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 Prɔxad-ɒk
he.NOM this morning Proxad-ACC

b. e-khon kitap dil-e
one-CL book gave-3

‘He gave Proxad a book this morning.’
b. pro azi ratipuwa Proxad-āk
pro this morning Proxad-ACC
e-khɔn kitap 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 Proxad-āk
Ram-NOM this morning Proxad-ACC
e-khɔn kitap dil-e
one-CL book gave-3
‘Ram gave Proxad a book this morning.’
b. azi ratipuwa Ram-e Proxad-āk e-khɔn kitap dil-e
c. Proxad-āk Ram-e azi ratipuwa e-khɔn kitap dil-e
d. e-khɔn kitap Ram-e azi ratipuwa Proxad-āk 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 gfiɔr-to bfiāgil-e
Ram-NOM my house-CL destroy-3
‘Ram destroyed my house.’
b. mor gfiɔr-to Ram-e bfiāgil-e
my house-CL Ram-NOM destroy-3
‘No one but Ram destroyed my house.’
c. mor gfiɔr-to kone bfiāgil-e
my house-CL who.NOM destroy-3
‘Who destroyed my house?’
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-1. Some types of case in Assamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nominative subjects occur with transitive predicates, (4), and unergative predicates, (5). Absolutive subjects occur with unaccusative predicates, (6).

(4) a. Ram-e khotha-to xunil-e
Ram-NOM news-CL heard-3
‘Ram heard the news.’

b. kukur-to-e Proxad-dk kamuril-e
dog-CL-NOM Proxad-ACC bit-3
‘The dog bit Proxad.’

c. Ram-e sahi bonal-e
Ram-NOM tea made-3
‘Ram made tea.’

d. manuhi-to-e dprob lol-e
man-CL-NOM medicine took-3
‘The man took medication.’

e. suali-zoni-e tair boyfriend-dk 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. manuhi-to-e djur-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.’
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.

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

\[\text{Ram-} \tilde{\text{dr}} \quad \text{du-} \tilde{\text{kh} \tilde{\text{a}}}n \quad \tilde{\text{fi}}\tilde{\text{a}}t \quad \text{ase} \]

‘Ram has two hands.’

(10) *Alienable possession*

a. \[\text{Ram-} \tilde{\text{dr}} \quad \text{du-} \tilde{\text{to}} \quad \tilde{\text{la}}\tilde{\text{gw}a} \quad \text{as}i\tilde{\text{l}} \]

‘Ram had two servants.’

b. \[\text{i.} \tilde{\text{m}o} \quad \text{e-} \tilde{\text{ta}} \quad \text{kukur} \quad \text{ase} \]

‘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) \( \text{Ram-}dr \ niz-dr \ uporot \ kh\eta \ uthil \)
Ram-GEN self-GEN above/on anger raised
‘Ram got angry with himself.’

(12) \( \text{Ram-e,} [\Delta_i \ thanda \ lagabo] \)
Ram-NOM [\Delta.GEN cold feeling]
\( \text{ni-}bisar-e \)
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 \( k\eta r \) ‘do’ renders the subject more volitional. The same observation applies to (14a–b).

(13) a. \( \text{Ram-}dr \ e-ta \ buddlii \ khelal \)
Ram-GEN one-CL idea played
‘Ram got an idea.’ OR ‘An idea occurred to Ram.’

b. \( \text{Ram-e} \ e-ta \ buddlii \ k\viri\-e \)
Ram-NOM one-CL idea did-3
‘Ram did/planned an idea.’

(14) a. \( \text{Ram-}dr \ phurti \ lagil \)
Ram-GEN exhilaration felt
‘Ram felt very happy.’

b. \( \text{Ram-e} \ phurti \ k\viri\-e \)
Ram-NOM exhilaration did-3
‘Ram celebrated/partied.’

