

CONTROL PREDICATES IN STANDARD WRITTEN ARABIC (SWA)	Mohamed, Moustafa Thabet Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Minya
---	---

### 1.0 Objectives of the study

This study aims to investigate the features of obligatory control predicates<sup>1</sup> in standard written Arabic (henceforth, SWA). Control predicates in SWA refer to a class of verbs which are usually followed by the complementizer ?an and its complement. The complement is usually unmarked for tense and its PRO is controlled externally either by the subject or the object of its matrix (s)entence. In other words, this type of control predicates<sup>2</sup> is subcategorized for infinitive clauses headed by the complementiser ?an and their PROs are co referentially<sup>3</sup> co indexed with either their subjects or objects.

The present study aims to identify the syntactic and semantic features of control predicates in SWA and to classify their types. The purpose of investigation is to determine which argument of the control predicate can be the appropriate controller of the PRO of the ?an complement. The study also purports to examine whether this control relation is determined by the semantic features and

subcategorisation features of the control predicate or the syntactic rules are the sole determiners of this relation. The study also examines the validity of categorizing control predicates into subject / object / objective subject control predicates. Finally, the study suggests a tentative eclectic model which is applied on the present corpus. The model suggested here is based on both semantic and syntactic components.

### **1.1 Types of control predicates in SWA**

Control predicates in SWA, as mentioned above, refer to those verbs which subcategorize for infinitive phrases (IPs) headed by ?an and has PRO . This PRO is controlled obligatorily either by the subject or the object of its matrix S. SWA reflects three types of obligatory control predicates. The first type is the Subject control predicate. The predicate which belongs to this type is usually followed by the ?an IP complement where the PRO is obligatorily controlled by the argument which occupies the subject position of the matrix S . The second type is the Object control predicate. This type is structurally similar to the first type but the PRO in the ?an IP complement is obligatorily controlled by the argument which

occupies the object position of the matrix S. The third type is known as the objective subject control predicate. The predicates which belong to that type is structurally similar to raising verbs in English such as seem and expect, where they are followed by Ss not S's. Accordingly the subject of the ?an IP complement can be raised to the subject position of the matrix S. These different types can be illustrated in the following examples :-

1-yufjaawilu al-walad-u [?an PRO yaquuda assiyarah]  
                                   1                                  1  
       tries      def. boy-nom. [ to      drive      def. car ]

(lit.) The boy is trying to drive the car.

2- sa?ala al-?ab-u ?ibna-hu [?an PRO yusaafir-a]  
                   1          2                  1\*/2  
       asked      def.father-nom. son-his      [ to travel ]

(lit.) The father asked his son to travel.

3- Yatawaqqfu al-?ab-u ?ibnah-u [?an PRO yaSil-a  
                   1          2                  1\*/2  
       expects      def.father-nom. def. son his-acc. [ to arrive  
       qariib-an]  
       soon]

(lit.) The father expected his son to arrive soon.

It can be observed in (1) that the predicate 'yufjaawilu' (he tries) is followed by an IP which is headed by the

complementiser  $\text{ʔan}$ . The PRO which exists in the IP complement is obligatorily controlled by the lexical NP  $\text{ʔal-walad-u}$  ( the boy ). In (2), The PRO of the  $\text{ʔan}$  IP complement is obligatorily controlled by the object of the matrix S,  $\text{ʔibna-hu}$  ( his son ), whereas in (3), the PRO is controlled by the lexical NP  $\text{ʔibnah-u}$  ( his son ), which is the underlying subject of the  $\text{ʔan}$  IP complement.

## 1.2 Approaches to control predicates analysis

The classification of control predicates into subject / object and objective subject control predicates has resulted in the production of an extensive literature on the theory of control introduced by different schools of linguistics . This production can be subsumed in three major different as well as controversial approaches. The first approach is syntactic. It argues that the obligatory control and co reference between an argument and The PRO in the  $\text{ʔan}$  IP is basically justified on syntactic basis. The major representatives of this approach are Rosenbaum ( 1967 ), Chomsky ( 1980, 1981, 1986 ) ,Larson (1991) and Hornstein (1999). The second approach is semantic. It renounces the idea that principles and

parameters of syntax can resolve the feature of control. Instead the approach argues that the feature of control can be resolved within the domain of semantics. Jackendoff (1969,1972,1985, 1990,1995 ) and Cullicover and Jackendoff (1995 , 1997 ,2001 , 2004 ) among others are the major advocates of this approach.

