A quest for control

Marga Petter

0. Introduction

It has been noted in the literature on control constructions (Abraham 1983; Farkas 1988; Van Haaften 1991; Jackendoff 1972, 1990; Larson 1991; Rooryck 1992; Růžička 1983; Sag and Pollard 1991; and others) that some verbs display control shift in certain contexts.[1] Most of these verbs are communication verbs such as *ask, tell, promise* and *offer*. I will assume that the lexical properties of each control verb determine a canonical control relation between the embedded subject and a matrix argument, but that external factors may disturb the canonical control relations. This paper will be concerned with the Dutch verb *vragen (=ask)* as a control verb and with deontic modality as a factor interfering with the canonical control relations.[2]

I will show that in Dutch and English the verb *ask* can be represented as two different lexical verbs, namely ASK_R, which selects a request as its complement, and ASK_Q, which selects a wh-question as its complement. I will assume that the lexical properties of these verbs determine their canonical control relations as subject control for ASK_Q, and object control for ASK_R. I will show that within one class (ASK_R) the control relations may shift when a deontic modal is added in the control clause. Traditional analyses of control that depend entirely on the matrix verb for an explanation of control relations, either by semantic selection (Chomsky 1981; Růžička 1983) or by a Minimal Distance Principle (Rosenbaum 1967; Larson 1991), are not capable of explaining control shift in these cases. In this paper I will propose that the deontic modals trigger control shift, because they introduce an additional External Authority argument, the interpretation of which interferes with the control relation and causes control to shift away from the canonical object control relation of ASK_R to subject control.

---

[1] I would like to thank Hagit Borer, fellow students at UMass fall 1994, Marcel den Dikken and Ans van Kemenade for fruitful discussions on the topic and comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewer for helpful comments. Part of this article was developed during my stay at UMass, Amherst, which has been funded partly by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

[2] For a detailed characterization of modals see Palmer (1979). The deontic modal typically involves an 'outside force' that I will refer to as the External Authority later in this paper.

AVT 12 (1995), 163–174. 10.1075/avt.12.16pet
ISSN 0929–7332 / E-ISSN 1569–9919 © Algemene Vereniging voor Taalwetenschap

1. Setting the Problem

*1.1. Two verbs **ask**?* In this section I will show that there is reason to assume that the verb *ask* actually comes in two variants, each of which is a separate lexical item. In languages like English and Dutch the two lexical items are homophonous, *ask* and *vragen*, as exemplified in the sentences in (1). These verbs can take either a request or a question as their complement clause.

(1) a Jan vroeg Marie [om PRO *Oorlog en Vrede* te lezen]
John asked Mary [C PRO *War and Peace* to read]
b John asked Mary to read *War and Peace*
c Jan vroeg Marie [of hij *Oorlog en Vrede* moest lezen]
John asked Mary [whether he *War and Peace* should read]
d John asked Mary [whether PRO to read *War and Peace*], or not

In languages like Japanese, Hebrew and German these two different complement types also require a different matrix verb.[3]

(2) a John-ga Mary-ni [*War and Peace-o* yomu yooni]tanom-da
John-Nom Mary-Dat [*War and Peace*-Acc read Comp] ask-Past
b John-ga Mary-ni [kare/pro *W&P-o* yomu beki kadooka] tazune-ta (Jap)
John-Nom Mary-Dat [he/pro W&P-Acc read should whether] ask-Past
c John bikeš mi Mary [likvo et *Milxama ve-Shalom*]
John asked of Mary [to-read Acc *War and Peace*]
d John ša'al et Mary [im hu tsarix likvo et M&S]
John asked Acc Mary [if he should to-read Acc W&P] (Hebrew)
e Jan hat Maria gebeten [PRO *Krieg und Frieden* zu lesen]
Jan has Maria asked [PRO *War and Peace* to read]
f Jan hat Maria gefragt [ob er K&F lesen sollte]
Jan has Maria asked [if he W&P read must] (German)

We may assume that the verb *ask* in the languages in (1) needs to be represented as two homophonous lexical items, say ASK_R (for request) and ASK_Q (for question). Then, ASK_R might be analysed as an object control verb, belonging to the class of *persuade*-type control verbs; and ASK_Q might be analysed as a subject control verb, belonging to the class of *promise*-type control verbs, as exemplified in (3).