To elaborate, experiential predicates with \( k\eta r \) ‘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).
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, khôŋ uthil ‘anger raised’ and phurti lagil ‘exhilaration felt’ can be classified as state or process predicates that Case-mark their subjects genitive. The predicates khôŋ kôrile ‘anger did’ and phurti kôrile ‘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: khôŋ uthil ‘anger raised’ and phurti lagil ‘exhilaration felt’ simply mean ‘get angry’ and ‘feel happy’ respectively, while khôŋ kôrile ‘anger did’ and phurti kôrile ‘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).\(^1\)

\[(17)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{likh-Ø-e} \\
& \text{write-HABITUAL-3} \\
& \text{‘she/he/they write(s)’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{likh-ib-a} \\
& \text{write-FUT-3} \\
& \text{‘she/he/they will write’} \\
\text{c. } & \text{likh-is-e} \\
& \text{write-IMPERFECTIVE-3} \\
& \text{‘she/he/they has/have written’} \\
\text{d. } & \text{likh-il-e} \\
& \text{write-PAST-3} \\
& \text{‘she/he/they wrote’}
\end{align*}\]
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-ŋr tini-ta loguwa
[Ram-GEN three-CL servant
thak-a-r karone] xi/tar gfiōiniyak-e
keep-INF-GEN because] he.NOM/his wife-NOM
gfōr-ŋr kam na-kōr-e
house-GEN work NEG-do-3
‘Because Ram has three servants, he/his wife doesn’t do housework.’

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

(19) Contingent: Verb stem + -ōte
a. kha-ōte ⇒ ‘while eating’

b. [Ram-e bįat kha-ōte]
[Ram-NOM rice eat-INF]
xi Prōxad-ŋk 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-ōte] Prōxad-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. kōr-ile ⇒ ‘if one does’

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

c. [Prōxad-ŋr bįok lag-ile] xi
[Proxad-GEN hunger strike/feel-INF] he.NOM
bįat khaib-ŋ
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 (Dwarkesh 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb stem</th>
<th>( \rightarrow )</th>
<th>‘keeping, having kept’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thak-(i)</td>
<td>⇒</td>
<td>‘keeping, having kept’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. \( Ram-e [xomd\(i\)] na-thak-\(i\)\)
   Ram-NOM [time NEG-keep-CNP]
   \( b\dot{\text{fi}}\dot{\text{a}}t na-kh\(a\)-\(e\)\)
   rice NEG-ate-3

   ‘Having no time, Ram didn’t eat rice.’

c. \( Ram [b\dot{\text{fi}}\dot{\text{a}}\dot{\text{g}}\dot{\text{o}}]\(r\) lag-\(i\)\)
   Ram.ABS [exhaustion feel-CNP]
   thakil sleep

   ‘Having felt exhausted, Ram fell asleep.’
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.

\[(22)\]
\[a. \quad \text{Tom ate a sandwich and drank a soda.}\]
\[b. \quad *\text{What did Tom eat a sandwich and drink _______?}\]

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.

\[(23)\]
\[a. \quad \text{Ram ate a sandwich and drank a soda.}\]
\[b. \quad \text{Ram bought a book and read a magazine.}\]
Nonfinite clauses in Assamese

b. *alosani  e-khøn  Ram-e  kitap
   magazine  one-CL  Ram-NOM  book
   e-khøn  kinil-e  aru  _____  pɔrɔil-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  khøñ  uthil
   Ram-GEN  anger  raised
   aru  mor  gfiɔr-to  bʰiaŋil-e
   and  my  house-CL  destroyed-3
   ‘Ram got angry and destroyed my house.’
   b. *mor  gfiɔr-to  Ram-ɔr  khøñ
   my  house-CL  Ram-GEN  anger
   uthil  aru  _____  bʰiaŋil-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. \[\text{Ram-e} \quad [\text{khøŋ} \quad \text{uth-i}] \quad \text{mor} \]
   Ram-NOM [anger get-CNP] my
   gðør-to bðaŋil-e
   house-CL destroyed-3
   ‘Having got angry, Ram destroyed my house.’

   b. \[\text{Ram-e} \quad [\text{kam-to} \quad \text{kør-i}] \quad \text{søfi} \]
   Ram-NOM [job-CL do-CNP] tea
   khal-e ate-3
   ‘Having done the job, Ram had tea.’

