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How to cope with the missing subject of infinitival clauses

- **Coefficients of orientation.** Bech (1955)

- **Deletion:** “Identity Erasure Transformation“ (Equi-NP deletion). Rosenbaum (1970)

- **Empty category:** PRO as a an e.c. that is simultaneously subject to principle A and B of the binding theory. Chomsky (1981)

How to cope with missing subjects of infinitival clauses

- **Coefficients of orientation**: Bech (1955; repr. 1983).
  No null subject assumed; see also LFG, HPSG.

  **Bech (1983:38;183): coefficients of e.g. ‘bitten’ and ‘gestatten’**
  
  a. Man bittet ihn, sich beeilen zu wollen \( V'(A':N'') + V''(2) \)
  
  b. Wir bitten ihn, uns ausruhen zu dürfen \( V'(N':N'') + V''(2) \)
  
  a. Wir gestatteten ihm, sie zu besuchen \( V'(D':N'') + V''(2) \)

  - **HPSG**
    
    c. Nobody asked you [to believe this]_VP
    
    d. ask: SUBCAT \( \langle NP, NP_i, VP[SUBCAT \langle NP_i \rangle] \rangle \)
**How to cope with missing subjects of infinitival clauses**

  
  a. *DS*: Rosenbaum tried [*Rosenbaum* to analyze infinitivals]  
  ↓ delete ↓  
  b. *SS*: Rosenbaum tried [*to analyze infinitivals*]

  **Rosenbaum’s flaw**
  
  c. Some claim that [*some/they fully understand infinitivals*]
  
  d. Some claim [*to fully understand infinitivals*]

**How to cope with missing subjects in infinitival clauses**

- **PRO** (Chomsky “On Binding”, G&B)
  
  “It is reasonable, then, to regard PRO as a pronominal anaphor subject to both the binding conditions (A) and (B).”  
  (G&B, p. 191)

  i. It is reasonable [*PRO to regard “PRO” as a pronominal anaphor*]

  Where is the obligatorily required antecedent for the allegedly anaphorical PRO? (positive requirement for anaphors)
How to cope with missing subjects in infinitival clauses

- **Rosenbaum’s Equi is revived in the M.P. framework**

  Movement & deletion of PF-features of a copy left by A-movement (e.g. Hornstein 1999, 2001; Hornstein & Polinsky 2010).

Examples

i. [You should try [you to [you forget this quickly]]]

ii. [Nothing forces you to [you accept this]]

First of all, let’s resolve a background issue for the discussion:

Empty vs. absent subject?

Positive evidence for a null subject

- Null subject as target of a nominative apposition
- Null subject as antecedent of a nominative distributive phrase
- Null subject as antecedent of a nominative predicate
- No impersonal infinitival clauses
Empty vs. absent subject? Empirical evidence?

- **Null subject as target of a nominative apposition**
  
  a. Er hat ihn gebeten, den Vorfall zu untersuchen
  b. Er hat *ihn* gebeten, den Vorfall *als erster* zu untersuchen
  c. Er hat ihn *als ersten* gebeten, den Vorfall zu untersuchen
  d. Er ließ *ihn* als ersten den Vorfall untersuchen
     
     i.e.: an implicit argument cannot serve as antecedent

  Where does the nominative in (b.) come from?

Empty vs. absent subject? Empirical evidence?

- **Null subject as antecedent of a nominative distributive phrase**
  
  a. Er hat uns gebeten, den Raum *einer nach dem anderen* zu verlassen
  b. Er hat uns *einen nach dem anderen* gebeten, den Raum zu verlassen

  Where does the nominative in (a.) come from?
Empty vs. absent subject? Empirical evidence?

Null subject as antecedent of a nominative predicate

a. Sie hat ihn gebeten, ein fairer Schiedsrichter zu sein
b. Sie hat ihn gedrängt, ein engagierter Umweltschützer zu bleiben
c. Sie hat ihn animiert, ein passionierter Golfer zu werden

Where does the nominative on the predicative DP come from?

d. Wir lassen Gott einen lieben Mann Acc. sein

The case of the predicative DP is either copied (d), or it is nominative if the DP relates to a subject argument, as in (e) and (a-c).

e. Laß mich dein guter Herold Nom sein (from: St. Zweig, Marie Antoinette)
Empty vs. absent subject? Empirical evidence?

