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It is widely held, across frameworks, that complement control universally targets the subject function, cross-cutting major alignment divisions. Whether case follows an accusative or ergative or other alignment, it is consistently the subject of a non-finite complement clause that is normally unexpressed and understood as coreferent with a matrix argument. This squib examines a recent challenge to that characterization from Belhare [byw], a Kiranti (Sino-Tibetan) language, which is alleged to have a pattern of control targeting the absolutive argument of the complement clause, regardless of its grammatical function. I argue that the challenge from Belhare is mis-characterized, and that even on the primary description of the relevant Belhare data, the facts are consistent with the universal characterization of control as syntactically targeting subjects.

1 Introduction

Across a variety of theoretical traditions, something along the following lines has been held to constitute a syntactic universal:

(1) When case and grammatical function diverge, it is the function SUBJECT and not a case category (nominative, absolutive, ergative, etc.) that determines which argument in a non-finite clause is subject to control.

In this squib, I will examine an alleged counter-example, from Belhare (Sino-Tibetan), which has been taken (Bickel & Nichols 2001; Malchukov 2014) to show an instance of control on an ergative–absolutive alignment, and thus that (1) represents only a strong trend, and not a true universal. I argue that the conclusion
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is hasty, and that even on Bickel’s own analysis, the data do not in fact challenge (1).1

2 Control is not case

To begin, it may help to have a brief review of the standard evidence for (1).

In the canonical control configuration, a designated argument in a non-finite complement is obligatorily unexpressed, and obligatorily coreferent with an argument in a higher clause. A long established tradition represents the controlled element as PRO. In English, PRO is always the subject, never the object of the non-finite clause. There are of course also ways of representing this dependency without a null element in the syntax, but for current purposes, the important observation is that it is the subject of the non-finite clause that is shared/coreferent with an argument (subject in (2) or object, as with ask, tell, etc.) of the matrix clause.

(2) a. Leo tried [ PRO_{NOM} / *Mika / *himself to win ].
   b. Leo tried [ PRO_{NOM} to choose his teacher_{ACC} ].
   c. * Leo tried [ his teacher_{NOM} to choose PRO_{ACC} ].

In a canonical nominative–accusative alignment, where there is a direct correspondence between nominative case and the grammatical function subject, it is not possible to decide on simple empirical grounds whether the distribution of PRO should be stated in terms of case or subjecthood. Famously, Vergnaud (2008); Chomsky (1980) proposed that the distribution of control is reducible to the distribution of case: English nominative case is restricted to finite subjects, thus lexical subjects are excluded from the subject position of non-finite clauses

---

1I restrict the discussion here to Belhare. Bickel & Nichols (2001) argue that Chechen shows a similar pattern to Belhare, but is subsumed under the same analysis, without the complicating factor of morphological deponence. In her survey of complement control cross-linguistically, Stiebels (2007) presents Austronesian and Mayan as showing a different type of challenge to (1). In these languages, control may single out either the grammatical subject or the logical subject (agent/actor/external argument) on her analysis, sometimes with variation across constructions in a single language (see also Kroeger 1993; Wurmbrand 2013 on Tagalog). Whether these challenge (1) as phrased depends in large part on how “subject” is defined, a matter of no small controversy in particular in Austronesian. I am unable to address these examples within the confines of a squib, but my narrow goal here is to defend the claim that case is never the determining factor as to which argument will be PRO, and the Austronesian and Mayan examples are thus orthogonal to that narrow point. For additional discussion of control in ergative languages, and some important additional qualifications, see Polinsky (2016: 104–109).
(unless they are “exceptionally” assigned case by a higher verb or preposition). If this view were correct, one would expect to find that variation in case patterns – which is amply attested – would correlate with variation in the distribution of PRO. That expectation, it turns out, is resoundingly false.

For example, in an ergative–absolutive alignment, the transitive subject bears ergative case while the object and intransitive subject share the typically unmarked absolutive case. Case and subjecthood do not align: there is no case that is assigned to all and only subjects. If Vergnaud were right, and the account of control was that some designated case is unavailable in non-finite contexts, then the control pattern should track case, rather than subjecthood. For example, an absolutive pattern of control would look like the following, with PRO as the object, but not the subject, of a transitive infinitive:

(3)  
a. Leo tried [ PRO\textsubscript{ABS} to win ].
b. * Leo tried [ PRO\textsubscript{ERG} to choose his teacher\textsubscript{ABS} ].
c. Leo tried [ his teacher\textsubscript{ERG} to choose PRO\textsubscript{ABS} ].

