This paper focuses on a very rarely discussed subtype of control, viz. split control, witness (1). Albeit cross-linguistically ‘neglected’ and hence rather poorly understood, it nevertheless contributes to a better understanding of the overall control subject and as such cannot be swept under the rug.

Recently, control has become a hot area of very intense research. In the era of Minimalism, there are basically two theories of control: the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) (Hornstein 1999 and subsequent) and the Agree Theory of Control (ATC) (Landau 2000 and subsequent). As regards the split control phenomenon, linguistic opinions vary. The MTC argues that the relevant species of control represents Non-Obligatory Control (NOC), whereas ATC deems split control to be subsumed under Obligatory Control (OC).

It goes without saying that split control within the MTC cannot be categorized as a facet of OC, the latter being reduced to (A-)movement. More precisely, a chain with two antecedents is theoretically impossible. I show, however, that an analysis of split control within the MTC framework is feasible. Importantly, I depart from Hornstein’s contention that split control is an exclusive property of NOC. Employing familiar diagnostics of OC, as presented in Landau (2000), I show on the basis of data from Polish that some OC contexts allow split control. In order to account for this claim, I develop a theory that relies on the presence of the Addressee/Speaker Phrase immediately dominating TP in the non-finite clause.

Pak (2006) shows that exhortative constructions in Korean host the sentence final particle –ca (see (2)) which marks that the subject of the sentence is the addressee and the speaker (2a) or signals that the missing subject in the embedded clause is interpreted as referring to both the matrix subject and object (2b). The particle conveys information concerning the subject via an agreement mechanism between the persons and the particle itself. Pak argues that –ca heads the Addressee/Speaker Projection in the syntax and that it is a Spell-out of two features: [+addressee] and [+speaker]. (The Addressee/Speaker Phrase is independently motivated as it plays a role in accounting for another important aspect of Korean grammar, the speech style particles). Pak proposes that the relevant projection is situated in the left periphery of the clause, immediately dominating the structural subject position.

Drawing on Pak’s analysis, I examine split control in Polish. This type of control is typically an ability of object control verbs, as in (1a-b). I argue that split control in Polish can be licensed by only object control verbs of proposal (more specifically, those that carry some exhortative force) as only such verbs select for the Addressee/Speaker Projection which dominates the non-finite TP projection. This is plausible since I treat –ca as being simply phonetically unrealized in Polish. Albeit overtly missing, the head of this projection contains [+addressee] and [+speaker] which, in the context of control, translates as [+matrix object] and [+matrix subject], respectively. For split control with object control verbs I propose a derivation in (3). I assume that the sentence is derived as a run-of-the-mill example of pure object control. Ani ‘Ann’ is merged in [Spec, vP] for thematic reasons, from where it raises to [Spec, TP]. Then it A-moves to a higher clause to check an internal θ-role of the matrix predicate. Note that the movement across C is not unauthorized since in Polish it is PolP and not vP that constitutes a phase. Next, Marek ‘Mark’ is taken from the numeration and merged in the matrix [Spec, vP] and in the end it raises to [Spec, TP] for EPP and case reasons. The split control effect arises due to the presence of two features in Addressee/Speaker: [+addressee] and [+speaker]. These features get activated due to the presence in the embedded
clause of the feature [+Syn(tactic)Pl(urality)] on the elements that require that their subject be syntactically plural. Once the relevant projection is introduced into the tree, the features percolate up until they find elements that will satisfy their requirements. So, when [+speaker] has reached the matrix subject Marek ‘Mark’, the feature percolates no further as it is saturated. The same reasoning carries over to [+addressee] which reaches the matrix object Ani ‘Ann’. Consequently, with the Addressee/Speaker head specifying the reference of the subject it is linked to, the non-finite subject (anachronistic PRO) is construed as plural although formally we find only the copy of Marek ‘Mark’ in both the thematic and structural subject position.

All in all, the paper constitutes a contribution to the ongoing debate whether control can be reduced to movement or is it best viewed as an instance of Agree. I show that split control, purportedly problematic to the MTC, can be accommodated within the latter.

(1) a. Marek1 zaproponował Ani2, żeby [PRO1+2 zrobić sobie nawzajem śniadanie].
    Mark suggested Ann so-that to-make each other breakfast
    ‘Mark suggested to Ann making breakfast for each other.’
b. Jan1 przekonał Marię2, żeby [PRO1+2 zostać członkami tego klubu].
    John convinced Mary so-that to-become members this club
    ‘John convinced Mary to become members of this club’

(2) a. Icey kongpwuha-ca.
    now study-EXH
    ‘Now, let’s study.’
b. John-i Tom-ekey [cip-ey ka-ca]-ko mal-ha-ess-ta
    John-NOM Tom-DAT home-to go-EXH]-COMP say-do-PAST-DEC
    (Intended meaning) ‘John said to Tom let’s go home.’ (indirect speech)

(3) [TP Marek T-past [PolP F [+case] [vP {Marek} v+zaproponował [vP Ani zaproponował [CP żeby [Addressee/Speaker P Addressee/Speaker [+addressee, +speaker] [Ø-ca]] [TP {Ani} [vP {Ani} zrobić sobie nawzajem śniadanie]]]]]]]]
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