

A three-way distinction in adjunct control in Polish

Jacek Witkoś – Sylwiusz Żychliński
Adam Mickiewicz University

Adjunct control in Polish must be discussed with reference to three empirical domains of control, i.e. control into adjunct clauses, control into gerunds and participial control. We propose that there is no unified approach as far as control into adjuncts is concerned and, therefore, argue that only control into adjunct clauses meets the standard requirements for Non-obligatory Control, whereas gerunds and participial clauses are both constructions which exemplify Obligatory Control. This lack of uniformity is taken to be the consequence of a difference in the internal structure of these constructions, with a CP layer present in adjunct clauses but absent from gerunds and participial clauses.

Firstly, adjunct clauses are adjoined high enough to render them inaccessible to subjects in Spec,TP. This has to be so to exclude problematic examples, as in (1b-c):

- (1) a. Jan₁ zwolnił Marię₂, [_{CP} żeby PRO_{1/*2} zatrudnić Zbyszka].
b. Jan₁ zwolnił kuzynkę, [_{CP} żeby PRO_{*1/arb} nie zarzucić mu₁ faworyzowania rodziny].
c. Samochód₁ został spalony, [_{CP} żeby PRO_{*1/Arb} wyłudzić ubezpieczenie].

Although subject control (1a) is the predominant interpretation for adjunct clauses, (1b) shows that in some active transitive constructions (1b) and in short passives (1c) the syntactic subject cannot be the controller for PRO. Therefore, by postulating a high adjunction site, e.g. in the TP-area, one safeguards against this unwelcome outcome. How can the relevant interpretation be obtained? The key aspect of the explanation rests in the presence of the operator on C, as argued by Manzini and Roussou (2000). It is this operator, whether generic or specific, which, obeying a revised (Scopal) MLC (Manzini and Roussou 2000), is the source of, respectively, arbitrary (2a) or specific/anaphoric (via pragmatic inference, (2b)) interpretation of the PRO subject of the adjunct.

- (2) a. [_{CP} C+OP_{Generic} [_{TP} Jest ciężko] [PRO_{Arb} pracować].
b. [_{CP} C+OP_{Specific} [_{TP} Jest nam₁ ciężko] [PRO₁ pracować].

Control into gerunds calls for a different treatment. Polish gerunds which allow for a control configuration to be established form at least three classes, with constructions, distinguished by the exact preposition which heads them, showing by default subject control in active and demoted subject control in passive (3a,b), object control in active and matrix subject control in passive (4a,b), or both (5a,b).

- (3) a. Szeff₁ zwolnił swego najlepszego pracownika₂ [bez PRO_{1/*2} zmrużenia oka].
b. Najlepszy pracownik₂ został pro₁ zwolniony [bez PRO_{1/*2} zmrużenia oka]
(4) a. Szeff₁ zwolnił swego najlepszego pracownika₂ [za PRO_{*1/2} picie w pracy].
b. Najlepszy pracownik₂ został pro₁ zwolniony [za PRO_{*1/2} picie w pracy]
(5) a. Sędzia₁ wysłał piłkarza₂ poza boisko [po PRO_{1/2} przebiegnięciu kilkunastu metrów].
b. Piłkarz₂ został pro₁ wysłany poza boisko [po PRO_{??1/2} przebiegnięciu kilkunastu metrów]
c. Bramkarz₂ został pro₁ wysłany poza boisko [po PRO_{1/*2} obejrzeniu 15 minut jego₂ fatalnej gry tyłem do bramki]

Since no operator-mediated interpretation is possible as a CP-less structure of gerunds creates no home for it, we argue that different adjunction sites of gerunds combined with the movement of arguments into positions licensing PRO subjects of gerunds via Connectedness (Kayne 1984, Manzini and Roussou 2000) are responsible for the interpretive properties of these constructions. Thus, gerunds headed by *bez* are adjoined outside the scope of the object, presumably at a vP level, and in (3a) the subject moving to Spec,TP creates a licit (connected sub-tree) movement path for the subject in the adjunct:

- (6) [_{TP} Sub T [_{vP} [_{vP} <Sub> v [_{vP} V ...]]] [_{PP} bez [PRO gerund]]]

In passive (3b), the *pro* subject must be postulated in Spec,vP, which then moves up to a functional Spec,FP, thus creating the same, licit configuration for the movement out of the gerund. To avoid the defective intervention due to the movement of the object DP over the *pro* subject, we partly assume the smuggling approach to passive (Collins 2005), whereby the whole PartP (including the PartP plus the VP projection with the DP object) first moves up to Spec,VoiceP, only then to be extracted from it on its way to Spec,TP:

(7) [TP Obj T [VoiceP <[PartP Part [VP V <Obj>]]> Voice [FP <pro> F [vP [vP <pro> v <[PartP Part [VP V <Obj>]]>] [PP bez [PRO gerund]]]]]]

For object control effects with gerunds, we assume that the gerunds selected by the preposition *za* are merged at the level of V'. Additionally, we assume, following Chomsky (2008), that *v* bequeaths its ϕ -features and the edge feature (EPP) to V, which leads to the Object shift and creates a configuration facilitating the Connectedness arrangement:

(8) [vP v [VP Ob [v' [V' V <Obj>] [PP za [PRO gerund]]]]]]

For (5a,b) we assume that *po* gerunds may be attached at either *v'* or *V'*, yielding two different interpretations.

Participial phrases never allow for variation in control interpretation, subject control being their only option. Thus, we treat them as cases of Obligatory Control, attached at the level of vP:

(9) Jan₁ widział Marię [PRO₁ wracając z pracy].

(10) ??Maria₁ była widziana [PRO₁ wracając z pracy].

In conclusion, in this presentation our goal is to show how the conspiracy between the point of attachment of the adjunct phrase, its internal composition (CP+OP/less than CP), MLC and Connectedness underscore the variation in adjunct control patterns in Polish. It is also worth noting that our findings call for enrichment and a revision of the adjunct control mechanism, as presented in the relevant recent publications on this topic (Bondaruk 2004, Landau 2003, 2010, Boeckx, Hornstein and Nunes 2010, Hornstein and Polinsky 2010).

Selected references:

- Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein and J. Nunes. 2010. *Control as Movement*. New York: CUP.
- Bondaruk, A. 2004. *PRO and Control in English, Irish and Polish: a minimalist analysis*. Lublin: KUL.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Collins, C. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8: 81-120.
- Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hornstein, N. and M. Polinsky (eds.). 2010. *Movement Theory of Control*. The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Kayne, R. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of control. Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Landau, I. 2003. Movement out of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 471 - 498.
- Landau, I. 2010. *The Locative Syntax of Experiencers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Manzini, R. and A. Roussou. 2000. A minimalist theory of A-movement and Control. *Lingua* 110: 409 - 447.
- Van Urk, Coppe. 2010. On Obligatory Control: A Movement and PRO Approach. Ms. Utrecht University.