Such a pattern has been prominently claimed not to exist. For example, in an important survey of ergativity, Dixon (1994: 134–135) notes:

Whenever [concepts such as ‘can’, ‘try’, ‘begin’, ‘want’ “and similar verbs”] are realised as lexical verbs, taking an object complement clause construction which involves another verb, the two verbs must have the same subject (S or A) irrespective of whether the language is accusative or ergative at morphological and/or syntactic levels...

This is a universal, relating to the universal category of subject.

There are, of course, many questions one can ask about which constructions should and shouldn’t fall under the scope of such a universal (for example, where to draw the line between control and raising, and whether adjunct control and complement control should be grouped together, and whether this should include control by the matrix object). For the narrow goals of this squib, we may abstract away from some of these important issues.

The Tsez (Nakh-Dagestanian) examples in (4) from Polinsky (2016: 319) illustrate Dixon’s observation nicely. Tsez has an ergative alignment in case and agreement, but the distribution of PRO cannot be characterized uniquely in terms of case. It is neither all-and-only ergative NPs nor all-and-only absolutive NPs that correspond to PRO. Rather, PRO corresponds to the NP that stands in the
subject function of the infinitive complement to -et- ‘want/need’, whether that NP would be ergative (4a) or absolutive (4b).2

(4) Tsez
   a. ...prο₁ [ PRO₁ gulu b-exad-a ] r-eti-n.
      ...1sg.lat PRO.erg horse.abs.iii iii-slaughter-inf .iv iv-want-nw
      ‘I need to slaughter the horse.’
   b. Đā-r₁ [ PRO₁ źek’u-de kec-a ] r-eti-n.
      1sg.lat PRO.abs man.apud sleep-inf .iv iv-want-nw
      ‘I needed to sleep with a man.’

And even in nominative–accusative languages, it is known that case and grammatical function can sometimes diverge, as famously documented for “quirky” (i.e., non-nominative) subjects in Icelandic (Andrews 1976; Zaenen et al. 1985; Sigurðsson 1991). When the subject would be dative and the object nominative, it is the subject, not the nominative NP, that is obligatorily suppressed and coreferent with a higher NP, i.e., PRO:3

(5) Icelandic (Jónsson 1996: 116)
   Jón vonast til [ að PRO lika þessa bók ].
   Jon.nom hopes for to PRO.dat like this book.nom
   ‘Jon hopes to like this book.’

The evidence from Icelandic and ergative languages provides a compelling reason to believe that it is quite generally subjecthood, not case, that determines the distribution of control effects regardless of language type.4

---

2I reproduce Polinsky’s glosses here; see Polinsky (2016: 319) on the different readings of -et- as ‘want’ versus ‘need’.

3That PRO here is indeed dative is well documented; Sigurðsson (1991) showed for example that elements which agree with the unexpressed subject, such as floating quantifiers, are obligatorily dative exactly when PRO replaces a subject that would be dative if it were overt, and analogously for all other cases.

4Legate (2008) defends a version of Case theory with its roots in the Vergnaud–Chomsky approach. Legate concedes that Case is not responsible for the distribution of PRO, but argues that there is nevertheless a connection between Case and finiteness that includes ergative languages. Space precludes a full engagement with Legate’s proposals, but it is relevant to observe that the majority of her arguments show that non-finite clauses in ergative languages distinguish absolutive subjects from absolutive objects. From this, she concludes that absolutive subjects are actually nominative (and objects aren’t), maintaining a role for Case. However, in all of the languages she considers (with an additional qualification for some, but not all, speakers of Warlpiri) the absolutive subjects pattern together with ergative subjects wherever testable, reflecting, as Dixon maintained, that it is the (possibly derived) notion of subject that is relevant for the effects considered, rather than a case category.
3 Object unification and restructuring

In the context of the quoted passage above, Dixon notes that there are two patterns shown across languages by this class of predicates. The canonical complement control pattern, in which the subjects are shared, is one such pattern. There is a second pattern, which could be described as unification or sharing of the entire argument structure of both predicates, i.e., as clause union or restructuring. In such contexts, in addition to a shared subject, if the lower predicate is transitive, the embedded object may behave in various ways as if it is the object of the matrix predicate (see Wurmbrand 2001). As we will see below, this patterning of the embedded object in a restructuring configuration will turn out to be the key to understanding the alleged Belhare counter-example to (1).

