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 tries to be nice’

(2) Piotrkazał synowi być miły-m / *mił-emu
    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
    I.NOM /I.INST, I.NOM like beans.ACC
    ‘Me, I like beans’

Left Dislocation Test

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 ‘wesołym 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? (człowikiem)
   Peter.NOM is happy-INST person-INST
   
   b. [TP Piotr [CopP Piotr jest [TP F [NP szczęśliwy człowiek]]]]

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreeing case</th>
<th>Predicative adjectives</th>
<th>Predicative nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inst. case</td>
<td>Obligatory for bare APs</td>
<td>Not possible (exception: insults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 być [AP PRO miły]]]]]

(12) [TP Johann [VP Johann próbuje [CP [TP PRO być [F [NP miłym człowiek]]]]]

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 REFLEEVEN.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 / *pijany-em / *pijany-ego
        Peter.NOM is drunk.NOM / drunk-INST / drunk-DAT / drunk-ACC

   b. Piotr-owi jest zimno / *zimno-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 [AppP synowi [CP [TP PRO być [F [NP miłym człowiek]]]]]]