

Predication under Control – The Case of Polish

Patrick Lindert, University of Stuttgart

CONTROL: Polish Subject Control (SC) with predicative adjectives gives rise to two different case markings on the adjective, agreeing nominative (nom) and instrumental (inst), see (1). Polish object control (OC) does not allow for a variation in case, only inst is licit, see (2).

- (1) Johann próbuje być miły / miły-m
John.NOM tries be.INF nice.NOM/ nice-INST
'John tries to be nice'

- (2) Piotr kazał syn-owi być miły-m / *mił-emu
Peter.NOM ordered son-DAT be.INF nice-INST / nice-DAT
'Peter ordered his son to be nice'

Przepiórkowski (2000) states that agreeing nom and inst case seem to be treated as the same in syntax, and it is then extra-syntactic information that decides which case surfaces. Bondaruk (2004) considers the inst in (1) ungrammatical and Witkoś (2010) considers inst in (1) substandard. In a mini-survey, all participants accepted the inst case. Thus, I aim at an analysis that can cover both, the agreeing nom and the inst case in SC. Even though analyses differ in their details, most of them share the view that the inst is a default case in Polish, whose assignment is the result of failure of other case assignment mechanism, most prominently seen in OC, where only inst is acceptable. However, applying standard tests for default case (Schütze (2001)) shows that the inst does not behave like one in Polish.

- (3) Ja /*mnie, ja lubię fasoli *Left Dislocation Test*
I.NOM /I.INST, I.NOM like beans.ACC
'Me, I like beans'

In left dislocation (3), it has been argued that the case that appears on the dislocated element must be a default case, as there is no case assigner. In Polish, only the nom is licit.

PREDICATION: This apparent case variation does not only arise in control, but also in predication. In (4), we see that a predicative adjective typically agrees with the subject, whereas an NP in the same position, appears in the inst (5).

- (4) Piotr jest szczęśliwy
Peter.NOM is happy.NOM
(5) Piotr jest szczęśliwy-m człowiek-iem
Peter.NOM is happy-INST person-INST

However, predicative adjectives surfacing in the inst case seem also to be possible, given the appropriate context, see (6) from the NKJP (the National Corpus of Polish).

- (6) Andrzej Lajborek potwierdził, że [...] jest 'wesółym i miłym w kompanii'
A. L. confirmed that he.is cheerful-INST and nice-INST in company-LOC
'A.L. confirmed that he is cheerful and nice when in company'

As predication and control seem to display the same properties, it seems natural to develop a theory that unifies the two phenomena.

AN ANALYSIS OF PREDICATION: I propose that Polish has two different predication structures – one for predicative adjectives (7) and one for predicative NPs (8). I propose the following underlying structures for the data in (4) and (5) respectively.

- (7) [TP Piotr [CopP ~~Piotr~~ jest [AP ~~Piotr~~ szczęśliwy]]] *AP Predication*
(8) [TP Piotr [CopP ~~Piotr~~ jest [FP F [NP szczęśliwym człowiekiem]]]] *NP Predication*

In (7), *Peter* and *happy* are base-generated within the same AP. That is also where they share their phi-features. *Peter* moves up to Spec,Cop– the CopP acts as a relator in the sense of den Dikken (2006) and establishes the predication relation. *Peter* moves further up, checks the EPP, and checks nom case. Due to the Agree-chain with the adjective, nom case also surfaces on the adjective. In (8) the derivation starts with the NP *person* and *happy* as its modifier. These two elements enter an Agree relation. I assume a functional projection FP that is projected on top

of the NP that assigns inst case to its complement and turns the saturated DP into a predicate. The CopP is the next projection, where *Peter* is base-generated, the CopP acts as a relator. *Peter* checks the EPP and gets case, which does not percolate down to the adjective as the adjective agreed with *person*, but not with *Peter*. The question remains how adjectives in the inst fit into this picture (6). I propose that these adjectives start out as modifiers of full NPs with the corresponding NP being subsequently deleted in a process of NP ellipsis (NPE). Consider (9a) and its corresponding derivation (9b).