A famous example of a clause union effect, cited by Bickel & Nichols (2001), is clitic-climbing in Romance. In (6), the object clitic corresponding to the object of the subordinate clause attaches to the matrix verb *quiero* ‘I want’, in this sense behaving as if it were the matrix object.

(6) Spanish

\[
\text{Lo}=\text{quiero} \quad [\text{ ver } \text{ a Juan}]. \\
3\text{SG.M.ACC}=\text{want.1SG} \quad \text{see.INF ACC Juan} \\
\text{‘I wanted to see Juan.’}
\]

In addition to clitics, long-distance agreement in restructuring clauses is attested for languages that display object agreement. In Itelmen, the modal *utu*-‘be.unable’ may (optionally) inherit the argument structure of its complement, inflecting intransitively if the complement is intransitive (7a) or transitively, if the complement is transitive (7b):

(7) **Itelmen**

a. komma t’-utu-s-kičen \[ ƞekse-kaz \].
   
   I 1sg-be.unable-PRS-1sg.SBJ  sleep-NFIN 
   
   ‘I can’t sleep.’ (Field notes: SA6-A)

b. komma t’-utu-z-in \[ əlčqu-ɐɬ-iɬ \].
   
   I 1sg-be.unable-PRS-2sg.OBJ  see-FUT-NFIN 
   
   ‘I can’t see you.’ (Field notes: S3:19)

Note that this restructuring construction is a special case of control;\(^5\) the subjects are shared in both the transitive and intransitive contexts. A quirk of Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages is the curiously absolutive-like agreement suffix

---

\(^5\)Or raising, if modals are always raising configurations, see Wurmbrand (1999).
position on the matrix predicate: in (7b), the matrix verb inflects transitively, and the suffix agrees with the object (of the embedded clause), while in (7a), the suffix (as well as the prefix) agrees with the local subject. This is not particular to restructuring – the double agreement in intransitives is a regular feature of Chukotko-Kamchatkan verbs (Bobaljik 1998). As a result of this morphological quirk, the matrix suffix comes to agree with the object of a transitive complement, but the subject of an intransitive complement, an apparently absolutive pattern in a language that otherwise lacks an ergative alignment. But the absolutive pattern is epiphenomenal: the analysis of (7b) proposed in Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (2005) is given in (8). Subject sharing is represented, as is standard, as control (PRO) or raising (t), but this is not crucial to the argument and a representation without a null subject argument in the embedded infinitive would work just as well. What is important, following Wurmbrand (2001; 2015) and many others, is the proposal that what sets restructuring complements apart from non-restructuring complements is that the infinitival clause (α) is transparent to clause- (or phase-) bounded phenomena, such as clitic movement and agreement (and others).

(8)

The intransitive complement is represented as in (9), with the characteristic double agreement with the intransitive subject:
Again, despite the morphological pattern on the matrix subject, there is no absolutive pattern of control here. Both arguments of the embedded clause are in effect shared – the subject is controlled and the object becomes a matrix object by clause union/restructuring. The apparent absolutive alignment is an artifact of how agreement works generally in Chukotko-Kamchatkan.

Belhare, which we will turn to in the next section, also shows predicates like Itelmen *utu-*, in which transitivity of the matrix predicate is determined by the transitivity of its non-finite complement. The complement is uninflected (non-finite), and the matrix predicate agrees with the subject and with the embedded object as if it were its own:

(10) Belhare
    a. [hit mett-a ] {ka-hiu-ka / *hiu-ka } i?
       look caus-sbjv 1sg-be.able-2.s be.able-2.s Q
       'Can you show me the way?'
    b. unna han lu-ma n-lapt-he-ga i?
       3sg.erg 2sg.abs tell-inf 3.a-be.about.to-pst.2.s Q
       'Was s/he about to tell you?'

