plural pronoun behind while it moves to Spec, TP, triggering another instance of PC.

All in all, I present two interesting properties of PC. First, the coupling of PC readings in adjunct clauses with PC effects in the complement clause points to the OC status of adjunct control, contra Landau. Thus, Landau's claim that partial control is licensed only in complements must be loosened (if not dropped). Second, PPCE require an analysis in the form of interarboreal movement of the controller. The ATC finds itself at a disadvantage in this case, as the matrix T or v probes cannot access PRO within the adjunct.

REFERENCES

- Hornstein, N. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96.
Hornstein, N. 2003. On control. In *Minimalist syntax*. R. Hendrick (ed.) 6-81. Oxford: Blackwell.
Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of control. Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Rodrigues, C. (2007). Agreement and flotation in Partial and Inverse Partial Control Configurations. Ms. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Wurmbrand, S. (2007). Infinitives are tenseless. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*. 13.1.