

CONTROL VIA SELECTION

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last five years, a vigorous debate has unfolded around control theory, focusing on the movement theory of control (MTC) (Hornstein 1999, 2001; Culicover and Jackendoff 2001; Landau 2003; Boeckx and Hornstein 2003; Davies and Dubinsky 2004). The MTC invokes theoretical parsimony to reduce control to raising, thereby eliminating the theoretically problematic empty pronoun PRO (but see fn. 3 *infra*). The opponents of the MTC justifiably argue that its partisans sacrifice empirical adequacy to theoretical elegance.

The purpose of this paper will be twofold. First, in line with the critics of the MTC, I will show that there are four empirical generalizations, which cannot be explained by the MTC. Second, I will briefly recapitulate the analysis of control proposed in Rooryck 2001, which offers an explanation of the full variety of control facts in infinitival complementation by proposing an analysis in terms of selection. This analysis provides an explanation for the semantically fine-grained differences between control verbs (*promise* vs. *ask* vs. *offer*), which have long been observed (see Abraham 1982, 1983; Rudanko 1985, 1989; Ružička 1983a, b, Siebert-Ott 1983, 1985; Wegener 1989), but ignored in the majority of the generative work on control – a gap that stretches back in time to Rosenbaum 1967.¹

In this paper, I will limit myself to data involving subject and object control of infinitival complements selected by the matrix control verb as in (1), where the controller of PRO is located in the immediately superordinate clause:

- (1) a. Eva_k said that Kim_i remembered [PRO_{i/*k} to leave]
- b. Eva_k said that Kim_i forced/advised Sue_j [PRO_{*i/j/*i+j/*k} to take the lead]

For an analysis of control in adjuncts within the framework developed here, I refer the reader to Rooryck 2001 (Chap. 3).

2. FOUR EMPIRICAL GENERALIZATIONS

2.1 Generalization 1: Variable but local control verbs (VLC verbs)

There is a substantial set of verbs, illustrated in (2–4), that allow either their subject or object to function as the controller, but not a superordinate argument.

- (2) *Subject-or-object control*:
 Eva_k said that Kim_i offered Sue_j [PRO_{*ij/i+j/*k*} to leave]
- (3) *Subject-to-Object control shift*
 a. Eva_k said that Kim_i promised Sue_j [PRO_{*i/*j/i+j/*k*} to leave]
 b. Eva_k said that Kim_i promised Sue_j [PRO_{**ij/*i+j/*k*} to be allowed to leave]
- (4) *Object-to-Subject control shift*
 a. Eva_k said that Kim_i asked Sue_j [PRO_{**ij/i+j/*k*} to leave]
 b. Eva_k said that Kim_i asked Sue_j [PRO_{*i/*j/*i+j/*k*} to be allowed to leave]

It is important to emphasize the locality of the domain for control in these cases. The domain where the controllers dwell is the next clause up, but no further (Manzini 1983). As a result, these cases can simply not be reduced to non-obligatory control (NOC), as NOC strictly involves cases of control which do not obey such locality. *Pace* the OC/NOC distinction (see Vanden Wyngaerd 1994: Chap. 8; O'Neill 1997), the locality of the controller domain is similar to that of anaphoric contexts such as (5):

- (5) a. They_k said that Kim_i talked to Sue_j about herself_{*ij/*k*}
 b. They_k said that Kim_i talked to Sue_j about themselves_{*i+j/*k*}

A case like (5b), where both Kim and Sue are the (joint) local antecedents of the anaphor *themselves*, can be usefully compared to (2), where Kim and Sue are the (joint) local antecedents of PRO.

2.2 Generalization 2: The semantic coherence of variable control verbs

The VLC verbs in (2–4) all belong to a coherent semantic class, namely verbs which express a commitment to, or a request for, the *temporally unrealized, future transfer* of a Theme.² In both (6a) and (6b), the DP *the apple* is transferred from a Source to a Goal. With a verb of giving, the actual transfer corresponds to the reference time. In the case of VLC verbs, the transfer is delayed to an unspecified moment after the reference time of promising, offering or asking.

- (6) a. Kim gave/granted Sue the apple (transfer *at* reference time)
 b. Kim promised/offered/asked Sue (for) the apple. (transfer *after* reference time)

In control contexts, the DP Theme argument of VLC verbs is realized as an infinitival complement, cf. (2–4). The distinction between ‘actual’ transfer (6a) and ‘delayed’ transfer is relevant for control properties in the following way. ‘Actual’ transfer verbs involve only object control, while ‘delayed’ transfer verbs display variable but local control as already exemplified in (2–4):