

OBLIGATORY AND NON-OBLIGATORY CONTROL IN IRISH AND POLISH

ANNA BONDARUK

0. Introduction

The aim of the paper is to establish a typology of control in Irish and Polish. What is first examined in the two languages analysed are verbs taking non-finite complements. The main focus of the paper is laid on two types of control, namely obligatory and non-obligatory control. Having presented the criteria for distinguishing obligatory from non-obligatory control, the validity of these criteria is tested against Irish and Polish data. Within the class of obligatory control two subtypes are recognised, i.e. exhaustive and partial control. The distinctive properties of these two subtypes of obligatory control are scrutinised together with the contexts where they obtain in the languages investigated. It is argued that the various control types occur in analogous contexts and show similar properties in Irish and Polish.

1.0. Verbs taking non-finite complements in Irish and Polish

There exist seven classes of verbs in Irish and Polish that can take non-finite complements. These classes are listed in table 1 below.

Table 1

Verb Class	Irish	Polish
1. modals	<i>caithfidh</i> ‘must’, <i>tá ar</i> ‘have to’, <i>is gá do</i> ‘it is necessary’, <i>teastaíonn ó</i> ‘need’, <i>tig le</i> ‘can/may’, <i>féadann do</i> ‘can’	<i>musiéc</i> ‘must’, <i>umieć</i> ‘can’, <i>powinno się</i> ‘should’, <i>mieć</i> ‘be to’
2. aspectuals	<i>tosaigh</i> ‘begin’, <i>coinníonn</i> ‘continue’, <i>stad de</i> ‘stop’, <i>stop ó</i> ‘stop, cease’	<i>zaczynać</i> ‘start’, <i>kończyć</i> ‘finish’, <i>przestać</i> ‘stop’

Verb Class	Irish	Polish
3. implicatives	<i>éiríonn le</i> ‘succeed, manage’, <i>teipeann ar</i> ‘fail’, <i>chuaigh de</i> ‘fail’, <i>cinneann ar</i> ‘fail’, <i>cliseann ar</i> ‘fail’, <i>déan dearmad</i> ‘forget’	<i>ośmielać się</i> ‘dare’, <i>zdołać</i> ‘manage’, <i>zapominać</i> ‘forget’, <i>pamiętać</i> ‘remember’
4. factives	<i>taitníonn le</i> ‘like’, <i>tá mé sásta</i> ‘I am glad/content’, <i>is maith le</i> ‘like’	<i>lubić</i> ‘like’, <i>nienawidzieć</i> ‘hate’, <i>nie znosić</i> ‘can’t stand’, <i>być przykro</i> ‘be sorry’
5. propositionals	<i>abair</i> ‘say’	<i>powiedzieć</i> ‘say’
6. desideratives	<i>tá faoi</i> ‘intend’, <i>tá sé ar intinn ag</i> ‘intend’, <i>sil</i> ‘intend’, <i>socraigh</i> ‘decide’, <i>teastaíonn ó</i> ‘want’, <i>is fearr le</i> ‘prefer’	<i>chcieć</i> ‘want’, <i>woleć</i> ‘prefer’, <i>mieć nadzieję</i> ‘hope’, <i>obawiać się</i> ‘be afraid’, <i>zgodzić się</i> ‘agree’, <i>zamierzać</i> ‘intend’
7. interrogatives	<i>tá a fhios agam</i> ‘I know’, <i>fiafraigh</i> ‘inquire’, <i>tá tuairim ag</i> ‘be of opinion/guess’	<i>pytać</i> ‘ask’, <i>zastanawiać się</i> ‘wonder’, <i>wypytywać</i> ‘inquire’ <i>dowiadzać się</i> ‘find out’

The above classification requires a word of comment. The labels, such as modals, aspectuals, implicatives, etc., used in table 1, have been borrowed from Landau (2000:38) and the reader is referred to his work to determine what exactly the particular label denotes. As regards modal verbs, some of them represent raising, rather than control, predicates, a fact observed for Irish by McCloskey (1984, 1985) and for Polish by Witkoś (1998).¹

¹ McCloskey (1985) notes that the verb *caithfidh* ‘must’ can function as a raising or as a control predicate. These two uses are illustrated by examples (i) and (ii), respectively:

(i) *Caithfidh sí [gan __ a bheith breoite].* (McCloskey (1985:200))
 must she NEG PRT be-VN ill
 ‘She must not be ill.’

(ii) *Caithfidh [gan í a bheith breoite].*
 must NEG her PRT be-VN ill
 ‘It must be that she is not ill.’

Furthermore, McCloskey (1984) argues that at least on their epistemic readings modals represent raising predicates.

See also S. Mac Mathúna (1975) for an earlier discussion of some of these verbs. [Eds].

Aspectual verbs in Irish and Polish can also be treated as raising predicates.² Interrogative complements in Irish, unlike their Polish counterparts, are restricted to expressing only place, time, manner or reason, as shown by the bracketed portion of sentence (1) below:³

(1) go bhfuil fhios agatsa [cad ina thaobh í a bheith mar atá sí]⁴

C is knowledge at-you-EMPH why she PRT be-VN like be-REL she
'that you know why she is the way she is'

Since this paper is devoted to a typology of control, only verbs that can take control, not raising, non-finite complements will be scrutinised here.

