

Background Within minimalism two opposing theories to account for control are still contested. Agree/predication approaches to control (Williams 1992, Gallego 2011, Landau 2013, 2015, among others) follow from GB models in using PRO to represent the null subject of a controlled clause, while the movement theory of control (MTC) (Hornstein 1999, 2001 and Boeckx, et al. 2010) strives to eliminate PRO from the grammar, instead analyzing the controlled subject as a deleted copy of the controller. Control can be established in both complement and adjunct clauses, with a main difference being that in adjunct control, only subject control, and not object control, has been claimed to occur (Landau 2013, 2015, Boeckx et al. 2010). In (1), only the first person subject can control PRO, not the direct object ‘Juan’.

- (1) Yo_i vi a Juan_j antes de PRO_{i/*j} ir_{me/*se} para España.
I saw.1SG DOM Juan before of PRO leave.INF-RFL{1SG/3SG} for Spain
‘I saw Juan before he left for Spain.’

However, novel data from Spanish challenge the generalization that only subjects can control into adjuncts since object clitics can establish control, as demonstrated in (2).

- (2) Yo lo_i vi antes de PRO_i ir-se para España.
I him saw.1SG before of PRO leave.INF-RFL3SG for Spain
‘I saw him before he left for Spain.’

I show how these data add to the discussion of the distribution of control and provide new insight to the theoretical debate. Crucially, while the data can be accounted for under an account that establishes control via c-command, like Landau’s (2015) two-tiered theory of control (TTC), the MTC fails to offer an adequate account.

Data: Object clitic control into adjuncts Clitic control is limited to preverbal/climbed clitics (3a). Non-climbing clitics, located in the same position as full DP objects, cannot control (3b).

- (3) a. La policía los_i está buscando después de PRO_i robar un banco.
The police them is looking-for after of PRO rob.INF a bank.
‘The police are looking for them after they robbed a bank.’
b. *La policía está buscando-los_i después de PRO_i robar un banco
The police is looking for-them after of PRO rob.INF a bank.
‘The police are looking for them after they robbed a bank.’

Further, these examples of clitic control appear to be true cases of obligatory control (OC).

While non-obligatory control (NOC) can refer to a long distance, discourse or arbitrary referent, OC is only established locally by a syntactic dependency. One test to determine the type of control is the possibility of [-human] controllers, which are only possible in OC structures (Boeckx, et al. 2010, Landau 2015). Non-human clitic controllers are possible in Spanish (4), suggesting that these are true OC structures.

- (4) Lo_i cosechó antes de PRO_i florecer.
It harvested before of PRO flower.INF
‘He/She harvested it before it flowered.’

Clitic control cannot be movement In the MTC, adjunct control is established by sideward moving a copy of the controller from the adjunct subject position to the matrix subject position. Object control into adjuncts is ruled out based on economy restrictions. For object control to occur, the adjunct subject would instead move to the matrix object position. Boeckx et al. (2010) argues that this movement is unmotivated given that the matrix subject, still in the numeration/lexical array, must be merged first before moving an argument from the adjunct in order to respect Merge over Move (MOM) (Chomsky 1995). An identical problem is expected to occur with Spanish clitics, which likewise are merged in the internal argument position and

move like XPs on a bare phrase structure (Ormazabal and Romero 2013, Kramer 2014). There seems to be no motivation to not respect MOM in these cases. Moreover, even if there were motivation for not respecting MOM, further stipulations would be needed to account for why only preverbal clitics would be licensed to not respect MOM and establish control but full DP objects and clitics not having climbed would be excluded from doing so.

Clitic control in the TTC In contrast, Landau's (2015) account of OC as predication does seem to allow for both the lack of full DP object and non-climbed clitic controllers as well as the possibility of preverbal/climbed clitic controllers. In the TTC, the lack of object control into an adjunct (1) can be explained by a lack of c-command between the object and the adjunct. If the object does not c-command the adjunct, predication cannot take place between the two items and control is not established. However, the clitics in (2) and (3a) move to a higher position in TP (following Kramer 2014, I assume the object clitics are moved/tucked into an inner specifier of T) where they c-command PRO in the vP-adjoined adjunct. The structure of (2) is shown in (5).

(5) $[_{TP} \text{pro} \text{ lo } [_{T'} \text{vi} [_{vP} [\text{vP} \text{vi} \text{ } \emptyset]]] [_{PP} \text{ antes de PRO irse para España}]]]$

Under this approach, clitics that are not moved to a preverbal position would likewise not be expected to control. The example in (3b), where a non-climbed clitic cannot control, supports this prediction. Therefore, although examples with an object clitic are not explicitly discussed in the TTC, this approach can be extended to account for clitic control examples while still maintaining the generalization that full DP objects cannot control an adjunct subject. Thus, I conclude that these data provide support in favor of a control analysis, like the TTC, that relies on the importance of c-command in order to establish control, rather than the MTC.

Optionality in clitic control While the TTC can account for how clitics can control adjunct PRO, subject control in these structures is also possible. A question arises of how both clitics and subjects can control into otherwise identical adjuncts, as in the minimal pair of (2) and (6).

(6) Yo_i lo vi_j antes de PRO_j ir-me para España
 I him saw.1SG before of PRO leave.INF-RFL1SG for Spain.
 'I saw him before (my) leaving for Spain.'

I suggest this optionality arises based on the position of both controllers in TP. With the clitic tucked into a specifier of T, following the definition of closeness from Rackowski and Richards (2005), neither the clitic nor the subject is closer than the other to the goal, PRO, since there is no head or maximal projection that c-commands the subject but not the clitic (or vice-versa). With neither intervening, either could establish control of PRO. A similar pattern can be seen in examples of reflexive binding. While either the subject or object clitic can bind the reflexive anaphor in (7a), an in-situ object is not able to do so in (7b). The clitic and subject appear to be equally close.

(7) a. Le hablé de {mí-mismo/sí-mismo} b. *Hablé a Juan de sí-mismo
 3SG spoke.1SG of myself/himself Spoke.1SG to Juan of himself
 'I spoke to him about myself/himself' 'I spoke to Juan about himself'

Selected references: Boeckx, Cedric, Hornstein, Norbert & Nunes, Jairo. (2010). *Control as movement* (Vol. 126). Cambridge Univ. Press. Hornstein, Norbert. (1999). Movement and control. *LI*, 30, 69-96. Landau, Idan. (2013). *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge Univ. Press. Landau, Idan. (2015). *A two-tiered theory of control* (Vol. 71). MIT Press. Ormazabal, Javier., & Romero, Juan. (2013). Object clitics, agreement and dialectal variation. *International Journal of Latin and Romance Linguistics*, 25(2), 301-344. Rackowski, Andrea., & Richards, Norvin. (2005). Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *LI*, 36(4), 565-599.