(27) a. \[\text{mor} \quad \text{gðør-to} \quad \text{Ram-e} \quad [\text{khøŋ} \quad \text{uth-i}] \]
   my house-CL Ram-NOM [anger get-CNP]
   _____ bðaŋil-e
   _____ destroyed-3
   ‘My house, having got angry, Ram destroyed.’

   b. \[\text{søfi} \quad \text{Ram-e} \quad [\text{kam-to} \quad \text{kør-i}] \]
   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” (Haskelmath 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.
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; Masica 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. \[Prōxad, bhīalkoi gal-e\]  
Proxad.ABS well sang-3  
‘Proxad sang well.’

b. *\[Ram-or \[Δ, bhīalkoi ga-i\]\]  
Ram-GEN [Δ well sing-CNP]  
bhīal lagil  
good felt  
‘Proxad sang well, and Ram felt good.’

(31)  
a. \[Prōxad, xdmāi na-thakil\]  
Proxad.ABS time NEG-kept  
‘Proxad didn’t have time.’

b. *\[Ram-e \[Δ, xdmāi na-thak-i\]\]  
Ram-NOM [Δ time NEG-keep-CNP]  
bhīat 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**  
\[[\text{Matrix} [\text{Subordinate Subject…}]] [\text{Matrix Subject…}]]

b. **Backward Control**  
\[[\text{Matrix} [\text{Subordinate Subject…}]] [\text{Matrix Subject…}]]

c. **Copy Control**  
\[[\text{Matrix} [\text{Subordinate Subject…}]] [\text{Matrix 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.  \[\text{Kamal-}ak_i \ [\Delta_v^*/k \text{ doon ghante} \]
\[\text{Kamal-DAT [\Delta.NOM two hours} \]
\[naants-unu] \ [\Delta.NOM \text{ fever came} \]
dance-CNP] fever came
‘Having danced for two hours, Kamal got sick.’

b.  \[\Delta_v^*/k \text{ kushii ye-unu}] \[\Delta.DAT \text{ happiness come-CNP} \]
\[\text{Kamal-ni}_i \ [\text{naantsu laaglo} \]
Kamal-ERG dance did
‘Upon getting happy, Kamal danced.’

(34)  Marathi
a.  \[\Delta_v^*/k \text{ AruuN-ne}_i \ [\text{djewaN} \]
\[\text{Arun-ERG [\Delta.NOM meal} \]
\[banauun] \ [\text{movie baghitli} \]
prepare-CNP] movie watched
‘Having prepared dinner, Arun watched a movie.’

b.  \[\Delta_v^*/k \text{ taap yeuun}] \[\Delta.DAT \text{ fever come-CNP} \]
\[\text{AruuN-ne}_i \ [\text{aushad ghete} \]
\text{medication took}
‘Arun got sick and took medication.’
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) \( [\Delta_i^* k \quad \text{kam-to} \quad k\sigma r-i] \quad \text{Ram}_i \quad \text{gusi} \quad \text{gol} \)

\( [\Delta.\text{NOM} \quad \text{work} \quad \text{do-CNP}] \quad \text{Ram.ABS} \quad \text{away} \quad \text{went} \)

‘Having done the work, Ram left.’

(37) \( \text{Ram-}_e_i \quad [\Delta_i^* k \quad \text{xomi} \quad \text{na-thak-i}] \quad \text{Ram-NOM} \quad [\Delta.\text{GEN} \quad \text{time} \quad \text{NEG-keep-CNP}] \)

\( \text{bflat} \quad \text{na-khal-e} \quad \text{rice} \quad \text{NEG-ate-3} \)

‘Having no time, Ram didn’t eat rice.’

(38) \( [\Delta_i^* k \quad \text{bafut} \quad \text{kam} \quad k\sigma r-i] \quad \text{Ram-}_pr_i \)

\( [\Delta.\text{NOM} \quad \text{much} \quad \text{work} \quad \text{do-CNP}] \quad \text{Ram-GEN} \)

\( \text{ga} \quad \text{bea} \quad \text{hol} \quad \text{body} \quad \text{bad} \quad \text{became} \)

‘Having worked hard, Ram got sick.’