Example (1) also illustrates a striking property of Irish non-finite clauses, namely the presence of an overt subject. In fact, Irish non-finite clauses can either exhibit an overt subject, as in (1), or can have the covert PRO subject, as in (2) below:

(2) Ba mhaith liom [PRO imeacht].
COP good with-me go-VN
'I would like to go'

It is often the case that a verb in Irish can subcategorise a non-finite clause either with an overt subject or with a covert one. For instance, the verb *ba mhaith le* 'would like' in example (2) above subcategorises a non-finite complement with the covert subject, but it can also subcategorise a non-finite clause with an overt subject, as can be seen in sentence (3):

² Witkoś (1998:301) argues that modals and aspectuals in Polish are raising verbs because they can co-occur with weather verbs and preserve the idiomatic meaning of idiom chunks. These two tests are exemplified by (i) and (ii) below:

- (i) Jutro może/zacznie padać.
tomorrow may/will-begin rain/to rain
'Tomorrow it may/will start rain/to rain.'
- (ii) Wtedy musi/zacznie wyjść /wychodzić szydło z worka.
then must/will-begin come out/to-come-out needle out-of sack
'Then the truth must/will be revealed.'

³ Non-finite questions in Irish, in a way analogous to non-finite interrogative complements, can only refer to place, time, manner or reason, as can be seen in (i):

- (i) Ach [cad ina thaobh é a bheith craptha], an dóigh leat?
but why it PRT be-VN wasted COP likely to-you
'But why is it shrunk, do you think?'

Example (i) above comes from "Leoithne Aniar" edited by Pádraig Tyers.

⁴ This example has been taken from "An Gleann agus a Raibh Ann" by Séamus Ó Maolchathaigh.

- (3) Ba mhaith liom [é a imeacht].
 COP good with-me him PRT go-VN
 'I would like him to go'

In contradistinction to Irish, Polish non-finite clauses can contain only PRO and can never show any overt subject. Since this paper focuses on various types of control, Irish non-finite clauses with overt subjects, which do not require any control, will not be analysed here.⁵

2.0. Typology of control in Irish and Polish

In the literature two classes of control have been recognised, namely obligatory control (henceforth, OC) and non-obligatory control (henceforth, NOC). Although this distinction has been widely adopted, there is no consensus as to where to set the division lines between these two control types. Section 2.1 concentrates on two sets of criteria that can be used to distinguish OC from NOC. Their merits and weaknesses are compared and tested against the data from Irish and Polish in section 2.2. Section 2.3 examines a much less frequently noted division of OC into exhaustive control (henceforth, EC) and partial control (henceforth, PC). The properties of EC and PC in Irish and Polish are pointed out in section 2.4.

2.1. Obligatory vs. non-obligatory control - the diagnostics

Recently two suggestions have been made regarding what distinguishes OC from NOC.⁶ One is offered by Hornstein (1999, 2001) and the other by Landau (2000). Let us present briefly either of these proposals.

Hornstein (1999, 2001) puts forward the following characteristics of OC:

- (4) a. the controller must be present
 b. the controller must be local
 c. the controller must c-command the OC PRO
 d. under VP Deletion, OC PRO allows only a sloppy reading⁷
 e. the controller cannot be split
 f. OC PRO allows only *de se* interpretation.

⁵ The licensing of overt subjects in Irish non-finite clauses has been subject to numerous analyses, cf., for example, Chung and McCloskey (1987), McCloskey and Sells (1988), Noonan (1994), Harley (2000) and Bondaruk (2004).

⁶ Another recent proposal concerning OC/NOC distinction has been made by Wurmbrand (2001). She postulates that the division line between these two control types should be drawn by semantics. For her, OC obtains in case there occurs a uniquely predetermined controller, otherwise NOC holds.

⁷ In OC, a sloppy reading is also possible if the DP modified by the QP *only* controls PRO. This is the seventh OC test used by Hornstein (1999, 2001), cf. example (5g).

The above properties of OC can be illustrated by means of the following examples, taken from Hornstein (2001:31):

- (5) a. *It was expected [PRO to shave himself].
 b. *John thinks that it was expected [PRO to shave himself].
 c. *John's campaign expects [PRO to shave himself].
 d. John expects [PRO to win] and Bill does too (=Bill win).
 e. *John₁ told Mary₂ [PRO₁₊₂ to leave together].
 f. The unfortunate expects [PRO to get a medal].
 g. Only Churchill remembers [PRO giving the BST speech].

The data above show that OC PRO requires an antecedent (cf. (5a)), which has to be local (cf. (5b)), and which must c-command PRO (cf. (5c)). Under VP Deletion OC PRO allows only a sloppy reading (cf. (5d)), and it cannot have a split antecedent (cf. (5e)). Furthermore, OC PRO allows only the *de se* interpretation in (5f), according to which the unfortunate believes of himself that he will get a medal. Finally, (5g) can be interpreted as: only Churchill has the memory because Churchill alone gave the speech, that is, only Churchill must act as PRO's antecedent.

NOC regularly contrasts with OC and displays the characteristics illustrated in (6), quoted after Hornstein (2001:32):

- (6) a. It was believed that [PRO shaving] was important.
 b. John₁ thinks that it is believed that [PRO₁ shaving himself] is important.
 c. Clinton's₁ campaign believes that [PRO₁ keeping his sex life under control] is necessary for electoral success.
 d. John thinks that [PRO getting his resume in order] is crucial and Bill does too.
 e. John₁ told Mary₂ that [PRO₁₊₂ washing each other] would be fun.
 f. The unfortunate believes that [PRO getting a medal] would be boring.
 g. Only Churchill remembers that [PRO giving the BST speech] was momentous.