(3) a $John_j$ persuaded $Mary_m$ [PRO_m to read *War and Peace*]

---

[3] With thanks to Kiyomi Kusumoto and Masumi Matsumoto for the Japanese examples, and to Isadora Cohen for the Hebrew examples.

b John$_j$ asked Mary$_m$ [PRO$_m$ to read *War and Peace*]
c John$_j$ promised Mary$_m$ [PRO$_j$ to read *W&P* before the summer]
d John$_j$ asked Mary$_m$ [when PRO$_j$ to read *War and Peace*]

1.2. Control Shift with One Matrix Verb. The type of control relation, however, cannot always be used as a criterion for deciding which class of ASK a particular instance of the verb *ask* belongs to. A problem for the analysis in the previous section arises when one and the same matrix verb, ASK$_R$, may shift from object to subject control, depending on the modal interpretation of the embedded clause, compare the examples in (4).

(4) a Jan vroeg Marie$_m$ [om PRO$_m$ *Oorlog en Vrede* te lezen]
Jan asked Marie [C PRO *War and Peace* to read]
'Jan asked Marie to read *War and Peace*'
b Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie [om PRO$_j$ *Oorlog en Vrede* te *mogen* lezen]
Jan asked Marie [C PRO *War and Peace* to may read]
'Jan asked Marie to be allowed to read *War and Peace*'

This control shift may, at first impression, be ascribed to a shift from ASK$_R$ to ASK$_Q$. The Japanese example in (5), however, shows clearly that the only difference between the (a) and (b) sentence is the addition of a modal affix, and that the matrix verb does not change.

(5) a John-ga$_j$ Mary-ni$_m$ [*War and Peace-o pro*$_{*j/m}$ yomu yooni] tanom-da
John-Nom Mary-Dat [W and P -Acc read Comp] ask-Past
'John asked Mary to read W&P'

b John-ga$_j$ Mary-ni$_m$ [*W&P-o pro*$_{j/*m}$ yoma-nakutemoyoi yooni] tanom-da
John-Nom Mary-Dat [W&P-Acc read-not-need Comp] ask-Past
'John asked Mary that he need not read W&P'

As we can see in (5) the matrix verb *tanom-da* (=ASK$_R$) has remained the same, although the control relation has shifted. This supports the idea that the matrix verb in the Dutch examples in (4a) and (b) also remains constant, and only the modal in the embedded clause can be the trigger for the change in control relations. English also allows this kind of control shift, although not all speakers find the constructions acceptable.[4]

[4] With thanks to David Holton, Ed Rubin, Mike Dickey, André Isaak and John Alderete for their native speaker judgements that helped me develop my ideas for the present paper.

(6) a John asked Mary$_m$ [PRO$_m$ to read *War and Peace*]
b John$_j$ asked (%Mary) [PRO$_j$ to be allowed to read *War and Peace*]
c %John$_j$ asked Mary [PRO$_j$ not to have to read *War and Peace*]

Both an approach in terms of thematic selection (e.g. Růžička 1983) and an approach of structurally nearest controller (e.g. Larson 1991) fail to account for these facts, since in their view control depends entirely on the properties of the matrix verb. Rooryck (1992: 29) discusses similar shifts in control for French and notes that the modal verbs in question introduce an additional 'Source' argument.[5] In the next section, I will show that Dutch gives evidence for assuming just such an additional argument, which I will call the 'External Authority' (EA).[6] In section 3 I will propose a syntactic analysis for the interference of the EA with control relations.

2. *The Proposal*

In what follows, we will concentrate on Dutch examples, since Dutch modals can appear in the infinitival form, and clearly influence the control relation, if the modal has a deontic interpretation.