- (9) a. Piotr jest szczęśliwy-m ?(człowiek-iem)
 Peter.NOM is happy-INST person-INST
 b. [TP Piotr [CopP ~~Piotr~~ jest [FP F [NP szczęśliwym ~~człowiekiem~~]]]]

The derivation is the same as in (8) with the difference that in (9) NPE has taken place. We can follow Przepiórkowski's intuition about the agreeing nom and inst being treated as the same in syntax, and add that the distribution might be linked to individual speaker's sensitivity when it comes to the application of NPE. The distribution of predicative case is summarized in (10).

(10)

	Predicative adjectives	Predicative nouns
Agreeing case	Obligatory for bare APs	Not possible (exception: insults)
Inst. case	Possible as modifiers of elided NPs	Obligatory

AN ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT CONTROL: Building on Landau's (2015) insights concerning the use of a predication relation in control, the data in (1) would get the following (simplified) analysis.

- (11) [TP Johann [VP ~~Johann~~ próbuje [CP [TP PRO [CopP ~~PRO~~ być [AP ~~PRO~~ miły]]]]
 (12) [TP Johann [VP ~~Johann~~ próbuje [CP [TP PRO [CopP ~~PRO~~ być [FP F [NP miłym ~~człowiekiem~~]]]]

When PRO moves up to Spec,TP in (11), it can enter an agree relation with *Johann* inheriting all of the latter's features (cf. Landau's 2000 Agree-model). As PRO and *nice* have shared their phi-features, the features percolate down to the adjective as well, deriving the agreeing option. In (12), PRO and *Johann* also enter an agree relation, however, the adjective shared its phi-features with *person*, and has gotten its case from F. As all informants accepted (12) as grammatical, this seems to suggest that locality plays a role in the licensing of NPE. This view is supported by the data in (13) from Przepiórkowski (2004), the elliptical parts in brackets are added by me, which shows that the agreeing nom gets worse once a greater distance is created.

- (13) Jan bał się nawet chcieć spróbować wydawać się ??szczęśliwy/szczęśliwy-m (~~człowiek-iem~~)
 Jan.NOM feared REFL even want.INF try.INF seem.INF REFL happy.NOM/happy-INST (person-INST)
 'John was afraid to even want to try to seem happy'

AN ANALYSIS OF OBJECT CONTROL: OC, in contrast to SC, does not allow for a variation in case: only the inst case on the adjective is licensed. I propose that the impossibility of the agreeing option is due to the fact that in Polish predicative adjectives cannot appear in dative or accusative in primary predication, see (14).

- (14) a. Piotr jest pijany / ?pijany-m / *pijan-emu / *pijan-ego
 Peter.NOM is drunk.NOM / drunk-INST / drunk-DAT / drunk-ACC
 b. Piotr-owi jest zimno /*zimn-emu
 Peter-DAT is cold.DEFAULT / cold-DAT
 'Peter is feeling cold'

Thus, we can account for (2) by proposing that AP predication is not licit in object control due to a constraint on predicative non-nom adjectives in Polish. Therefore, only NP predication is allowed in this construction, see (15) for a simplified analysis for (2).

- (15) [TP Piotr [VP ~~Piotr~~ kazał [AppPSynowi [CP [TP PRO [CopP ~~PRO~~ być [FP F [NP miłym ~~człowiekiem~~]]]]

REFERENCES: Bondaruk, A. 2004. *PRO and Control*. KUL. Den Dikken, M. 2006. *Relators and linkers*. MIT. Landau, I. 2015. *A Two-Tiered Theory of Control*. MIT. Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of Control*. Kulwer. Przepiórkowski, A. 2000. Case Assignment and the Argument/Adjunct Dichotomy. Ph.D diss. Przepiórkowski, A. 2004. On case transmission in Polish control and raising. *Poznań Studies in Contem. Ling.* 39, 103-23. Schütze, C. 2001. On the nature of default case. *Syntax* 4.3, 205-38. Witkoś, J. 2010. Movement Theory of Control and CP-Infinitives in Polish. In: Hornstein & Polinsky (eds.) *Movement Theory of Control*. Benjamins, 45-66.