(6a) shows that NOC PRO does not require an antecedent. (6b) indicates that its antecedent may be non-local, whereas (6c) demonstrates that the antecedent does not need to c-command NOC PRO. VP Deletion in (6d) may give rise to a strict reading, i.e., one in which Bill thinks that getting John's resume in order is crucial. NOC PRO allows control by a split antecedent, as can be seen in (6e), and can have a *de re* reading in (6f). Finally, NOC PRO in (6g) does not need to be interpreted as having *only Churchill* as its antecedent.

Another set of properties distinguishing OC from NOC, slightly different from that offered by Hornstein, is proposed by Landau (2000). Landau's diagnostics of OC and NOC are listed in (7) below:

- (7) a. Arbitrary Control is impossible in OC, possible in NOC.
(Landau (2000:31))
b. Long-distance Control is impossible in OC, possible in NOC.
c. Strict reading of PRO is impossible in OC, possible in NOC.
d. *De re* reading of PRO is impossible in OC (only *de se*), possible in NOC.

The properties of OC and NOC enumerated by Landau can be illustrated by examples (8) and (9), respectively:

- (8) a. Mark₁ expected [PRO_{1/*arb} to win].
b. John₁ knew that Mark₂ expected [PRO_{2/*1} to win].
c. Mark₁ expected [PRO₁ to win] and John₂ did too.
(=John₂ expected PRO₂ to win)
d. The unfortunate₁ expected [PRO₁ to get a medal].
- (9) a. It is dangerous for babies [PRO_{arb} to smoke around them].
(Landau (2000: 34-35))
b. Mary₁ knew that it damaged John [PRO₁ to perjure herself].
c. John thinks that it will be difficult [PRO to feed himself], and Bill does too.
d. The unfortunate₁ believes that it would be boring [PRO_{1/arb} to get a medal].

The above data show that whereas arbitrary control is disallowed in OC contexts (cf. (8a)), it is perfectly licit in cases of NOC (cf. (9a)). While long distance control is unavailable in cases of OC (cf. (8b)), it can be found in NOC contexts (cf. (9b)). In instances of OC only sloppy reading is possible (cf. (8c)), however, NOC tolerates also strict reading under VP ellipsis (cf. (9c)). Finally, only the *de se* interpretation can be ascribed to OC PRO (cf. (8d)), but NOC PRO can be associated with the *de re* interpretation (cf. (9d)).

Landau further specifies that OC holds in all non-finite complements, while NOC is attested in subject and adjunct clauses.⁸ This generalisation is supported by the data like (6), (8) and (9). All the instances of OC illustrated

⁸ Control into adjunct clauses is not thoroughly discussed by Landau (2000). He notes, however, that some adjunct clauses allow only OC, contrary to the predictions made by his analysis.

in (8) are found in complement clauses, whereas all cases of NOC presented in (6) are restricted to subject clauses. Extraposed subject clauses, like the ones in (9), are adjoined to VP and hence function as adjuncts. They trigger NOC and therefore comply with Landau's generalisation.

Landau argues, contra Hornstein (1999, 2001), that neither c-command by the controller nor the ban on a split antecedent constitute characteristics typical of OC (cf. (4c) and (4e) above). The evidence in support of this claim is provided in (10):

- (10) a. It has helped Mary₁'s career [PRO_{1/*arb} to have a father on the board of directors].⁹
 b. Mark₁ promised his daughter₂ [PRO₁₊₂ to watch TV together].

In (10a) PRO is obligatorily controlled, yet its controller, i.e. *Mary*, does not c-command it. In (10b), control by a split antecedent is possible with a prototypical OC verb *promise*. Consequently, it appears that c-command by an antecedent is not a necessary condition for OC to arise, and the possibility of control by a split antecedent does not necessarily imply NOC. Since Landau's proposal fares better than Hornstein's with respect to the data like (10a) and (10b), it is going to be adopted for the presentation of the properties of OC and NOC in Irish and Polish, an issue addressed in the next section.

2.2. OC and NOC in Irish and Polish

Let us now adopt Landau's diagnostics in (7) to Irish and Polish data. All the tests put forward by Landau can be applied to Polish, however, test (7c) is inapplicable to Irish, as VP ellipsis is not possible in non-finite clauses in this language (Jim McCloskey, p.c.). Consequently, Irish equivalents of the English sentences with ellipsed VPs, as in (11a), do not 'drop' the VP at all, as can be seen in (11b):

- (11) a. John must leave and Mary must too.
 b. Caithfidh Seán fágáil agus caithfidh Máire fágáil freisin.
 must John leave-VN and must Mary leave-VN too
 'John must leave and Mary must too'

⁹ Example (10a) is problematic for Landau's claim that NOC is limited to subject and adjunct clauses. Although the bracketed non-finite clause in (10a) is extraposed and hence functions as an adjunct, it exhibits OC only. For a possible analysis of such sentences cf. Landau (2000: 109).

