



UNIVERSITÄT
LEIPZIG

69. StuTS + TaCoS Leipzig

Attitudinal object control predicates

8.5.2021

Barbara Stiebels

Control

The notion of control I'm referring to is the referential dependency between a matrix clause argument and the covert subject of an infinite clause (as complement or adjunct) = former Equi-NP deletion.

- (1) Maria_i versuchte [_{-i/*j} ihr altes Auto los zu werden].
Maria try.PST.3SG her old car rid to get.INF
controller control predicate **controllee**
'Maria tried to get rid of her old car'

- The structure is biclausal.
- The controller is local (an argument of the control predicate),

Canonical object control predicates

- (2) Der Räuber_i **zwang** die Chefin_j der Filiale, [_{-j/*k/*i} den Tresor
the robber force.PST.3SG the female.boss the.GEN branch the.ACC safe
zu öffnen].^C
to open.INF
- (3) a. Er_i **befahl** ihnen_j, [_{-j/*k/*i} ihre Pizza künftig selber zu zahlen].^C
he order.PST.3SG 3PL.DAT 3PL.POSS pizza in.future self to pay.INF
- b. Wir_i haben Eltern_j **gebeten**, [_{-j/*k/*i} uns die Nummern
1PL AUX.1PL parent.PL ask.PTCP 1PL.DAT the number.PL
ihrer Kinder zu geben].^C
3PL.POSS.GEN children to give.INF

Goals and structure of the talk

- General goal: demonstrate the role of the lexicon for syntax
 - Specific goal: demonstrate (a) that the study of control needs a closer look at the various subclasses of control predicates and (b) that Landau's analysis needs further refinement
1. Attitude predicates and their control properties (Landau 2015)
 2. Excursus on logophoricity (Landau's appeal to the notion of logophoricity for the dependency relation between controller and controllee)
 3. Counterexamples to the restriction of human/sentient object controllers
 4. Excursus on *de se/de te*
 5. Counterexamples to the restriction of interlocutors as object controllers

Attitude predicates



Attitude predicates I

Attitude predicates are identified with the opaque context test.

- (4) Context: Maria has a new colleague (named Ralf). She wants her brother to pick up the new colleague from the station. She is not aware of the fact that the colleague's name is Ralf.

a. Maria_i **zwang** ihren Bruder_j, [_{-j/*k/*i} den neuen
 Maria force.PST.3SG 3SG.F.POSS.ACC brother the.ACC new
 Kollegen_z vom Bahnhof ab-zu-holen].
 colleague from.the station VPT-to-fetch.INF

‘Maria forced her brother to pick up the new colleague from the station’

b. ⇒ Mary **zwang** ihren Bruder, Ralf_z vom Bahnhof abzuholen.

‘Maria forced her brother to pick up Ralf from the station’

Attitude predicates II

- c. Maria **bat** ihren Bruder_j, [_{-j/*k/*i} den neuen Kollegen_z
 Maria ask.PST.3SG 3SG.F.POSS.ACC brother the.ACC new colleague
 vom Bahnhof ab-zu-holen].
 from.the station VPT-to-fetch.INF
 ‘Maria asked her brother to pick up the new colleague from the station’
- d. \nRightarrow Mary bat ihren Bruder, Ralf_z vom Bahnhof abzuholen.
 ‘Maria asked her brother to pick up Ralf from the station’

Attitudinal object control predicates in German

Predicate class	Example	
Directive speech act predicates	<i>bitten</i>	‘ask’
Predicates of authorization	<i>erlauben</i>	‘allow’
Predicates denoting the designation of tasks/duties	<i>vorsehen</i>	‘designate’
Activity-/property-ascribing predicates	<i>nachsagen</i>	‘say of sb’
Predicates of critique/praise	<i>rügen</i>	‘reprimand’
Emotive-factive predicates	<i>beneiden</i>	‘envy’

Table 1: Attitude predicates with object control (Stiebels 2010)

Note: The **ZAS database on clause-embedding predicates** in German comprises about 300 predicates that invariably show object control with infinitival complements in object position (= 20% of the about 1.500 infinitive-selecting predicates in the ZAS database).

Partial vs. exhaustive control I

Attitudinal control predicates allow partial control (PC; $i+k$), whereas other control predicates are restricted to exhaustive control (EC). Partial control is tested with embedded collective predicates and a controller in the singular.

