

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

Youssef A. Haddad

CONTROL INTO CONJUNCTIVE PARTICIPLE CLAUSES

THE CASE OF ASSAMESE

TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS

DE
—
G

Control into Conjunctive Participle Clauses

The Case of Assamese

by

Youssef A. Haddad



De Gruyter Mouton

ISBN 978-3-11-023824-2
e-ISBN 978-3-11-023825-9
ISSN 1861-4302

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Haddad, Youssef A., 1972–
Control into conjunctive participle clauses : the case of Assamese /
by Youssef A. Haddad.
p. cm. — (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs ; 233)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-3-11-023824-2 (alk. paper)
1. Assamese language — Syntax. 2. Control (Linguistics)
I. Title.
PK1552.H33 2011
491.4'515—dc22

2010039871

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany.

www.degruyter.com

Control into Conjunctive Participle Clauses

Trends in Linguistics

Studies and Monographs 233

Editor

Volker Gast

Founding Editor

Werner Winter

Editorial Board

Walter Bisang

Hans Henrich Hock

Matthias Schlesewsky

Niina Ning Zhang

Editor responsible for this volume

Hans Henrich Hock

De Gruyter Mouton

For Elena and Aaya

Acknowledgments

This monograph is based in part on my 2007 dissertation “Adjunct Control in Telugu and Assamese,” which was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. BCS 0131993 to Eric Potsdam and by the University of Florida Russell Dissertation Fellowship. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are mine.

Since 2007, I have done more research on the topic of Adjunct Control in South Asian languages and collected more data. Some of my work on Telugu has appeared in the following journals: *Journal of Linguistics*, *The Linguistic Review*, and *Journal of South Asian Linguistics*. This book, on the other hand, brings together in one volume a thorough investigation of control into conjunctive participle clauses with a special focus on Assamese. I thank the Center for the Humanities and the Public Sphere at the University of Florida for the Summer Humanities Fellowship 2010 that allowed me to devote more time to the book and finish it in a timely manner.

All the data in this monograph, unless otherwise specified, were collected during interviews with native speakers. For the Assamese data, I am grateful to the following consultants: Upanita Goswami, Nirupama Upadhyay, Priyankoo Sarmah, Chandan Talukdar, Randeep Pratim Khaund, and Sakib R. Saikia. For the Telugu data, I would like to thank Sashikiran Chowdary, Suhitha Reddy Chigarapalli, Karthik Boinapally, Mahesh Taniruru, Santhosh Kopidaka, and Ganga Bhavani Manthini. For the data from other South Asian languages, I thank Prajakta Joshi (Marathi), Amey Kelkar (Konkani), Amitava Ghosh (Bengali), and Vibhuti Pandey (Hindi).

In addition, I owe a lot to Eric Potsdam, formerly for being a formidable advisor and now for being an excellent mentor and colleague. Several people were of great help while I was working on this project and they still are; I thank them all for the discussions and feedback and/or for the moral support. I especially wish to thank Theresa Antes, Brent Henderson, Virginia LoCastro, D. Gary Miller, Maria Polinsky, Janet Rose, K.V. Subbarao, Mary Watt, Ann Wehmeyer, and Caroline Wiltshire. I am also grateful to Anne Mark for doing such a great job copyediting the book and to Hans Henrich Hock, Birgit Sievert, and Wolfgang Konwitschny of Mouton de Gruyter for being prompt and professional.

I remain in greatest debt to my family. I thank my wife for understanding the nature of my work and for being so loving and supportive. I also thank my mother, my late stepfather, my sisters, and my sister-in-law for all their love and sacrifices.

Finally, I thank God for seeing me through it all. “Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me” – they always have.