It seems that Irish and Polish OC shows the properties listed for OC in English by Landau (2000). That this is indeed the case can be seen in (12) and (13):

- (12) a. Ba mhaith liom₁ [PRO_{1/*arb} fanacht].
COP good with-me stay-VN
'I would like to stay.'
- b. Shíl Máire₁ gur mhaith le Seán₂ [PRO_{*1/2} a dhul abhaile].
thought Mary C good with John PRT go-VN home
'Mary thought John would like to go home'
- c. B'fhéarr leis an duine mí-ámharach₁ [PRO_{1/*2} bonn a fháil].
COP-better with the person unfortunate medal PRT get-VN
'The unfortunate would prefer to get a medal'
- (13) a. Marek₁ chciał [znaleźć PRO_{1/*arb} swoje₁ rzeczy].
Mark wanted to-find self's things
Mark wanted to find his things'
- b. Maria₁ powiedziała, że Marek₂ chce [PRO_{*1/2} znaleźć swoje_{*1/2} rzeczy].
Mary said that Mark wants to-find his things
'Mary said that Mark wants to find his things'
- c. Marek₁ chce [PRO₁ znaleźć swoje rzeczy] i Maria też.
Mark wants to-find his things and Mary too
'Mark wants to find his things and Mary does too'
- d. Nieszczęśnik₁ spodziewa się [PRO₁ dostać medal].
unfortunate expects REFL to-get medal
'The unfortunate expects to get a medal'

Sentences (12a) and (13a) indicate that OC PRO in Irish and Polish must have an antecedent, which must be local (cf. (12b) and (13b)). Furthermore, Irish and Polish OC PRO has the *de se* reading only (cf. (12c) and (13d)). Example (13c) demonstrates that in OC contexts in Polish only sloppy reading is allowed under VP Ellipsis.

NOC in Irish and Polish displays properties regularly contrasting with the ones typical of OC in these languages. First of all, arbitrary reading is available in the case of NOC in Irish (cf. (14a)) and Polish (cf. (15a)). Secondly, NOC PRO may have a long distance controller, as can be seen for Irish in (14b) and for Polish in (15b). Thirdly, the *de re* reading can be associated with NOC PRO both in Irish (cf. (14c)) and in Polish (cf. (15d)). Finally, NOC in Polish can give rise to strict reading under VP ellipsis (cf. (15c)). Once again the ellipsis test cannot be applied to Irish for the reasons already stated.

- (14) a. Creideann Seán go bhfuil sé tábhachtach [PRO_{arb} a bheith sláintiúil].¹⁰
believes John C is it important PRT be-VN healthy

‘John believes that it is important to be healthy’

- b. Creideann Seán₁ go síleann Máire₂ go bhfuil sé tábhachtach
[PRO₁ é₁ féin a bheathú i gceart].
believes John C thinks Mary C is it important
him self PRT feed-VN properly

‘John believes that Mary thinks that it is important to feed himself properly’

- c. Creideann an duine mí-ámharach₁ go bhfuil sé leadránach/
tábhachtach [PRO_{1/arb} bonn a fháil].
believes the person unfortunate C is it boring /
important medal PRT get-VN

‘The unfortunate believes it is boring/important to get a medal’

- (15) a. Ewa uważa, że [wczesne PRO_{arb} wstawanie] jest denerwujące.¹¹
Eve thinks that early getting-up is annoying

‘Eve thinks that getting up early is annoying.’

- b. Marek₁ myśli, że ludzie uważają, że [PRO₁ dbanie o swoje
interesy] jest dla niego ważne.
Mark thinks that people consider that taking-care of his
business is for him important

‘Mark thinks that people consider that taking care of his business is important for him.’

- c. Marek sądzi, że [wczesne PRO wstawanie] jest denerwujące
i Maria też.
Mark thinks that early getting-up is annoying
and Mary too

¹⁰ In addition to being arbitrary, PRO in (14a) may be controlled by *Seán* ‘John’. There exist cases where PRO can be arbitrary in the absence of any potential controller, as in (i):

(i) Ní féidir [PRO_{arb} imeacht]. (Ó Siadhail (1989: 256))
not can leave-VN
‘One cannot leave.’

¹¹ In addition to the arbitrary reading, sentence (15a) also allows the reading that may be paraphrased as: Eve thinks that her getting up early is annoying.

‘Mark thinks that getting up early is annoying and Mary does too.’

- d. *Nieszczęśnik₁ wierzy, że [PRO_{1/arb} dostanie medalu] jest ważne.*
 unfortunate believes that getting medal is important
 ‘The unfortunate believes that getting a medal is important.’

Just like in the case of English (cf. (10a) and (10b)), c-command by the controller or the ban on a split antecedent cannot be taken to be prerogatives of OC either in Irish or in Polish. The data in (16) and (17) below demonstrate that OC PRO may have a non-c-commanding or split antecedent in the two languages analysed.

- (16) a. *Is é mo₁ ghnó [PRO_{1/*arb} ord a choinneáil anseo].*
 (Stenson (1981:62))
 COP it my business order PRT keep-VN here
 ‘It is my job to keep order here.’
- b. *Chuir Seán₁ ina luí ar Mháire₂ [PRO₁₊₂ a chéile a ní].*
 put John in-the pressure on Mary each other PRT
 wash-VN
 ‘John persuaded Mary to wash each other.’
- (17) a. *[PRO_{1/*arb} Posiadanie zamożnych rodziców] pomogło jej₁ w zrobieniu szybkiej kariery.*
 having wealthy parents helped her in making quick career
 ‘Having wealthy parents has helped her in making a quick career.’
- b. *Marek obiecał synowi₂ [PRO₁₊₂ pograć razem w piłkę].*
 Mark promised son to-play together in ball
 ‘Mark promised his son to play ball together.’

In (16a) and (17a) only OC is possible in spite of the fact that the controller does not c-command PRO, which strongly argues against including c-command among the OC tests, as Hornstein (1999, 2001) does (cf. (4c) above). In (16b) and (17b) PRO is controlled simultaneously by the matrix subject and the prepositional complement or the complement of the verb, in spite of the fact that the Irish and Polish equivalents of the English verbs *persuade* and *promise* are typical OC verbs. This allows us to arrive at the conclusion that control by a split antecedent is not an exclusive property of NOC.

So far it has been demonstrated that OC and NOC in Irish and Polish comply with the OC/NOC diagnostics postulated by Landau (2000) and

captured under (7). The data provided in (12) and (13) additionally support Landau's generalisation that OC is to be found in complement clauses, whereas examples (14) and (15) show that NOC is typical of adjunct and subject clauses. However, there exist instances of control both in Irish and in Polish which may cast doubts on Landau's generalisation that only OC can appear in non-finite complements. Let us first analyse the following data:

- (18) a. Is maith leis₁ [PRO*_{1/2} 'chuile shórt a dhéanamh dhó1].
 (Ó Siadhail (1989:257))
 COP good with-him everything PRT do-VN for-him
 'He likes one to do everything for him.'
- b. Ewa₁ lubi, [żeby PRO*_{1/2} ja₁ chwalić].
 Eve likes so-that her to-praise
 'Eve likes being praised.'

In the sentences above PRO in the complement clause must not be co-referential with the matrix subject. If it were, it would bind the co-indexed pronoun in the non-finite clause and hence trigger a violation of Condition B of the Binding Theory. In order to avoid this violation PRO must be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, yielding a NOC structure. However, if Condition B does not intervene, the predicates in (18) trigger only OC, as confirmed by (19):

- (19) a. Is maith leis₁ [PRO_{1/*2} 'chuile shórt a dhéanamh].
 COP good with-him everything PRT do-VN
 'He likes to do everything.'
- b. Ewa₁ lubi [PRO_{1/*2} się chwalić].
 Eve likes REFL to-praise
 'Eve likes boasting.'

Consequently, the data in (18) only apparently contradict Landau's generalisation that OC is restricted to complement clauses, but in fact show that an intervening factor, such as Condition B of the Binding Theory, may be at play in control contexts turning the expected OC structures into NOC ones.

Sentence (18b) reveals the property of Polish control clauses, which has not been mentioned yet, namely the fact that these clauses can be introduced by the overt *C żeby* 'so that'.¹² Control clauses with the *C żeby* can give rise to NOC not only in sentences like (18a), where NOC is

¹² Irish control clauses are never introduced by any overt complementiser.

forced by Condition B of the Binding Theory, but also in one additional case, which is illustrated in (20) below:

- (20) a. Marek₁ wolał, [żeby PRO_{*1/2} dać mu₁ nagrodę].
 Mark preferred so-that to-give him prize
 ‘Mark preferred to be given a prize.’
 b. Marek₁ wolał, [żeby PRO_{*1/2} dać innym nagrodę].
 Mark preferred so-that to-give others prize
 ‘Mark preferred for somebody to give others a prize.’

Although Condition B, as used to account for the lack of OC PRO in (18b), can be held responsible for the impossibility of OC PRO in (20a), it does not explain why OC PRO is banned in (20b), where no pronoun co-referential with the matrix subject appears. Consequently, it seems that some factor other than Condition B has to be invoked to block OC PRO in *żeby*-complements of verbs like *woleć* ‘prefer’ used in (20b).¹³ We would like to suggest that the ban on OC PRO in *żeby*-complements like (20b) is reminiscent of the phenomenon of obviation. The term obviation is used to denote the fact that the subject of subjunctive clauses in many languages, e.g. French (cf. Tsoulas (1996) and Farkas (1992)), Italian (cf. Johnson (1985)), Spanish (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin (2001)) and Russian (cf. Avrutin and Babyonyshev (1994)), must be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject. Obviation can also be attested in Polish subjunctives introduced by the C *żeby* ‘so that’, as in (21a), which regularly contrasts with its indicative equivalent in (21b) as regards the co-reference possibilities of the embedded subject.

- (21) a. *Marek₁ planuje, [żeby (on₁) wyjechał za granicę]. Subjunctive -
 Obviation
 Mark plans so-that he would-go for abroad
 ‘Mark plans for himself to go abroad.’
 b. Marek₁ planuje, [że (on₁) wyjedzie za granicę]. Indicative –
 Lack of Obviation
 Mark plans that he will-go for abroad
 ‘Mark plans that he will go abroad.’

Obviation affects pronominal subjects of subjunctive clauses, but never does it force disjointness of the object pronoun in the embedded clause from the matrix subject, e.g.:

¹³ Other verbs, which resemble *woleć* ‘prefer’ in this respect, include *chcieć* ‘want’, *pragnąć* ‘desire’, *zdecydować* ‘decide’, *lubić* ‘like’, *nie znosić* ‘can’t stand’, etc.

- (22) Marek₁ zaplanował₁ [żeby Ewa pomogła mu₁ napisać wypracowanie].
 Mark planned so-that Eve would-help him to-write essay
 ‘Mark planned for Eve to help him to write an essay.’

The properties of obviation just mentioned closely resemble the situation found in non-finite *żeby*-complements like (20b). Their subject must be obligatorily disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, in the same way that the pronominal subject of finite subjunctives must be. Just like in finite subjunctive clauses (cf. (22)), the pronominal object in non-finite *żeby*-complements of verbs like *woleć* ‘prefer’ may be co-referential with the matrix subject (cf. (20a)). It is also worth noting that cross-linguistically obviation is commonly found with volitional verbs (cf. the references cited above), and, as has been mentioned in footnote 13, the class of verbs behaving like *woleć* ‘prefer’ comprises mainly verbs of this kind. All these arguments strongly argue that these verbs, in spite of taking non-finite subjunctive clauses as their complements, are subject to the same obviation effect as finite subjunctive complements. Consequently, NOC PRO found in cases like (20b) results from the phenomenon of obviation, which seems to be operative both in finite and non-finite *żeby*-complements in Polish.