(7)	a	Jan vroeg Marie$_m$	[om PRO$_m$	O&V te (willen)	lezen]	
		Jan asked Marie	[C	W&P to (want)	read]	(be willing to)
	b	Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie	[om PRO$_j$	O&V te mogen	lezen]	
			[C	W&P to may	read]	(give permission)
	c	Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie	[om PRO$_j$	O&V te kunnen	lenen]	(arrange
			[C	W&P to can	borrow]	possibility)
	d	Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie	[om PRO$_j$	O&V niet te hoeven	lezen]	
			[C	W&P not to need	read]	(leave choice)

The example in (7a) exemplifies the canonical control relation of ASK$_R$. Examples with the modals *zullen (=shall, will)* and *moeten (=must)* are ungrammatical for semantic reasons: both *zullen* and *moeten* imply a sense of inevitability and obligatoriness, yielding a complement clause of the semantic type of 'command'; but the matrix verb s-selects only 'request' or 'question' type

[5] It has also been argued that these cases of control shift involve a 'causative coercion' (Sag and Pollard 1991) or a 'responsibility' relation (Farkas 1988), that interferes with the control relation.

[6] As we will see in example (14), an 'ordinary' Source argument to a lexical verb does not cause a shift in control relations. Therefore, I will refer to the modal argument as the External Authority, in order not to confuse the modal 'source' with Source arguments to lexical verbs.

complements.[7] Therefore, we will not be concerned with these particular modals in this paper. With respect to the examples in (7b,c,d) we see that the original object control relation of ASK_R has shifted to the subject. It must be noted that each of the modals involved in control shift introduce an additional participant in the embedded clause, as can de seen in (8a,b,c).

(8) a Jan mag *van Marie* het boek lezen
Jan may from Marie the book read
'Marie allows Jan to read the book'
b Jan hoeft *van Marie* het boek niet te lezen
Jan needs from Marie the book not to read
'Marie told John that it is not necessary to read the book'
c Je kunt *(van) me* de pot op!
You can from me the pot up
' ≈ Go to hell!/ ≈ Don't expect me to grant your wishes'
d *Jan wilde *van Marie/zichzelf* het boek lezen
Jan wanted from Marie/himself the book read

The modal *willen* does not introduce control shift (7a), nor does it allow an additional argument (8d). I will call this additional argument of the modals in (8a,b,c) the External Authority (EA), because it functions as the 'authority' ultimately responsible for the rest of the embedded event. Some modals always introduce this EA argument (*mogen, niet hoeven*), even if it remains implicit. I will represent them with an argument structure as in (9):

(9) MOGEN [Jan het boek lezen] [van Marie]
≈ ALLOW [Jan (to) read the book] [by Marie]

where *mogen* has two arguments, the embedded clause and the *van*-PP. For the present purpose it is important that *van Marie* is an argument of the deontic modal. It will need further research to say more about the exact syntactic representation of the modal verbs. A second group of modals optionally introduce an EA (*kunnen, moeten*); and a third class of modals never seem to introduce an extra EA argument (*willen, zullen*). Only if a modal is interpreted as having an External Authority can it be characterized as deontic and will it interfere with the canonical control relation. Compare the examples in (10).

---

[7] Cf. Grimshaw (1979) on s-selection of complements. It must also be noted that the modal verbs *moeten* and *zullen* are perfectly grammatical when they combine with other matrix verbs:

i Jan_j beloofde $Marie_m$ [PRO_j O&V voor maandag te zullen lezen]
Jan promised Marie [W&P before Monday to will read]
ii Jan_j zei tegen $Marie_m$ [$PRO_{j/m}$ O&V voor maandag te moeten lezen]
Jan said to Marie [W&P before Monday to must read]

(10) a Jan vroeg $Marie_m$ [om PRO_m volgende week vrijdag het gedicht te kunnen opzeggen]
Jan asked Marie [C next week Friday the poem to be-able-to recite] (acquire the ability to)

b Jan_j vroeg $Marie_m$ [om $PRO_{m/j}$ het verhaal *op zondagmiddag* te kunnen voorlezen] in plaats van zaterdag
Jan asked Marie [C the story *on Sunday afternoon* to can PRT-read] instead of Saturday (have/give opportunity to)

c Jan_j vroeg $Marie_m$ [om PRO_j het boek te kunnen lenen (van $haar_m$)]
Jan asked Marie [C the book to can borrow (from her)]

