

## Non-subject control of temporal adjuncts

Jeffrey J. Green, University of Maryland

Keywords: syntax, control, logophoricity

Previous research on adjunct control [4, 7, 12, 13] classifies it as Obligatory Control (OC) due to facts such as the following: the matrix subject can control PRO, but the object cannot (1), and only a sloppy interpretation is available under ellipsis (2). With examples such as (3), however, it has been demonstrated that this is not always the case [10, 18]. Here, PRO may refer to an entity not represented syntactically in the sentence, so these must be instances of Non-Obligatory Control (NOC). Landau [10] argues that NOC of right-adjoined adjuncts is only available under two conditions: the adjunct clause is in active voice, and subject control would lead to “semantic deviance.” We discuss counterexamples to these claims and suggest that NOC in temporal adjuncts is more available than previously thought. We agree with Landau, though, that non-subject control in these cases is an instance of logophoric control.

- (1) Jon<sub>i</sub> kissed Mary<sub>j</sub> [before PRO<sub>i/\*j</sub> leaving].
- (2) Peter<sub>j</sub> left [after PRO<sub>j</sub> dancing], and Harry<sub>i</sub> did, too.  
'And Harry<sub>i</sub> left after he<sub>i/\*j</sub> danced.'
- (3) a. Potatoes are tastier [after PRO boiling them].  
b. The stairs were washed [before PRO entering the basement].  
c. That oasis was a vision [after PRO dragging ourselves through the desert all day].

Landau provides examples such as (4) to support his claim that NOC is impossible for passive adjuncts. However, similar examples containing passive adjuncts, but allowing non-subject control, can easily be constructed (5). Landau's claim that non-subject control readings require that subject control would describe a strange or unlikely situation is based on examples like (3). But for at least some types of adjuncts, non-subject control does not require that subject control would lead to semantic anomaly. For example, in the context of (6a), many speakers allow non-local control of PRO in (6b), even though a dishwasher arriving at the house is perfectly plausible.

- (4) \*That oasis was a vision after being dragged through the desert all day.
- (5) a. That Gatorade was a vision after being worked to exhaustion by my coach today.  
b. The prisoner's sentence was finally released [after PRO being forced to wait for over a week while the judge made his decision].
- (6) a. At some point yesterday, the dishwasher broke, and at some other point, Peter came home for a two-week visit. Mom thought that Peter broke the dishwasher, but. . .  
b. Peter<sub>i</sub> says [the dishwasher broke [before PRO<sub>i</sub> even arriving at the house]].

So neither of Landau's conditions are necessary. Additionally, although attachment site of the adjunct may affect the probability of NOC [8], it alone cannot determine the availability of non-subject control interpretations, as demonstrated in (7).

- (7) a. [After PRO eating sugar], those lemons tasted especially sour.  
b. Those lemons, [after PRO eating sugar], tasted especially sour.  
c. Those lemons tasted especially sour [after PRO eating sugar].

Instead, the relevant conditions seem to include those known to potentiate logophoric interpretations. For example, because the speaker of an utterance is inherently logophoric [15], (3c) allows logophoric NOC. But in (8a), which requires a third person antecedent, NOC is impossible without supporting context establishing a logophoric center such as (8b) (tense changed to force adjunct to attach to embedded clause). And while out of context (9a) seems only to mean that darkness pitched the tents, non-local control of its PRO is possible in a context like (9b), which establishes

a logophoric center as a potential controller. This is not to say that all cases of control of temporal adjuncts are logophoric. Indeed, because logophoric control requires a human antecedent [4, 8], some temporal adjuncts must have non-logophoric subject control (10); it may even be the case that all cases of local control of temporal adjuncts are non-logophoric OC.

- (8) a. ??That oasis was a vision [after PRO dragging himself through the desert all day].  
 b. Sam thinks [that oasis will be a vision [after PRO dragging himself through the desert all day]].
- (9) a. #Darkness fell [before PRO<sub>arb</sub> pitching the tents].  
 b. Peter<sub>i</sub> and Jon<sub>j</sub> were arguing about when they finally got their tents pitched.  
 Peter<sub>i</sub> thought [that darkness fell [before PRO<sub>i+j</sub> pitching the tents]].
- (10) The dishwasher<sub>i</sub> broke [after PRO<sub>i</sub> working properly for years].

We propose that logophoric NOC of temporal adjuncts is always permitted by the grammar, unconditionally (to an even greater extent than Landau [10] suggests), contrary to the traditional view [3, 7, 11] that OC and NOC are grammatically complementary. Note that it cannot be the case that the NOC readings reported here are all simply OC by some syntactically represented perspective holder [17], as tests for OC fail; in (11), inasmuch as logophoric control is available in the first conjunct, PRO may have a strict interpretation in the elided second clause. This interpretation would be unavailable under OC.

- (11) Peter<sub>i</sub> says [the dishwasher broke [before PRO<sub>i</sub> getting home]], and Sara thinks [the microwave did, too].  
 'And Sara thinks the microwave broke before Peter got home.'

Although OC and NOC are both allowed by the grammar for temporal adjuncts, OC appears to be much more common. We speculate that this may be the result of performance biases in comprehension. Among these may be a bias to assign strings the simplest possible structure [2, 5, 10, 16] if indeed logophoric construal indicates a more complex structure, as claimed by Landau [9, 10], or a bias to interpret PRO as the trace of movement rather than a null pronominal if the Movement Theory of Control [1, 7] is correct for temporal adjuncts. Yet another possible bias could be a preference to interpret variables as bound rather than free [6, 14]. In addition, subject control may be especially preferred when the subject makes a good logophoric center. Whatever the source of the preference for subject control in adjuncts, comprehenders may be influenced to override it in favor of non-subject logophoric control readings by features of the context, which may include semantic anomaly, the structure of the adjunct, and other factors, each of which may contribute to the likelihood of logophoric NOC, even if none on its own is a determining factor.

## References

- [1] Boeckx, C., Hornstein, N., & Nunes, J. (2010). *Control as movement*. [2] Bošković, Ž. (1996). *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. [3] Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. [4] Clark, R. L. (1990). *Thematic theory in syntax and interpretation*. [5] Grimshaw, J. (1994). Minimal projection and clause structure. [6] Heim, I. & Kratzer, A. (1998). *Semantics in generative grammar*. [7] Hornstein, N. (1999). *Linguistic Inquiry*. [8] Landau, I. (2013). *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. [9] Landau, I. (2015). *A two-tiered theory of control*. [10] Landau, I. (2017). Adjunct control depends on voice. [11] Manzini, M. R. (1983). *Linguistic Inquiry*. [12] Mohanan, K. P. (1983). *Linguistic Inquiry*. [13] Pires, A. (2007). *Syntax*. [14] Reinhart, T. (1983). *Linguistics and Philosophy*. [15] Sells, P. (1987). *Linguistic Inquiry*. [16] Speas, M. (2006). Economy, agreement, and the representation of null arguments. [17] Sundaresan, S. (2012). *Context and (co)reference*. [18] Williams, E. (1992). Adjunct control.