Obviation in Irish, in contradistinction to Polish, is never found when PRO is the subject of the non-finite complement of a volitional predicate. This is illustrated in (23a), which contrasts with Polish sentences like (23b):

- (23) a. Ba mhaith le Seán₁ [PRO_{1/*2} carr a cheannach].
 COP good with John car PRT buy-VN
 ‘John would like to buy a car.’
 b. Marek₁ chce [żeby PRO_{*1/2} kupić samochód].
 Mark wants so-that to-buy car
 ‘Mark wants for somebody to buy a car.’

Only in (23b) must PRO be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, which, as argued before follows from obviation, whereas in sentence (23a) PRO must be obligatorily controlled by the matrix subject and can never be disjoint in reference from it. This strongly supports the claim that obviation has no role to play in Irish control clauses. However, obviation is possible in Irish non-finite complements with overt subjects (cf. section 1.0) like (24) below:

- (24) Ba mhaith le Seán₁ [é_{*1/2} carr a cheannach].
 COP good with John him car PRT buy-VN
 ‘John₁ would like him_{*1/2} to buy a car.’

Example (24) is grammatical only if the embedded subject is disjoint in reference from the matrix subject. In this respect (24) is similar to Polish sentences like (21a) above.

To sum up, OC and NOC in Irish and Polish comply with the criteria posited for English OC and NOC by Landau (2000). The presence of NOC PRO, instead of the expected OC PRO, in some complement clauses in Irish and Polish follows from the intervening factor, such as Condition B of the Binding Theory. Obviation constitutes an additional factor held responsible for the occurrence of NOC PRO in Polish control complements with the overt *C żeby* ‘so that’ of primarily volitional predicates. Only if these two intervening factors are recognised can Landau’s generalisation that OC holds in complement clauses and NOC in adjunct and subject clauses be maintained for Irish and Polish.

3.3. EC and PC – general properties

Within the category of OC, Landau (2000) distinguishes two subgroups, i.e. EC and PC.¹⁴ The former obtains whenever the reference of PRO is identical with that of its controller, whereas the latter is attested in case the reference of PRO contains the reference of its antecedent but is not identical with it. The environments in which PC appears involve collective predicates such as *gather, meet, together*. These predicates must typically co-occur with plural subjects. However, this condition can be relaxed for some control predicates, which exhibit a singular controller for PRO but nonetheless are compatible with collective predicates, thus yielding the PC effect, illustrated in (25) below:

- (25) Mark₁ wants [PRO₁₊ to meet at 3].¹⁵ desiderative

In (25), PRO includes the matrix subject, *Mark*, in its reference together with other individuals salient in the context, and hence there is no mismatch between the collective predicate *meet* and PRO, controlled by the singular

¹⁴ The division of OC into EC and PC has attracted little attention in the literature. EC and PC have been either merely mentioned or to some extent analysed by Lawler (1972), Petter (1998), Martin (2001) and Wurmbrand (2001).

¹⁵ The symbol PRO₁₊ is used throughout the paper to represent PC.

DP. No such possibility exists in cases like (26) below, where the reference of PRO is co-extensive with the reference of its antecedent, producing the EC effect. Consequently, sentence (26) is ungrammatical due to a mismatch between the collective predicate and PRO, controlled by the singular DP.

(26) * Mark_i managed [PRO_{i+} to meet at 3]. implicative

Landau argues that the predicates which allow PC comprise desiderative, interrogative, factive and propositional verbs (cf. (25)), whereas the remaining predicate types, i.e. modals, aspectuals and implicatives, exhibit only EC (cf. (26)). He notes that EC-complements lack any independent tense specification and are therefore interpreted as denoting an action simultaneous with the action in the matrix clause, while PC-complements are specified for their own tense.^{16 17} To illustrate the contrast between these two groups of complements, let us analyse (27a) and (27b), which instantiate EC- and PC-complements, respectively.

(27) a. * Yesterday Mark managed to read the book tomorrow.
 b. Yesterday Mark hoped to read the book tomorrow.

Only PC-complements allow the use of conflicting time adjuncts in the main and the embedded clause (cf. (27b)), whereas no such possibility exists for EC-complements (cf. (27a)), which supports Landau's claim that PC-complements are tensed, while EC-complements are untensed.¹⁸

Finally, Landau argues that PC PRO resembles collective nouns in that it can co-occur with collective predicates, such as *gather*, *together*, *meet*, etc. Thus, in a way similar to collective nouns, PC PRO is semantically plural. Although PC PRO is semantically plural, it cannot be treated as syntactically plural, since it cannot appear with syntactically plural anaphors, as shown in (28):

(28) * Mark wondered [when PRO to meet each other].

The predicate *wonder* in (28), being an interrogative verb, co-occurs with PC-complements, which can contain collective predicates, such as *meet*.

¹⁶ The idea that infinitives have tense goes back to Stowell (1982), who suggests that all infinitival clauses denote irrealis tense with respect to the matrix tense. This idea has been utilized in various analyses of control, cf. Pesetsky (1992), Bošković (1997), Martin (2001) and Wurmbrand (2001).

