Assignment 8

This problem is based on Landau (2001) and concerns the distribution of Non-Obligatory Control (NOC). An electronic copy of the Landau (2001) paper can be found at http://www.bgu.ac.il/~idanl/files/Super-Equi.pdf

The first generative analyses of control treated control constructions in terms of a deletion rule called \textit{Equi}, which obligatorily deleted the subject of an infinitival under identity with an argument of the matrix predicate. Thus \textit{John tried [to leave]} was taken to be \textit{John tried [he to leave]}. At some point this analysis was abandoned in part because it became clear that \textit{Everyone wants [to leave]} does not mean \textit{Everyone wants [he to leave]}. Still the name comes up every now and then.

1 Super-Equi

The problem at hand concerns the phenomena of \textit{Super-Equi}, where an argument of a superordinate predicate controls the subject of a clause that is not its own complement.

\begin{enumerate}
\item (also \textit{please, be a relief})
\begin{enumerate}
\item Mary knew that it disturbed John [PRO to perjure himself/*herself].
\item Mary knew that [PRO perjuring himself/herself] disturbed John.
\end{enumerate}
\item (also \textit{help, be a help})
\begin{enumerate}
\item Mary knew that it damaged John [PRO to perjure himself/herself].
\item Mary knew that [PRO perjuring himself/herself] damaged John.
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Provide a theory of control that predicts the pattern of grammaticality seen in (1). Demonstrate how you handle the examples in (1). The theory you present should also explain the following contrast:

\begin{enumerate}
\item (a) *Mary$_i$ thought that it pleased John [PRO$_i$ to talk about herself].
\item ?Mary$_i$ thought that it pleased the man greatly who hired her for the job [PRO$_i$ to talk about herself].
\end{enumerate}

2 Logophoricity

What predictions does your existing theory of control make for the following contrasts?

\begin{enumerate}
\item (a) It would help Bill’s$_i$ development [PRO$_i$ to behave himself in public].
\item *It would help Bill’s$_i$ friends [PRO$_i$ to behave himself in public].
\end{enumerate}
b. [PRO_{i,j} finishing his work on time] is important to [John’s friends].

(5) a. It would help Bill’s confidence [PRO_i to plan his itinerary in advance].
   b. *It would help Bill’s car [PRO_i to plan his itinerary in advance].

What modifications are needed to handle the above contrasts?
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