Bickel & Nichols (2001) refer to this as “agreement climbing” to highlight the parallel to clitic-climbing, citing examples from other languages as well. Their analysis is not expressed in phrase structure terms, but is directly comparable to (8). They treat the matrix predicate as a light verb whose argument structure is labile, and which thus inherits its arguments via unification with its non-finite complement, and in addition, they argue that the embedded object remains in the embedded clause, as in (8). Within the notation of Bickel & Nichols (2001), (8) corresponds to the following (their (13a)). Working up from the bottom: hir-‘be.able.to’ in (10) has a labile argument structure. In this example it is bivalent ⟨A,O⟩, which unifies with the bivalent argument structure of its complement ⟨a,o⟩ (capital versus small letters are simply for keeping track of matrix versus embedded frames). In the syntax, hir- is transitive, with A (subject) and O (object) corresponding to the shared arguments with the embedded predicates. The morphology (agreement) is faithful to the syntax, and both arguments of the embedded predicate are expressed on the matrix predicate.

(11) Morphology:                                   A   O
                             |   |
Syntax:                            A   O
                             |   |
Arg Str: ⟨a,o⟩ + ⟨A,O⟩   ⟨A=a , O=o⟩
The key correspondences among the frameworks are that subject “sharing” is implemented as control or raising and that unification is represented phrase structurally as a transparent domain (α). Object “sharing” is not represented directly in (8) although it could have been. In (8), I have represented the object as remaining in the embedded clause, and syntactically related to the matrix verb via agreement, but the transparency of the node α effectively encodes the effect that the embedded object stands in the object-of relation to both verbs simultaneously.

It is not central to the argument here that the object remain in the embedded clause, or that the subject raise – the object could raise (as in Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005) or both subject and object could in principle remain in the embedded clause with matrix agreement targeting both, as in backwards raising/control. Bickel (2004: 159-160) presents the following examples to argue that the object of a light verb remains in the embedded clause (a), while expressing it in the matrix clause (b) results in “questionable grammaticality”. This contrasts with the shared subject in a related light verb construction, which may occur in the matrix clause (c). The data provided are sparse and open to other interpretations.

(12) Belhare
   1SG tell-NFIN may-NPST-EXCL
   ‘I may be told.’

b. [t1 lu-ma ] ŋka_j nui-ʔ-ŋa.
   t1 tell-NFIN 1SG may-NPST-EXCL
   ‘I may be told.’

   tell-NFIN 1SG must-NPST-EXCL
   ‘I must tell him/her.’

To this point, everything presented has been consistent with (1). The important interim conclusion is this: control (or possibly control and raising) always involves subject sharing, with a subset of control constructions also involving a sharing-like dependency between the matrix predicate and the embedded object. The subject is always shared, and if transparency obtains, then the embedded object may also behave as local to the matrix clause.6

6It may be possible to have transparency of the infinitive without control, a point I leave for future discussion.
4 Belhare – absolutive control?

Bickel (2004) identifies a range of light verbs in Belhare, with meanings corresponding to: ‘may’, ‘must’, ‘begin’, ‘stop’, ‘finish’, ‘can’, ‘forget’, ‘know’, ‘be about to’, ‘already’, ‘be able to’, ‘want’, ‘think’. These fall squarely in the cross-linguistically expected class of raising and restructuring predicates. A number of these verbs behave as illustrated above in (10) – that is, they are unexceptional restructuring or clause union (or transitive raising) predicates: in one way or another both arguments of the embedded predicate are treated as arguments of the matrix predicate. Bickel notes in addition that two of the Belhare modal light verbs in the list above have a slightly different morphological pattern, illustrated here with nus- ‘may’:

(13)  a. Khon-ma nui-ka
     play-INF may.NPST-2.S
     ‘You may play.’

     b. Lu-ma nui-ka
     tell-INF may.NPST-2.S
     ‘I/she/he/they may tell you.’ or ‘You may be told.’
     Not: ‘You may tell someone/them.’