¹⁷ The tense in the case of complements of desideratives and interrogatives is irrealis, whereas in the case of complements of factives and propositional predicates it is realis.

¹⁸ The term 'untensed' is understood as a semantic notion, not a syntactic one.

The unacceptability of the above example follows from the fact that the closest potential binder for the reciprocal *each other*, namely PC PRO, cannot bind it, as it is not syntactically plural but rather semantically plural. Since it is syntactic plurality, not semantic plurality, which is required for anaphor binding, the mismatch arises in cases like (28) between the anaphor and its binder, leading to ungrammaticality.

2.4. EC and PC in Irish and Polish

Both subtypes of OC, i.e. EC and PC, can be found in Irish and Polish. In fact, EC and PC occur with the same range of predicates in these two languages as have been listed for English in the previous section. Thus, EC-complements in Irish and Polish appear with modals and implicatives (cf. table 1), as shown in (29), while PC-complements in the languages analysed are attested with desiderative, factive, propositional and interrogative predicates, as can be seen in (30). Aspectuals are not mentioned here as they represent raising verbs and therefore do not take a non-finite complement with the PRO subject.

- (29) a. *Is ceart do Sheán₁ [PRO₁₊ cruinniú anseo]. modal
 COP right to John gather-VN here
 ‘* John should gather here.’
- b. *Marek₁ musi [PRO₁₊ się spotkać o 3-ej].
 Mark must REFL meet at 3
 ‘* Mark must meet at 3.’
- c. *D’éirigh le Seán₁ [PRO₁₊ cruinniú anseo]. implicative
 rose with John gather-VN here
 ‘* John managed to gather here.’
- d. *Marek₁ zapomniał [PRO₁₊ się spotkać o 3-ej].
 Mark forgot REFL to-meet at 3
 ‘* Mark forgot to meet at 3.’
- (30) a. B’fhearr le Seán₁ [PRO₁₊ cruinniú anseo]. desiderative
 COP-better with John gather-VN here
 ‘John would prefer to gather here.’
- b. Marek₁ woli [PRO₁₊ spotykać się o 3-ej].
 Mark prefers to-meet REFL at 3
 ‘Mark prefers to meet at 3.’
- c. Tá Seán₁ sásta [PRO₁₊ cruinniú anseo]. factive
 is John happy gather-VN here
 ‘John is happy to gather here.’
- d. Marek₁ lubi [PRO₁₊ spotykać się o 3-ej].
 Mark likes meeting REFL at 3

- ‘Mark likes meeting at 3.’
- e. Níl a fhios ag Seán₁ [conas PRO₁₊ cruinniú anseo]. interrogative
is-not its knowledge at John how gather-VN here
‘John doesn’t know how to gather here.’
- f. Marek₁ zastanawiał się, [PRO₁₊ kiedy się spotkać].
Mark wondered REFL when REFL to-meet
‘Mark wondered when they would meet.’
- g. Dúirt Seán₁ [PRO₁₊ cruinniú anseo]. propositional
said John gather-VN here
‘John said to gather here.’
- h. Marek₁ myślał, [żeby PRO₁₊ spotkać się o 3-ej].
Mark thought so-that to-meet REFL at 3
‘Mark thought of meeting at 3.’

In all the sentences above the Irish and Polish equivalents of the collective verbs *meet* and *gather* appear in the bracketed non-finite complement. The presence of these verbs in complements to modals and implicatives leads to ungrammaticality, as in (29), but is entirely licit in complements to desideratives, factives, propositionals and interrogatives, as in (30). Consequently, the former group of predicates allows only EC PRO, whose reference is fully co-extensive with that of its controller, while the latter group of predicates gives rise to PC PRO, whose reference includes the reference of its controller, but is not entirely co-extensive with it.

Furthermore, just like in English, also in Irish and Polish PC-complements are tensed, while EC-complements untensed. This contrast is illustrated in (31), where the bracketed clause represents an EC-complement, and (32), where the bracketed clause is a PC-complement:

Implicative:

- (31) a. *D’ éirigh le Seán₁ inniu [PRO₁ bualadh le Máire amárach].
rose with John today meet-VN with Mary tomorrow
‘* John has managed today to meet Mary tomorrow.’
- b. * Dzisiaj Marek₁ zdołał [PRO₁ odwiedzić Marię w przyszłym tygodniu].
today Mark managed to-visit Mary in next week
‘* Today Mark managed to visit Mary next week.’

Desiderative:

- (32) a. B’fhearr le Seán₁ inniu [PRO₁₊ bualadh le Máire amárach].
COP-better with John today meet-VN with Mary tomorrow
‘John would prefer today to meet Mary tomorrow.’

- b. Wczoraj Marek wolał [PRO₁₊ odwiedzić Marię w przyszłym tygodniu].
 yesterday Mark preferred to-visit Mary in next week
 ‘Yesterday Mark preferred to visit Mary next week.’

Sentences (31a) and (31b) show that the Irish and Polish counterparts of the verb *manage* require complements whose tense specification is determined by the matrix clause and therefore these complements cannot host a time adjunct conflicting with the one present in the main clause. Sentences (32a) and (32b), with the Irish and Polish equivalents of the English verb *prefer*, can contain two conflicting time adjuncts in the main clause and in the embedded one, which proves that the non-finite complement in such cases has independent time specification and is thus tensed.

