Tsukuba English Studies (1988) vol.7, 283-285

On Control

Yoshio Endo
Yuji Takano
Mikio Hashimoto

We have mainly discussed the following examples.

(1) John persuaded $Mary_i$ PRO_i to go to college.
(2) $John_i$ promised Mary PRO_i to go to college.
(3) $Mary_i$ was persuaded PRO_i to go to college.
(4)*Mary was promised PRO to go to college.
(5) $John_i$ promised Mary PRO_i to be examined.
(6) John promised $Mary_i$ PRO_i to be allowed to go to college.
(7)*Mary was promised PRO to be examined.
(8) $Mary_i$ was promised PRO_i to be aoolwed to go to college.

The main purpose of this report is to propose a syntactic way to interpret the subject of complements in the above examples which previous approaxhes cannot handle systematically. We propose the Revised Minimal Distance Principle(RMDP), which need not have the lexical specification [+SC] that indicates a matrix subject serves for an embedded covert subject:

(9) PRO is assigned the index of the nearest NP at D-structure.

In order to maintain (9), we heavily depend on the projection system proposed by Fukui(1986) and the assumption that arguments mirror the thematic hierarchy as discussion in Jackendoff(1972) at D-structure.

Then, persuade-cases (1) and (3) have the following D-structures (10a,b), respectively.

(10) a. $[_{IP}[_{V'}[_{V'}[V[_{IP}PRO...]]Mary]John]]$
b. $[_{IP}$ en$[_{V'}[_{V'}[V[_{IP}PRO...]]Mary]e]]$ (e = empty)

RMDP correctly predicts that the controller is Mary.

Before turning to promise-case, note that there are structural differences between persuade-case and promise-case:

(11) a. *Who did you promise to go to college ?
b. Who did you persuade to go to college ?
c. John promised (Mary) to go to college.
d. John persuaded *(Mary) to go to college.

The paradigm above indicates that the indirect object in promise-case is an adjunct whicl the indirect object in persuade-case is an argument.

Then, promise-cases(2) and (4) have the following D-structures (12a,b), respectively, assuming that, as in Fukui(1986), adjuncts are outside arguments at D-structure.

(12) a. $[_{IP}[_{V'}[_{V'}[V[_{IP}PRO...]]John]Mary]]$
b. $[_{IP}$ en$[_{V'}[_{V'}[V[_{IP}PRO...]]e]Mary]]$

In (12a) we can choose the correct controller, but in (12b) PRO is indexed with the empty e. We assume with Culicove and Wilkins(1984) that an empty element cannot serve as a controller. Thus, (4) is ungrammatical.

Finally, we consider (5)-(8). In our approach the status of embedded sentences plays an important role in deciding a controller. Then, we assume that PRO to be examined is an argument and that PRO to be allowed to go to college is an sdjunct,as shown by do-so test in (13).

(13) a. John promised Mary to be allowed to leave and
Nancy did so to be allowed to stay.
b. *John promised Mary to be examined and Nancy did so
to be hit.

That is, an sdjunct is permitted to be located outside do-so, while an argument is not. The D-structures of (5)-(8) are as follows:

(14) a. $[_{IP}[_{V'}[_{V'}[V[_{IP}PRO...]]John]Mary]]$
b. $[_{IP}[_{V'}[_{V'}[V$ John] Mary] $[_{IP}PRO...]]]$
c. $[_{IP}$ en$[_{V'}[_{V'}[V[_{IP}PRO...]]e]Mary]]$
d. $[_{IP}$ en$[_{V'}[_{V'}[V$ e]Mary] $[_{IP}PRO...]]]$

The correct control relation is obtained by the indexing at D-structures in (14).

So far, we have presented the systematic way to expoain control phenomena, which previous approaches(Chomsky(1980), Manzini(1983), Rizicka(1983), Bresnan(1983), etc.) fail to explain systematically.