In (10a,b) where PRO is interpreted as the matrix object *Marie*, we can see from the interpretations of 'acquire ability to' or '*have* opportunity to' that no external authority argument is introduced, hence the canonical control relation is not disturbed. In (10b,c), where PRO is interpreted as the matrix subject *Jan*, the EA is introduced, as appears from the interpretations of '*give* opportunity/permission to'. At this point we can formulate the following descriptive conclusion: if a modal introduces an External Authority, then this argument is interpreted as the matrix object of ASK_R, making the object unavailable as a controller for PRO. As a consequence, control shifts to the matrix subject. The External Authority argument thus appears to be syntactically active, hence our next task will be to give a formal representation of this descriptive generalization.

3. A Syntactic Representation

3.1. Towards an Operator-Variable Relation. Chomsky (1982:30-33) discusses cases of WH- or *tough*-movement involving movement of an implicit embedded indirect object to an empty operator in COMP, see (11). As these examples also display control shift, we will examine the sentences in more detail. If the embedded indirect object is a referential expression, the empty subject corefers with the matrix subject (11a); but if the embedded indirect object is implicit (11b), it behaves like a variable, and is interpreted via operator-binding (11c) as the matrix subject. This means that the embedded subject can no longer corefer with the matrix subject, because this would yield a violation of Principle C of the Binding Theory inside the embedded clause.

(11) a the men are too stubborn [e_1 to talk to Bill] (referential expr)
b the men are too stubborn [e_2 to talk to e_3] (variable)
c the men are too stubborn [$_S$· O_3 [$_S$ e_2 to talk to e_3]

The embedded clause is a complement of *too+Adjective*. The empty operator in the embedded SpecCP in (11c) heads the operator-variable chain, fulfilling the 0-subjacency requirement for operator interpretation (Chomsky 1986:65), linking it to the matrix clause, so that it can be interpreted as the matrix subject. Apparently, these operator-variable relations cause the canonical control relations to shift.

Other examples with operator bound variables in an embedded clause are parasitic gap (PG) sentences as in (12). The only difference between (11) and (12a) is that the embedded operator-variable chain in (11) is directly linked to a matrix argument in an A-position, but that the embedded PG-chain in (12a) is linked to a matrix argument in an A'-position of a wh-chain.

(12) a Who did you tell *t* [$_{CP}$O that you would visit *e*]
b *Who did you ask *t* [$_{CP}$why you should visit *e*]
(from Chomsky 1986a:62)

Following Chomsky (1986: 54-68), the (a) example in (12) is grammatical, since the PG is bound by an empty operator in SpecCP, from where it is 0-subjacent to the matrix clause. The example in (12b) differs from (11) and (12a) with respect to the availability of the Spec of CP. In (12b) this position is filled with a wh-element, preventing the PG to be bound by a null operator, hence violating the 0-subjacency requirement.

The operator-variable construction in (11c) seems to have at least one thing in common with modalized complement clauses as in (7), namely, they both entail a shift in control relations. Therefore, I would like to formulate the following hypothesis: the EA argument of a modal verb is a variable and, as the embedded CP is a complement of ASK, must bound by an empty operator in SpecCP, as in (13). Thus the operator-variable chain is 0-subjacent to the matrix clause.

(13) Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [0$_m$ om PRO$_j$ O&V te mogen lezen e_m]
Jan asked Marie [0 C PRO W&P to may read *e*]

I will assume that the lexical properties of the matrix verb that determined the canonical object control relation for ASK$_R$, determine the interpretation of the variable along the exact same lines. Without the deontic modal, the embedded Authority is inseparably connected to the Agent role of PRO. The deontic modal, however, separates the two functions and introduces a syntactic position for its EA argument.[8] Principle C of the Binding Theory says that variables behave like

[8] It was noted by a referee that the preposition of empty operators in Dutch can be stranded, and that this might be a problem for the present analysis of implicit EAs, since the preposition of these arguments cannot be stranded. I would like to comment first that the EA is an argument of a modal verb, which might show a different behaviour from a lexical verb in this respect. However, it is

referential expressions in that they cannot be bound to a co-argument within their binding domain. I will assume that PRO and the Authority variable are in the same binding domain, since they are both participants in the same embedded event, and not separated by a CP-barrier. Therefore, their reference cannot be to the same matrix argument. If the lexical properties of the matrix verb ASK_R determine the reference of the syntactically highest empty argument, or the Authority bearing argument in the embedded clause, to be the matrix object, PRO must necessarily be coreferent with the matrix subject, since PRO-reference is restricted to an argument of the next clause up.[9] I assume the EA to be higher in the embedded clause than the PRO subject, since the EA has scope over the entire embedded clause, including the subject.

