

Attitudinal object control predicates

Barbara Stiebels (invited speaker)

University of Leipzig

barbara.stiebels@uni-leipzig.de

With the systematic exception of manipulative predicates such as *force*, most object control predicates belong to the class of attitudinal clause-embedding predicates. According to Landau (2015), attitudinal control predicate display logophoric control (in contrast to predicative control found with non-attitudinal control predicates); the controllee (PRO) in object control is interpreted *de te* – a generalization that is valid for the classes of object control predicates considered by Landau (e.g., the class of directive speech act predicates). However, not all classes of attitudinal object control (necessarily) exhibit a *de te* reading. Two classes are of special interest: predicates that denote the attribution of activities or attitudes to the object referent (e.g., German *vorwerfen* ‘reproach’, *nachsagen* ‘say of sb that’, *beschuldigen* ‘accuse of sth’) and predicates of critique/praise, which may display a factive reading in certain uses. Some predicates of these two classes exhibit a *de te* reading (e.g. *vorwerfen*), many others allow for non-*de-te* readings, in which an aboutness relation between the matrix object and the clausal argument is established. Some predicates resemble prolepsis predicates (e.g. *nachsagen*), however, differ in their argument realization from prototypical prolepsis cases in German. These two predicate classes have been analyzed as instances of “inherent control” (Stiebels 2010), requiring argument identification with all clausal complement types. However, a closer look reveals that only predicates that do not induce a RESP-relation with the clausal argument (in the sense of Farkas 1988) show strict finite control as well. Predicates that induce a RESP-relation allow for “mediated control”.

In my talk I will focus on the control properties of these two little-discussed predicate classes, demonstrating differences between the predicates (e.g., in terms of control shift and mediated control). I will also discuss cross-linguistic differences/commonalities for a small convenience sample.

References: • Farkas, D. F. 1988. On obligatory control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11. 27–58.
• Landau, I. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. • Stiebels, B. 2010. Inhärente Kontrollprädikate im Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte* 224. 391–440.