(39) \( [\Delta_i^* k \quad \text{ga} \quad \text{bea} \quad h\sigma i] \quad \text{manu}-\text{to-}_e_i \)

\( [\Delta.\text{GEN} \quad \text{body} \quad \text{bad} \quad \text{become-CNP}] \quad \text{man-CL-NOM} \)

\( \text{dpro} \quad \text{lol-e} \quad \text{medicine} \quad \text{took-3} \)

‘Having got sick, the man took medication.’
(40) \[\Delta_{/\iota^k} \quad ga \quad bea \quad hɔ-i\]
\[\Delta_{.GEN} \quad body \quad bad \quad become-CNP\]
\[\text{manufi-to}_{-ri} \quad bfiagɔr/dukh \quad lagil\]
\[\text{man-CL-GEN} \quad tired/sad \quad felt\]
‘Having got sick, the man felt tired/sad.’

(41) \[\Delta_{/\iota^k} \quad bfiagɔr \quad lag-i\]
\[\text{Ram}_{i} \quad \Delta_{.GEN} \quad exhaustion \quad feel-CNP\]
\[\text{xui} \quad \text{thakil} \quad sleep \quad kept\]
‘Having felt exhausted, Ram fell asleep.’

(42) \[\Delta_{/\iota^k} \quad kukur-to \quad fieru-i\]
\[\Delta_{.NOM} \quad dog-\text{CL} \quad lose-CNP\]
\[\text{sinta} \quad fɔis-e\]
\[\text{worried} \quad become-3\]
‘Having lost his dog, Proxad is worried.’

(43) \[\Delta_{/\iota^k} \quad kɔth-a-to \quad xun-i\]
\[\Delta_{.NOM} \quad news-\text{CL} \quad hear-CNP\]
\[\text{dukh} \quad lagil\]
\[\text{sad} \quad felt\]
‘Having heard the news, Proxad felt sad.’

(44) \[\Delta_{/\iota^k} \quad boyfriend-ok \quad dekh-i\]
\[\Delta_{.NOM} \quad boyfriend-\text{ACC} \quad see-CNP\]
\[\text{suali-zɔni}_{-ri} \quad laz \quad lagil\]
\[\text{girl-\text{CL-GEN}} \quad shy \quad felt\]
‘Having seen her boyfriend, the girl felt shy.’

(45) \[\Delta_{/\iota^k} \quad laz \quad lag-i\]
\[\Delta_{.GEN} \quad shy \quad feel-CNP\]
\[\text{Sarita}_{i} \quad tai\]
\[\text{room-ot} \quad gɔl\]
\[\text{room-LOC} \quad went\]
‘Having felt shy, Sarita went to her room.’

(46) \[\Delta_{/\iota^k} \quad bagi-ok \quad dekh-i\]
\[\Delta_{.NOM} \quad tiger-\text{ACC} \quad see-CNP\]
\[\text{kukur-to}_{-ri} \quad lagil\]
\[\text{bhipe} \quad lagil\]
\[\text{fear} \quad felt\]
‘Having seen a tiger, the dog got scared.’
Assamese Adjunct Control: A descriptive overview

(47) $\Delta i^{/k}$ bhâne lag-i] kukur-to, polai gɔl
[Δ.GEN fear feel-CNP] dog-CL.ABS escape went
‘Having got scared, the dog ran away.’

(48) Sarita-ri, $\Delta i^{/k}$ marathon dɔur-i]
Sarita-GEN marathon run-CNP
piafī lagil
thirst felt
‘Having run a marathon, Sarita felt thirsty.’

(49) Sarita-ɛi, $\Delta i^{/k}$ piafī lag-i]
Sarita-NOM thirst feel-CNP
lemonade khal-e
lemonade drank-3
‘Having felt thirsty, Sarita drank lemonade.’

(50) $\Delta i^{/k}$ e-ta bhâal buddhîi khela-i]
[Δ.GEN one-CL good idea play-CNP]
Ram-ɛi phurti kɔril-e
Ram-NOM party did-3
‘Having got a nice idea, Ram celebrated.’

(51) Ram-ɔr, $\Delta i^{/k}$ e-ta bhâal buddhî
Ram-GEN one-CL good idea
khel-i] bhâal lagil
play-CNP] good felt
‘Having got a nice idea, Ram felt good.’

(52) $\Delta i^{/k}$ lottery jik-i] mor ghoiniyak-ɔr
[Δ.NOM lottery win-CNP] my wife-GEN
phurti lagil
exhilaration felt
‘Having won the lottery, my wife felt very happy.’

(53) mor ghoiniyak-ɛi, $\Delta i^{/k}$ lottery jik-i]
my wife-NOM [Δ.NOM lottery win-CNP]
notun głoar kinil-e
new house bought-3
‘Having won the lottery, my wife bought a new house.’
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)  
\[ \text{Backward Control} \]
\[ \text{[Matrix \ [Subordinate Subject\ldots] \ [Matrix Subject\ldots]]} \]

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)  
\textit{Telugu (Haddad 2009a: 82, (30a–b))}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{a.} \( \Delta_i^{\ast k} \) \[ \text{Kumaar-ki, aakali wees-i} \]
  \( \Delta.\text{NOM} \) \[ \text{Kumar-DAT hunger fall-CNP} \]
  sandwich \( \text{tinnaa-Du} \)
  sandwich \( \text{ate-3.M.S} \)
  ‘Having got hungry, Kumar ate a sandwich.’
  
  \item \textit{b.} \( \Delta_i^{\ast k} \) \[ \text{Kumaar-ki, jwaram wacc-i} \]
  \( \Delta.\text{NOM} \) \[ \text{Kumar-DAT fever.NOM come-CNP} \]
  mandulu \( \text{waaDaa-Du} \)
  medicines \( \text{used-3.M.S} \)
  ‘Having had a fever, Kumar took medication.’
\end{itemize}

(57)  
\textit{Mizo (Subbarao 2004, in Davison 2008: 31, (9b))}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \( \Delta_i^{\ast k} \) \[ \text{Zova, tSutleng-ah a tSu} \]
  \( \Delta.\text{ERG} \) \[ \text{Zova.NOM bench-on 3.S sit.INF} \]
  Duh \( \text{want} \)
  ‘Zova wants to sit on the bench.’
\end{itemize}
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) $\Delta_{i/k}$ 

$[\text{Ram-}$\textit{dr}$_i \ xdm\textit{di} \ na-thak-\textit{i}]$

$\Delta.$\text{NOM} 

$[\text{Ram-GEN} \ \text{time} \ \text{NEG-keep-CNP}]$

$\textit{b\textit{fiat} na-khal-e}$

rice \ \text{NEG-ate-3}

‘Having no time, Ram didn’t eat rice.’

(59) 

$[\text{manu}$\textit{fi-to-r}$_i \ \text{ga} \ \text{bea} \ h\omega-i]$

$\Delta_{i/k}$

$[\text{man-CL-GEN} \ \text{body} \ \text{bad} \ \text{become-CNP}]$

$\Delta.$\text{NOM}

$\textit{d\text{prob} lol-e}$

medicine \ \text{took-3}

‘Having got sick, the man took medication.’

(60) 

$[\text{manu}$\textit{fi-to-r}$_i \ \text{ga} \ \text{bea} \ h\omega-i]$

$\Delta_{i/k}$

$[\text{man-CL-GEN} \ \text{body} \ \text{bad} \ \text{become-CNP}]$

$\Delta.$\text{GEN}

$\textit{b\text{fiag}\text{"or}/dukh lagil}$

tired/sad \ \text{felt}

‘Having got sick, the man felt tired/sad.’

(61) 

$\Delta_{i/k}$ 

$[\text{Ram-}$\textit{dr}$_i \ \text{b\text{"or}a} \ lag-i]$

$\Delta.$\text{ABS} 

$[\text{Ram-GEN} \ \text{exhaustion} \ \text{feel-CNP}]$

$xui \ \text{thakil}$

sleep \ \text{kept}

‘Having felt exhausted, Ram fell asleep.’

(62) 

$[\text{Sarita-r}$_i \ \text{laz} \ lag-i]$

$\Delta_{i/k}$ \ \text{tai}$

$[\text{Sarita-GEN} \ \text{shy} \ \text{feel-CNP}]$

$\Delta.$\text{ABS} \ \text{her}$

$\text{room-ot} \ \text{g\text{"ol}$

room-LOC \ \text{went}

‘Having felt shy, Sarita went to her room.’

(63) 

$[\text{kukur-to-r}$_i \ \text{b\text{"or}e} \ lag-i]$

$\Delta_{i/k}$ \ \text{polai} \ g\text{"ol}$

$[\text{dog-CL-GEN} \ \text{fear} \ \text{feel-CNP}]$

$\Delta.$\text{ABS escape \ \text{went}$

‘Having got scared, the dog ran away.’
(64) \( \Delta_{v^*k} \) [Sarita-\( r_i \) \( piafi \) \( lag-i \)]  
\( \Delta.NOM \) [Sarita-GEN thirst feel-CNP]  
lemonade \( khal-e \)  
lemonade drank-3  
‘Having felt thirsty, Sarita drank lemonade.’

(65) [Ram-\( dr_i \) e-\( ta \) b\( \bar{f}i\)al budd\( \bar{f}i \)i khela-i]  
[Ram-GEN one-CL good idea play-CNP]  
\( \Delta_{v^*k} \) phurti k\( \bar{\sigma} \)ril-e  
\( \Delta.NOM \) party did-3  
‘Having got a nice idea, Ram celebrated.’

(66) \( \Delta_{v^*k} \) [Ram-\( dr_i \) e-\( ta \) b\( \bar{f}i\)al budd\( \bar{f}i \)i khel-i]  
\( \Delta.GEN \) [Ram-GEN one-CL good idea]  
b\( \bar{f}i\)al 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) \( ?\Delta_{v^*k} \) [Ram-\( e_i \) phurti k\( \bar{\sigma} \)ril-i]  
\( \Delta.GEN \) [Ram-EXP.NOM exhilaration do-CNP]  
b\( \bar{f}i\)ok lagil  
hunger felt  
‘Having had a party, Ram felt hungry.’

(68) \( ?[\text{Ram-}\( e_i \) dukh k\( \bar{\sigma} \)ril-i] \( \Delta_{v^*k} \) \( \Delta.ABS \)  
[\text{Ram-EXP.NOM} sadness do-CNP]  
gusi g\( \bar{\sigma} \)l 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).
Assamese Adjunct Control: A descriptive overview

(69) *[manuɦ-zɑn-e  bɑɦɪut  kam  kɔr-i] Δ
    [man-CL-NOM  much  work  do-CNP] Δ.GEN
    ga  bea  ḥɔl

body  bad  became

‘Having worked hard, the man got sick.’

(70) *[Prɔxad-e  kukur-to  ḥiɛr-i] Δ
    [Proxad-NOM  dog-CL  lose-CNP] Δ.NOM
    sinta  ḥiɔis-e
worried  become-3

‘Having lost his dog, Proxad is worried.’

(71) *[Prɔxad-e  kɔtha-to  xun-i] Δ
    [Proxad-NOM  news-CL  hear-CNP] Δ.GEN
    dukh  lagil
sad  felt

‘Having heard the news, Proxad felt sad.’

(72) *[suali-zɑni-e  boɣrɪɛ-ok  dekh-i] Δ
    [girl-CL-NOM  boyfriend-ACC  see-CNP]
    laz  lagil

Δ.GEN  shy  felt

‘Having seen her boyfriend, the girl felt shy.’

(73) *[kukur-to-e  bɑɣɦ-ok  dekh-i] Δ
    [dog-CL-NOM  tiger-ACC  see-CNP] Δ.GEN
    bɪpɛ  lagil
fear  felt

‘Having seen a tiger, the dog got scared.’

(74) *Δ  [Sarita-e  marathon  dɔur-i]  piaʃi  lagil
Δ.GEN  [Sarita-NOM  marathon  run-CNP]  thirst  felt

‘Having run a marathon, Sarita felt thirsty.’

(75) *[mor  ghiɔiniyak-e  lottery  jik-i] Δ
    [my  wife-NOM  lottery  win-CNP] Δ.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) \[\text{Ram-e} \quad \text{kam-to} \quad \text{kɔr-i} \quad \Delta \]
\[\text{[Ram-NOM} \quad \text{work} \quad \text{do-CNP]} \quad \Delta.\text{ABS} \]
\[\text{gusi} \quad \text{gɔl} \]
\[\text{away} \quad \text{went} \]
\[\text{‘Having done the work, Ram left.’} \]

(77) Ram \quad \text{accident-ot} \quad \text{mɔril}
\[\text{Ram.ABS accident-LOC died} \]
\[\text{‘Ram died in an accident.’} \]

(78) \[\text{Ram-e} \quad \text{bɔiri} \quad \text{khua-r} \quad \text{karone} \quad \text{mɔril} \]
\[\text{Ram-NOM cigarette smoking-GEN because died} \]
\[\text{‘Ram died because of smoking cigarettes.’} \]

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) \[\text{Ram-e} \quad [\Delta \quad \text{kam-to} \quad \text{kɔr-i}] \quad \text{gusi} \quad \text{gɔl} \]
\[\text{Ram-NOM} \quad [\Delta.\text{NOM} \quad \text{work} \quad \text{do-CNP}] \quad \text{away} \quad \text{went} \]
\[\text{‘Having done the work, Ram left.’} \]

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-ia taap ye-uun] tya-ne
[Arun-DAT fever come-CNP] he-ERG
aushad ghette
took medication
‘Arun got sick, and he took medication.’
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-ŋr khng uth-i]  Ram-e
[Ram-GEN anger raise-CNP]  Ram-NOM
mor gfr-to bfrngl-e
my house-CL destroyed-3
‘Having got angry, Ram destroyed my house.’

(85)  [Ram-ŋr 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.’
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. \[\text{Ram-}dr \quad (*\text{janibuji}) \quad e-ta \quad \text{buddii} \quad \text{khelal}\]  
\[\text{Ram-GEN (knowingly) one-CL idea played}\]  
‘An idea occurred to Ram (*on purpose).’

b. \[\text{Ram-e \quad janibuji \quad e-ta \quad \text{buddii \ k}oril-e}\]  
\[\text{Ram-NOM knowingly one-CL idea did-3}\]  
‘Ram got an idea on purpose.’  
Also meaning ‘Ram knowingly tricked someone.’

(93)  

a. \[\text{Ram-}dr \quad (*\text{janibuji}) \quad \text{kh}on \quad \text{uthil}\]  
\[\text{Ram-GEN (knowingly) anger did}\]  
‘Ram angered (*on purpose).’

b. \[\text{Ram-e \quad janibuji \quad kh}on \quad \text{k}oril-e\]  
\[\text{Ram-NOM knowingly anger did-3}\]  
‘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)  

\[\text{[Ram-e \quad khon \quad koril-e]} \quad \text{Ram-e}\]  
\[\text{[Ram-EXP.NOM anger raise-CNP]} \quad \text{Ram-NOM}\]  
\[\text{mor ghir-to \quad bia}nil-e\]  
\[\text{my house-CL destroyed-3}\]  
‘Having got angry (having expressed his anger), Ram destroyed my house.’
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) ✓/*[manu-zi-dn-e  bafiat  kam  kɔr-i]
[man-CL-NOM  much  work  do-CNP]
manu-zi-dn-ɔr  ga  bea  ɦɔl
man-CL-GEN  body  bad  became
‘Having worked hard, the man got sick.’

(98) ✓/*[Proxad-ɛ  kukur-to  ɦeru-i]
[Proxad-NOM  dog-CL  lose-CNP]
Proxad-ɔr  sinta  ɦɔsi-e
Proxad-GEN  worried  become-3
‘Having lost his dog, Proxad is worried.’

(99) ✓/*[Proxad-ɛ  ɡɔtha-to  xun-i]
[Proxad-NOM  news-CL  hear-CNP]
Proxad-ɔr  dukh  lagil
Proxad-GEN  sad  felt
‘Having heard the news, Proxad felt sad.’
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)  
\[\text{Ram-\text{GEN} very hunger feel-CNP] xi/besera-to-e posa b håt khal-e} \]
he.NOM/poor guy-CL-NOM stale rice ate-3
‘Ram felt very hungry, and he/the poor guy ate stale rice.’