3.2. Arguments to Lexical Verbs Do Not Cause Control Shift. The examples in (14) show that it cannot be an argument of the embedded *lexical* verb that triggers the control shift, but that it is only the EA argument introduced by the modal that does so.

(14)	a	Jan_j	vroeg	$Marie_m$	[om PRO_j	O&V te *mogen* lezen *(van haar)*$_m$]
		Jan	asked	Marie	[C	W&P to may read (from her)]
	b	Jan_j	vroeg	$Marie_m$	[om PRO_j	O&V te *kunnen* [lenen *(van haar)*$_m$]]
		Jan	asked	Marie	[C	W&P to can [borrow (from her)]]
	c	Jan_j	vroeg	$Marie_m$	[om PRO_m	O&V te *willen* lezen]
		Jan	asked	Marie	[C	W&P to want read]
	d	Jan_j	vroeg	$Marie_m$	[om $PRO_{*j/m}$	O&V te *willen* [lenen *van* **haar*$_m$]]
		Jan	asked	Marie	[C	W&P to want [borrow from her]]

As we can see in the (b) and (d) examples, the embedded lexical verb *lenen* has a Source argument in its thematic structure. In (14d) this argument cannot refer to

---

beyond the scope of this article to go into detail about the syntactic properties of modal verbs. Second, the EA is an implicit argument that may in certain respects be compared to a passive by-phrase and a Beneficiary *for*-PP of adjectives, neither of which allow P-stranding. Finally, a similar analysis with universal operators has been proposed by Epstein (1984), where these (implicit) Beneficiary arguments are bound by a universal operator in SpecCP.

[9] Even if the matrix object and the modality in the embedded clause remain implicit, the modal interpretation with an EA may be forced, as can be seen from the examples in (i) and (ii):

i John asked e [PRO to go home]

ii John asked e [PRO to read *War and Peace*]

In (i) we naturally get subject control and the embedded clause is interpreted as if there were a modal involved, expressing permission. In (ii) the embedded subject may also be interpreted as the implicit object of the matrix clause, with an arbitrary reading. Hence we have to assume that, though English does not have the possibility of an overt modal in the infinitive, sentences like (i) have an implicit modal and an EA that causes control shift.

Marie, only to *Jan*, for which we need the masculine pronoun *hem*. The Source argument of the lexical verb in combination with the modal *willen* does not introduce a shift in control, while the Source argument in (14b) seems to do just that. In order to explain this difference we will have to conclude that it is the modal, and not the Source argument of the lexical embedded verb, that introduces this control shift. Apparently, (14b) involves an implicit External Authority that is interpreted as referring to the same person as the Source of the lexical verb.

The examples in (14a,b) also show that the EA can either be overtly realized or left implicit, and we see that the interpretation of an implicit EA is the same as that of the overt variable. Example (15) shows that the EA may also be realized in between the complementizer *om* and the rest of the sentence. This leads me to propose the following bracketed structures for modal constructions involving an External Authority argument:

(15) Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [$_{CP}$0$_m$ om [$_{MP}$ (*van haar*)$_m$ [$_{IP}$ PRO$_j$ O&V te *mogen* lezen t_m]]]
Jan asked Marie [0 C (from her) PRO W&P to may read *t*]

I will assume, with Chomsky (1986), that variable interpretation takes place at LF in SpecCP where it will be bound by a modal operator. The fact that the overt modal authority in (15) may move to a position between the complementizer *om* and the rest of the clause at S-structure, suggests that there is another position available just below CP, which I will call SpecMP, the Specifier of a separate Modal Phrase.[10] The movement to SpecMP may be motivated by reasons of scope, since the External Authority argument has scope over the entire embedded clause, as the authority ultimately responsible for the entire embedded event. Further LF movement to SpecCP will be necessary to satisfy the 0-subjacency requirement for operator interpretation, i.e. linking the operator to an argument in the next higher clause.

