

## Adjunct Control

In the control debates of the recent years (cf. Hornstein 1999, Landau 2000, 2015, a.o.), adjunct control has only played an ancillary role. There are at least three reasons for this: (i) empirically, adjunct control comprises a very heterogeneous set of examples; (ii) as Landau (2013, 2015) points out, adjunct control cannot be categorized in unison as obligatory or non-obligatory control (OC vs. NOC); instead, the distinction between OC and NOC cuts through the set of examples involving adjunct control (an observation which adds to its heterogeneous character); (iii) NOC as such has typically played a minor part in theories of control. What we aim to do in this talk is the following: since, in the literature, the discussion of adjunct control has mainly been based on English data, we would like to provide insight into German data involving adjunct control. Moreover, we aim to show how these data can be captured theoretically, drawing on ideas by Landau (2015) and Fischer (2017). The data we consider comprise adverbial infinitives headed by (*an*)*statt* ('instead'), *ohne* ('without') and *um* ('in order to'), cf. (1), adverbial present and past participle constructions, cf. (2), and adverbial small clauses headed by the particle *als* ('as'), cf. (3).

- (1) **Ein Licht**<sub>i</sub> genügt, [PRO<sub>i</sub> um das Zimmer zu erleuchten]. (cf. Bech 1957: 97)  
*one light*<sub>NOM</sub> *suffices* *in.order.to the room* *to light.up*  
 'One light suffices to light up the room.'
- (2) [PRO<sub>i</sub> Auf einem Bein hinkend] kam **sie**<sub>i</sub> ins Zimmer. (Zifonun et al. 1997: 2160)  
*on one leg hopping came she*<sub>NOM</sub> *into.the room*  
 'Hopping on one leg, she entered the room.'
- (3) [PRO<sub>i</sub> Als Studentin] hat **sie**<sub>i</sub> **Noam Chomsky**<sub>j</sub> [PRO<sub>j</sub> als weltberühmten Linguisten] eingeladen.  
*as student*<sub>NOM</sub> *has she*<sub>NOM</sub> *Noam Chomsky*<sub>ACC</sub> *as world-famous linguist*<sub>ACC</sub> *invited*  
 'As a student, she invited Noam Chomsky as a world-famous linguist.'

What can be observed is that adjunct control can (i) neither be restricted to subject control, cf. (4), (5), (ii) nor be reduced to NOC, cf. (6) (only sloppy reading under ellipsis available), (7) (non-human PRO allowed) (tests shown only for examples involving adjuncts introduced by *um*). Although both characteristics have been acknowledged before, many papers still tend to simplify the facts (cf., for instance, Hornstein 1999, who focuses on obligatory subject control into adjuncts, mentioning other possibilities only in fn. 10).

- (4) Eine Kerze genügt **ihm**<sub>i</sub>, [PRO<sub>i</sub> um sich zurechtzufinden]. (cf. Haider 2015: 1)  
*a candle suffices him*<sub>DAT</sub> *for Refl* *to.orientate*<sub>INF</sub>.  
 'A candle is sufficient for him in order to orientate himself.'
- (5) [PRO<sub>i</sub> Erst vor kurzem aus Südamerika gekommen], mochte **ihn**<sub>i</sub> niemand mehr leiden.  
*only for short from South.America come*<sub>PRT.2</sub> *wanted him*<sub>ACC</sub> *no.one more like*  
 'Having arrived shortly from South America, no one liked him anymore.'
- (6) **Die Seeschwalben**<sub>i</sub> fliegen im Herbst nach Südafrika, [PRO<sub>i</sub>/\*arb/k um im Winter überleben zu können], und das tun auch **einige andere Zugvögel**<sub>j</sub> ~~nach Südafrika fliegen~~  
*the sea.swallows fly in.the fall to South.Africa in.order.to in.the winter survive to can* *and that do also some other migrating.birds to South.Africa fly*  
~~[PRO<sub>j</sub>/\*i um im Winter überleben zu können].~~ (Høyem 2016)  
*in.order.to in.the winter survive to can*  
 'In fall, the sea swallows fly to South Africa to be able to survive in winter, and so do some other migrating birds, too.'
- (7) Man gab **dem Raumschiff**<sub>i</sub> genug Brennstoff mit, [PRO<sub>i</sub> um auch noch den Merkur erreichen zu können]. (Leys 1971: 34)  
*one gave the spacecraft*<sub>DAT</sub> *enough fuel with in.order.to also still the Mercury reach to can*  
 'The spacecraft got enough fuel to be able to even reach Mercury.'