PC PRO in Irish and Polish mimics the behaviour of the English PC PRO in that, though semantically plural, it can never be plural syntactically. This property of PC PRO is exemplified by (33):

- (33) a. *Ba mhaith le Seán₁ [PRO₁₊ castáil ar a chéile₁].
 COP good with John meet-VN on each other
 ‘* John would like to meet each other.’
 b. *Marek₁ powiedział Marii₂, że pro₁ woli [PRO₁₊₂₊ spotkać się ze sobą nawzajem o 3-ej].
 Mark told Mary that prefers to-meet
 REFL with each other at 3
 ‘* Mark told Mary that he prefers to meet each other at 3.’

The sentences above are ungrammatical, as the syntactically plural anaphors cannot be bound the syntactically singular PC PRO.

Polish non-finite complements introduced by the C *żeby* ‘so that’ can trigger PC if they function as complements to PC-verbs (cf. (30) above). For instance:

- (34) Marek₁ marzył, [żeby PRO₁₊ spotkać się o 3-ej].
 Mark dreamt so-that to-meet REFL at 3
 ‘Mark dreamt of meeting at 3.’

The collective verb *spotkać się* ‘meet’ is possible within the bracketed *żeby*-complement in (34), which confirms that PRO in this case is controlled by *Marek* ‘Mark’ and some other individuals salient in the context and therefore represents PC PRO.

Finally, it may seem that predicates like *woleć* ‘prefer’, when used with a *żeby*-complement, as in (35), can give rise to PC (see (20a) and (20b)).

- (35) Marek woli, [żeby PRO się spotkać o 6-ej].
 Mark prefers so-that REFL to-meet at 6
 ‘Mark prefers for somebody to meet at 6.’

However, this time the reference of PRO does not include the reference of the matrix subject, as the binding facts in (36) make clear:

- (36) Marek₁ chce, [żeby PRO_{*1/2} się spotkać bez niego₁].
 Mark wants so-that REFL to-meet without him
 ‘Mark wants for somebody to meet without him.’

If PRO in (36) included the matrix subject in its reference, (36) would be ungrammatical, as PRO would bind the co-indexed pronoun *niego* ‘him’, in violation of Condition B of the Binding Theory.¹⁹ Since the reference of PRO in (36) is not co-extensive with the reference of the matrix subject, the complement in question does not exemplify PC. Since it is legitimate to use the collective predicate *spotkać się* ‘meet’ in *żeby*-complements like (36), the conclusion may be drawn that PRO, disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, can be semantically plural. This derives the apparent PC effect found in *żeby*-complements to verbs like *woleć* ‘prefer’ (cf. footnote 13).

To recapitulate, both Irish and Polish exhibit two subtypes of OC, namely EC and PC, which occur with the same range of predicates as in English. Furthermore, they are subject to analogous restrictions as the English PC PRO, i.e. EC-complements are untensed, while PC-ones are tensed, and PC PRO is always semantically plural but never is it syntactically plural.

3.0. Conclusion

The paper has aimed at presenting a typology of control in Irish and Polish. The typology of control offered here closely mimics the one put forward

¹⁹ Unlike (36), example (34) becomes ungrammatical if the non-finite *żeby*-complement contains a pronoun co-referential with the matrix subject, as can be seen in (i) below:

- (i) *Marek₁ marzył, [żeby PRO₁ spotkać się bez niego₁].
 Mark dreamt so-that to-meet REFL without him
 ‘* Mark₁ dreamt of meeting without him₁.’

The ungrammaticality of (i) follows from Condition B of the Binding Theory, as PC PRO, co-indexed with the matrix subject, binds the pronoun co-referential with the main clause subject.

for English by Landau (2000). The main division line is placed between OC and NOC, which both in Irish and in Polish show properties analogous to English OC and NOC listed in (7). Furthermore, OC and NOC in the languages studied are restricted to complement and subject/adjunct clauses, respectively. Wherever this generalisation is not respected, some intervening factors have to be taken into account, i.e. Condition B of the Binding Theory in Irish and Polish and obviation in Polish. Two subclasses have been distinguished within OC, namely EC and PC. It has been argued that EC obtains in Irish and Polish in untensed complements to modals and implicatives, while PC is found in tensed complements to factives, desideratives, interrogatives and propositionals. Finally, it has been demonstrated that PC PRO, though semantically plural, is always syntactically singular.

The Catholic University of Lublin

Abbreviations

C – complementiser	NEG – negation	REL – relative
COP – copula	PRT – particle	VN – verbal noun
EMPH – emphatic	REFL – reflexive	

ANNA BONDARUK

KONTROLA OBLIGATORYJNA I KONTROLA FAKULTATYWNA W JĘZYKU IRLANDZKIM I POLSKIM

Celem artykułu jest ustanowienie typologii zjawisk kontroli w zdaniach niefinitywnych w języku irlandzkim i polskim. Predykaty wykazujące zjawisko kontroli w ramach swoich dopełnień obejmują czasowniki implikatywne, faktytywne, zdaniowe, dezyderatywne oraz interrogatywne. Zdania ze zjawiskiem kontroli w polszczyźnie mają zawsze pusty podmiot PRO, natomiast w irlandzkim podmiotem zdań tego typu może być albo PRO, albo leksykalna DP. Podmiot PRO może być kontrolowany obligatoryjnie lub fakultatywnie. W celu odróżnienia kontroli obligatoryjnej od kontroli fakultatywnej zostały przyjęte kryteria Landau'a (2000). W ramach kontroli obligatoryjnej wyróżniono kontrolę całkowitą i kontrolę częściową, które występują w irlandzkim i w polskim w analogicznych kontekstach.