- (5)
- a. John_{*i*} **wanted** [$_{-i+k}$ to assemble in the hall].
 - b. John_{*i*} **expected** [$_{-i+k}$ to go on vacation together].
 - c. *John_{*i*} **tried** [$_{-i+k}$ to assemble in the hall].
 - d. *John_{*i*} **managed** [$_{-i+k}$ to go on vacation together].
 - e. Er_{*i*} ist **bereit**, [$_{-i+k}$ sich dort zu treffen, wo der Hilfe-suchende
 he be.3SG ready REFL there to meet.INF where the help-seeking
 “sich sicher und wohl fühlt” ...].^C
 REFL safe and well feel.3SG

Partial vs. exhaustive control II

Partial control has been discussed less for object control predicates ((6a) taken from Pearson).

- (6) a. John_i **advised** Mary_j [_{-j+k} to work on the project as a team].
- b. Context: the coach is expected to meet people from the media.
 Der Vereins-präsident_i **bat** den Trainer_j, [_{-?j+k/i+j} sich am
 the club-president ask.PST.3SG the.ACC coach REFL at.the
 Stadion-eingang zu treffen].
 stadium-entry to meet.INF

Modifier mismatches

Partial control predicates allow mismatches of temporal/local modifiers in matrix clause and complement clause (Landau 2000). However, the correlation between partial control and admissibility of modifier mismatches is not perfect (Pearson 2013, 2016).

- (7) Der Trainer_i hat den Ko-Trainer_j **gestern** **gebeten**/ ***gezwungen**, [_{-j}
 the coach AUX.3SG the.ACC co-coach yesterday ask.PTCP force.PTCP
 das Training **morgen** zu über-nehmen].
 the training tomorrow to over-take.INF
- (8) Nonattitude complements are untensed and force EC; attitude complements are tensed and allow PC. (Landau 2015: 19)

Attitudinal vs. non-attitudinal control predicates

	Non-attitude pred. = Predicative control (22)	Attitude pred. = Logophoric control (23)
Inflected clausal complement	Obligatory control (OC)	Non-control (NC)
[-human] PRO	✓	–
Implicit control	–	✓
Control shift	–	✓
Partial control	–	✓
Split control	–	✓

Table 2: Logophoric vs. predicative control (Landau 2015)

Excursus: logophoricity

Logophoric pronouns

Logophoric pronouns (LOG) refer to “individuals whose speech, thoughts, or feelings are reported or reflected in a given context” (Clements 1975: 141).

(9) Yoruba: logophoric pronoun *òun* (Adesola 2006)

a. Olú_{*i*} sọ [pé ó_{*j*}/_{**i*} rí bàbá òun_{*i*}].

Olu say COMP he see father LOG

‘Olu said that he saw his father’

b. Olú_{*i*} ti kẹde [pé òun_{*i*}/_{**j*} má#a wá ní òla].

Olu ASP announce COMP LOG will come at tomorrow

‘Olu has announced that he will come tomorrow’

Long-distance/exempt anaphora

- (10) Korean: long-distance anaphor *caki* (Kim 1993, Rudnitskaya 2005)
- a. John_i-un Bill_j-eykey [**caki**_{i/*j}-ka tayhak iphaksihem-ey
 John-TOP Bill-DAT REFL-NOM college entrance.examination-at
 hapkyekhayssta-nun] iyaki-lul **hay-ss-ta**.
 passed-REL story-ACC say-PST-DECL
 ‘John told Bill that he passed the college entrance examination’
- b. John_i-un Bill_j-loputhe [**caki**_{i/j}-ka tyhak iphaksihem-ey
 John-TOP Bill-from REFL-NOM college entrance.examination-at
 hapkyekhayssta-nun] iyaki-lul **tule-ss-ta**.
 passed-REL story-ACC hear-PST-DECL
 ‘John heard from Bill that he passed the college entrance examination’

Sells (1987)

Sells (1987) restricts logophoricity (in non-local anaphora) to the three discourse roles SOURCE, SELF and PIVOT.