Chomsky (1980, 1981,1986 ) deals with the feature of control within the framework of the Binding theory. PRO, as stated by condition B of the Binding principles<sup>4</sup> , is similar in its distribution to pronominals in the sense that it must be free in its governing category. Accordingly, PRO cannot be controlled locally with an NP which exists within its governing category<sup>5</sup> and it seeks its controller within the matrix S. In the following examples:

4- John tries [PRO to dance ]

1        1

5- John promised Mary [ PRO to dance ]

1        2    1 / 2\*

6- John persuaded Mary [ PRO to dance ]

1        2    1\* / 2

PRO in (4) is controlled by the matrix S subject ` John ` . In (5), PRO is controlled by the subject `John` , not by the object `Mary`. In (6), the object `Mary` , not the subject `John` is the controller of PRO.

However, PRO is not always controlled by an entity outside its governing category. In certain contexts, PRO can have its uncontrolled free co reference. This can be shown in the following example:

7- It is known [ what to PRO do ]

Although PRO is uncontrolled in its clause, it is also uncontrolled by any entity outside its clause. So, we can say that PRO has two references :- (1) a proximate<sup>6</sup> reference where PRO is controlled by an entity in the matrix S, and (2) obviative<sup>7</sup> reference where the PRO is free and is uncontrolled.

The problem with the control of PRO within the Binding theory of Chomsky is the lack of systematic distributional analysis for PRO. The theory does not tell us when the PRO is proximate or obviative, or when PRO is controlled and when it is not controlled. Moreover, the situation becomes more complicated when we regard the antecedents<sup>8</sup> of PRO in (5) and (6). In (5) the antecedent of PRO is 'John', the subject, whereas, in (6), the antecedent 'Mary', the object. Then, we have here three different distributions of PRO:- 1) subject – controlled PRO, 2) object- controlled PRO and 3) free PRO. Besides, Radford (1981) refers to a fourth distribution for PRO that it can be controlled either by the

subject or the object of the matrix S. This distribution can be noticed in the following example ( his, 65):-

8- John asked Bill PRO to leave.

1            1    1/2

PRO in the above example can be controlled either to the subject 'John' or the object 'Bill

From the above survey , the distribution of PRO can be subsumed as follows:-

9- a- uncontrolled PRO

b- subject - controlled PRO

c- object – controlled PRO

d- subject or object controlled PRO

The theory of control , as surveyed above , has introduced a little with regard to PRO and its variable distribution. The syntactic component with its co indexing rules and its conditions on these rules is not adequate to justify the different co reference of PRO and its arbitrary distribution. No syntactic rules are introduced to justify or specify the contexts which determine the controller of PRO. Rosenbaum (1967) classifies control predicates into two major types:- promise- verbs and persuade- verbs ; where the first set of verbs are taken as subject controllers, and the second type is the object controllers. But this classification does not tell why the subject of promise is the controller of PRO, and the

---

object of persuade is the controller of PRO. Moreover, verbs such as 'ask', as in (8), where we have two different candidates as controllers of PRO, are not included in Rosenbaum's classification. The only rule that is regarded as more general and powerful in the syntactic component is the one which states that PRO must be free in its government category. Beyond that rule, syntax does not go further.

The second approach to the study of the control theory is basically semantic. It relies on the fact that the semantic features of the verb determine the appropriate controller of PRO. Jackendoff and Culicover, (henceforth J& C) (2004) introduce an outline of a semantic model to explain and justify the different distributions of PRO, as referred to in (9). In their article J&C stress the fact that control is a feature that can be resolved in the domain of semantics. They also argue that the lexical semantic entry of the verb, neither its syntactic categorization nor its position, determine the co-indexing of PRO in the infinitive phrase with the subject or the object of the matrix S. Their model is based on the rules of the lexical semantics of the verb. C&J argue that the verb which requires unique<sup>9</sup> (obligatory) control should span a number of semantic classes. For instance, verbs such as promise, learn or agree require their subjects to be unique



controllers. And verbs such as persuade, teach or remind demand their objects to be their unique controllers. J&C notice that the verbs which require control select actional complements such as intention, obligation and ability. So, verbs such as oblige and order, for instance, impose obligation, and accordingly, the person who is under obligation is in the object position of the matrix S and is the controller of PRO in the infinitive phrase. Conversely, verbs such as promise and learn require the person who is under obligation to be in the subject position of the matrix S and hence to be the controller of PRO in the infinitive phrase.

Based on these observations, J&C classify unique verbs that require unique actional complements into six cases:-

**Intention** : the Actor is intending to make x. Here, the action of the actor is confined to the intender.

**Ability** : the ability to do x is bound to the actor position. In other words, the performance of the action is confined to the actor position, which is the subject position.

**Obligation** : person A under obligation is required to fulfill an action x for the benefit of person b. As a consequence, the agent of the action falls in the object position.

**Normativity**: person A knows the norm, so, he falls in the subject position as he is supposed to perform the action . Or,

---

person A is to comply with the norm, so somebody else is supposed to perform the action and accordingly, falls in the object position verbs such as learn, remember and forget represent the first type of norm are subject control predicates, where verbs such as remind and help are object control predicates as they represent the second type of norm.

**Force – dynamic predicates** : They include predicates of causing, preventing, enabling and helping. Agents of these predicates are always mapped into subject position.

**Requesting** : person A is influenced to perform an action for person B. Once again , person A is in object position, while person B falls in subject position.

To sum up , For J&C, unique control , as outlined above, is determined by the semantic features of the predicate .At the same time, syntax has no rule to play in the process of unique control assignment.

### 1.3 Model of analysis

The survey of the two controversial approaches towards the obligatory control of PRO, as outlined in (1.2), reflects the following observations: (1) PROs are similar to pronominals in their distributions, in the sense that PRO must be free in its governing category and not to be construed with

any entity within its category. (2) To achieve grammaticality, PRO is always controlled from outside its governing category by an entity. (3) The controller entity of the PRO is either to be the subject or the object of the matrix S. (4) The control assignment of PRO is determined by the semantic entries of the predicate of the matrix S.

It can be summarized, then, that the syntactic component and the semantic component are interrelated in determining and specifying the controller of the PRO. The co-indexing of PRO with a controller outside its category does not represent a problem if that controller is the only entity of the predicate of the matrix S. As a result, the syntactic component is adequate to achieve this co-reference. The situation becomes problematic and complicated when the matrix S has two arguments. Hence, the semantic component is used to assign the appropriate obligatory controller. Accordingly, the model that can adequately account for the control of PRO should combine both syntactic as well as semantic components.

The model suggested in this study is eclectic. It comprises two components. The first component is syntactic and is based on condition B of the Binding theory. The second component is semantic and is based on the

---

lexical semantic model as outlined by (J&C). The model suggested is as follows :

**7- A-The syntactic component :-**

- 1- Assign a controller for PRO outside its governing category.
- 2- When a control predicate has one argument assign it as the controller of PRO in ?an IP complement

**(B) The semantic component:-**

- 1- When a control predicate has two arguments the controller of PRO must be the doer or supposed to be the doer of the action in the ?an IP complement.

The model as formulated and presented above will be used to investigate the distributions of PRO in SWA to overcome the shortcomings of both the syntactic and semantic approaches when they are applied separately.

**2-0 Syntactic features of ?an**

The word `?an` is equivalent to the infinitive(to) in English. `?an` is a verbal complementizer where it is followed by a verb. There are specific syntactic features which distinguish the verb that follows ?an. Also, there are

syntactic features that characterize the predicate that precedes the complementizer ?an.

The verb that follows ?an shows the subjunctive mood and is regarded as a mood assigner (Kamel, 1991). