

## How to Jointly Control? On the Track of Split Control

This paper focuses on a very rarely discussed subtype of control, viz. split control, witness (1a) for Polish and (1b) for English. Albeit cross-linguistically ‘neglected’ and hence rather poorly understood, this phenomenon nevertheless contributes to a better understanding of the overall control subject and as such cannot be swept under the rug.

Recently, control has become a hot area of very intense research. In the era of Minimalism, there are basically two theories of control: the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) (Hornstein 1999 and subsequent) and the Agree Theory of Control (ATC) (Landau 2000 and subsequent). As regards the split control phenomenon, linguistic opinions vary. The MTC argues that the relevant species of control represents Non-Obligatory Control (NOC), whereas ATC deems split control to be subsumed under Obligatory Control (OC).

It goes without saying that split control within the MTC cannot be categorized as a facet of OC, the latter being reduced to (A-)movement. More precisely, a chain with two antecedents is theoretically impossible. I show, however, that an analysis of split control within the MTC framework is feasible. Importantly, I depart from Hornstein’s contention that split control is an exclusive property of NOC. Employing familiar diagnostics of OC, as presented in Landau (2000), I show on the basis of data from English and Polish that some OC contexts allow split control. In order to account for this claim, I develop a theory that relies on the presence of the Addressee/Speaker Phrase immediately dominating TP in the non-finite clause.

Pak (2006) shows that exhortative constructions in Korean host the sentence final particle *-ca* (see (2)) which marks that the subject of the sentence is the addressee and the speaker (2a) or signals that the missing subject in the embedded clause is interpreted as referring to both the matrix subject and object (2b). The particle conveys information concerning the subject via an agreement mechanism between the persons and the particle itself. Pak argues that *-ca* heads the Addressee/Speaker Projection in the syntax and that it is a Spell-out of two features: [+addressee] and [+speaker]. (The Addressee/Speaker Phrase is independently motivated as it plays a role in accounting for another important aspect of Korean grammar, the speech style particles). Pak proposes that the relevant projection is situated in the left periphery of the clause, immediately dominating the structural subject position.

Drawing on Pak’s analysis, I examine split control in both English and Polish. This type of control is typically an ability of object control verbs, as in (1a-b). I argue that split control can be licensed by only object control verbs of proposal (more specifically, those that carry exhortative force) as only such verbs select for the Addressee/Speaker Projection which dominates the non-finite TP projection. This is plausible since I treat *-ca* as being simply phonetically unrealized in both English and Polish. Albeit overtly missing, the head of this projection contains [+addressee] and [+speaker] which, in the context of control, translates as [+matrix object] and [+matrix subject], respectively. To explain split control with object control verbs I propose derivations in (3). I assume that the sentences are derived as run-of-the-mill examples of pure object control. As regards, for example, (3b) as an epitome of split control, *Mary* is merged in [Spec, vP] for thematic reasons, from where it raises to [Spec, TP]. Then it sideward-moves to a higher clause to check an internal  $\theta$ -role of the matrix predicate. Next, *John* is taken from the numeration and merged in the matrix [Spec, vP] and in the end it raises to [Spec, TP] for EPP and case reasons. The split control effect arises due to the presence of two features in Addressee/Speaker: [+addressee] and [+speaker]. These features get activated due to the presence in the embedded clause of the feature [+Syn(tactic)Pl(urality)] on the elements that require that their subject be syntactically plural. Once the relevant projection is introduced into the tree, the features percolate up until they

find elements that will satisfy their requirements. So, when [+speaker] has reached the matrix subject *John*, the feature percolates no further as it is saturated. The same reasoning carries over to [+addressee] which reaches the matrix object *Mary*. Consequently, with the Addressee/Speaker head specifying the reference of the subject it is linked to, the non-finite subject (anachronistic PRO) is construed as plural although formally we find only the copy of *John* in both the thematic and structural subject position.

As far as the course of computational events is concerned, split control in Polish in (3a) is parallel to that proposed for English SpC. The only difference lies in the fact that in Polish C is lexicalized and this obviously raises the issue of an illegal movement of the indirect object. However, here I follow Witkoś (2007) who argues that in Polish it is Pol(arity) P(hrase) with a [+case] feature and not vP that constitutes a phase.

All in all, the paper constitutes a contribution to the ongoing debate whether control can be reduced to movement or is it best viewed as an instance of *Agree*. I show that split control, purportedly problematic to the MTC, can be accommodated within the latter.

- (1) a. Marek<sub>1</sub> zasugerował Ani<sub>2</sub>, żeby [PRO<sub>1+2</sub> zrobić sobie nawzajem śniadanie].  
 Mark suggested Ann so-that to-make each other breakfast  
 ‘Mark suggested to Ann making breakfast for each other.’  
 b. John<sub>1</sub> proposed to Mary<sub>2</sub> [PRO<sub>1+2</sub> to perjure themselves].
- (2) a. Icey kongpwuha-**ca**. (Korean)  
 now study-EXH  
 ‘Now, let’s study.’  
 b. John-i Tom-ekey [cip-ey ka-**ca**]-ko mal-ha-ess-ta  
 John-NOM Tom-DAT home-to go-EXH]-COMP say-do-PAST-DEC  
 (Intended meaning) ‘John said to Tom let’s go home.’ (indirect speech)
- (3) a. [TP Marek T-past [PolP F<sub>[+case]</sub> [vP {Marek} v+zasugerował [vP Ani zasugerował [CP żeby [Addressee/Speaker P Addressee/Speaker [+addressee, +speaker] [Ø-ca] [TP{Ani} [vP {Ani} zrobić sobie nawzajem śniadanie]]]]]]]].  
 b. [TP John T-past [vP {John} v+proposed [vP [PP to Mary] proposed [Addressee/Speaker P Addressee/Speaker [+addressee, +speaker] [Ø-ca] [TP{Mary} to [vP {Mary} perjure themselves]]]]]].

## Selected references

- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. “Movement and control.” *Linguistic inquiry* 30: 69-96.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control. Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Madigan, Sean. 2008. “Obligatory split control into exhortative complements in Korean.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 493-502.
- Pak, Miok. 2006. “Jussive clauses and agreement of sentence final particles in Korean.” In: Vance, T. (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Volume 14*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. 295-306.
- Witkoś, Jacek. 2007. Control and predicative adjectives in Polish. To appear in: *Elements of Slavic and Germanic Grammars: A Comparative View*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2003. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.