At this point I will conclude that deontic modals indeed introduce an operator-variable relationship. The introduction of an EA causes the canonical control relation to shift, so that canonical object control for ASK$_R$ shifts to subject control. Similarly, verbs that canonically select subject control, for instance the verb *promise*, show a shift to object control when a deontic modal is introduced in the infinitival complement. Apparently the interpretation of the highest empty argument in the embedded clause depends on the matrix verb's selectional properties. As a consequence PRO in a complement clause to ASK$_R$ can no

[10] See also Mulder and Den Dikken (1992) and Den Dikken (1993) for a proposal to introduce an additional Mood and Modality Phrase (M&MP).

longer also be controlled by the matrix object, since the EA is in a higher position and is interpreted as the matrix object. If PRO had the same interpretation, this would lead to a Principle C violation of the Binding Theory.

3.3. Arguments for a Modal Phrase. As we saw in (15), the overt EA can be moved up to a position just below the complementizer *om*. I will assume that this is not just scrambling to a focus position in this case, since the PP need not be stressed, and also naturally allows the following object to be stressed for focus reasons. As I mentioned before, I will assume that this movement licenses the scope of the External Authority over the entire embedded clause.

The exact position of such an MP is still unclear, however, since we cannot be sure whether the empty subject is higher or lower than the EA argument. If we compare the infinitival construction in (14) with its finite counterparts, we must conclude that we need various positions for subject placement, assuming the EA is in the specifier of a Modal Phrase (MP) which has one designated position, as has also been proposed for NegP (cf. Pollock 1989; Rizzi 1990). The various options for a finite complement to *vragen (=ask)* are illustrated in (16).

(16) a Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [of Piet/hij$_j$ [O&V *mocht* lezen *van haar*$_m$]]]
Jan asked Marie [if Piet/he [W&P might read from her]]]
b Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [of hij$_j$ [*van haar*$_m$ O&V *mocht* lezen t]]]
c *Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [of *van haar*$_m$ [hij$_j$ O&V *mocht* lezen t]]]
d Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [of *van haar*$_m$ [Piet O&V *mocht*lezen t]]]
e Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [of Piet [*van haar*$_m$ O&V *mocht* lezen t]]]
f Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie$_m$ [of Piet/hij$_j$ O&V [*van haar*$_m$ t_{obj} *mocht* lezen t]]]

As we can see, the EA argument may always appear at the end of the entire embedded clause (16a). It can also always appear directly after a subject (16b,e), but only directly in front of a full NP subject (16d), not a pronominal subject (16c). Apparently the pronominal subject is higher in the clause than the full NP subject needs to be. Zwart (1993) argues that these pronouns are in the hybrid C/AgrS Phrase. I will not go into detail about this, but assume that a PRO subject in Dutch never reaches the Agr-phrase, since it does not show any number agreement, contrary to PRO constructions in English, see (17).

(17) De kinderen wensen [PRO dokter(*s) te worden]
The children want [PRO doctors/*doctor] to become]
'The children want to become doctors'

Thus, the embedded PRO subject will stay in the lower position in the infinitival construction, while the EA argument of the modal verb intervenes between C and the rest of the sentence, as is also the case in (16d) for the lexical NP subject

Piet. Assuming that the Modal verb heads its own projection (MP), we may assume that the relative position of the MP in (15) is above the embedded subject position (in SpecIP), from where it can structurally interfere with the control relation.

4. *ASK_Q and Modal Interpretation*

In this section we will return to ASK_Q, and in particular, we will show that the proposal of a modal operator and an External Authority argument is also relevant for the control relations of this verb. As we saw earlier, ASK_Q always seems to induce subject control. But note the cases in (18c,d). Although these are hardly grammatical with an infinitival complement, there is a clear difference in control relations if we force an interpretation.[11] In what follows I will give a tentative account for this, though it must be noted that work is still in progress.