- (11) Sells's discourse roles of logophoric antecedents (Sells 1987)
- a. SOURCE: one who is the intentional agent of the communication
 - b. SELF: one whose mental state or attitude the content of the proposition describes
 - c. PIVOT ("point of view"): one with respect to whose (space-time) location the content of the proposition is evaluated
 - d. Mary wants me to come to John's party.
speaker = SOURCE, Mary = SELF, John = PIVOT

Object control and logophoricity

- Logophoricity is not cross-linguistically uniform. Only some languages allow certain objects to be logophoric antecedents.
- Landau (2015) does not define his notion of logophoricity (major aspect: antecedent/controller is human/sentient).
- Landau acknowledges that logophoric pronouns and controllees have a different syntactic distribution (PRO \neq LOG).
- Most object controllers do not bear one of the roles SOURCE, SELF or PIVOT.
- Object controllers are not primary attitude holders (no licensing of evaluative adjectives). According to Charnavel (2019), they may be “empathy loci” (licensing of possessive ‘dear/beloved’).

Charnavel (2019)

(12) French (Charnavel 2019: 193)

- a. Maud_i a dit à Alexandre_j [que l'=avenir de la troupe
 Maud AUX.3SG say.PTCP to Alexandre COMP the=future of the troupe
légendaire dépendait de lui_j-même].
 legendary depend.3SG.IPFV of 3SG-self
 'Maud said to Alexandre that the legendary troupe's future depends on himself'
- b. Maud_i a dit à Alexandre_j [que l'=avenir de la troupe
 Maud AUX.3SG say.PTCP to Alexandre COMP the=future of the troupe
 dépendait de son_j **cher** mentor].
 depend.3SG.IPFV of his dear mentor
 'Maid said to Alexandre that the troupe's future depends on his dear mentor'

Back to Landau (2015)

The top right corner of the slide features a decorative graphic composed of several overlapping triangles. There are two shades of red: a darker, more muted red and a brighter, more vibrant red. Additionally, there is a light blue triangle that overlaps with the bottom edge of the red shapes. The overall effect is a modern, abstract geometric design.

Landau (2015)

Landau bases his analysis of object control on the properties of the verbs *tell* and *persuade*. He assumes the following for attitudinal control predicates:

- The controller is human.
- The controllee is interpreted *de se* or *de te* (= speech act interlocutor).
 - Subject control: *de se*
 - Object control: *de te* (*tell*) or *de se* (*persuade*)

The background features a large white triangle on the left side. To its right, there are several overlapping triangles in shades of red and teal. A dark red triangle is at the top right, a medium red triangle is below it, and a teal triangle is at the bottom right, overlapping the other red shapes.

Control by non-human objects

Non-human controllers I

The class of activity-/property-ascribing control predicates allows non-human controllers.

- (13) a. **nach-sagen** ‘say of sb/sth’: P-y-x; ACC-DAT-NOM
 [Verschiedenen Inhaltsstoffen pflanzlicher Nahrungsmittel];
 various.PL.DAT ingredient.PL plant.based.PL.GEN food.PL
 wird **nach-gesagt**, [_{-j}/_{*i} vor Krebs zu schützen].^C
 AUX.PASS.3SG VPT-say.PTCP from cancer to protect.INF
- b. **bescheinigen** ‘certify’: P-(y)-x; ACC-DAT-NOM
 in Wien, jener Metropole_j, der_j ein Verhaltens-forscher
 in Vienna, DEM.DAT metropolis REL.PRO.DAT a behavioral-researcher
bescheinigte, [_{-j} die langsamsten Einwohner zu beherbergen].^C
 attest.PST.3SG the slowest inhabitant.PL to accommodate.INF

Non-human controllers II

- c. **ab-sprechen** ‘deny’: P-y-x; ACC-DAT-NOM
 Auch dieser Ausrüstung_j wurde **abgesprochen**, [_{-j}
 also this equipment AUX.PASS.PST.3SG deny.PTCP
 polar-tauglich zu sein].
 polar-suitable to be.INF
- d. **verdächtigen** ‘suspect’: ; GEN-ACC-NOM
 ... eines Gift-_{s_j}, das_j **verdächtigt** wird, [_{-j} Krebs zu
 a.GEN poison-GEN REL.PRO suspect.PTCP AUX.PASS.3SG cancer to
 erzeugen und das Immunsystem zu schwächen].^C
 generate.INF and the immune.system to weaken.INF

Non-human controllers III

- e. **aus-erküren** 'choose': P-y-x; OBL[ZU]-ACC-NOM
Längst ist 2006; da-zu **auserkoren**, [_j der Republik den
long.since AUX.3SG 2006 there-to choose.PTCP the republic the
nächsten Weltmeister-Titel zu schenken].^C
next world.champion-title to donate.INF

Non-human controllers IV

- (14) **beneiden** ‘envy’
- a. Viele deutsche Städte würden Hannover_j dar-um **beneiden**, [_{-j}
many German cities would Hannover there-around envy.INF
solche Flächen vorausschauend bereit zu haben].^C
such areas foresighted ready to have.INF
- b. Ich **beneide** dein Auto_j dar-um, [_{-j} so von dir geliebt zu
1SG envy 2SG.POSS car there-around so by 2SG.DAT love.PTCP to
werden].
AUX.PASS.INF

Status of the predicate class

Activity-/property-ascribing control predicates differ from many other control predicates in that they do not require actional clausal complements (see also Farkas' 1988 RESPONSIBILITY-relation) \Rightarrow non-human controllers possible.

This raises the following questions:

- Is logophoricity the right notion to capture the control relation of attitudinal control predicates?
- Since these verbs also allow human object controllers: do these verbs select for different clausal complement structures (as suggested by Landau's proposal)?

Landau (2015)

Landau bases his analysis of object control on the properties of the verbs *tell* and *persuade*. He assumes the following for attitudinal control predicates:

- The controller is human.
- The controllee is interpreted *de se* or *de te* (= speech act interlocutor).
 - Subject control: *de se*
 - Object control: *de te* (*tell*) or *de se* (*persuade*)

de se/de te in object control

Landau uses the following paraphrases to illustrate the *de te* and *de se* orientation.

- (15)
- a. Mary **told** John [_ to shut up].
 - b. Mary **told** John: “You should shut up!”
 - c. Mary **persuaded** John [_ to shut up].
 - d. Mary caused John to entertain the desire: “I should shut up”

However, wrt. *persuade*, corpora only reveal examples for direct quotes with second person.

- (16) *Mary_i persuaded John_j: ”I_j should shut up.”



Excursus: *de se/de te* readings

De se readings

Recall: the acquaintance-relation to a referent matters for attitude predicates, but not for other clause-embedding predicates.

(17) Pearson (2016: 694)

An attitude *de se* is an attitude—a belief, desire, expectation, etc.—that has the following properties:

- a. the attitude is about the attitude holder and
[= aboutness condition]
- b. the attitude holder is aware that the attitude is about herself
[= awareness condition]

De se in infinitival vs. finite complements

- (18) Scenario: Peter is watching a video of a traffic accident caused by him. He does not recognize himself in the video.
- a. Peter_i **bedauert**, [_{-i/*j} den Verkehrs-unfall verursacht zu haben].
Peter regret.3SG the.ACC traffic-accident cause.PTCP to have.INF
'Peter regrets having caused a traffic accident' (causer: he himself/*the man in the video) ⇒ *de se*
- b. Peter_i **bedauert**, [dass er_{i/j} einen Verkehr-sunfall verursacht hat].
Peter regret.3sg that he a.ACC traffic-accident cause.PTCP AUX.3SG
'Peter regrets that he (he himself/the man in the video/someone else) has caused a traffic accident' ⇒ *de re*

De te readings

(19) *de te* reading (example from [Ninan 2010](#): 554)

“John is hosting a party, and he’s told by a friend that Mary is behaving boorishly. As he looks for Mary, he runs into a woman he believes is Mary’s sister Sue. He says to her, Mary has to leave—she’s offending the other guests. But, in fact, the woman he is speaking to is Mary, not Sue.”

(20a) is claimed to be true for a context such as (19), whereas (20b) excludes the *de re* reading in this context.

- (20) a. John_i **told** Mary_j [that she_j had to leave].
b. John_i **told** Mary_j [__j to leave].



Control by non-interlocutor objects

Non-interlocutor objects I

Numerous object control predicates are not confined to *de te* readings (ignoring cases of *de se* here). Test: *in X's absence*

- Predicates of critique/praise/accusation: *tadeln* ‘rebuke’, *rügen* ‘reprimand’, *schelten* ‘scold’, *loben* ‘praise’, *verspotten* ‘mock’, *beschuldigen* ‘accuse’ ...
- *verdächtigen* ‘suspect’
- Factive emotive predicates: *bemitleiden* ‘pity’, *bewundern* ‘admire’, *verachten* ‘despise’, *verzeihen* ‘forgive’ ...
- Predicates of authorization: *freistellen* ‘leave sth up to sb’