It is this pattern that is held to show an absolutive pattern of control, contravening (1). I understand the relevant observation to be this: the matrix predicate nui-ka ‘may’ agrees with only the 2sg argument, which corresponds to the absolutive NP in the infinitive – the subject in (13a) and the object in (13b). The ergative argument is not expressed via agreement on the modal, even when the paradigm has (non-zero) affixes to do so.

Note that the object (and subject) may be overt in the embedded clause (14), but apparently resists expression in the matrix clause, as we have seen above. Thus considering this in terms of control requires relaxing one of the canonical criteria (that the argument be obligatorily unexpressed) and that this be considered a case of “backwards control”. I return to this observation in the final section, but set it aside for now.

(14)  han lu-ma nui-ka
     2  tell-INF may.NPST-2.S
     ‘[They] may tell you.’ (Bickel 2004: 156)

So the question is: is this an absolutive pattern of control, in the sense that is relevant for (1)? Bickel & Nichols (2001) contend that it is, with specific reference
to Dixon’s quoted passage above. Following them, Malchukov (2014) refers to this pair to argue that control may, if rarely, follow an ergative alignment.

Yet Bickel’s and Nichols’s analysis of the facts gives room for pause. Syntactically, their analysis is in relevant respects analogous to the analysis of Itelmen in (8) in which the apparent ergative–absolutive pattern is a quirk of agreement morphology and not a matter of the syntax of control. Bickel (2004) and Bickel & Nichols (2001) argue that nus- in (13) shows in fact the same argument unification pattern as the other light verbs considered above in (10). What sets nus- and (on one reading) khes- ‘must’ aside from the other light verbs is a morphological quirk – although they undergo argument unification, they are morphologically deponent, a notion familiar from Latin and Greek (Baerman et al. 2007): syntactically transitive, but morphologically intransitive. More specifically, their agreement follows an absolutive alignment. Their analysis of the representation of nus- with a transitive complement, (13b) is given here:

(15) Morphology:  

| Syntax:  | Arg Str: |

| A | O |

This represents the following claims: nus- has a bivalent argument structure ⟨A,O⟩, which unifies with the bivalent argument structure of its complement ⟨a,o⟩. On their analysis, in the (line labeled) syntax, nus- is bivalent, i.e., transitive, with A (subject) and O (object) corresponding to the shared arguments with the embedded predicates. But in the morphology, where verbs like hir- in (10) would express both arguments via agreement, nus- is deponent, and only cross-references one argument, namely the absolutive (the normal pattern for a verb in an ergative alignment that cross-references a single argument, see Bobaljik 2008).7

The key observation here is that in (15), there is no ergative (or absolutive) alignment in the syntax, i.e., the portion of the notation that represents control. Leaving out the Morphology line, (15) is indistinguishable from (11). Using the same correspondences across frameworks, the phrase structure implementation

---

7Bickel & Nichols (2001) note in support of this analysis that Belhare has other deponent verbs, including experiencer predicates that take two syntactic actants but inflect intransitively and other light verbs which show the reverse morphology–syntax mismatch, inflecting transitively whether they have one or two arguments. They note also that case patterns support a deponent analysis of nus- and khes-, which would otherwise be the only instances of a transitive case array (erg–nom) with an intransitive predicate.
of Bickel and Nichol’s analysis is (16a), identical to (8) except that it lacks agreement with the transitive subject. The corresponding intransitive is given in (16b) (cf. 9).

(16) a.

Expressed in terms of phrase structure, as in (16), nothing in this pattern falls afoul of (1), as can readily be seen by examining the structures. In all relevant examples, the unexpressed, referentially dependent element in the non-finite clause is the subject. Restructuring/clause union/α transparency makes available an additional morphosyntactic dependency between the matrix predicate and the embedded object. Agreement is free to follow an ergative–absolutive pattern, even in clause-union configurations and it is independently known to do so. But (1) is not intended to be read so as to constrain agreement relations, and so no issue arises if the ergative–absolutive agreement sits atop a clause-union configuration which itself shows sharing (i.e., control) of the subject. As far as I can see, this is indeed the state of affairs that Bickel & Nichols (2001) argue for, namely, that the apparent ergative (absolutive) alignment in the Belhare control configuration is a property of the morphosyntax of agreement, not of the syntactic represen-
tation of control. The Belhare facts (and for that matter the Itelmen suffixes) challenge (1) only if the various aspects of the morphosyntactic representation are not factored out in this way, and (1) is held to range over all aspects of the representation, including agreement.