Youssef A. Haddad
Fall 2010
Gainesville, Florida

List of Abbreviations

*	unacceptable/ungrammatical
?	degraded
✓	acceptable/grammatical (only used in contrast with * or ?)
1	1 st person
3	3 rd person
ABS	absolutive
ACC	accusative
CL	classifier
CNP	conjunctive participle
COMP	complementizer
DAT	dative
EMPH	emphatic
ERG	ergative
EXP NOM	experiential nominative
F	feminine
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
GRND	gerund
HON	honorific
INF	infinitive
LOC	locative
M	masculine
N	neuter
NEG	negative
NOM	nominative
P	plural
pro _{EXP}	null expletive
REFL	reflexive
S	singular
SUB	subjunctive
SUBJ	subject

Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
List of Abbreviations	xiii

Chapter 1

Introduction	1
1. Research questions	1
2. Domain of investigation	2
3. Analytic approach.....	4
3.1. From Government and Binding to Minimalism: An overview	5
3.1.1. The architecture of the grammar in Government and Binding.....	5
3.1.2. The architecture of the grammar in the Minimalist Program.....	8
3.2. Control in Government and Binding.....	12
3.3. Control in the Minimalist Program	15
3.3.1. The PRO Theory of Control	15
3.3.2. The Movement Theory of Control.....	18
3.4. Multiple copy spell-out and the realization vs. deletion of copies	22
3.4.1. Deletion of copies	22
3.4.2. Realization of multiple copies	26
4. Structure of the study	28

Chapter 2

Assamese Adjunct Control: A descriptive overview	30
1. Introduction	30
2. Linguistic overview.....	30
3. Case in Assamese: A descriptive overview.....	32
4. Finite clauses in Assamese	38
5. Nonfinite clauses in Assamese	39
5.1. Infinitive clauses in Assamese	39
5.2. Conjunctive participle clauses in Assamese.....	41
5.3. The subordinate nature of CNP clauses	42
6. CNP clauses and Adjunct Control.....	45
6.1. Forward Control in Assamese	47
6.2. Backward Control in Assamese	51

6.3	Copy Control.....	56
6.4.	Exceptions.....	65
7.	Conclusion.....	67

Chapter 3

Forward/Backward Adjunct Control: The analysis		69
1.	Introduction	69
2.	Forward/Backward Control: The facts	70
2.1.	Forward Control	72
2.2.	Backward Control	79
3.	Assamese Adjunct Control as Obligatory Control	83
4.	Assamese Adjunct Control as sideward movement	85
4.1.	Forward Control	87
4.1.1.	Forward Control as sideward movement	87
4.1.2.	Forward Control as sideward plus remnant movement.....	89
4.2.	Backward Control in Assamese	91
5.	Multiple Case checking and Copy Control	99
6.	Case in raising vs. control	101
6.1.	Landau's analysis.....	101
6.2.	Raising vs. control in Assamese.....	103
6.3.	Case in raising vs. control: The counterargument.....	104
6.3.1.	Boeckx and Hornstein's analysis.....	105
6.3.2.	Beyond Assamese: Case and Theta-Role Visibility ..	106
7.	Conclusion.....	109

Chapter 4

Copy Adjunct Control: The analysis.....		111
1.	Introduction	111
2.	Copy Control as movement.....	115
3.	Copy Control: The derivational history.....	117
4.	Copy Control and linearization	120
4.1.	Multiple copy spell-out	122
4.1.1.	Nunes's analysis	122
4.1.2.	Fujii's analysis.....	123
4.2.	Multiple copy spell-out and Multiple Spell-Out	126
4.2.1.	Multiple Spell-Out and copy raising.....	127
4.2.2.	Multiple Spell-Out and Copy Control.....	130
5.	Adjunction to CP and unwanted sideward movement	136
6.	Phonological realization of copies.....	141

6.1. Movement and the PF realization of copies	142
6.2. Lack of cataphoricity and the nature of the CNP subject	146
7. Conclusion	150

Chapter 5

Adjunct Control violations as Expletive Control	151
1. Introduction	151
2. Nonvolitional as unaccusative	156
3. Unaccusative predicates and Expletive Control	157
3.1. Adjunct Control and the target of sideward movement	163
3.2. Expletive Control and cyclic merge	166
4. English Expletive Control	169
5. Conclusion	175

Chapter 6

Trigger: Why movement in control?	176
1. Introduction	176
2. Enlightened Self-Interest and control	177
3. Event and control	179
4. CP vs. IP and control	182
4.1. IP as defective for [Person]	186
4.2. IP as defective for [Tense]	187
5. Movement and predication	188
5.1. Theoretical assumptions	188
5.1.1. The merge of adjuncts	189
5.1.2. Predication	190
5.2. CNP clauses as predicative	191
5.3. Sinhala CNP clauses as nonpredicative	195
6. Conclusion	197

Chapter 7

Summary and conclusion	198
1. Summary	198
2. Theoretical implications	200
2.1. Multiple Case checking	201
2.2. R-expressions vs. pronominals in Copy Control	201
2.3. Why movement	202
3. Concluding remarks	202

Notes 204

References 212

Index 225

Chapter 1

Introduction

1. Research questions

This study is based in the Minimalist Program of the Principles-and-Parameters approach to syntactic theory (Chomsky 1981, 1995, 2000; Chomsky and Lasnik 1995). It explores a phenomenon of control into a special type of adjunct known as the adverbial or conjunctive participle clause in a South Asian, Indo-Aryan language: Assamese.

Control is a relation of interpretation dependency between two arguments in a given structure, one in the matrix clause and one in the subordinate clause. To illustrate, in sentence (1), there are two arguments: a “manage-er” realized as Tom and an implied “eat-er.” Both arguments have to be coreferential, and thus the “eat-er” is unmistakably Tom.

- (1) *[Tom managed [____ to eat the whole hamburger by himself]]*

This study focuses on Adjunct Control, which is a relation of obligatory coreferentiality between the subject in the matrix clause and the subject in the adjunct/conjunctive participle clause.

Control has been a controversial issue in Chomskyan generative grammar for a long time. One prevalent assumption in the literature has been that control is a relation of coreferentiality between an overt NP in a higher (matrix) clause and a silent NP in a lower (subordinate) clause, as sentences (2) and (3) illustrate. The silent NP is symbolized by Δ .

- (2) *[Matrix Tom_i hopes [Subordinate Complement Δ_i to win]]*
(3) *[[Matrix Tom_i won] [Subordinate Adjunct without Δ_i knowing it]]*

These are not the only attested patterns, however. Other patterns do exist, leading to the following typology of control in (4) (Polinsky and Potsdam 2006: 174). In Forward Control, (4a), only the matrix NP is pronounced. In Backward Control, (4b), only the subordinate NP is pronounced. In Copy Control, (4c), both the matrix and subordinate NPs are pronounced.

- (4) a. *Forward Control*
 [Matrix NP_i ... [Subordinate Δ_i ...]]
- b. *Backward Control*
 [Matrix Δ_i ... [Subordinate NP_i ...]]
- c. *Copy Control*
 [Matrix NP_i ... [Subordinate NP_i ...]]

Forward Control is the most researched. Its history goes back to the 1960s (Chomsky 1965; Rosenbaum 1967). Backward Control is a less studied phenomenon. It has been investigated in a number of languages, including Japanese (Kuroda 1965, 1978), Tsez (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002), Malagasy (Polinsky and Potsdam 2003), and Korean (Monahan 2003). Copy Control is the least studied phenomenon. It has been explored in Tongan (Chung 1978), San Lucas Quiavini Zapotec (Lee 2003; Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes 2007), and Telugu (Haddad 2009a).

Interestingly, all three types of control are attested in Assamese, although Backward Control seems to be quite restricted. The main questions that the study means to answer are the following:

- What are the syntactic characteristics of Adjunct Control – or, more specifically, control into conjunctive participle clauses – in Assamese?
- What are the mechanics involved in the derivation of the different types of control (Forward, Backward, and Copy)?
- How does Adjunct Control contribute to the analysis of control in general?

The rest of the chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the domain of investigation of the study. Section 3 lays out the theoretical foundation upon which the following chapters are built. Section 4 provides a brief overview of the monograph.

2. Domain of investigation

This study is mainly concerned with one South Asian language: Assamese, an Indo-Aryan language. The Indo-Aryan language family is one of the major language families that share the South Asian subcontinent. It is also one of the five largest language families in the world, having more than 640 million speakers (est. 1981) (Masica 1991: 8).¹

Assamese, also known as Asamiya, is the major language of the state of Assam in the far northeastern part of India. More than half of the people living in Assam (ca. 13 out of ca. 22 million) speak Assamese as a native language. Many others, both in Assam and in the neighboring states of Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh, and Nagaland, speak it as a second language (Masica 1991; Goswami and Tamuli 2003: 393–394). Assamese has a long literary tradition that arguably goes back to the 6th or 7th century AD. However, the earliest literary work that is unmistakably Assamese dates to the 13th century AD (Goswami and Tamuli 2003: 397).

This study focuses on one aspect of Assamese, namely, Obligatory Adjunct Control into a special type of nonfinite participial clause known as the conjunctive participle (CNP) clause. Adjunct Control is a control relation between two subjects, one in the matrix clause and one in an adjunct. Three types of Assamese Adjunct Control are examined. These are Forward Control, in which only the matrix subject is pronounced, (5a); Backward Control, in which only the subordinate/adjunct subject is pronounced, (5b); and Copy Control, in which both subjects are pronounced, (5c).

- (5) a.

<i>[Ram-e_i</i>	<i>[Δ_i *_k</i>	<i>xɔmɔi</i>	<i>na-thak-i]</i>
[Ram-NOM	[Δ	time	NEG-keep-CNP]
<i>bfiat</i>	<i>na-khal-e]</i>		
rice	NEG-ate-3]		
'Having no time, Ram didn't eat rice.'			
- b.

<i>?[Δ_i *_k</i>	<i>[Ram-dr_i</i>	<i>xɔmɔi</i>	<i>na-thak-i]</i>
[Δ	[Ram-GEN	time	NEG-keep-CNP]
<i>bfiat</i>	<i>na-khal-e]</i>		
rice	NEG-ate-3]		
'Having no time, Ram didn't eat rice.'			
- c.

<i>[[Ram-dr</i>	<i>xɔmɔi</i>	<i>na-thak-i]</i>
[[Ram-GEN	time	NEG-keep-CNP]
<i>Ram-e</i>	<i>bfiat</i>	<i>na-khal-e]</i>
Ram-NOM	rice	NEG-ate-3]
'Having no time, Ram didn't eat rice.'		

Although structures that involve a CNP clause are generally Obligatory Control structures, a few exceptions exist. For example, sentence (6) involves a CNP clause, yet disjoint subjects are allowed.

- (6) *[[dfumufia aɦ-i] boɦut gos bɦanɦil]*
 [[storm.ABS come-CNP] many trees.ABS broke]
 ‘A storm having come, many trees were destroyed.’

The following chapters account for structures like (5a–c) and (6) within syntactic theory. Section 3 highlights relevant aspects of this theory.

3. Analytic approach

Building on work by Hornstein (1999, 2003), I analyze Adjunct Control as an instance of movement, whereby the subject is base-generated in the adjunct before it moves to the matrix clause. The analysis of Adjunct Control requires answering two questions. First, what are the mechanics involved in the derivation of Assamese Adjunct Control structures? Second, what are the mechanics involved in the pronunciation of either or both subjects in the different types of Adjunct Control structures that Assamese allows?

The answer to the first question requires familiarity with the syntactic theory related to control in general. Assuming the Movement Theory of Control (Hornstein 1999) and that the two subjects in an Adjunct Control structure are related via movement, the answer to the second question is based in the broader phenomenon of multiple copy spell-out, whereby more than one copy of the same token is pronounced in a single structure. The main task is to determine the factors that are decisive in the realization of copies, resulting in variation in Adjunct Control.

I address these questions in Sections 3.2 through 3.4. In Sections 3.2 and 3.3, I review two opposing approaches to control theory: the PRO Theory of Control and the Movement Theory of Control. I show that the movement approach is more compatible with the Assamese data. Section 3.4 deals with the issue of multiple copy spell-out. It brings to the fore the factors that may be decisive in the pronunciation of either or both subjects in the different types of Assamese Adjunct Control structures.

First, however, an overview of the framework within which this study is based is appropriate. The study adopts the movement approach to control, which has been made possible by changes in syntactic theory during the 1990s. Section 3.1 highlights some major aspects of this theory and explains how the changes came about.