STUDIA UBB PHILOLOGIA, LXVI, 2, 2021, p. 201 - 214
(RECOMMENDED CITATION)
DOI:10.24193/subbphilo.2021.2.14

REVIEWING MINIMALIST THEORIES OF CONTROL AND A BRIEF LOOK AT ROMANIAN CONTROL

MIHAELA BUZEC[1]

ABSTRACT. ***Reviewing Minimalist Theories of Control and a Brief Look at Romanian Control.*** The phenomenon of control is a long-discussed topic within the enterprise of generative grammar. Multiple theories were composed and dismissed along with the advancement of the module, and with the development of the Minimalist program, more recent theories on control came to surface. The present article provides a review of two minimalist theories of control: the Movement Theory of Control and the Agree Model of Obligatory Control. A synopsis of one applied model of the MTC on Romanian data is also part of the paper, as is a brief commentary on the structure of Romanian control, namely an exploration of the tension between subjunctive and infinitive control complements.

Keywords: *control theories, minimalist program, Romanian control, Agree Model of Control, Movement Theory of Control*

REZUMAT. ***O recenzie a teoriilor minimaliste de control și un comentariu succint asupra fenomenului de control în limba română.*** În cadrul școlii gramaticii generative, fenomenul controlului este un subiect foarte dezbătut. Diverse teorii au fost compuse dar și respinse pe măsură ce modulul generativ a avansat, iar dezvoltarea programului minimalist a dus la apariția unor teorii noi, recente. Articolul de față prezintă o recenzie a două teorii minimaliste ale controlului: Movement Theory of Control (teoria controlului ca deplasare) și Agree Model of Obligatory Control (modelul controlului bazat pe acord). O parte secundară a lucrării de față o reprezintă un sinopsis al modelului de analiză al MTC adaptat și aplicat pe structuri din limba română. La acest rezumat se adaugă un comentariu succinct asupra structurii gramaticale a controlului în limba română, concentrat asupra tensiunii dintre conjunctiv și infinitiv în structurile de control.

Cuvinte-cheie. *teorii de control, programul minimalist, fenomenul de control în limba română, controlul ca acord, controlul ca deplasare*

[1] **Mihaela BUZEC** is a PhD student at the Babeș-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. Her main field of study is generative grammar. Buzec researches the linguistic behaviour of aphasiacs and possible correlations with the faculty of language. She has previously published articles and presented papers on Old English onomastics and kennings, linguistic relativity, and the development of hashtags in computer-mediated communication. Email: mihaela.buzec@ubbcluj.ro

Students of generative grammar coming across the notion of control might find difficulties in understanding its role and development within the enterprise. Oftentimes, control structures are defined in contrast with raising structures, the difference between the two being boiled down to the distribution of theta roles by the matrix verb. The classic examples are "John tried to kiss Mary." versus "John seemed to kiss Mary." In the first example John is perceived as both the kisser and the trier, whereas in the second example he is the kisser, but he takes no additional theta role from "seem", i. e. he is no "seemer." Although the two constructions appear very similar, they differ in a number of ways. See Table 1 for a synopsis, according to Hornstein, Nunes, and Grohmann in *Understanding Minimalism*:

Table 1.

Raising Structures	Control Structures
Subject takes a role associated with the embedded predicate.	Subject takes roles associated with both main and embedded predicate.
Expletives may occupy subject position.	Expletives may not occupy subject position.
Idiom chunks may occupy subject position.	Idiom chunks may not occupy subject position.
Voice transparent	Not voice transparent

When looking at control by itself, however, understanding it is strongly interconnected with the development of the program within which it is defined. Both the Standard Theory and Government and Binding (GB) contained accounts of control. In the first case, the proposition was that an internal rule—the Equi rule—deletes the lower John (the subject of the embedded clause), which is co-referential with a higher John, base-generated as specifier of the higher *v*P. The Standard Theory approach, although important and the basis for future research, did not stand, as it failed to explain some of the basic properties of control, such as the selection of the controller in Obligatory Control (OC) and Non-Obligatory Control (NOC) structures.

The GB Theory introduced PRO as an empty category, base-generated as specifier of the lower *v*P and anaphorically linked to John. The GB account involving PRO was an important starting point, but as more types of control were identified, more nuances needed to be added, and as such shortcomings in the theory came to surface. With the Minimalist program, both these accounts were revised, and a new analysis of control was deemed necessary. In this descriptive article, I present a synopsis of the main minimalist theories of control and an account of how an adapted framework might fit the analysis of Romanian data. The purpose of this article is to provide a basis for students of control to understand the current debate surrounding this phenomenon, especially for those looking to study Romanian control.

1. The Minimalist Context

A first account for this phenomenon within the program was that of the Null case, which posited that PRO (as understood in GB) carried an abstract null case, assigned to it by a non-finite inflection. However, this account seems to be a rather circular and non-productive justification, which only apparently solved an issue in the previous existent theory of GB. As explained in *Control as Movement*,

> once the distribution of PRO cannot be reduced to a [±tense] feature of T, null Case finds no independent motivation within the system and follows from nothing but the attested distribution of PRO. [...] In order to work, the null Case approach requires three stipulations: (i) PRO has no phonetic content; (ii) null Case must be assigned to PRO; and (iii) only PRO can bear null case. These three stipulations track but do not explain the facts under discussion. (Boeckx et al. 18)

The GB and Standard Theory versions, as well as the idea of Null case, were necessary for the identification of certain problem areas, as well as for the understanding of what needs to be explained in order for a theory on control to stand. As mentioned in *Control as Movement*, there are four aspects for which a theory on control needs to account (Boeckx et al. 7):

1) The various types of control, how they differ, and why
2) The configuration of control, as well as that of the controller and the controlee
3) The interpretation of the controlee (how the antecedent is determined and what relation obtains between the two)
4) The nature of the controlee

All of these things considered, there are at the moment two accounts in the Minimalist program which attempt to explain the phenomenon of control: the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) and the Agree Model of Obligatory Control. A synopsis of the two theories is presented below.

2. The Movement Theory of Control

As proposed by Hornstein et al, the MTC is a theory that builds on—yet at the same time departs from—the earlier accounts of control, especially those of the Government and Binding theory. This theory relies on one aspect: that control is derived from movement, and as such it is movement-dependent. The operation Move is understood in the MTC as: one element is copied and moved to another position; later in the derivation one copy is deleted[2]. The idea of

[2] Which copy is deleted differs depending on the language.

accounting for control with movement was received with skepticism, particularly as movement is what accounts for raising structures as well. However, this type of approach—to justify two different phenomena on the basis of one internal mechanism of language—has been justified within the Minimalist program. What helped the cause of this hypothesis in the case of control structures was the disposal of the Deep Structure (DS). At the DS level all thematic positions had to be filled in order for the derivation to continue, and as such, movement to a theta-position could not be postulated. Yet with Minimalism giving up on the DS, the path for a movement account of control opened up.

2.1. The MTC: Features & Proposal

Some defining characteristics of the MTC are that it "endorses a syntactic analysis of control, imposes locality restrictions on control, and sees the controller-controlee antecedence relation as parasitic on Move/Agree relations" (Hornstein and Polinsky 4). Within the theoretical framework of the MTC, three different versions have been proposed, all of which share the features mentioned above, but which differ on some essential aspects. Below is a representation of the sentence "John tried to kiss Mary" in each account:

> First account: [John [past] [John v [try [(John) to [John v [kiss Mary]]]]]]
> Second account: [John [past] [John v [try [PRO to [PRO v [kiss Mary]]]]]]
> Third account: [John [past] [John v [try [(John-DP) to [John-DP v [kiss Mary]]]]]] (Hornstein and Polinsky 2-3)

The difference between these accounts lies in the nature of the moved element. The second approach employs PRO, and the third variant relies on a doubling of the DP, which could also be a PRO. These two variants postulate this empty category PRO to account for the theta-criterion, which prevents a single DP from having two theta-roles. The second and third options are different in regard to "whether movement to a θ-position is possible; yes on version three and no on version two" (Hornstein and Polinsky 3). However, the first account renounces PRO completely and deems the theta-criterion null[3], allowing "John"

[3] Some versions retain a variant of the theta-criterion, but the reductionist MTC makes a stronger claim to propose that it is rendered obsolete specifically because it was a consequence of the existence of DS: "In GB, D-structure is the representation of the level of grammatical representation where all and only θ-roles are filled. As lexical insertion precedes movement and as all and only θ-positions can be occupied at DS the prohibition against an expression bearing multiple θ-roles follows. In other words, the relevant part of the θ-criterion is not axiomatic, but follows from how DS was conceived in GB (as well as in almost every theory before it)" (Hornstein and Polinsky 8). Consequently, "the PRO-free MTC implies that DS cannot exist. Indeed, it implies something stronger still; that the θ-criterion is not a principle of UG." (Hornstein and Polinsky 9).

to move to a theta position and receive a second thematic role. Although this idea of the MTC saw skepticism from the community, the MTC is part of the Minimalist program, and as such it seems only natural that it tries to simplify and reduce the number of conditions according to which control needs to be accounted for.

Further elaboration on the PRO-less account of the MTC is necessary. In this version, the OC PRO is treated as an A-trace, taking into consideration both its interpretative and configurational properties:

> a. It requires an antecedent
> b. Its antecedent must c-command it
> c. Its antecedent must be local
> d. It cannot appear in Case-marked positions
> e. It gets a sloppy interpretation under ellipsis
> f. It cannot have split antecedents
> g. It has an obligatory de se interpretation in "unfortunate" contexts
> h. It must receive a bound reading when linked to an only-DP (Boeckx et al., Control as Movement 39)

By employing the derivation model proposed by the MTC, all of these properties can be justified when treating PRO as a trace (result of movement). Furthermore, the MTC considers the PRO "a product of the grammar" (Boeckx et al., *Control as Movement* 44), and not a lexical category; at LF level, PRO is considered as indistinguishable from an A-trace.

Within the Minimalist program, the Bare Phrase Structure prevents lexically empty positions, since it "dispenses with the distinction between a lexical element and the position it occupies. Phrases are understood as projections of lexical items and are built through successive applications of Merge" (Boeckx et al., *Control as Movement* 44). Unlike PRO, which is considered a lexical primitive, a trace appears during the derivation as a result of computational mechanisms, and it is "not built from items of the lexicon" (Boeckx et al., *Control as Movement* 45), thus obeying the Inclusiveness Condition[4] added in the Minimalist program by Chomsky. In this account, considering the OC PRO an A-trace satisfies the Bare Phrase Structure as well.

Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes provide an answer to the four main issues (mentioned above, repeated below for ease of reading) they deemed necessary for any theory on control (*Control as Movement* 47-48):

1) The various types of control, how they differ, and why: the main type of control is Obligatory Control, as a type of A-movement which takes a DP and moves it through multiple theta-marked positions. The other type

[4] "Condition that the output of a system does not contain anything beyond its input." (according to the Utrecht Lexicon of Linguistics)

is Non-Obligatory Control, which appears in cases where movement is not possible.

2) The configuration of control, as well as that of the controller and the controlee: As an A-trace, the OC PRO (the controlee) appears as subject in non-finite clauses, whereas the controller is the head of the A-chain, and defined according to its landing position.
3) The interpretation of the controlee (how the antecedent is determined and what relation obtains between the two): OC results in an A-chain (with multiple theta-roles, but an A-chain nonetheless); as such, the controlled element is basically a locally bound anaphor; possible antecedents for the controlee are defined by the positions to which it can move.
4) The nature of the controlee: the controlee is a copy, deleted later in the derivation (and as such it has no phonological realization at PF).

2.2. Shortcomings and Problems

Given the nature of the theory—to rest the explanation of control structures on the same underlying principle as that of raising structures—a significant amount of criticism was brought to the MTC. However, those who proposed the theory reiterate frequently that the MTC is not a raising theory of control, and that as such it recognizes the differences between the structures. The principle is simply that control and raising rest on the same computational mechanism, that of movement. Much of the criticism brought to the MTC has been addressed and solutions have been offered. Nevertheless, several shortcomings remain. Landau points out a number of these: the fact that the choice of controller and the phenomenon of control shift are part of lexical semantics, the issue of "reflexive implicit control" (Landau 64), the under-generated data pertaining to the classifications of obligatory and non-obligatory control, and some lost contrasts between raising and control structures. Furthermore, the authors also address issues such as "cases where raising is not allowed, but control is", "cases in which the different morphological patterns associated with raising and control have been interpreted as showing that control constructions involve a Case-marked PRO", "control constructions involving *promise*-type verbs and control shift phenomena", as well as partial[5] and split control[6] (Boeckx et al., *Control as Movement* 103).

[5] "A partial control configuration is one where the individual denoted by the controller is a proper subset of the understood subject of the embedded clause." (Pearson 691)

[6] "In split control, the referent of the controlee coincides with the joint referent of the matrix subject and object [...] Split control generally is possible with verbs indicating a cooperative behavior but also verbs of communication, commitment, or request such as propose and ask. Split control is a type of OC." (Potsdam and Haddad 13)

An especially interesting argument against the MTC comes from Icelandic and relates to quirky case and raising-control contrasts. For a more elaborate presentation of this issue, see the case made by Bobaljik and Landau in their 2009 article and the response by Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes from 2010 (*Icelandic Control*). The issue was further reiterated in Wood's 2012 article and responses to it can be found in Drummond and Hornstein.

Another criticism that came against Hornstein's MTC is related to the fact that it analyzes control strictly from a syntactic position, whereas a comprehensive theory of control should also contain semantic (and probably pragmatic) considerations as well. Culicover and Jackendoff present a number of arguments for why the MTC is insufficient in this respect.

3. The Agree Model of Control

The Agree Model of Control was proposed mainly by Landau, and it sees control as a phenomenon that is parasitic/residual to the Agree operation. The Agree relation is actually a double one; the first operation appears between a matrix functional head and the controller DP, while the second ensues between the functional head of the matrix clause and an element from the embedded clause which carries phi-features. As such, the functional head in the matrix becomes coindexed with both the controller and the PRO, which leads to obligatory control.

3.1. The Agree Model of OC: Features & Proposal

This theory proposes that all complement types be classified according to features existent on I (inflection) and C (complementizer), more specifically [±T] and [±Agr]. These are explained as such:

- [+Agr]: overt morphological agreement
- [-Agr]: abstract agreement (as in infinitives)
- [+T]: semantic tense (may/may not be overt tense morphology)
- [-T]: absence of semantic tense (embedded tense is anaphoric to matrix tense)

Besides these features, the Agree Model wishes to distinguish between referentially dependent and referentially independent entities: [+R] (*pro*, overt DPs) and [-R] (PRO). The rule which Landau proposes for R-assignment is the following (Landau 67):

[+T, +Agr] → [+T, +Agr, +R]
[-T, +Agr] → [-T, +Agr, -R]
[+T, -Agr] → [+T, -Agr, -R]
[-T, -Agr] → [-T, -Agr, -R]

This helps account for the control status of clauses, with the Agree relation between DPs with [R] (inherent) and the [R] on I or C (derivative). Where the I or C exhibit [+R], they would require an overt DP or a *pro*, whereas an I or C with [-R] would require a local PRO. As Landau points out, "[t]he interesting generalization that emerges is that "fully specified clauses" – typically, indicatives – would never exhibit OC, but any type of "partially specified" clause might" (Landau 67). Note that this rule is only applicable where there are both [T] and [Agr] features, and if one of them is missing, it does not apply.

This Agree-based model explains OC and is especially concerned with partial control and finite control[7]. With this approach, although PRO is still in use, it is not considered a result of government and it is not explained based on case considerations, but rather on multiple Agree relations. The underlying model simplifies the approach to PRO, considering it the "elsewhere case", whereas DPs and *pro* are considered "natural cases" (Landau 67). The case of PRO is also explained through the nature of its Agree relation with the matrix probe (direct or indirect Agree – via C).

3.2. Shortcomings and Problems

One of the problems of this approach is that is relies on composite Agree relations, which complicate the explanations and require additional justifications for more specific problems. As Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes explain,

> the technical apparatus rests on various stipulations regarding the properties of features needed to track the distribution and interpretation of PRO and on composite agreement relations that are not independently motivated and lead to overgeneration. (Control as Movement 30)

Landau also explains some additional shortcomings of the theory, including its lack of insight into backward control and copy control, as well as the impossibility to properly explain split control, and the fact that "its reliance on elaborate feature specifications is not always perfectly matched by overt morphology" (Landau 68). We will further see that especially when it comes to Romanian data, the Agree Model cannot provide a satisfactory framework for the analysis of control (especially backward control).

4. Romanian Control

Romanian is a *pro*-drop language with a rich morphology. In control situations, the subject can originate in a number of positions, and the sentence

[7] Control structures with finite embedded clauses.

remains grammatical, which contrasts with other languages—English, for instance—where the "shared argument is constrained to a matrix clause position" (Alboiu 6). This is a phenomenon called backward control, specifically because in these cases, the controlee is the one that retains the phonetical form, while the controller is silent. Because of these aspects, it has been tough to properly classify Romanian obligatory control and to place it within the parameters of only one theory. However, in her work "Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising", Alboiu presents some of the main aspects to be considered when discussing Romanian control, as well as an adopted version of the MTC which seems to properly fit Romanian data. I synthesize some of her findings here, but not before tackling an issue related to the structure of Romanian control constructions.

In Alboiu's study, she focuses on subjunctive OC complements, yet in the literature there is mention and frequent analysis of Romanian infinitival OC complements as well. Since infinitive shows no overt morphological agreement markers, these cases prove more difficult to insert in the described analysis. However, I have found that recently infinitival control complements have begun to fall out of use. Scientific curiosity pushed me to explore this issue further.

4.1. Are infinitival OC complements falling out of use?

A survey[8] testing the acceptability of different sentences was carried out on 158 native speakers (L1) of Romanian and 3 speakers with L2 Romanian. The acceptability test featured a set of equivalent sentences with infinitival and subjunctive complements, with one additional condition across the board: 1st person subject and 3rd person subject. The six matrix predicates selected for testing were: "a încerca" (to try), "a începe" (to start), "a fi capabil" (to be able), "a hotărî" (to decide), "a se gândi" (to think (about/of something)), "a urî" (to hate). To diminish the mere exposure effect the test also featured fillers, which are not part of the analysis. As fillers I have also included test sentences to evaluate how well the respondents understand the evaluation scale; some were grammatically incorrect, some were semantically incoherent, others were perfectly acceptable from all standpoints. In order to randomize the sets of sentences to make sure the respondents were not simply getting used to a pattern, I first used the Latin square technique to distribute the sets, then I also randomized according to a random number. For the demographics, I gathered data on the age, gender, mother tongue, knowledge of other languages, the area in which respondents live, and the area in which they grew up.[9] The test asked respondents to evaluate sentences on a scale of one to three, where:

[8] The survey was part of my MA dissertation thesis. I present here a short summary.

[9] For reasons of space, these data points are not presented here. Should anyone be interested in these results, please contact the author of the paper via email.

1 - nu am auzit şi nu aş folosi propoziţia (e incorectă după standardele mele)
2 - am auzit, dar nu aş folosi propoziţia
3 - am auzit şi aş folosi propoziţia[10]

The tension which was created in the test and reflected in the results was infinitive control versus subjunctive control. The results for the evaluation of each sentence are presented in Table 2:

Table 2

Sentence[11]	Count of 1	Count of 2	Count of 3	Average score	Mode
M-am gândit a pleca eu însămi la mare.	99	55	7	1.428571429	1
Oana s-a gândit a pleca ea însăşi la mare.	97	56	8	1.447204969	1
M-am gândit a pleca la mare.	88	64	9	1.50931677	1
Oana s-a gândit a pleca la mare.	96	60	5	1.434782609	1
Urăsc să stau singur în cameră.	2	7	152	2.931677019	3
Alex urăşte să stea singur în cameră.	5	12	144	2.863354037	3
Urăsc să stau în cameră.	2	4	155	2.950310559	3
Alex urăşte să stea în cameră.	2	14	145	2.888198758	3
Urăsc a sta singură în cameră.	65	75	21	1.726708075	2
Oana urăşte a sta singură în cameră.	75	70	16	1.633540373	1
Urăsc a sta în cameră.	66	79	16	1.689440994	2
Oana urăşte a sta în cameră.	78	74	9	1.571428571	1
Am încercat să gătesc.	2	1	158	2.968944099	3
Alex a încercat să gătească.	4	3	154	2.931677019	3
Am încercat a găti.	75	72	14	1.621118012	1
Oana a încercat a găti.	92	66	3	1.447204969	1
Am început să citesc cartea.	1	3	157	2.968944099	3
Alex a început să citească cartea.	5	15	141	2.844720497	3
Am început a citi cartea.	58	85	18	1.751552795	2
Oana a început a citi cartea.	62	84	15	1.708074534	2
Sunt capabil să merg la magazin.	16	31	114	2.608695652	3

[10] 1 – Never heard it & would not use it
2 – I have heard it, but I would not use it
3 – I have heard it & I would use it (author's translation)

[11] For reasons of space, the glosses for these sentences are not part of the article. Should anyone need access to them, please reach out to the author of the paper via email.

Sentence[11]	Count of 1	Count of 2	Count of 3	Average score	Mode
Alex e capabil să meargă la magazin.	12	37	112	2.621118012	3
Sunt capabilă a merge la magazin.	75	72	14	1.621118012	1
Oana e capabilă a merge la magazin.	94	58	9	1.472049689	1
M-am hotărât să merg eu însumi la magazin.	26	82	53	2.167701863	2
Alex s-a hotărât să meargă el însuşi la magazin.	26	63	72	2.285714286	3
Am hotărât să merg la magazin.	6	7	148	2.881987578	3
Alex a hotărât să meargă la magazin.	10	13	138	2.795031056	3
M-am hotărât a merge eu însămi la magazin.	79	67	15	1.602484472	1
Oana s-a hotărât a merge ea însăşi la magazin.	86	62	13	1.546583851	1
Am hotărât a merge la magazin.	76	76	9	1.583850932	1, 2
Oana a hotărât a merge la magazin.	96	59	6	1.440993789	1
M-am gândit să plec eu însumi la mare.	52	75	34	1.888198758	2
Alex s-a gândit să plece el însuşi la mare.	42	80	39	1.98136646	2
M-am gândit să plec la mare.	5	1	155	2.931677019	3
Alex s-a gândit să plece la mare.	0	7	154	2.956521739	3

At any point in the development of a language, it is likely for co-existent structures to fulfil the same function, until the point where one is preferred over the other and replaces it completely. What we witness with the change from infinitive to subjunctive might build up to this point as well. Looking at the results of this survey, sentences with infinitival constructions scored lower across the board. For example, the sentence "M-am gândit a pleca la mare." had a count of 88 one scores, and a total of 73 of two and three scores combined.

m-	am	gândit	a	pleca	la	mare
CL.1SG	AUX.PAST.1SG	thought	INF	leave	to	seaside

I thought of going to the seaside.

Contrastively, the subjunctive counterpart of this example, "M-am gândit să plec la mare.", had a total of 5 one scores and 156 two plus three scores.

m-	am	gândit	să	plec	la	mare
CL.1SG	AUX.PAST.1SG	thought	SUBJ	leave	to	seaside

I thought of going to the seaside.

These sentences are simple constructions, with no overt markings that could inflict bias (such as gender markings), so the correlation would be that their low score is the result of the infinitive, considering that similar sentences with subjunctive complements were rated as perfectly acceptable.

Although stating that infinitival control complements are definitively out of use is incorrect at this moment—since correlation is not causation—the test seems to show the native speakers' preference of the subjunctive over the infinitive in these contexts. If this tendency continues, the subjunctive control complements will become the norm in the natural language use. Now I turn back to an analysis of Romanian data against a minimalist framework for the study of control.

4.2. Romanian Control Constructions and the MTC

The following is a synopsis of Alboiu's proposal for Romanian data. Firstly, considering the fact that Romanian allows for backward control, the accounts based on PRO—as well as restructuring theories—are deemed infelicitous. Alboiu proposes that a version of a reductionist theory based on the MTC as elaborated by Hornstein could be appropriate for Romanian. There are some questions to be considered, for a proper account of Romanian control: "(i) Where does the DP subject originate? (ii) Is movement involved? and if so, (iii) What factors determine pronunciation site? (iv) Is there any genuine evidence for PRO or *pro*?" (Alboiu 7). The conclusion Alboiu reaches is that the proper analysis borrows "insights from Hornstein (1999 et seq.) but differs from that approach in at least two ways: […] theta-roles can be satisfied simply by chain formation without any dislocation, and […] A-chains cannot cross phasal CP boundaries" (36). In this analysis, theta-roles are validated simply through the operation Agree as feature-checking, and not necessarily under the condition of sisterhood. Furthermore, another important distinction is that case valuation does not fall under the domain of T, but it is a property of phasal domains. According to her proposal, "OC subjunctives are non-phasal, and, consequently temporally unsaturated domains" (Alboiu 20), which explains why a DP which is first selected from Numeration to merge with the lower VP will satisfy the uninterpretable theta-feature of the embedded *v* but will remain caseless, and therefore still be available for selection by further Agree operations. A second Agree operation which this DP can enter occurs when the matrix *v* merges with the higher VP (which takes as complement the CP/TP, the embedded clause) and it also has an unvalued theta-role to assign; it acts as a probe and selects the DP for valuation. However, the matrix functional head will have an interpretable [T] feature and as such it will be able to select the DP and assign it case, validating its need and rendering it unelectable for future Agree operations.

Another critical point is made in this work, related to Landau's critique on Hornstein's theory: the account of partial control. Although problematic for English and other languages, the problem of partial control does not apply to Romanian, which seems to only exhibit cases of exhaustive control in OC cases. The following examples are given by Alboiu to prove this point:

a. * Eu vreau [să plec împreună]
I want. PRES.1SG [SBJ leave.1SG together]
b. * Vreau [să plecăm eu împreună]
want.PRES.1SG [SBJ leave.1PL I together]
c. Eu vreau [să plecăm x împreună]
I want.PRES.1SG [SBJ leave.1PL x together]
'I want to leave together. (Alboiu 10-11)

Because of the overt morphological realization of Agree in Romanian, any semantic plurality is reflected in the syntax. As such, "syntactic plurality can only be guaranteed by formal feature checking against a plural value" (Alboiu 11), meaning that the embedded subject in the *c* example above would have to be a *pro*, which takes the sentence out of the scope of obligatory control. These examples also offer a classification of Romanian control, which is reduced to two cases: obligatory control (with verbs such as aspectuals, implicatives) and non-obligatory control (with verbs such as desideratives).

5. Conclusions

As theories still in progress, both the Movement Theory of Control and the Agree Model of Obligatory Control need the back-and-forth communication with the scientific community, in order to address crucial problems and identify more areas which cross-linguistically raise issues. The theories are not yet fully defined, just as the phenomenon of control is not yet fully understood. However, in order to approach the subject, one needs to be aware of the history of control theories, their development, and the current state of the research on the topic. This article presented a systematic review of the two theories mentioned above, comprising the main features, as well as shortcomings of both. Additionally, a look at one possible model of analyzing Romanian data against a minimalist framework was provided for the discussion on Romanian control, with a supplementary note on the structure of Romanian control based on an acceptability test performed on native speakers.

WORKS CITED

Alboiu, Gabriela. "Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising." *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*, edited by William Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, Springer, 2007, pp. 187-211.

Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Idan Landau. "Icelandic Control is not A-movement: The Case from Case." *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2009, pp. 113-32.

Boeckx, Cedric et al. *Control as Movement*. Cambridge UP, 2010.

---. "Icelandic control really is A-movement: Reply to Bobaljik and Landau." *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2010, pp. 111-30.

Culicover, Peter, and Ray Jackendoff. "Control Is Not Movement." *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2001, pp. 493-512.

Drummond, Alex, and Norbert Hornstein. "Some Purported Problems for the Movement Theory of Control." *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2014, pp. 449-62.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Maria Polinsky. "Control as movement: Across languages and constructions." *Movement Theory of Control*, edited by Norbert Hornstein and Maria Polinsky. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010, pp. 1-44.

Hornstein, Norbert et al. *Understanding Minimalism*. Cambridge UP, 2012.

Landau, Idan. *Control in Generative Grammar. A Research Companion*. Cambridge UP, 2013.

Pearson, Hazel. "The Semantics of Partial Control." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 34, 2016, pp. 691-738.

Potsdam, Eric, and Youssef Haddad. *Control Phenomena*. <www.people.clas.ufl.edu/potsdam/files/Potsdam-Haddad-2017.pdf>. Accessed 21 Nov 2020.

The Utrecht Lexicon of Linguistics. Edited by Johan Kerstens, Eddy Ruys, and Joost Zwarts. n.d. <www.lexicon.hum.uu.nl/>. Accessed 03 May 2020.

Wood, Jim. "Against the Movement Theory of Control: Another Argument from Icelandic." *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 43, no. 2, 2012, pp. 322-30.