Apart from that, German adjunct control might as well involve NOC; cf. (8)-(10), where PRO can be interpreted as arbitrary PRO, cf. (9), (10), or as speaker, cf. (8), (10).

- (8) Er ist, [PRO<sub>speaker</sub> ohne zu übertreiben], weit und breit der beste Billiard-Spieler. (Pittner 1999: 338)  
*he is without to exaggerate wide and broad the best billiard.player*  
 'He is without exaggeration by far the best billiard player.'
- (9) [PRO<sub>arb</sub> Von Mainz kommend] empfiehlt sich die Fahrt mit der S-Bahnlinie 8 bis Wiesbaden  
*from Mainz coming<sub>prt,1</sub> recommends Refl the trip with the city.line 8 to Wiesbaden*  
 Hauptbahnhof. (cf. Brodahl 2016: 113)  
*main.station*  
 'When coming from Mainz, it is recommended to take the metro line no. 8 to the central station in Wiesbaden.'
- (10) Ich<sub>i</sub> bin der Meinung, dass [<sub>DP</sub> ein Leben [PRO<sub>arb/i</sub> als herumreisender Zauberkünstler]]  
*I am the opinion<sub>GEN</sub> that a life as travelling magician*  
 nicht einfach ist.  
*not easy is*  
 'I am of the opinion that a life as a travelling magician is not easy.'

We suggest that OC is analyzed as  $\phi$ -feature valuation through reverse Agree between the valued  $\phi$ -features of the controller and the unvalued  $\phi$ -features of PRO (cf. Wurmbrand 2011, Fischer 2017). That subject control into adjuncts is more frequent than object control follows from the fact that the most frequent adjunction site is adjunction to vP – as a result, the subject is the closest goal and typically acts as controller (note that the surface order in German might be misleading since it is V2; the control relation is usually established earlier in the derivation, i.e. before V2-movement takes place). In the case of object control, the adjunct is typically attached lower in the tree such that the object turns out to be the closest potential goal which can value PRO's  $\phi$ -features and thereby establish a control relation. NOC emerges as the result of a last resort strategy if the strict OC conditions cannot be satisfied (cf. also McFadden & Sundaresan 2016, Fischer 2017), i.e. if there is no local syntactic antecedent available to value PRO's  $\phi$ -features. This might be the case because the adjunct is attached too high in the tree (cf. also Landau 2015, who points out that NOC can generally be observed with right-edge adjuncts = highly-attached adjuncts), or because there is no potential goal around at all. So how is NOC PRO licensed? Recall that NOC PRO has long been shown to behave like a logophor (cf. Kuno 1975, Landau 2013, 2015). Adopting assumptions from Speas (2004), Sundaresan & Pearson (2014), Landau (2015), a.o., we suggest that logophoric anchoring is syntactically encoded in terms of a logophoric center in the left periphery, which is projected if OC fails. This formally introduces the antecedent a logophor needs for licensing (cf. Zribi-Hertz 1989). As a result, PRO can be bound by the attitude holder, which is the speaker in (8) or the non-local matrix subject in (10). In (9), where there is no other salient antecedent in the discourse, PRO is interpreted as arbitrary PRO. Although the adjunct control data as such are heterogeneous, German does not really differ from English (and presumably Norwegian), which supports the idea that an analysis along these lines might be on the right track, which takes the different underlying structures of different adjuncts as pivotal point for a syntactic analysis of adjunct control (which would then be the same in the afore-mentioned languages).

### Selected references

Fischer, S. 2017. On the locality of control and islands in German: exploring a hybrid theory of control. Ms., University of Stuttgart. • Hornstein, N. 1999. Movement and control. *LI* 30: 69-96. • Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of control*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. • Landau, I. 2015. A two-tiered theory of control. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. • McFadden, T. & S. Sundaresan. 2016. Failure to control is not a failure: it's *pro*. Ms., ZAS/Berlin/University of Leipzig. • Speas, M. 2004. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114: 255-276. • Wurmbrand, S. 2011. On agree and merge. Revised course notes from Problems in Syntax: <http://wurmbrand.uconn.edu/Papers/Agree-and-Merge.pdf>.