5 Postscript: Belhare control

Above, I have argued that the alleged absolutive alignment in Belhare control is an artifact of agreement morphology and not a property of the syntactic representation of control. Since Bickel observes that the “controlled” NPs are not obligatorily unexpressed, and may remain in the embedded clause in the light verb constructions, the discussion was predicated on allowing “control” to include “backwards” control, a configuration involving apparent argument-sharing, but in which the shared argument is in the embedded, not the matrix clause. As it happens, Belhare does have non-finite contexts which show a more canonical control configuration: a designated argument is obligatorily unexpressed and is coreferent with a matrix argument, i.e., PRO. These are the non-finite verb forms apparently in adverbial or purpose-clause function, marked by the suffixes -sa or -si. Under Bickel’s description, these show exactly the Tsez-like pattern expected of control in a language with an ergative case system: neither an S (absolutive) nor an A (ergative) argument may be overt, while any other argument, including the absolutive object, may be overt. The PRO gap is necessarily understood as coreferent with an argument of the matrix clause.

Andrej Malchukov asks whether the “passive” paraphrases such as ‘You may be told’ in (13b) indicates a kind of passive syntax in which the embedded object is syntactically represented as the matrix subject. Note that this is not a property of the analysis in Bickel & Nichols (2001) or Bickel (2004), nor in my translation of their analysis into phrase structural terms. In all these analyses, the embedded object remains in the embedded clause. Bickel glosses examples of this sort variously as ‘I/she/he/they may tell you,’ or ‘You may be told.’ or ‘Someone may tell you.’ Of these, the passive version seems to most closely convey the meaning of an impersonal matrix subject, but at the cost of an unfaithful rendering of the Belhare (morpho-)syntax. The passive construction in English allows you to be the subject of may, associating it with the deontic force of the modal. However, this syntax is not required. We know from English and other languages that the deontic force of a modal need not be directed to the matrix subject, as illustrated by examples such as The cookies may/must be eaten (by Paul) (Warner 1993; Wurmbrand 1999). In the absence of counter-evidence, I take it that the choice of paraphrase here represents an attempt to render the meaning in English as closely as possible, given that a literal paraphrase of this construction (with or without an overt matrix subject) would be ungrammatical in English, but that no particular syntactic analysis should be read into the paraphrase.
16 Absolutive control and absolute universals

(17) a. [ *(un) khatd-e yunŋ-sa ] mai-lur-he.
    3 bed-LOC sit-ss 1sg.u-tell-pst
    ‘He told it to me while (*he) sitting on the bed.’

b. [ *(un-chik-ŋa) dhol teĩ-sa ] la ŋŋ-us-e.
    3-nsg-erg drum beat-ss dance 3.nsg.s-dance-pst
    ‘They danced (*they) beating the drum.’ (Bickel 2004: 147)

Thus, while Belhare has a rich array of light verb constructions, some of which have intriguing agreement patterns, it also has far more canonical syntactic control constructions, with an obligatory gap (PRO), and these adhere, without any complications, to the universal pattern that it is the function subject and not a case category (nominative, absolutive, ergative, etc.) that determines which argument in a non-finite clause is subject to control.

Abbreviations

| 1 | first person | LOC | locative |
| 2 | second person | M | masculine |
| 3 | third person | NFIN | non-finite |
| III | III gender | NOM | nominative |
| IV | IV gender | NPST | non-past |
| A | agent-like argument of a canonical transitive verb | NSG | non-singular |
| ABS | absolutive | OBJ | object |
| ACC | accusative | PRS | present |
| AGR | agreement | PST | past |
| APUD | apudessive (case) | Q | question particle |
| CAUS | causative | S | single argument of a canonical intransitive verb |
| DAT | dative | SBJ | subject |
| ERG | ergative | SBJV | subjunctive |
| EXCL | exclusive | SG | singular |
| FUT | future | SS | same subject |
| INF | infinitive | U | undergoer |
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