Non-interlocutor objects II

- (21) a. Rumsfeld **beschuldigte** erneut [Syrien und Iran]_j, [_{-j} eine Rolle im Rumsfeld accuse.PST.3SG again Syria and Iran a role in.the irakischen Widerstand zu spielen].^C
 Iraqui resistance to play.INF
- b. Sie_i **verdächtigen** die Demokraten_j, [_{-j} ihre Anhänger doppelt und 3PL suspect.3PL the democrat.PL 3PL.P supporter.PL doubly and dreifach zu registrieren].^C
 three.times to register.INF
- c. Merkel_i hat dem Hessen_j wohl nie **verziehen**, [_{-j} gegen Merkel AUX.3SG the.DAT Hessian probably never forgive.PTCP against ihre Kanzler-kandidatur opponiert zu haben].^C
 her chancellor-candidacy oppose.PTCP to AUX.INF





Summary and outlook

- Not all classes of attitudinal object control predicates show the predicted “logophoric” properties for the object controllers (sentience and interlocutor role).
- ⇒ Landau’s restriction on the controllee needs to be loosened in the respective cases
- Syntacticians consider object control to be structurally simple (controller choice being determined by some principle of locality). But: most object control predicates are inherent control predicates (Stiebels 2010); they require argument identification with other clausal complements of the respective predicates.

References I

-  Charnavel, Isabelle. 2019. *Locality and logophoricity: A theory of exempt anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-  Clements, George N. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10. 141–177.
-  Farkas, Donka F. 1988. On obligatory control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11. 27–58.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00635756>.
-  Kim, Sun-Hee. 1993. *Division of labor between grammar and pragmatics: the distribution and interpretation of anaphora*. Yale University phdthesis.
-  Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
-  Landau, Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

References II

-  Ninan, Dilip. 2010. De se attitudes: Ascription and communication. *Philosophy Compass* 5/7. 551–567.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-9991.2010.00290.x>.
-  Pearson, Hazel. 2013. *The sense of self: Topics in the semantics of de se expressions*. Harvard University phdthesis.
-  Pearson, Hazel. 2016. The semantics of partial control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34. 691–738.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-015-9313-9>.
-  Rudnitskaya, Elena. 2005. The experiencer of stative psych predicates in Korean as a bearer of the prominent discourse role “the subject of a psychological state”. in *Proceedings of the 1st European conference of Korean Linguistics* 137–150. Seoul: Hankookmunhwas.

References III

-  Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 445–479.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178550>.
-  Stiebels, Barbara. 2010. Inhärente Kontrollprädikate im Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte* 224. 391–440.

Appendix



Predicative vs. logophoric control (Landau 2015)

(22) Predicative control (Landau 2015: 26/29)

- a. $[_{TP} \text{John } [_{VP} \text{John managed } [_{VP} t_V [_{FinP} \text{PRO}_j \text{ Fin}_{[uD]} [_{TP} \text{PRO}_j \text{ to } [_{VP} \text{stay healthy }]]]]]]$
- b. $[_{TP} \text{John } [_{VP} \text{John forced } [_{RP} \text{Bill Rel } [_{FinP} \text{PRO}_j \text{ Fin}_{[uD]} [_{TP} \text{PRO}_j \text{ to } [_{VP} \text{stay home }]]]]]]]]$

(23) Logophoric control (Landau 2015: 44)

- a. John intends to visit Athens.
- b. $[_{TP} \text{John } \lambda x [_{VP} \text{John } [_{VP} \text{intends } [_{CP} [_{GP} [G_{\text{SELF}} \text{ pro}_x] i'] C_i [_{FinP} \text{PRO}_j = \lambda j \text{ Fin}_{[uD]} [_{TP} \text{PRO}_j \text{ to visit Athens }]]]]]]]]$

Inherent control and *de se/de te*

The factive verb *bereuen* ‘regret/repent’ differs from its near synonym *bedauern* in not allowing *de re* readings with finite complements.

(24) Scenario as in (18)

Peter_{*i*} **beraubt**, [dass er_{*i*}/_{**j*} einen Verkehrs-unfall verursacht hat].

Peter regret/repent that he a.ACC traffic-accident cause.PTCP AUX.3SG

‘Peter regrets/repents that he (himself/# the man in the video) caused a traffic accident’

(25) Context (19)

John **befahl** Mary_{*j*}, [dass sie_{*j*} die Party verlassen soll].

John order.PST Mary COMP she the party leave.INF should

‘John told Mary that she should leave the party [John knows that Mary behaved boorishly]’