(18) a ?Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie [wat PRO$_j$ te doen]
Jan asked Marie [what PRO to do]
b ??Jan$_j$ vroeg Marie [waar naar toe PRO$_j$ te (mogen/moeten) gaan]
??Jan asked Marie [where PRO to be allowed/have to go]
c ??Jan vroeg Marie$_m$ [waar naar toe PRO$_m$ te willen gaan]
??Jan asked Marie [where PRO to be willing to go]

If we paraphrase the above +WH-examples with a finite complement clause, we will always end up inserting expressions like *should* or *ought to*, as in (19).

(19) Jan vroeg Marie [wat hij *moest* doen]
'Jan asked Marie [what he *should* do]'

Therefore, it appears that ASK_Q always involves this type of interpretation of *should* or *ought to* as a default modality, even when no modal verb is overtly expressed. The default modal interpretation is one that obligatorily involves an additional EA argument, which via operator-variable relations, is interpreted as the matrix object, hence inducing subject control in order to avoid a Principle C violation. As we saw in (8d), the modal *willen* (which is not a deontic modal) does not introduce an EA argument. If its use (in 18d) is interpretable at all, the overt modal appears to override the meaning of the default, empty modal, hence

[11] The idea that the modal operator must move to SpecCP to satisfy 0-subjacency is supported by the fact that all examples with a wh-infinitive and a modal verb are almost completely ungrammatical. SpecCP is filled with a wh-operator, which blocks movement of the modal operator into this position, hence the 0-subjacency requirement for the interpretation of the modal operator is violated.

there is no EA to interfere with the object control relation of ASK. Thus, the 'canonical' subject control relation for ASK_Q may be caused by the default interpretation of the control clause as involving a deontic modal with an External Authority argument.

5. *Conclusion*

I will conclude from the above discussion that some modals have an External Authority argument, that functions as the ultimate authority responsible for the embedded event. This EA argument behaves as a variable, if it is a(n empty) pronoun. If this variable needs to be interpreted in a control context of ASK_R, it will be interpreted as the matrix object, making control by the object impossible and causing control shift to the subject.

References

Abraham, W. (1983) 'The Control Relation in German', in *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, ed. W. Abraham, 217-242, John Benjamins.
Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
Chomsky, N. (1982) *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Chomsky, N. (1986) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Den Dikken, M. (1993) 'Empty Operator Movement in Dutch Imperatives', in *Language and Cognition* 2, Groningen.
Epstein, S. (1984) 'Quantifier-*pro* and the LF-Representation of PRO-arb', in *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 499-505.
Farkas, D.F. (1988) 'On Obligatory Control', in *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11, 27-58.
Grimshaw, J.B. (1979) 'Complement Selection and the Lexicon', in *LI* 10, 279-326.
Haaften, T. van (1991) *De Interpretatie van Verzwegen Subjecten*, PhD-diss, Dordrecht.
Jackendoff, R.S. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press.
Jackendoff, R.S. (1990) *Semantic Structures*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Larson, R.K. (1991) '*Promise* and the Theory of Control', in *Ling. Inquiry* 22, 103-139.
Mulder, R. and M. den Dikken (1992) 'Tough Parasitic Gaps', in *NELS* 1991.
Palmer, F.R. (1979). *Modality and the English Modals*. Longman Linguistics Library. London.
Pollock, J.Y. (1989) 'Verb Movement, Universal grammar, and the Structure of IP', *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 365-424.
Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Rizzi, L. (1991) 'Residual verb Second and the Wh-Criterion', in *Technical Reports in Formal and Computational Linguistics*, 2, Université de Genève.
Rooryck, J. (1992) *Out of Control*, ms., Indiana University, Bloomington.
Rosenbaum, P. (1967) *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*, MIT Press.
Růžička, R. (1983) 'Remarks on Control', *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 309-324.
Sag, I. and C. Pollard (1991) 'An Integrated Theory of Complement Control', *Language* 67, 63-113.
Zwart, C.J.W. (1993) *Dutch Syntax, A Minimalist Approach*, Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics.