

## Chapter 2

### Assamese Adjunct Control: A descriptive overview

#### 1. Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed description of the phenomenon of Adjunct Control in Assamese. The focus is on subject control into conjunctive participle or adverbial clauses. To set the scene, the chapter also outlines the aspects of Assamese morphosyntax that are relevant to the phenomenon in question.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 offers a general linguistic overview of Assamese. Section 3 presents a descriptive survey of Case, especially as it relates to subject NPs. Section 4 briefly describes finite clauses in Assamese, with a special focus on agreement. Section 5 delineates the characteristics of nonfinite clauses, drawing a distinction between nonfinite subordinate clauses that do not enforce a control interpretation and conjunctive participle clauses that do. Section 6 highlights the different types of Adjunct Control that are allowed in the language. These are Forward Control (Section 6.1), Backward Control (Section 6.2), and Copy Control (Section 6.3). Exceptions to the phenomenon are presented in Section 6.4. Section 7 summarizes the chapter.

#### 2. Linguistic overview

Assamese is a head-final, SOV language (Goswami and Tamuli 2003). It is also a subject pro-drop language in which overt subjects and *pro* are interchangeable. That is, both (1a) and (1b) are grammatical.

- (1) a.        *xi*                    *azi*    *ratipuwa*            *Proxad-ɔk*  
              he.NOM            this    morning               Proxad-ACC  
              *e-khɔn*                *kitab*    *dil-e*  
              one-CL                book    gave-3  
              ‘He gave Proxad a book this morning.’

- b.     *pro*            *azi*     *ratipuwa*     *Prɔxad-ɔk*  
           *pro*            this     morning        Proxad-ACC  
           *e-khɔn*       *kitab*   *dil-e*  
           one-CL     book    gave-3  
           ‘He gave Proxad a book this morning.’

Although the canonical word order in Assamese is SOV, OSV is also possible. In fact, apart from the position of the verb, which is usually fixed, any constituent can be sentence-initial in a topic position, as the sentences in (2) demonstrate.

- (2) a.     *Ram-e*            *azi*     *ratipuwa*     *Prɔxad-ɔk*  
           *Ram-NOM*     this     morning        Proxad-ACC  
           *e-khɔn*       *kitab*   *dil-e*  
           one-CL     book    gave-3  
           ‘Ram gave Proxad a book this morning.’
- b.     *azi ratipuwa Ram-e Prɔxad-ɔk e-khɔn kitab dil-e*  
 c.     *Prɔxad-ɔk Ram-e azi ratipuwa e-khɔn kitab dil-e*  
 d.     *e-khɔn kitab Ram-e azi ratipuwa Prɔxad-ɔk dil-e*

The immediate preverbal position is a focus position. For example, the subject in (3a) may occupy preverbal position for emphatic purposes, as (3b) illustrates. At the same time, question words, which are focal elements, occupy preverbal position, (3c). Note, however, that question words may also be pronounced in situ, (3d).

- (3) a.     *Ram-e*            *mor*     *ghɔr-to*            *bhɔɳil-e*  
           *Ram-NOM*     my     house-CL         destroy-3  
           ‘Ram destroyed my house.’
- b.     *mor*     *ghɔr-to*            *Ram-e*            *bhɔɳil-e*  
           my     house-CL         *Ram-NOM*         destroyed-3  
           ‘No one but Ram destroyed my house.’
- c.     *mor*     *ghɔr-to*            *kone*            *bhɔɳil-e*  
           my     house-CL         who.NOM         destroyed-3  
           ‘Who destroyed my house?’

- d. *kone mor għor-to bħaŋil-e*  
 who.NOM my house-CL destroyed-3  
 ‘Who destroyed my house?’

The following section delineates the main characteristics of Case in Assamese, focusing mainly on the Case of the subject.

### 3. Case in Assamese: A descriptive overview

Case in Assamese is a morphological and syntactic category. Morphologically, Assamese Case-marking is agglutinative in nature. Syntactically, an NP must inflect for Case in order to be used in a sentence; its inflection determines its function (Masica 1991: 230–236; Goswami and Tamuli 2003: 319).

Since this study is concerned with subject control into adjuncts, the focus in the following sections is mainly on the Case of subject NPs. These can be Structural Case-marked (e.g., nominative) or Inherent Case-marked (e.g., genitive). Structural Case is associated with grammatical relationships. For example, although the subject of passive constructions in English is a theme, it is Structural Case-marked nominative. Inherent Case, on the other hand, is associated with theta-roles. For instance, an experiencer subject NP – that is, an NP whose physical or emotional state the predicate describes – is genitive in Assamese.

Assamese is a nominative-accusative language (contra Amritavalli and Sarma 2002). The subject in Assamese may be Case-marked nominative, absolutive, accusative, or genitive (Goswami 1982; Nath 2001; Goswami and Tamuli 2003). And as we will see shortly, nominative is further split into two categories: nominative and experiential nominative. Assamese Case-marked NPs display minimum morphophonemic variation, although pronouns seem to be more susceptible to such variation, as Table 2-1 shows.

*Table 2-1.* Some types of case in Assamese

Case	Form	‘man-CL-case’	‘he’
Nominative	-e/Ø	<i>manuħi-zøn-e</i>	<i>xi</i>
Absolutive	-Ø	<i>manuħi-zøn-Ø</i>	<i>xi</i>
Accusative	-(o)k	<i>manuħi-zøn-øk</i>	<i>ta-k</i>
Genitive	-ør	<i>manuħi-zøn-ør</i>	<i>ta-r</i>

Nominative subjects occur with transitive predicates, (4), and unergative predicates, (5). Absolutive subjects occur with unaccusative predicates, (6).

- (4) a. *Ram-e kotha-to xunil-e*  
 Ram-NOM news-CL heard-3  
 ‘Ram heard the news.’
- b. *kukur-to-e Proxad-ɔk kamuril-e*  
 dog-CL-NOM Proxad-ACC bit-3  
 ‘The dog bit Proxad.’
- c. *Ram-e safi bɔnal-e*  
 Ram-NOM tea made-3  
 ‘Ram made tea.’
- d. *manuɸi-to-e dɔrob lol-e*  
 man-CL-NOM medicine took-3  
 ‘The man took medication.’
- e. *suali-zɔni-e tair boyfriend-ɔk dekhil-e*  
 girl-CL-NOM her boyfriend-ACC saw-3  
 ‘The girl saw her boyfriend.’
- (5) a. *Ram-e nasil-e*  
 Ram-NOM danced-3  
 ‘Ram danced.’
- b. *manuɸi-to-e dɔur-e*  
 man-CL-NOM runs-3  
 ‘The man runs.’
- c. *lora-to-e khal-e*  
 boy-the-NOM ate-3  
 ‘The boy ate.’
- d. *Ram-e xaturil-e*  
 Ram-NOM swam-3  
 ‘Ram swam.’

- (6) a. *Prøxad xui thakil*  
 Proxad.ABS sleep kept  
 ‘Proxad fell asleep.’
- b. *bofiut manufi möril*  
 many people.ABS died  
 ‘Many people died.’
- c. *Ram afil*  
 Ram.ABS came  
 ‘Ram arrived.’
- d. *Sarita poril*  
 Sarita.ABS fell  
 ‘Sarita fell down.’

Accusative subjects, on the other hand, are a rare phenomenon. They occur only “with the verb *lag* ‘want/need’, which is invariably in the third person” (Goswami and Tamuli 2003: 432). Sentences (7a–b) are examples. Note, however, that (7c) is an alternative with a nominative subject. Accusative subjects will not be discussed in this monograph.

- (7) a. *Ram-øk tØka lag-e*  
 Ram-ACC money want-3  
 ‘Ram wants/needs money.’
- b. *Sarita-k ei-to gari lag-e*  
 Sarita-ACC this-CL car want-3  
 ‘Sarita wants this car.’
- c. *Ram-e pani bisaril-e*  
 Ram-NOM water wanted-3  
 ‘Ram wanted water.’

Genitive subjects occur with experiential predicates. They are experiencers whose emotional or physical state the predicate describes, (8).

- (8) a. *Ram-ør khøŋ uthil*  
 Ram-GEN anger raised  
 ‘Ram got angry.’

- b. *Ram-Ør*      *thanda*      *lagil*  
 Ram-GEN      cold      felt  
 ‘Ram felt cold.’
- c. *tar*      *phurti*      *lagil*  
 he.GEN      exhilaration      felt  
 ‘He felt very happy.’
- d. *manuñ-to-r*      *ga*      *bea*      *ñol*  
 man-CL-GEN      body      bad      became  
 ‘The man got sick.’
- e. *suali-zØni-r*      *laz*      *lagil*  
 girl-CL-GEN      shy      felt  
 ‘The girl felt shy.’
- f. *kukur-to-r*      *bñiøe*      *lagil*  
 dog-CL-GEN      fear      felt  
 ‘The dog felt scared.’

In addition, genitive subjects show up in constructions for “inalienable” and “alienable” possessions, as (9) and (10) illustrate (Nath 2001: 21, (20)–(21)).

(9) *Inalienable possession*

- Ram-Ør*      *du-khØn*      *ñat*      *ase*  
 Ram-GEN      two-CL      hands      has  
 ‘Ram has two hands.’

(10) *Alienable possession*

- a. *Ram-Ør*      *du-to*      *laguwa*      *asil*  
 Ram-GEN      two-CL      servant      had  
 ‘Ram had two servants.’
- b. *mor*      *e-ta*      *kukur*      *ase*  
 I.GEN      one-CL      dog      have  
 ‘I have a dog.’

Assamese predicates do not show agreement in nonnominative subject constructions. Proof that genitive subjects are in fact subjects comes from

two sources. First, they function as antecedents to anaphors, (11). Second, they function as the unpronounced arguments in control structures, (12).

- (11) *Ram-Ør*      *niz-Ør*      *uporot*      *khøj*    *uthil*  
 Ram-GEN      self-GEN      above/on      anger    raised  
 ‘Ram got angry with himself.’
- (12) *Ram-e<sub>i</sub>*      [ $\Delta_i$ ]      *thanda*      *lagabo]*  
 Ram-NOM      [ $\Delta$ .GEN      cold      feeling]  
*ni-bisar-e*  
 NEG-want-3  
 ‘Ram doesn’t want to feel cold.’

A further note on experiencer subjects is in order for the purpose of this study. Compare the sentences in (13). While (13a) and (13b) are somewhat synonymous, (13b) implies a more conscious effort on the part of the subject. Using *kør* ‘do’ renders the subject more volitional. The same observation applies to (14a–b).

- (13) a. *Ram-Ør*      *e-ta*      *buddfi*      *khelal*  
 Ram-GEN      one-CL      idea      played  
 ‘Ram got an idea.’ OR ‘An idea occurred to Ram.’
- b. *Ram-e*      *e-ta*      *buddfi*      *køril-e*  
 Ram-NOM      one-CL      idea      did-3  
 ‘Ram did/planned an idea.’
- (14) a. *Ram-Ør*      *phurti*      *lagil*  
 Ram-GEN      exhilaration      felt  
 ‘Ram felt very happy.’
- b. *Ram-e*      *phurti*      *køril-e*  
 Ram-NOM      exhilaration      did-3  
 ‘Ram celebrated/partied.’

To elaborate, experiential predicates with *kør* ‘do’ allow expressions like ‘on purpose’ or ‘knowingly’, as (15a) and (16a) illustrate. The same expressions make sentences with nonvolitional experiential predicates unacceptable, (15b) and (16b).

- (15) a. *Ram-e*      *janibuji*      *e-ta*      *buddfi*  
 Ram-NOM      knowingly      one-CL      idea  
*kɔril-e*  
 did-3  
 ‘Ram got an idea on purpose.’  
 Also meaning ‘Ram knowingly tricked someone.’
- b. \**Ram-ɔr*      *janibuji*      *e-ta*      *buddfi khelal*  
 Ram-GEN      knowingly      one-CL      idea      played  
 ‘An idea occurred to Ram on purpose.’
- (16) a. *Ram-e*      *janibuji*      *khɔŋ*      *kɔril-e*  
 Ram-NOM      knowingly      anger      did-3  
 ‘Ram got angry on purpose.’  
 Meaning ‘Ram knowingly expressed his anger.’
- b. \**Ram-ɔr*      *janibuji*      *khɔŋ*      *uthil*  
 Ram-GEN      knowingly      anger      did  
 ‘Ram angered on purpose.’

Nevertheless, this observation does not deprive the nominative subjects in (13b) and (14b), as well as in (15a) and (16a), of being experiencers on a par with their genitive counterparts. According to Abbi (1991), experiential predicates can be divided into at least three categories: State Experiential, Process Experiential, and Stative Action Process Experiential. The first and second types describe a physical, mental, or emotional state (e.g., ‘be hungry’ or ‘get hungry’). The last type indicates that “an experiencer is in a certain state or condition with respect to an action undertaken by himself. In this respect, it is always reflexive” (pp. 255–256).

Given Abbi’s remarks, *khɔŋ uthil* ‘anger raised’ and *phurti lagil* ‘exhilaration felt’ can be classified as state or process predicates that Case-mark their subjects genitive. The predicates *khɔŋ kɔrile* ‘anger did’ and *phurti kɔrile* ‘exhilaration did’, on the other hand, are Stative Action Process Experiential predicates that Case-mark their subject experiential nominative. The two types of predicates differ in meaning: *khɔŋ uthil* ‘anger raised’ and *phurti lagil* ‘exhilaration felt’ simply mean ‘get angry’ and ‘feel happy’ respectively, while *khɔŋ kɔrile* ‘anger did’ and *phurti kɔrile* ‘exhilaration did’ mean ‘express one’s anger’ (e.g., yell) and ‘celebrate’. The Case assigned by either type of predicate is related to the theta-role experiencer regardless of the morphological form. The reason why experiential nomina-



tive subjects are not considered simply nominative is based on empirical grounds. The two types of nominative subjects exhibit different behaviors in Adjunct Control structures, as we will see in Section 6.3.

The following section briefly describes finite clauses in Assamese. The focus is mainly on the agreement behavior of finite predicates.

#### 4. Finite clauses in Assamese

Finite clauses in Assamese contain verbs that are inflected for aspect, tense, and agreement, in this order. There are three types of aspect in Assamese: imperfective *-is*, habitual *-Ø*, and perfective. The perfective collapses with the simple past into one portmanteau morpheme *-il*. Tense is also divided into three categories: past *-il*; present, which is associated with the stem itself; and future *-ib*. Regarding agreement, verbs inflect for person (1st, 2nd, and 3rd) and honorificity (only 2nd person is [+ , −, or Ø honorific]). Assamese verbs do not inflect for gender or number. For example, all the forms of the verb *likh* ‘to write’ in (17) may be used in a finite clause to agree with a 3rd person, singular or plural, feminine or masculine subject. The variation in (17c) and (17e) is morphophonological (Goswami and Tamuli 2003: 422–423).<sup>1</sup>

- (17) a. *likh-Ø-e*  
write-HABITUAL-3  
‘she/he/they write(s)’
- b. *likh-ib-a*  
write-FUT-3  
‘she/he/they will write’
- c. *likh-is-e*  
write-IMPERFECTIVE-3  
‘she/he/they has/have written’
- d. *likh-il-e*  
write-PAST-3  
‘she/he/they wrote’

- e. *likh-is-il-Ø*  
 write-IMPERFECTIVE-PAST-3  
 ‘she/he/they had written’

Variation in tense and/or aspect in finite clauses does not have an effect on Adjunct Control. This is why most of the examples of Adjunct Control will exhibit one tense form: the past. The following section provides a descriptive overview of nonfinite subordinate clauses. The focus is on adjuncts.

## 5. Nonfinite clauses in Assamese

Assamese has two types of nonfinite subordinate clauses that function as adjuncts. The first type is what I will refer to as infinitive clauses (INF clauses). The second type is known as adverbial clauses or conjunctive participle clauses (CNP clauses) (Lindholm 1975; Klaiman 1981). Section 5.1 deals with INF clauses. Section 5.2 delineates the characteristics of CNP clauses, which are the chief domain of investigation of this study.

### 5.1. Infinitive clauses in Assamese

An INF clause in Assamese contains a nonfinite verb. It may also have an overt subject that is Case-marked like the subject of a finite clause.

The subordinate nonfinite verb may take several forms, depending on the intended meaning. Following are three examples. The first form in (18) is a nominal or gerundive form that is Case-marked like any noun phrase. It is followed by an overt complementizer when used in an INF clause. The forms in (19) and (20), on the other hand, do not take an overt complementizer. All three forms have the same characteristics with respect to control: no control interpretation is required. That is, the subject of an INF clause does not have to be coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause.

- (18) Nominal: Verb stem + *-a*
- a. *thak-a* ⇒ ‘keeping’
- b. *thak-a-r karone* ⇒ ‘because of keeping’

c. *[Ram-ɔr tini-ta loguwa*  
 [Ram-GEN three-CL servant  
*thak-a-r karone] xi/tar ghoiniyak-e*  
 keep-INF-GEN because] he.NOM/his wife-NOM  
*ghɔr-ɔr kam na-kɔr-e*  
 house-GEN work NEG-do-3  
 ‘Because Ram has three servants, he/his wife doesn’t do housework.’

b. *[lora-to-e bfialkoi nas-a-r*  
 [boy-CL-NOM well dance-INF-GEN  
*karone] tar mak-ɔr bfiat lagil*  
 because] his mother-GEN good felt  
 ‘Because the boy danced well, his mother felt good.’

(19) Contingent: Verb stem + *-ɔte*

a. *kha-ɔte* ⇒ ‘while eating’

b. *[Ram-e bfiat kha-ɔte]*  
 [Ram-NOM rice eat-INF]  
*xi Proxad-ɔk gai thaka xunil-e*  
 he.NOM Proxad-ACC sing keep heard-3  
 ‘While Ram was eating rice, he heard Proxad singing.’

c. *[Ram-e ga-ɔte] Proxad-e nasil-e*  
 [Ram-NOM sing-INF] Proxad-NOM danced-3  
 ‘While Ram was singing, Proxad danced.’

(20) Future conditional: Verb stem + *-(i)le*

a. *kɔr-ile* ⇒ ‘if one does’

b. *[Ram-e ga-ile] Proxad-e nasib-a*  
 [Ram-NOM sing-INF] Proxad-NOM will dance-3  
 ‘If Ram sings, Proxad will dance.’

c. *[Proxad-ɔr bfiok lag-ile] xi*  
 [Proxad-GEN hunger strike/feel-INF] he.NOM  
*bfiat khaib-ɔ*  
 rice will eat-3  
 ‘If Proxad is hungry, he will eat rice.’

The following section introduces another type of Assamese subordinate clause: the conjunctive participle or CNP clause.

### 5.2. Conjunctive participle clauses in Assamese

Conjunctive participle clauses in the Indian subcontinent are a defining characteristic that South Asian languages inherited from Sanskrit (Dwari-kesh 1971). In Assamese, as in most South Asian languages, CNP clauses are nonfinite clauses with no (overt) complementizer.

Although the CNP clause and the matrix clause might have a cause-effect relation, they can be fairly translated into English as two clauses joined by *and*. Despite this conjunctive nature, however, CNP clauses behave like adverbial subordinate clauses – for example, unlike conjuncts, they may be embedded within another clause whose predicate they functionally modify – which is why they are considered adverbial participle clauses or adjuncts (see, e.g., Haspelmath 1995; Jayaseelan 2004; Masica 2005: 110).

Assamese CNP verbs have a single form, presented in (21a). Note that the relation between the CNP clause and the matrix clause may be causal, (21b–d). Alternatively, the CNP clause may depict an event that is anterior to or simultaneous with that of the finite clause, (21e) (see Jansen 2004 for a similar observation).

- (21) Verb stem + *-i*
- a.     *thak-i*                   ⇒     ‘keeping,       having       kept’
- b.     *Ram-e*                    [*xɔmɔi*            *na-thak-i*]  
        Ram-NOM               [time             NEG-keep-CNP]  
        *bfiat*                   *na-khal-e*  
        rice                    NEG-ate-3  
        ‘Having no time, Ram didn’t eat rice.’
- c.     *Ram*                     [*bfiagɔr*         *lag-i*]               *xui*  
        Ram.ABS               [exhaustion     feel-CNP]         sleep  
        *thakil*  
        kept  
        ‘Having felt exhausted, Ram fell asleep.’

- d. *Ram-Ør* [train dñoribo na-ar-i]  
 Ram-GEN [train catch NEG-able-CNP]  
*khØŋ uthil*  
 anger raised  
 ‘Not being able to catch the train, Ram got angry.’
- e. *Ram-e* [kam-to kØr-i] *safi khal-e*  
 Ram-NOM [job-CL do-CNP] tea ate-3  
 ‘Ram did the job while having tea.’ OR  
 ‘Having done the job, Ram had tea.’

The following section shows that CNP clauses are subordinate clauses despite their conjunctive meaning.

### 5.3. The subordinate nature of CNP clauses

As mentioned above, semantically CNP clauses may denote a conjunctive meaning. Syntactically, however, they behave like adverbial clauses. For one thing, they do not obey the Coordinate Structure Constraint. This constraint disallows extraction of an element out of a conjunct (Ross 1967, cited in Kehler 1996). To illustrate from English, whereas (22a) is grammatical, (22b) is unacceptable because an NP is extracted out of a conjunct.

- (22) a. *Tom ate a sandwich and drank a soda.*  
 b. \**What did Tom eat a sandwich and drink \_\_\_\_\_?*

To prove that CNP clauses are not conjuncts, we need to show that they do not obey the Coordinate Structure Constraint. First, however, we have to make sure that conventional conjuncts in Assamese actually *do* obey the Coordinate Structure Constraint. The sentences in (23) indicate that they do. Sentence (23a) is grammatical, just like (22a); sentence (23b) is ungrammatical for the same reason (22b) is.

- (23) a. *Ram-e kitap e-khØn kinil-e*  
 Ram-NOM book one-CL bought-3  
*aru alosani e-khØn pØrñil-e*  
 and magazine one-CL read-3  
 ‘Ram bought a book and read a magazine.’

- b.        \**alosani*        *e-khɔn*        *Ram-e*        *kitab*  
              magazine        one-CL        Ram-NOM        book  
              *e-khɔn*        *kinil-e*        *aru*        \_\_\_\_\_ *pɔrɕil-e*  
              one-CL        bought-3        and        \_\_\_\_\_ read-3  
              ‘A magazine, Ram bought a book and read.’

In English, the Coordinate Structure Constraint can be violated without affecting grammaticality if there is a cause-effect relation between the conjuncts, as (24a–b) demonstrate (Kehler 1996: 2, (5), from Lakoff 1986). This point is important because many of the Assamese constructions we are dealing with may imply a cause-effect relation and might turn out to be grammatical for the wrong reasons.

- (24) a.        *The guys in the Caucasus drink this stuff and live to be a hundred.*  
              b.        *That’s the stuff that the guys in the Caucasus drink and live to be a hundred.*

This observation does not hold for Assamese conventional conjuncts. That is, even if the relation between the conjuncts is that of cause and effect, extraction still induces ungrammaticality. To illustrate, sentence (25a) is a coordinate structure in which the two conjuncts may be considered as a sequence of a cause and an effect. However, extraction out of one of the conjuncts results in ungrammaticality, as (25b) indicates.

- (25) a.        *Ram-ɔr*        *khɔŋ*        *uthil*  
              Ram-GEN        anger        raised  
              *aru mor gɕɔr-to bɕaŋil-e*  
              and my house-CL        destroyed-3  
              ‘Ram got angry and destroyed my house.’
- b.        \**mor gɕɔr-to Ram-ɔr khɔŋ*  
              my house-CL        Ram-GEN        anger  
              *uthil aru \_\_\_\_\_ bɕaŋil-e*  
              raised and \_\_\_\_\_ destroyed-3  
              ‘My house, Ram got angry and destroyed.’

Now we turn to structures with CNP clauses to see if they violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint. If they do, then they are conjuncts and they live up to their “name” both semantically and syntactically. Otherwise,

we can fairly assume that they are subordinate clauses, as the data seem to indicate. Sentences (26a–b) contain a CNP clause each. They can read as (27a–b) respectively and still be grammatical. That is, they are acceptable despite the NP extraction.

- (26) a. *Ram-e*            *[khɔŋ*            *uth-i]*            *mor*  
 Ram-NOM            [anger            get-CNP]            my  
*gɦɔr-to*            *bɦaŋil-e*  
 house-CL            destroyed-3  
 ‘Having got angry, Ram destroyed my house.’
- b. *Ram-e*            *[kam-to*            *kɔr-i]*            *safi*  
 Ram-NOM            [job-CL            do-CNP]            tea  
*khal-e*  
 ate-3  
 ‘Having done the job, Ram had tea.’
- (27) a. *mor gɦɔr-to*    *Ram-e*            *[khɔŋ*    *uth-i]*  
 my house-CL    Ram-NOM            [anger    get-CNP]  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *bɦaŋil-e*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ destroyed-3  
 ‘My house, having got angry, Ram destroyed.’
- b. *safi*    *Ram-e*            *[kam-to*            *kɔr-i]*  
 tea    Ram-NOM            [job-CL            do-CNP]  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *khal-e*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ ate-3  
 ‘Tea, having done the job, Ram had.’

Violating the Coordinate Structure Constraint is one way to prove that CNP clauses are subordinate clauses. Another criterion is “clause-internal word order” (Haspelmath 1995: 12). Coordinate clauses do not normally overlap. In other words, one conjunct cannot break the continuity of another conjunct. A subordinate clause, on the other hand, may be embedded in the matrix clause, breaking its continuity. The sentences in (28) and (29) indicate that a CNP clause may be realized either outside, (28a–b), or inside, (29a–b), the matrix clause. Notice that the pronounced subject in each of the sentences is Case-marked nominative by the matrix predicate. The CNP predicate in (29a) would Case-mark its subject genitive.

- (28) a. *[ananda lag-i] Ram-e*  
 [happiness feel-CNP] Ram-NOM  
*pagolor nisena nasil-e*  
 crazy person like danced-3  
 ‘Having felt happy, Ram danced like a crazy person.’
- b. *[kitab-khɔn khul-i] Prɔxad-e pɔrɔfil-e*  
 [book-CL open-CNP] Proxad-NOM read-3  
 ‘Having opened the book, Proxad read.’ OR  
 ‘Proxad opened the book and read.’
- (29) a. *Ram-e [ananda lag-i]*  
 Ram-NOM [happiness feel-CNP]  
*pagolor nisena nasil-e*  
 crazy person like danced-3  
 ‘Having felt happy, Ram danced like a crazy person.’
- b. *Prɔxad-e [kitab-khɔn khul-i] pɔrɔfil-e*  
 Proxad-NOM [book-CL open-CNP] read-3  
 ‘Having opened the book, Proxad read.’ OR  
 ‘Proxad opened the book and read.’

Given the above data, I consider CNP clauses as subordinate clauses. More specifically, they are adjuncts, or adverbial subordinate clauses, whose function is to modify the matrix predicate (Haspelmath 1995: 3; Mäsica 2005: 110).

The following section presents the Adjunct Control data. These data will be the subject of analysis in the following chapters.

## 6. CNP clauses and Adjunct Control

One relevant feature of CNP clauses is that they obey what is called the Common-Subject Requirement (Lindholm 1975: 30), the Same-Subject Condition (Klaiman 1981: 88), or the Identical Subject Constraint (Subbarao and Arora 2005). This means that the unpronounced subject of the CNP clause and the subject of the matrix clause are obligatorily coreferential, and that a sentence with a CNP clause is an instance of Obligatory Control. In other words, the (b) sentences in (30)–(31) are infelicitous under the des-



ignated reading, even though the (a) sentences are provided as context or prior knowledge.

- (30) a. *Prɔxadi bɸalkoi gal-e*  
 Proxad.ABS well sang-3  
 ‘Proxad sang well.’
- b. \**Ram-ɔr* [ $\Delta_i$  *bɸalkoi ga-i*]  
 Ram-GEN [ $\Delta$  well sing-CNP]  
*bɸal lagil*  
 good felt  
 ‘Proxad sang well, and Ram felt good.’
- (31) a. *Prɔxadi xɔmɔi na-thakil*  
 Proxad.ABS time NEG-kept  
 ‘Proxad didn’t have time.’
- b. \**Ram-e* [ $\Delta_i$  *xɔmɔi na-thak-i*]  
 Ram-NOM [ $\Delta$  time NEG-keep-CNP]  
*bɸiat na-khal-e*  
 rice NEG-ate-3  
 ‘Proxad having had no time, Ram didn’t eat rice.’

This obligatory coreferentiality qualifies Assamese sentences with CNP clauses as control constructions. Typologically, there are three types of control: Forward Control (32a), Backward Control (32b), and Copy Control (32c) (Polinsky and Potsdam 2006). In Forward Control constructions, the matrix subject is pronounced, while the subordinate subject is implied. In Backward Control constructions, the opposite is true. In Copy Control constructions, both subjects are pronounced.

- (32) a. *Forward Control*  
 [Matrix Subject...] [Subordinate Subject...]
- b. *Backward Control*  
 [Matrix Subject...] [Subordinate Subject...]
- c. *Copy Control*  
 [Matrix Subject...] [Subordinate Subject...]

Assamese shows evidence for all three types of control, although Forward and Copy Control structures are usually preferred to their Backward Control counterparts. I begin with Forward Control.

### 6.1. Forward Control in Assamese

Forward Control into CNP clauses is a phenomenon that Assamese shares with most – if not all – South Asian languages. The following are examples from three Indo-Aryan languages, Konkani, Marathi, and Bengali.

#### (33) *Konkani*

a. *Kamal-ak<sub>i</sub>* [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *doon ghante*  
*Kamal-DAT* [ $\Delta$ .NOM two hours  
*naants-unu]* *taap aaylo*  
 dance-CNP] fever came  
 ‘Having danced for two hours, Kamal got sick.’

b. [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *kushii ye-unu]*  
 [ $\Delta$ .DAT happiness come-CNP]  
*Kamal-ni<sub>i</sub>* *naantsu laaglo*  
 Kamal-ERG dance did  
 ‘Upon getting happy, Kamal danced.’

#### (34) *Marathi*

a. *AruuN-ne<sub>i</sub>* [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *ϕewaN*  
 Arun-ERG [ $\Delta$ .NOM meal  
*banauun]* *movie baghitli*  
 prepare-CNP] movie watched  
 ‘Having prepared dinner, Arun watched a movie.’

b. [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *taap yeun]* *AruuN-ne<sub>i</sub>*  
 [ $\Delta$ .DAT fever come-CNP] Arun-ERG  
*aushad ghetle*  
 medication took  
 ‘Arun got sick and took medication.’

- (35) *Bengali (adapted from Klaiman 1981: Chapter 4)*
- a. *Jodu<sub>i</sub> [Δ<sub>i/\*k</sub> phal per-e]*  
 Jodu.NOM [Δ.NOM fruit pick-CNP]  
*bikri korlo*  
 sale did  
 ‘Having picked the fruit, Jodu sold it.’
- b. *[Δ<sub>i/\*k</sub> lu leg-e]*  
 [Δ.GEN heatstroke affect-CNP]  
*Jodu<sub>i</sub> maaraa gaelo*  
 Jodu.NOM died  
 ‘Having had a heatstroke, Jodu died.’
- The above examples are instances of Forward Control in the sense that the matrix subject is pronounced, determining the identity of the unpronounced CNP subject. Assamese Forward Control structures are similar, as (36)–(54) show.
- (36) *[Δ<sub>i/\*k</sub> kam-to kɔr-i] Ram<sub>i</sub> gusi gɔl*  
 [Δ.NOM work do-CNP] Ram.ABS away went  
 ‘Having done the work, Ram left.’
- (37) *Ram-e<sub>i</sub> [Δ<sub>i/\*k</sub> xɔmɔi na-thak-i]*  
 Ram-NOM [Δ.GEN time NEG-keep-CNP]  
*bfiat na-khal-e*  
 rice NEG-ate-3  
 ‘Having no time, Ram didn’t eat rice.’
- (38) *[Δ<sub>i/\*k</sub> bafiut kam kɔr-i] Ram-ɔr<sub>i</sub>*  
 [Δ.NOM much work do-CNP] Ram-GEN  
*ga bea fiɔl*  
 body bad became  
 ‘Having worked hard, Ram got sick.’
- (39) *[Δ<sub>i/\*k</sub> ga bea hɔ-i] manu-fi-to-e<sub>i</sub>*  
 [Δ.GEN body bad become-CNP] man-CL-NOM  
*dɔrob lol-e*  
 medicine took-3  
 ‘Having got sick, the man took medication.’

- (40) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$             *ga*        *bea*        *hɔ-i]*  
 [ $\Delta$ .GEN            body      bad        become-CNP]  
*manuʃi-to-r<sub>i</sub>*                      *bʃagɔr/dukh*      *lagil*  
 man-CL-GEN                      tired/sad        felt  
 ‘Having got sick, the man felt tired/sad.’
- (41) *Ram<sub>i</sub>*    [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$         *bʃagɔr*        *lag-i]*                      *xui*        *thakil*  
 Ram.ABS [ $\Delta$ .GEN exhaustion feel-CNP]                      sleep      kept  
 ‘Having felt exhausted, Ram fell asleep.’
- (42) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *kukur-to*                      *ʃeru-i]*                      *Proxad-ɔr<sub>i</sub>*  
 [ $\Delta$ .NOM                      dog-CL                      lose-CNP]                      Proxad-GEN  
*sinta*                      *ʃɔis-e*  
 worried                      become-3  
 ‘Having lost his dog, Proxad is worried.’
- (43) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *kɔtha-to*                      *xun-i]*                      *Proxad-ɔr<sub>i</sub>*  
 [ $\Delta$ .NOM                      news-CL                      hear-CNP]                      Proxad-GEN  
*dukh*                      *lagil*  
 sad                      felt  
 ‘Having heard the news, Proxad felt sad.’
- (44) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *boyfriend-ok*                      *dekh-i]*  
 [ $\Delta$ .NOM                      boyfriend-ACC                      see-CNP]  
*suali-zɔni-r<sub>i</sub>*        *laz*        *lagil*  
 girl-CL-GEN        shy        felt  
 ‘Having seen her boyfriend, the girl felt shy.’
- (45) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *laz*        *lag-i]*                      *Sarita<sub>i</sub>*                      *tai*  
 [ $\Delta$ .GEN                      shy        feel-CNP]                      Sarita.ABS                      her  
*room-ot*                      *gɔl*  
 room-LOC                      went  
 ‘Having felt shy, Sarita went to her room.’
- (46) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *bagʃi-ok*                      *dekh-i]*                      *kukur-to-r<sub>i</sub>*  
 [ $\Delta$ .NOM                      tiger-ACC                      see-CNP]                      dog-CL-GEN  
*bʃɔpe*    *lagil*  
 fear    felt  
 ‘Having seen a tiger, the dog got scared.’

- (47) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *bhve lag-i]*                      *kukur-to<sub>i</sub>*                      *polai gəl*  
 [ $\Delta$ .GEN fear feel-CNP]                      dog-CL.ABS                      escape went  
 ‘Having got scared, the dog ran away.’
- (48) *Sarita-r<sub>i</sub>*                      [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *marathon*                      *dour-i]*  
 Sarita-GEN                      [ $\Delta$ .NOM                      marathon                      run-CNP]  
*piafi*                      *lagil*  
 thirst                      felt  
 ‘Having run a marathon, Sarita felt thirsty.’
- (49) *Sarita-e<sub>i</sub>*                      [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *piafi*                      *lag-i]*  
 Sarita-NOM                      [ $\Delta$ .GEN                      thirst                      feel-CNP]  
*lemonade*                      *khal-e*  
 lemonade                      drank-3  
 ‘Having felt thirsty, Sarita drank lemonade.’
- (50) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *e-ta*                      *bfial*                      *buddfi*                      *khela-i]*  
 [ $\Delta$ .GEN                      one-CL                      good idea                      play-CNP]  
*Ram-e<sub>i</sub>*                      *phurti*                      *kəril-e*  
 Ram-NOM                      party                      did-3  
 ‘Having got a nice idea, Ram celebrated.’
- (51) *Ram-ɔr<sub>i</sub>*                      [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *e-ta*                      *bfial*                      *buddfi*  
 Ram-GEN                      [ $\Delta$ .GEN                      one-CL                      good idea  
*khel-i]*                      *bfial*                      *lagil*  
 play-CNP]                      good felt  
 ‘Having got a nice idea, Ram felt good.’
- (52) [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *lottery*                      *jik-i]*                      *mor gfoiniyak-ɔr<sub>i</sub>*  
 [ $\Delta$ .NOM                      lottery                      win-CNP]                      my wife-GEN  
*phurti*                      *lagil*  
 exhilaration                      felt  
 ‘Having won the lottery, my wife felt very happy.’
- (53) *mor*                      *gfoiniyak-e<sub>i</sub>*                      [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$                       *lottery*                      *jik-i]*  
 my                      wife-NOM                      [ $\Delta$ .NOM                      lottery win-CNP]  
*notun*                      *ghɔr*                      *kinil-e*  
 new                      house                      bought-3  
 ‘Having won the lottery, my wife bought a new house.’

- (54) *Ram-ɔr<sub>i</sub>* [ $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *phurti* *kɔr-i*]  
 Ram-GEN [ $\Delta$ .EXP.NOM exhilaration do-CNP]  
*bfiok* *lagil*  
 hunger felt  
 ‘Having had a party, Ram felt hungry.’

## 6.2. Backward Control in Assamese

As indicated in (32b), repeated here as (55), Backward Control is the case where the subordinate/CNP subject is pronounced and the matrix subject is implied.

- (55) *Backward Control*  
 [Matrix [Subordinate Subject...]] [Matrix ~~Subject...~~]

Backward Control is a phenomenon that Assamese shares with a number of South Asian languages. The following are examples from Telugu and Mizo. In both cases, the CNP subject is pronounced, while the coreferential matrix subject is unpronounced.

- (56) *Telugu (Haddad 2009a: 82, (30a–b))*
- a.  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  [*Kumaar-ki<sub>i</sub>* *aakali wees-i*]  
 $\Delta$ .NOM [Kumar-DAT hunger fall-CNP]  
*sandwich tinnaa-Du*  
 sandwich ate-3.M.S  
 ‘Having got hungry, Kumar ate a sandwich.’
- b.  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  [*Kumaar-ki<sub>i</sub>* *jwaram wacc-i*]  
 $\Delta$ .NOM [Kumar-DAT fever.NOM come-CNP]  
*mandulu waaDaa-Du*  
 medicines used-3.M.S  
 ‘Having had a fever, Kumar took medication.’
- (57) *Mizo (Subbarao 2004, in Davison 2008: 31, (9b))*
- $\Delta_{i/*k}$  [*Zova<sub>i</sub>* *tSutleng-ah* *a* *tSu*]  
 $\Delta$ .ERG [Zova.NOM bench-on 3.S sit.INF]  
*Duh*  
 want  
 ‘Zova wants to sit on the bench.’

Assamese licenses Backward Control as well. However, the phenomenon is quite restricted. The restriction is mainly related to Case; Backward Control structures are considered acceptable if and only if the pronounced CNP subject is an Inherent Case-marked argument licensed by an experiential predicate. Sentences (58)–(66) are examples of Backward Control.

- (58)  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  [Ram- $\text{dr}_i$   $x\text{dm}\text{di}$  na-thak- $i$ ]  
 $\Delta$ .NOM [Ram-GEN time NEG-keep-CNP]  
*bfiat na-khal-e*  
 rice NEG-ate-3  
 ‘Having no time, Ram didn’t eat rice.’
- (59) [*manufi-to- $r_i$  ga bea hɔ-i*]  $\Delta_{i/*k}$   
 [man-CL-GEN body bad become-CNP]  $\Delta$ .NOM  
*dɔrob lol-e*  
 medicine took-3  
 ‘Having got sick, the man took medication.’
- (60) [*manufi-to- $r_i$  ga bea hɔ-i*]  $\Delta_{i/*k}$   
 [man-CL-GEN body bad become-CNP]  $\Delta$ .GEN  
*bfiagɔr/dukh lagil*  
 tired/sad felt  
 ‘Having got sick, the man felt tired/sad.’
- (61)  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  [Ram- $\text{dr}_i$  *bfiagɔr lag-i*]  
 $\Delta$ .ABS [Ram-GEN exhaustion feel-CNP]  
*xui thakil*  
 sleep kept  
 ‘Having felt exhausted, Ram fell asleep.’
- (62) [*Sarita- $r_i$  laz lag-i*]  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *tai*  
 [Sarita-GEN shy feel-CNP]  $\Delta$ .ABS her  
*room-ot gɔl*  
 room-LOC went  
 ‘Having felt shy, Sarita went to her room.’
- (63) [*kukur-to- $r_i$  bfiɔe lag-i*]  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *polai gɔl*  
 [dog-CL-GEN fear feel-CNP]  $\Delta$ .ABS escape went  
 ‘Having got scared, the dog ran away.’

- (64)  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  [*Sarita-r<sub>i</sub>* *piafi* *lag-i]*  
 $\Delta$ .NOM [*Sarita-GEN* thirst feel-CNP]  
*lemonade khal-e*  
 lemonade drank-3  
 ‘Having felt thirsty, Sarita drank lemonade.’
- (65) [*Ram-dr<sub>i</sub>* *e-ta* *bfi* *buddhi khela-i]*  
 [Ram-GEN one-CL good idea play-CNP]  
 $\Delta_{i/*k}$  *phurti* *kɔril-e*  
 $\Delta$ .NOM party did-3  
 ‘Having got a nice idea, Ram celebrated.’
- (66)  $\Delta_{i/*k}$  [*Ram-dr<sub>i</sub>* *e-ta* *bfi* *buddhi*  
 $\Delta$ .GEN [Ram-GEN one-CL good idea  
*khel-i]* *bfi* *lagil*  
 play-CNP] good felt  
 ‘Having got a nice idea, Ram felt good.’

While the experiential subject in each of (58)–(66) is genitive, sentences (67)–(68) contain subordinate nominative-experiential subjects. These are judged by some native speakers as less acceptable than sentences (58)–(66).

- (67)  $? \Delta_{i/*k}$  [*Ram-e<sub>i</sub>* *phurti* *kɔr-i]*  
 $\Delta$ .GEN [Ram-EXP.NOM exhilaration do-CNP]  
*bfiok* *lagil*  
 hunger felt  
 ‘Having had a party, Ram felt hungry.’
- (68)  $? [Ram-e<sub>i</sub>$  *dukh* *kɔr-i]  $\Delta_{i/*k}$   
 [Ram-EXP.NOM sadness do-CNP]  $\Delta$ .ABS  
*gusi* *gɔl*  
 away went  
 ‘Having made himself sad, Ram left.’*

On the other hand, if the CNP predicate licenses a Structural Case-marked subject, Backward Control is judged as unacceptable, (69)–(75).



- (69) \**[manuḥ-zḍn-e            bafut kam kḍr-i]*             $\Delta$   
       [man-CL-NOM            much work do-CNP]             $\Delta$ .GEN  
*ga        bea        fiḍ*  
 body bad became  
 ‘Having worked hard, the man got sick.’
- (70) \**[Prḍxad-e                kukur-to                fieru-i]*             $\Delta$   
       [Proxad-NOM            dog-CL                lose-CNP]             $\Delta$ .NOM  
*sinta                fiḍis-e*  
 worried                become-3  
 ‘Having lost his dog, Proxad is worried.’
- (71) \**[Prḍxad-e        kḍtha-to        xun-i]*             $\Delta$   
       [Proxad-NOM news-CL        hear-CNP]             $\Delta$ .GEN  
*dukh                lagil*  
 sad                felt  
 ‘Having heard the news, Proxad felt sad.’
- (72) \**[suali-zḍni-e                boyfriend-ok                dekh-i]*  
       [girl-CL-NOM                boyfriend-ACC                see-CNP]  
 $\Delta$                 laz        lagil  
 $\Delta$ .GEN                shy        felt  
 ‘Having seen her boyfriend, the girl felt shy.’
- (73) \**[kukur-to-e                bagḥ-ok                dekh-i]*             $\Delta$   
       [dog-CL-NOM                tiger-ACC                see-CNP]             $\Delta$ .GEN  
*bḥiḍe        lagil*  
 fear        felt  
 ‘Having seen a tiger, the dog got scared.’
- (74) \* $\Delta$         *[Sarita-e        marathon dḍur-i]*            *piafi        lagil*  
 $\Delta$ .GEN [Sarita-NOM        marathon run-CNP]            thirst        felt  
 ‘Having run a marathon, Sarita felt thirsty.’
- (75) \**[mor        gḥoiniyak-e        lottery jik-i]*             $\Delta$   
       [my        wife-NOM                lottery win-CNP]             $\Delta$ .GEN  
*phurti                lagil*  
 exhilaration        felt  
 ‘Having won the lottery, my wife felt very happy.’

Now consider the acceptable Backward Control structure in (76). Compared with the structures (69)–(75), (76) seems to stand out as an exception. Closer examination, however, shows that Assamese native speakers are likely to process the sentence as an instance of Forward Control. Here is why: the CNP subject is nominative, while the matrix subject is absolutive. The demarcation between these two types of Case, nominative and absolutive, is not as clear-cut as, say, the demarcation between nominative and genitive. As a matter of fact, nominative does replace absolutive in some instances, as already pointed out by Edwards (2003). According to Edwards, nominative Case indicates more responsibility on the part of the subject. To illustrate, compare (77) and (78) (from Edwards 2003: 53, (71a–b)). Ram is more responsible for his death in (78) than he is in (77). Note that the verb in (78) does not show agreement with the nominative subject, although in some instances it may.

- (76) *[Ram-e kam-to kɔr-i] Δ*  
 [Ram-NOM work do-CNP] Δ.ABS  
*gusi gɔl*  
 away went  
 ‘Having done the work, Ram left.’
- (77) *Ram accident-ot mɔril*  
 Ram.ABS accident-LOC died  
 ‘Ram died in an accident.’
- (78) *Ram-e bfiiri khua-r karone mɔril*  
 Ram-NOM cigarette smoking-GEN because died  
 ‘Ram died because of smoking cigarettes.’

All this is to indicate that (76) is more likely to be interpreted by Assamese native speakers as (79), whereby the subject is licensed by the matrix clause. This may explain why it is not considered unacceptable on a par with the other ungrammatical instances of Backward Control.

- (79) *Ram-e [Δ kam-to kɔr-i] gusi gɔl*  
 Ram-NOM [Δ.NOM work do-CNP] away went  
 ‘Having done the work, Ram left.’

The following section presents evidence for the less-studied phenomenon of Copy Control.

## 6.3 Copy Control

Assamese shows evidence of the cross-linguistically rare phenomenon of Copy Control. Copy Control constructions involve a matrix subject and a CNP subject that are not only obligatorily coreferential but also both pronounced. A number of other South Asian languages seem to license similar structures. Telugu is one such language, as the sentences in (80) illustrate. Other South Asian languages that seem to license Copy Control are Marathi, Konkani, and Bengali, (81)–(83); however, more in-depth study of the phenomenon is required for these languages.

(80) *Telugu (Haddad 2010a, (4))*

- a. *[Kumaar-(ee) tappu cees-i]*  
 [Kumar.NOM-(EMPH) mistake do-CNP]  
*Kumaar-ee edavatam modalupettaa-Du*  
 Kumar.NOM-EMPH crying started-3.M.S  
 ‘Kumar started crying although he has made a mistake.’
- b. *[Kumaar-(ee) annam vanD-i]*  
 [Kumar.NOM-(EMPH) rice make-CNP]  
*Kumaar-ee paarabosaa-Du*  
 Kumar.NOM-EMPH threw away-3.M.S  
 ‘Kumar threw away the food though it was he who cooked it.’
- c. *[Kumaar-(ee) kuuragaayalu kon-i]*  
 [Kumar.NOM-(EMPH) vegetables buy-CNP]  
*Kumaar-ee vanTa ceesaa-Du*  
 Kumar.NOM-EMPH cooking did-3.M.S  
 ‘Kumar bought vegetables, and he cooked too.’

(81) *Marathi*

- [AruuN-laa taap ye-uun] tya-ne*  
 [Arun-DAT fever come-CNP] he-ERG  
*aushad ghetle*  
 medication took  
 ‘Arun got sick, and he took medication.’

- (82) *Konkani*  
 [Kamal doon ghante nants-unu] takka  
 [Kamal-NOM two hours dance-CNP] he.DAT  
 taap aaylo  
 fever came  
 ‘Kamal danced for two hours, and he got sick.’
- (83) *Bengali*  
 [Jodu Ram-er upor rege giy-e]  
 [Jodu.NOM Ram-GEN on anger do-CNP]  
 hotocchara o-ke merei fello  
 the idiot him-ACC beat him to death  
 ‘Jodu got angry with Ram, and the idiot beat him to death.’

In Assamese, such structures are possible under the following three conditions. Condition 2 applies to all instances of South Asian Copy Control that I know of.

- Condition 1: The CNP clause contains an experiential predicate.
- Condition 2: The CNP clause is sentence-initial.
- Condition 3: The CNP subject is an R-expression (nonpronominal).

Condition 1 is based on the fact that Copy Control structures that involve nonexperiential CNP predicates are considered generally unacceptable. By comparison, Copy Control structures that contain experiential predicates are judged acceptable. The subject of an experiential predicate in Assamese is usually genitive. Sentences (84)–(91) are some examples.

- (84) [Ram-*ɔr* khɔŋ uth-i] Ram-e  
 [Ram-GEN anger raise-CNP] Ram-NOM  
 mor għɔr-to bhajil-e  
 my house-CL destroyed-3  
 ‘Having got angry, Ram destroyed my house.’
- (85) [Ram-*ɔr* phurti lag-i] Ram-e  
 [Ram-GEN exhilaration do-CNP] Ram-NOM  
 pagolor nisena nasil-e  
 crazy person like danced-3  
 ‘Having felt very happy, Ram danced like a crazy person.’

- (86) [*Ram-Ør*      *bfiagɔr*      *lag-i]*      *Ram*  
 [Ram-GEN      exhaustion      feel-CNP]      Ram.ABS  
*xui*      *thakil*  
 sleep      kept  
 ‘Having felt exhausted, Ram fell asleep.’
- (87) [*Ram-Ør*      *xɔmɔi na-thak-i]*      *Ram-e*  
 [Ram-GEN      time      NEG-keep-CNP]      Ram-NOM  
*bfiat-o*      *na-khal-e*  
 rice-even      NEG-ate-3  
 ‘Having no time, Ram didn’t even eat rice.’
- (88) [*manufi-to-r*      *ga*      *bea*      *hɔ-i]*      *manufi-to-e*  
 [man-CL-GEN      body      bad      become-CNP]      man-CL-NOM  
*dɔrob*      *lol-e*  
 medicine      took-3  
 ‘Having got sick, the man took medication.’
- (89) [*Sarita-r*      *laz*      *lag-i]*      *Sarita*      *tai*  
 [Sarita-GEN      shy      feel-CNP]      Sarita.ABS      her  
*room-ot*      *gɔl*  
 room-LOC      went  
 ‘Having felt shy, Sarita went to her room.’
- (90) [*kukur-to-r*      *bfiɔe*      *lag-i]*      *kukur-to*      *polai*  
 [dog-CL-GEN      fear      feel-CNP]      dog-CL.ABS      escape  
*gɔl*  
 went  
 ‘Having got scared, the dog ran away.’
- (91) [*Sarita-r*      *piafi*      *lag-i]*      *Sarita-e*  
 [Sarita-GEN      thirst      feel-CNP]      Sarita-NOM  
*lemonade*      *khal-e*  
 lemonade      drank-3  
 ‘Having felt thirsty, Sarita drank lemonade.’

As noted in Section 3, there are two types of experiential predicates in Assamese, those that license genitive subjects and those that license experiential nominative subjects. The difference between the two types is illustrated in (15)–(16), repeated as (92)–(93). Sentences (92a) and (93a)

contain what Abbi (1991) calls State Experiential and Process Experiential predicates. These license genitive subjects, and they do not allow the occurrence of adverbs like ‘intentionally’ or ‘knowingly’. Sentences (92b) and (93b), on the other hand, contain Stative Action Process Experiential predicates. In addition to being experiential, these predicates are volitional, which is why they license experiential-nominative subjects and they allow adverbs such as ‘knowingly’.

- (92) a. *Ram-Ør* (\**janibuji*) *e-ta buddhi khelal*  
 Ram-GEN (knowingly) one-CL idea played  
 ‘An idea occurred to Ram (\*on purpose).’
- b. *Ram-e janibuji e-ta buddhi kōril-e*  
 Ram-NOM knowingly one-CL idea did-3  
 ‘Ram got an idea on purpose.’  
 Also meaning ‘Ram knowingly tricked someone.’
- (93) a. *Ram-Ør* (\**janibuji*) *khōŋ uthil*  
 Ram-GEN (knowingly) anger did  
 ‘Ram angered (\*on purpose).’
- b. *Ram-e janibuji khōŋ kōril-e*  
 Ram-NOM knowingly anger did-3  
 ‘Ram got angry on purpose.’  
 Meaning ‘Ram knowingly expressed his anger.’

What is pertinent to this section is that Assamese allows Copy Control, not only if the subject is an experiential genitive NP, but also if it is an experiential nominative NP, as (94)–(96) show. As Condition 1 above points out, Copy Control structures are judged acceptable as long as the CNP clause contains an experiential predicate. This restriction holds regardless of the morphological case of the CNP subject.

- (94) [*Ram-e khōŋ kōr-i*] *Ram-e*  
 [Ram-EXP.NOM anger raise-CNP] Ram-NOM  
*mor għōr-to bhāŋil-e*  
 my house-CL destroyed-3  
 ‘Having got angry (having expressed his anger), Ram destroyed my house.’

- (95) *[Ram-e phurti kɔr-i] etiya*  
 [Ram-EXP.NOM exhilaration do-CNP] now  
*Ram-ɔr bfiok lagil*  
 Ram-GEN hunger felt  
 ‘Having had a party, Ram now felt hungry.’
- (96) *[Ram-e dukh kɔr-i] Ram-e*  
 [Ram-EXP.NOM sadness do-CNP] Ram-NOM  
*bfiat-o na-khal-e*  
 rice-even NEG-ate-3  
 ‘Having made himself sad, Ram didn’t even eat rice.’

On the other hand, if the CNP subject is not genitive or experiential nominative, (97)–(105), judgments pertaining to Copy Control become inconsistent. Notice that the CNP clause is sentence-initial and the CNP subject is an R-expression. Apparently, the only reason why the sentences are generally considered unacceptable by native speakers is that the CNP predicate is not an experiential predicate.

- (97) ✓/\**[manufi-zɔn-e bafiut kam kɔr-i]*  
 [man-CL-NOM much work do-CNP]  
*manufi-zɔn-ɔr ga bea fiɔl*  
 man-CL-GEN body bad became  
 ‘Having worked hard, the man got sick.’
- (98) ✓/\**[Prɔxad-e kukur-to fieru-i]*  
 [Proxad-NOM dog-CL lose-CNP]  
*Prɔxad-ɔr sinta fiɔis-e*  
 Proxad-GEN worried become-3  
 ‘Having lost his dog, Proxad is worried.’
- (99) ✓/\**[Prɔxad-e kɔtha-to xun-i]*  
 [Proxad-NOM news-CL hear-CNP]  
*Prɔxad-ɔr dukh lagil*  
 Proxad-GEN sad felt  
 ‘Having heard the news, Proxad felt sad.’

- (100) ✓/\*[*suali-zɔni-e*      *boyfriend-ok*      *dekh-i]*  
           [girl-CL-NOM      boyfriend-ACC      see-CNP]  
*suali-zɔni-ɔr laz lagil*  
 girl-CL-GEN shy felt  
 ‘Having seen her boyfriend, the girl felt shy.’
- (101) ✓/\*[*kukur-to-e*      *bagfi-ok*      *dekh-i]*  
           [dog-CL-NOM      tiger-ACC      see-CNP]  
*kukur-to-r bfiɛ lagil*  
 dog-CL-GEN fear felt  
 ‘Having seen a tiger, the dog got scared.’
- (102) ✓/\*[*Sarita-e*      *marathon*      *dɔur-i]*  
           [Sarita-NOM      marathon      run-CNP]  
*Sarita-r piɛfi lagil*  
 Sarita-GEN thirst felt  
 ‘Having run a marathon, Sarita felt thirsty.’
- (103) ✓/\*[*Ram-e*      *kam-to*      *kɔr-i]*      *Ram*  
           [Ram-NOM      work      do-CNP]      Ram.ABS  
*gusi gɔl*  
 away went  
 ‘Having done the work, Ram left.’
- (104) ✓/\*[*Ram-e*      *kukur-to*      *fieru-i]*  
           [Ram-NOM      dog-CL      lose-CNP]  
*Ram-ɔr dukh lagil*  
 Ram.GEN sad felt  
 ‘Having lost his dog, Ram felt sad.’
- (105) ✓/\*[*Ram-e*      *lottery*      *jik-i]*  
           [Ram-NOM      lottery      win-CNP]  
*Ram-ɔr phurti lagil*  
 Ram.GEN exhilaration felt  
 ‘Having won the lottery, Ram felt very happy.’

The acceptable examples of Copy Control in this section contain two R-expressions that are exact copies of the same token – Case-marking notwithstanding. Alternatively, the matrix clause may contain a pronoun or an



epithet that is coreferential with the CNP subject, as sentences (106)–(111) show.

- (106) [*Ram-ḍr khub bfiok lag-i]*  
 [Ram-GEN very hunger feel-CNP]  
*xi/besera-to-e posa bfiat khal-e*  
 he.NOM/poor guy-CL-NOM stale rice ate-3  
 ‘Ram felt very hungry, and he/the poor guy ate stale rice.’
- (107) [*Ram-e khḍḍḍ kḍr-i]*  
 [Ram-EXP.NOM anger raise-CNP]  
*xi/gadfiā-to-e mor gfiḍr-to bfiāḅil-e*  
 he.NOM/donkey-CL-NOM my house-CL destroyed-3  
 ‘Ram got angry (expressed his anger), and he/the idiot destroyed my house.’
- (108) [*manuḅi-to-r ga bea hḍ-i]*  
 [man-CL-GEN body bad become-CNP]  
*xi/besera-to-e ḍḍrob lol-e*  
 he.NOM/poor guy-CL-NOM medicine took-3  
 ‘The man got sick, and he/the poor guy took medication.’
- (109) [*Sarita-r laz lag-i tai tai*]  
 [Sarita-GEN shy feel-CNP] she.ABS her  
*room-ot gḍl*  
 room-LOC went  
 ‘Sarita felt shy, and she went to her room.’
- (110) [*kukur-to-r bfiḍe lag-i xi polai*]  
 [dog-CL-GEN fear feel-CNP] he.ABS escape  
*gḍl*  
 went  
 ‘The dog got scared, and he ran away.’
- (111) [*Sarita-r piāfi lag-i tai*]  
 [Sarita-GEN thirst feel-CNP] she.NOM  
*lemonade khal-e*  
 lemonade drank-3  
 ‘Sarita felt thirsty, and she drank lemonade.’

A word is in order regarding how Assamese native speakers seem to process sentences with CNP clauses. A speaker may be presented with a sentence that begins with a CNP clause with a pronounced CNP subject, (112a). If the speaker has to finish the sentence with a matrix clause that Case-marks its subject differently from the CNP clause – for example, the matrix clause in (112b) licenses a nominative subject, which is different from the genitive CNP subject in (112a) – then she or he starts the matrix clause with a pronounced subject, which may be an exact copy of the R-expression in the CNP clause or a pronoun or an epithet. The outcome is Copy Control, which the speaker seems to prefer over Backward Control. Descriptively, not pronouncing the matrix subject means that the structure qualifies as a Backward Control construction, and (as noted earlier) Assamese native speakers seem to prefer Forward and Copy Control over Backward Control.

- (112) a.        [*Ram-ɔr*        *khub*   *bfiok*            *lag-i]*  
                   [*Ram-GEN*    very    hunger          feel-CNP]
- b.        *Ram-e/xi/besera-to-e*                                    *posa*  
               *Ram-NOM/he.NOM/poor guy-CL-NOM*             *stale*  
               *bfiat*   *khal-e*  
               *rice*    *ate-3*

Nevertheless, if both the CNP and the matrix predicates license the same Case, Copy Control becomes redundant, although not unacceptable. In this case, Forward Control is preferred. For example, when presented with (113a–b), speakers automatically choose the latter, considering the former acceptable but redundant. When both the matrix and CNP predicates check the same Case (e.g., nominative) on their subjects, speakers assign the pronounced subject to the matrix clause, leaving the CNP subject silent, as (113c) indicates. Note, however, that an epithet makes the sentence sound less redundant.

- (113) a.        *Ram-e*            *lottery jik-i*                    *xi*        *notun*  
                   *Ram-NOM*      *lottery win-CNP*        *he.NOM*   *new*  
                   *gfiɔr*    *kinil-e*  
                   *house*   *bought-3*  
                   ‘Having won the lottery, Ram bought a new house.’

- b. *Ram-e*            *lottery jik-i*            *notun*  
 Ram-NOM        lottery win-CNP        new  
*ghor kinil-e*  
 house bought-3  
 ‘Having won the lottery, Ram bought a new house.’
- c. *Ram-e*            [*lottery*            *jik-i*]            *notun*  
 Ram-NOM        [lottery            win-CNP]        new  
*ghor kinil-e*  
 house bought-3  
 ‘Having won the lottery, Ram bought a new house.’

Most importantly, the two pronounced subjects in Assamese Copy Control have to be coreferential. Disjoint subjects result in ungrammaticality, as sentences (114)–(116) illustrate.

- (114) \**[Ram-dr<sub>i</sub> khɔŋ uth-i]*  
 [Ram-GEN anger raise-CNP]  
*xi<sub>i</sub>/Proxad gusi gɔl*  
 he.ABS/Proxad.ABS away went  
 ‘Ram got angry, and Proxad left.’
- (115) \**[Ram-dr<sub>i</sub> xɔmɔi na-thak-i]*  
 [Ram-GEN time NEG-keep-CNP]  
*xi<sub>i</sub>/Proxad-e bfiat-o na-khal-e*  
 he.NOM/Proxad-NOM rice-even NEG-ate-3  
 ‘Ram didn’t have time, and Proxad didn’t even eat rice.’
- (116) \**[Ram-e lottery jik-i] tar gfoiniyak-dr*  
 [Ram-NOM lottery win-CNP] his wife-GEN  
*phurti lagil*  
 exhilaration felt  
 ‘Ram won the lottery, and his wife felt very happy.’

In addition, Copy Control is unacceptable if the CNP clause is not sentence-initial, (117), and/or if the CNP subject is pronominal, (118).

- (117) a. \**Ram-e* [tar/Ram-*ɔr* xɔmɔi  
 Ram-NOM [he.GEN/Ram-GEN time  
*na-thak-i]* *bfiat* *na-khal-e*  
 NEG-keep-CNP] rice NEG-ate-3  
 ‘Ram had no time, and he didn’t eat rice.’
- b. \**manufi-to-e* [manufi-to-r/besera-to-r  
 man-CL-NOM [man-CL-GEN/poor guy-CL-GEN  
*ga bea hɔ-i]* *dɔrob* *lol-e*  
 body bad become-CNP] medicine took-3  
 ‘The man got sick, and the poor guy took medication.’
- (118) a. \**[tar* *bfiagɔr* *lag-i]*  
 [he.GEN exhaustion feel-CNP]  
*xi/Ram* *xui* *thakil*  
 he/Ram.ABS sleep kept  
 ‘Having felt exhausted, Ram now fell asleep.’
- b. \**[tar* *bfiɔe* *lag-i]* *kukur-to*  
 [he.GEN fear feel-CNP] dog-CL.ABS  
*polai* *gɔl*  
 escape went  
 ‘Having got scared, the dog ran away.’

The Assamese data presented in Sections 6.1 through 6.3 indicate that structures with CNP clauses require a control interpretation. Exceptions do exist, however. These are discussed in the following section.

#### 6.4. Exceptions

Although the Same Subject Condition is usually obeyed, and thus control is normally enforced, violations do occur. Observe structures (119)–(125), for example. Notice that, contrary to expectation, disjoint subjects are allowed in the environment of a CNP clause.

- (119) [*dfumufia* *aɦ-i]* *boɦut* *gos* *bfiangil*  
 [storm.ABS come-CNP] many trees.ABS broke  
 ‘A storm came and many trees got broken.’

- (120) *[e-ta għɔr-ot zui lag-i] bofiut*  
 [one-CL house-LOC fire.ABS happen-CNP] many  
*manuħi mɔril*  
 people.ABS died  
 ‘A house burned and many people died.’
- (121) *[Shimla-t boroph por-i] Delhi-t*  
 [Simla-LOC snow.ABS fall-CNP] Delhi-LOC  
*thanda fiɔl*  
 cold.ABS became  
 ‘The snow having fallen in Simla, it became cold in Delhi.’
- (122) *[bahirat thanda por-i] għɔr-ot*  
 [outside cold.ABS fall-CNP] house-LOC  
*thanda fiɔl*  
 cold.ABS became  
 ‘It having become cold outside, it became cold in the house.’
- (123) *[borokhum por-i] kheti barfiil*  
 [rain.ABS fall-CNP] plants.ABS grow  
 ‘The rain having fallen, the crop grew.’
- (124) *[wall bħiaŋ-i] xilguti poril*  
 [wall.ABS destroy-CNP] stones.ABS fell  
 ‘The wall having collapsed, stones fell.’
- (125) *[sɔki-kħɔn bħiaŋ-i] Ram poril*  
 [chair-CL.ABS destroy-CNP] Ram.ABS fell  
 ‘The chair broke, and Ram fell off.’

Just as Adjunct Control into CNP clauses is not unique to Assamese but common to most South Asian languages, so violations of adjunct control also occur in many of these languages (e.g., Bengali (Klaiman 1981), Marathi (Pandharipande 1997), Hindi (Davison 1981), and Tamil (Lindholm 1975)); see Haddad 2009b and Chapter 5 of this monograph. Klaiman’s is a systematic study on exactly this issue. The author examines Bengali CNP clauses and arrives at the following conclusion: the Same Subject Condition applies when either the matrix clause or the CNP clause expresses a “volitional activity.” If the activities in both clauses are nonvolitional, the condition can be violated (Klaiman 1981: 120). This generalization applies

to Assamese. If either of the activities in (119)–(120) is volitional, the sentences become unacceptable, as illustrated in (126)–(127). In (126) the CNP predicate is volitional, and in (127) the matrix clause is volitional. Both sentences are ungrammatical.

(126) \*[*Ram-e*      *ghor-to*      *zui*      *laga-i*]      *bofut*  
           [Ram-NOM    house-CL      fire      happen-CNP]    many  
           *manufi*      *moril*  
           people.ABS    died  
           ‘Ram burned the house; many people died.’

(127) \*[*e-ta*      *ghor-ot*      *zui*      *laga-i*]  
           [one-CL      house-LOC    fire      happen-CNP]  
           *bofut manufi-e*      *police-aloi*      *phone koril-e*  
           many    people.NOM    police-DAT      phone did-3  
           ‘A house burned and many people called the police.’

Commenting on a similar case in Bengali, Klaiman adds:

I hope I have shown that the conditioning is to a very large extent semantic, and that it is impossible to adequately describe any of these processes without reference to the underlying semantic opposition VOLITIONAL / NONVOLITIONAL... The one possibility I would confidently rule out is that any existing theoretical model can handle the facts. The material presented in this study calls for a new approach to meaning in grammar. (1981: 125–126)

Chapter 5 suggests that this semantic restriction is also a conspiracy in the syntax and that the examples that violate the Same Subject Condition are in fact instances of Obligatory Control.

## 7. Conclusion

This chapter presented a linguistic overview of Assamese morphosyntax, highlighting aspects that are relevant to the topic of Adjunct Control. One aspect that is most pertinent for our purposes is the licensing of Case-marked subjects in the different types of clauses. Assamese has Inherent and Structural Case-marked subjects. The two types are licensed in finite as well as in INF clauses, while the status of Structural Case-marked subjects in CNP clauses is uncertain (Table 2-2). In Backward Control structures,

such subjects are judged as degraded or unacceptable. In Copy Control structures, some speakers consider them acceptable.

*Table 2-2. Subjects licensed in Assamese*

	Type	Form	Finite clauses	INF clauses	CNP clauses
Inherent Case	GEN	<i>-dr</i>	✓	✓	✓
	EXP.NOM	<i>-e</i>			
Structural Case	NOM	<i>-e/-∅</i>	✓	✓	✓/?/ *
	ABS	<i>-∅</i>			

In addition, Assamese has nonfinite conjunctive participle (CNP) clauses that function as adjuncts. The language shows evidence for Adjunct Control into CNP clauses, licensing Forward, Backward, and Copy Control; Backward and Copy Control structures are generally considered unacceptable if the CNP subject is Structural Case-marked.

The following chapter presents a detailed analysis of Forward and Backward Adjunct Control in Assamese. It provides an account of the conditions that drive and constrain their occurrence. It also deals with the problems that the analysis brings about, especially as related to Case Theory.