

<Reports on the Sixth Annual Meeting of the
Tsukuba English Linguistic Society> Control
and Binding in English

journal or publication title	Tsukuba English Studies
volume	5
page range	193-194
year	1986-08-31
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/7465

Control and Binding in English

Shinji Saito

In recent studies on control, it has been argued that the properties of control show overlap with the properties of binding. We assume that this argument is essentially correct and argue that Chomsky's control theory would be decomposable into more fundamental principles: one is the binding theory applying at S-structure and the other our control theory applying at D-structure, which is different from Chomsky's one.

Consider the sentences below:

- (1) a. John persuaded Mary [PRO to leave]
- b. John promised Mary [PRO to leave]
- c. John told Mary [PRO to leave]
- d. John asked Mary [PRO to leave]
- e. [PRO to leave early] is impossible.
- f. It is unclear [what [PRO to do]]
- g. John turned on the light (in order) [PRO to read the book]

The PROs in (1a-d) are subject to both control theory at D-structure and the binding theory at S-structure. Thus their six properties listed in (2), which are lacking in the PROs in (1e-f), are derived:

- (2) a. PRO must find an antecedent within a certain domain.
- b. The antecedent must c-command the controlled PRO.
- c. The antecedent is uniquely determined.
- d. Lexical NP cannot appear in the position of PRO
- e. PRO never takes a split antecedent.
- f. PRO cannot have discourse reference.

(2a, b, d, e, f) are due to their anaphorhood (binding theory). As for (2c), we argue that this property is due to the position where the PROs appear (our control theory). So, pronominal PROs may be subject to the control theory, and hence have the property (2c), when they appear, for example, in the ask --- wh- to or

