Roger Martin (Yokohama National U.) and Juan Uriagereka (U. of Maryland)

Uniformity and Collapse

In this paper, we present an analysis of obligatory control (OC) structures in terms of chain uniformity and collapse. Our analysis does not make crucial use of null Case, or even a null formative PRO, and in this sense it is very much in the spirit of Hornstein (1999), but at the same time we do not wish to trivialize the nature of θ-roles by treating them as mere formal features akin to Case/φ-features. Although we agree on the need to associate multiple roles (a conceptual notion) to a single referential scope-taking object (an intentional notion), whereas Hornstein moves the controller, picking up roles-as-features, we maintain that roles can be assigned to distinct arguments in distinct 'base' configurations (resulting from first-Merge), and that it is a later process of 'collapse' at the relevant interface that associates these roles to a single intentional object, namely a chain (Martin 1996). Furthermore, we propose to abandon the distinction between occurrences (Chomsky 2001), of some lexical type or phrase built of such types, as opposed to tokens, assuming only the former ontologically. If all you have is occurrences, why in some instances do multiple identical occurrences get regarded as one and the same object for certain interpretative purposes, whereas in others the interface interprets them as distinct objects? Our answer is built on the notions uniformity and collapse.

Turning to OC, we argue that (1) derives from the structure (2) (we tentatively take the non-finite complement of an OC verb to be TP and abstract away from the issue of whether or not the EPP holds in clauses where T does not assign structural Case).

(1) John tried to get the job.

(2) [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ T [John *v* [tried [$_{TP}$ to [John *v* [get the job]]]]]]]

In (2), there are two occurrences of *John*. The question is whether these two occurrences collapse at the relevant interface as distinct objects (separate chains) for the purpose of interpretation or one. Following Uriagereka (2008), we assume a distributed semantics with independent C and I interfaces. We argue that whereas the mapping to C considers only very local configurations resulting from first-Merge, the mapping to I (and to A-P as well) looks at all of the occurrences within a given phase-space and in accordance with strict uniformity interprets any identical ones as just that, the very same object. The intuition behind uniformity in this sense is that unless multiple identical occurrences, of lexical items or phrases, are separated across phase-spaces and/or some feature values are added (which we take to be part of the rationale behind Case-valuation) to make them different, the system simply won't be able to tell them apart, and hence they must collapse as a single chain with a unique intentional interpretation.

Note that the difference between (1) and (3) follows straightforwardly from this proposal: We cannot interpret the occurrences of *John* and *Bill* in (3) as constituting a chain since strict uniformity does not hold between them.

(3) *John tried Bill to get the job.

Also consider (4)~(6), the standard paradigm to be accounted for when discussing the distribution of OC (or, closer to the spirit to our analysis here, of Equi-NP Deletion).

(4) *John *v* believes John to have gotten a good job.

(5) *John said John will get a good job.

(6) *John *v* criticized John.

We argue that in all of these instances, the multiple occurrences of *John* must be interpreted as distinct (note that, setting aside the Condition C issue, the sentences above are grammatical if the multiple occurrences are interpreted as distinct for PF/LF interpretation) due to the fact that they exist in different phase-spaces, with Case valued by distinct probes. We also easily derive the locality of OC, as illustrated by the fact that only object control is possible in (7).

(7) John *v* persuaded Mary [Mary/*John to apply for the job]

On our analysis, this follows straightforwardly from the locality of interpreting multiple occurrences as a chain; impossible across strong phases.

However, a question arises for our analysis of (1). Why doesn't *v* associated with *try* in (1) act as a probe (and project a strong phase in the sense of Chomsky 2001) just like *v* associated with *believe* in (4) *criticize* in (6) or *persuade* in (7)? It clearly must not for our analysis to work. Although we do not offer a full explanation, we suggest the direction for a answer based on San Martin and Uriagereka's (2002) observation that subject OC verbs in Basque typically exhibit unaccusative Case patterns when they occur with non-finite complements (8) as opposed to DP complements (9).

(8) Ni [pisua galtzen] sahiatu naiz
I.Abs weight lose.INF try.PRT BE.1p 'I have tried to lose weight.'

(9) Nik hori saihiatu dut
I.Erg that.A try.PRT HAVE.1p.3p 'I have tried that.'

Other chain conditions hold on the types of collapse described here.

(10) *It seems to Mary [Mary to have a good job]

For example, in (10), the higher occurrence of *Mary* presumably does not c-command the lower one, hence the system cannot collapse these together as a single chain. The same can be said of OC into adjuncts.

(11) [$_{TP}$ John T [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ Mary [John *v* [$_{VP}$ kiss Mary]]] [$_{Adjunct}$ before John/*Mary leaving]]

Assuming a structure like (11), with the adjunct adjoined to *v*P, so that both the raised object position and the base subject position c-command into it (assuming some minimalist analogue of segment theory), "object control" is blocked since the lower occurrence of *Mary* in the matrix does not c-command the occurrence of *Mary* in the adjunct. On the other hand, both the base and raised subject positions c-command an occurrence of *John* in the adjunct yielding subject control.

Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *A Life in Language*. MIT Press.

Martin, R. 1996. A minimalist theory of PRO and control. UConn doctoral dissertation.

Hornstein, N. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry*.

San Martin, I. and J. Uriagereka 2002. Infinitival complementation in Basque. UPV/EHU.

Uriagereka, J. 2008. *Syntactic anchors*. Cambridge University Press.