(107)  
\[\text{Ram-EXP.NOM anger raise-CNP] xi/gadfa-to-e mor ghôr-to b hânîl-e} \]
he.NOM/donkey-CL-NOM my house-CL destroyed-3
‘Ram got angry (expressed his anger), and he/the idiot destroyed my house.’

(108)  
\[\text{man-CL-GEN body bad become-CNP] xi/besera-to-e dorrab lol-e} \]
he.NOM/poor guy-CL-NOM medicine took-3
‘The man got sick, and he/the poor guy took medication.’

(109)  
\[\text{Sarita-GEN shy feel-CNP] she.ABS her room-ot gôl} \]
room-LOC went
‘Sarita felt shy, and she went to her room.’

(110)  
\[\text{dog-CL-GEN fear feel-CNP] he.ABS escape gôl} \]
went
‘The dog got scared, and he ran away.’

(111)  
\[\text{Sarita-GEN thirst feel-CNP] she.NOM lemonade khal-e} \]
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)  
\[\text{a. } [\text{Ram-} \text{dr} \quad \text{khub} \quad bfiok \quad \text{lag-i}] \]
\[\text{[Ram-GEN} \quad \text{very} \quad \text{hunger} \quad \text{feel-CNP} ]\]
\[\text{b. } \text{Ram-e/} \text{xi/besera-to-e} \quad \text{posa} \]
\[\text{Ram-NOM/he.NOM/poor guy-CL-NOM} \quad \text{stale} \]
\[\text{bfiat} \quad \text{khal-e} \]
\[\text{rice} \quad \text{ate-3} \]

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)  
\[\text{a. } \text{Ram-e} \quad \text{lottery jik-i} \quad \text{xi} \quad \text{notun} \]
\[\text{Ram-NOM} \quad \text{lottery win-CNP} \quad \text{he.NOM} \quad \text{new} \]
\[\text{gfiwr} \quad \text{kinil-e} \]
\[\text{house} \quad \text{bought-3} \]
\[\text{‘Having won the lottery, Ram bought a new house.’} \]
b. *Ram-e lottery jik-i notun
   Ram-NOM lottery win-CNP new
gför 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
gför 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, khwhy uth-i]
   [Ram-GEN anger raise-CNP]
   xi/Prxad gusi gɔl
   he.ABS/Proxad.ABS away went
   ‘Ram got angry, and Proxad left.’

(115) *[Ram-dr, xmdpi na-thak-i]
   [Ram-GEN time NEG-keep-CNP]
   xi/Prxad-e bʃat-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-ɒr xɒmɒi
     Ram-NOM [he.GEN/Ram-GEN time
na-thak-i] bɦiat na-khal-e
NEG-keep-CNP] rice NEG-ate-3
‘Ram had no time, and he didn’t eat rice.’

b. *manuɦi-to-e [manuɦi-to-r/besera-to-r
     man-CL-NOM [man-CL-GEN/poor guy-CL-GEN
ga bea ɦ-i] dʋrob lol-e
body bad become-CNP] medicine took-3
‘The man got sick, and the poor guy took medication.’

(118) a. *[tar bɦagɔr 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 bɦiʋe lag-i] kukur-to
     [he.GEN fear feel-CNP] dog-CL.ABS
polai ɡɔl
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) [ɗɪumufia aɦi-i] boɦiu t gɔs bɦiʋangil
    [storm.ABS come-CNP] many trees.ABS broke
‘A storm came and many trees got broken.’
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 ꜗɦɒ-tor zui laga-i] bofiut
[Ram-NOM house-CL fire happen-CNP] many

manuɦi mɔrıl

people.ABS died

‘Ram burned the house; many people died.’

(127) *[e-ta ꜗɦɒ-rot zui lag-i]
[one-CL house-LOC fire happen-CNP]

bofiut manuɦi-e police-aloi phone kɔrıl-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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Finite clauses</th>
<th>INF clauses</th>
<th>CNP clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inherent Case</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-ɒr</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXP.NOM</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Case</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>-e/-Ø</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.