➢ No impersonal infinitival clauses
  a. Es ist möglich, dass dabei geschluckt wird
  b.* Es ist möglich, dabei geschluckt zu werden

An infinitival clauses requires an argument relation for a subject. This is positive evidence for the existence of a subject in infinitival clauses, contrary to finite clauses.

In sum: The subject of an infinitival clause is a Null Subject

• Target of predicative relations
• No impersonal infinitival clauses

What kind of element is this null subject?
**The standard account of Control**

a. He\textsuperscript{i} expected [PRO\textsuperscript{i} to win] \textbf{Controlled PRO}
b. He\textsubscript{i} is expected [e\textsubscript{i} to win] \textbf{Raising of an ECM subject}

**Hornstein’s proposal**

a. He\textsubscript{i} expected [e\textsubscript{i} to win] \textbf{Raising to theta position}
b. He\textsubscript{i} is expected [e\textsubscript{i} to win] \textbf{Raising to non-theta position}

**Non-standard assumption** without any independent evidence:
The waiving of the theta-criterion

“There is no upper bound on the number of $\theta$-roles a chain can have” Hornstein (1999:78).

---

**Obligatory control (OC) vs. non-obligatory control**

“OC PRO must have an antecedent. [...] this antecedent must be local, and [...] must c-command the PRO.” Hornstein (1999:73)

Empirically \textbf{adequate} characterization of \textbf{obligatory control}:
If a potential controller is available, PRO is construed as controlled

a. \textit{Er} hofft, dass \textit{er/man} eine Lösung finden werde
b. \textit{Er\textsuperscript{i}} hofft, PRO\textsuperscript{i}/arb eine Lösung zu finden
c. \textit{Er\textsuperscript{i}} hofft, PRO\textsuperscript{arb}/arb eine Lösung zu finden sei noch möglich
d. \textit{Du} glaubst vielleicht, dass es möglich sei, sich/dich anschließend zu erholen
e. \textit{Wir} glauben, dass sie hofft, dass \textit{wir} uns darum kümmern
f. \textit{Wir\textsuperscript{i}} glauben, dass \textit{sie} hofft, PRO\textsubscript{i} uns\textsubscript{i} darum zu kümmern
EVALUATING the control-by-movement idea

“A given fact is explained scientifically only if a new fact is predicted with it.”

Imre Lakatos (1978:34)

Prediction #1:

Passivizing a subject control verb yields a raising construction (see Landau (2004: 318f.); insufficiently replied by Boeckx & Hornstein 2004)

“OC PRO is the residue of movement and has all the characteristics of NP-trace. The only real distinction between raising and control structures is that the former involve raising a D/NP to a non-θ position whereas the latter raises expressions to θ-positions. Both raising and control chains (generally) terminate in Case positions.”

(Hornstein 1999: 93)
**Prediction #1:**

Passivizing a *subject control verb* yields a **raising construction**.

a. He$_1$ expected [he$_1$ to win the prize]  
   control

b. He$_1$ was expected [he$_1$ to win the prize]  
   raising

Two subject $\theta$-roles in (a); one subject $\theta$-role in (b).

c. He expected [to win the prize]
d. We expected [him to win the prize]

---

**Prediction #1:**

Passivizing a *subject control verb* yields a **raising construction**.

a. He$_1$ tried [e, to persuade us]  

b. * He$_1$ was tried [e, to persuade us]  
   (2 Google hits: "regretted him to")

c. * We regretted him to be pro-French  
   (3 Google hits: "he was regretted to")

d. * He was regretted to be pro-French  
   (2 Google hits: "regretted him to")

e. He will deserve to win the award  
   (113,000 Google hits: "will deserve to win the")

f. * He was deserved to win the award  
   (6 Google hit: "was deserved to win the")

g. * We deserved him to win the award  
   (1 Google hit: "deserved him to win the")
   (0 hits in the BNC)
**Prediction #1:**

Passivizing a *subject control verb* yields a *raising construction*. For German, a sentence such as (b) is predicted to be grammatical

a. Wir haben nicht erwartet/versucht [e, ihn dort anzutreffen]

b. *Wir wurden nicht erwartet/versucht [e, ihn dort anzutreffen]*

c. Es wurde nicht erwartet/versucht [ihn dort anzutreffen]

d. *Wir erwarteten/versuchten [sie ihn dort anzutreffen]*

*We expected [her to meet him there]*

German does not admit ECM-constructions with *zu*-infinitives (d). Hence it does not admit the counterparts of English raising constructions with *to/zu*-infinitives (b), either.

Clearly, the prediction is not fulfilled in German.

---

**Prediction #1**

Passivizing a *subject control verb* yields a *raising construction* ... is wrong.
Wrong prediction #1:
Passivizing a subject control verb yields a raising construction.

Prediction #2:
The controller of OC must be a possible target of A-movement

Possessive pronoun as controller

a. Mein¹ Versprechen, mich¹ zu beeilen, ...
b.* Mein Versprechen, sich zu beeilen, ...

There is no long-distance A-movement that targets the position of the possessive pronoun in a DP:

c. [Your¹ friends] expect [e to win the race]

See Hornstein (1999:73):

d.* [John’s¹ campaign] expects [PRO¹ to shave himself]

Split antecedents as controller

“We have deduced the interpretive properties of OC PROs. They require nonsplit local antecedents because they are formed by movement.” (Hornstein 1999: 91).

Correctly identified requirement, but incorrect empirical assessment:

Hornstein (1999: 73): “(4e) shows that OC PRO cannot have split antecedents.” (4) e. *John, told Mary_{i} PRO_{i&j} to wash themselves/each other.

a. *Ich_{i} werde mit ihrl \{ausmachen/festlegen/verabreden/vereinbaren/…\} dass wir_{i&j} uns/\*sich morgen registrieren lassen.

b. *Ich_{i} werde mit ihrl \{ausmachen/festlegen/verabreden/vereinbaren/…\} PRO_{i&j} uns/\*sich morgen registrieren zu lassen.

c. Ich_{i} möchte dir_{i} vorschlagen, mich/dich/uns/\*sich rechtzeitig zu erkundigen, ob ...

“dir vorschlagen, dich zu”: 7670 hits. “dir vorschlagen, sich zu”: 3 hits.

Wrong prediction #1:
Passivizing a subject control verb yields a raising construction.

Prediction #2:
The controller must be a possible target of A-movement ... is wrong.

• In OC-constructions, the controller may be in a position that is inaccessible for A-movement.
• In OC-constructions with split antecedents, the controllers cannot have been moved out of the controlee position.
Wrong prediction #1:
Passivizing a subject control verb yields a raising construction.

Wrong prediction #2:
The controller must be a possible target of A'-movement

Prediction #3:
Contexts that are opaque for movement cannot be contexts of obligatory control.

Obligatory control into adverbial clauses

a. Claudius murdered him [in order to usurp the throne]
b.* What did Claudius murder him [in order to usurp e_i ?]

Hornstein’s account?
In the paper, these data are not considered at all.
• No token of ‘in order to’ occurs in the paper.
• The terms ‘adverb’ or ‘adverbiai’ do not occur in the paper.
Obligatory control into **adverbial clauses**

a. Ich verließ den Raum [ohne [mich/*sich um sie zu kümmern]]
b. Du bist verreist [anstatt [dich/*sich um sie zu kümmern]]
c. Ich habe angerufen [um mich/*sich darum zu kümmern]

d. He called her in order to introduce **himself**
e. * He called her in order to introduce **oneself**

(see G&B p.190-191)

d. Sie\textsuperscript{i} ist zu klug, um sich\textsuperscript{i} ertappen zu lassen
e. Sie\textsuperscript{i} ist zu klug, um sie\textsuperscript{i} in flagranti ertappen zu können
e. Sie\textsuperscript{i} ist zu klug, um erwarten zu dürfen, dass sie\textsuperscript{i} sich ertappen ließe
f. Sie\textsuperscript{i} ist zu klug, um erwarten zu dürfen, dass wir sie\textsuperscript{i} laufen ließen
g. * Sie\textsuperscript{i} ist zu klug, um PRO\textsuperscript{arb} erwarten zu dürfen, sich\textsuperscript{i} ertappen zu lassen
**Prediction #3:**
Contexts that are **opaque for movement** cannot be contexts of obligatory control.

... is wrong.

Adverbial clauses are opaque for movement but they are contexts of obligatory control.

---

**Wrong prediction #1:**
Passivizing a *subject control verb* yields a raising construction.

**Wrong prediction #2:**
The controller must be a possible target of A-movement

**Wrong prediction #3:**
Contexts that are **opaque for movement** cannot be contexts of obligatory control.

**Prediction #4:**
Obligatory control contexts always involve an *overt controller.*
(Sources not mentioned in Hornstein’s paper: Bach (1969), Bresnan (1982), Visser (1969))

**Bach’s Generalization** (Bach 1969):

a. This leads *(people\textsuperscript{i}) [PRO\textsuperscript{i} to accept the conclusion]

**Visser’s Generalization** (Visser 1969-73):

b. *They\textsuperscript{i} were promised [PRO\textsuperscript{arb} to reserve seats for them]

In (a) and (b), the controlling object cannot be an implicit argument.

**But**, there are contexts of obligatory control without an overt controller:

"It was intended to check the” 354.000 hits
"It was intended to open the” 350.000 hits
"It was planned to increase the” 332.000 hits
"It was forgotten to include the ” 4.670 hits
"It was promised to increase the” 1 hit
"It was promised to check the” 1 hit
"It was cancelled in order to” 189.000 hits

Van Urk (2013: 168) suggests a reinterpretation of V’s Generalization:

"Obligatory control by the thematic subject of a passive is sensitive to a purely syntactic restriction: it is only possible if T does not agree with an overt DP".
In German, neither Bach’s nor Visser’s Generalization holds:

a. Ich ersuchte/bat (jemanden) [PRO das Fenster zu schließen]
b. Ich empfahl (jemandem) [PRO das Fenster zu schließen]
c. Es wurde mir (von ihr) versprochen [PRO mich zu briefen]
d. Es wurde (von ihr) versäumt [PRO mir den Termin mitzuteilen]

But, ‘nominative subject’ is an interfering factor (g,h):

e. Man hat ihm in Aussicht gestellt, PRO den Schaden zu ersetzen
f. Ihm wurde in Aussicht gestellt, PRO den Schaden zu ersetzen
g. ??Er kriegte in Aussicht gestellt, PRO den Schaden zu ersetzen
h. ??Ich wurde ersucht, PRO sich setzen zu dürfen

In German, neither Bach’s nor Visser’s Generalization holds:

• Dutch

a. Het werd hem toegezegd zijn college van de lijst te verwijderen

Earlier English (see Visser (1969), quoted from Rizzi (1986))

• Middle English

b. When he commaunded to receiue the man ... into the church again, in what church commaunded he to receiue him?
   (1532-3 St. Th. More, Wks (1557) 826 E7)

• Early modern English

c. I then advised to fly. (1725 Pope, Tr. Odyssey (World Classics) IX p. 133)
Bach’s Generalization – corpora searches

- **Corpus of Contemporary American English**
  a. The State Board of Health has *recommended* not to screen newborns for galactosemia
  b. Each of the 11 states *recommended* not to change the constitution, but to add 17 amendments
  c. Karen, a life coach who *asked* not to use her real name in this article, ...

- **BNC** (only passive)
  e. And it’s also not recommended to run in highly polluted areas
  f. It’s not recommended to place the material directly on top of insulation

  “*recommends that the*” produces 93 hits in the BNC

What might be behind Bach’s Generalization?

**The non-availability of oblique case marking?**

- For **91%** of the verbs with a controlling *Acc* that are listed by Bech (1955), the Acc object is obligatory.
- For the verbs with an *Dat* controller, the Dat is obligatory only for **9%**.

German double accusative constructions resemble the English patterns of double object control verbs:

a. “Man hat uns gelehrt zu” ... 1.340 Google hits
b. “Man hat gelehrt zu” ... 0 Google hits
c. “Wir wurden gelehrt zu” ... 446 Google hits
**Prediction #4:**
Obligatory control contexts always involve an **overt controller**.

... is wrong.

- Visser’s Generalization is compatible with implicit obligatory control. Bach’s Generalization is not universal.
- Consequently, obligatory control contexts do not necessarily contain an **overt controller**.

---

**In sum, central predictions are all wrong:**

**Wrong prediction #1:**
Passivizing a **subject control verb** yields a **raising construction**.

**Wrong prediction #2:**
The controller is always a **possible target** of A-movement.

**Wrong prediction #3:**
Contexts that are **opaque for movement** do not admit obligatory control.

**Wrong prediction #4:**
Obligatory control contexts always involve an **overt controller**.
To conclude:

Control does not involve movement.
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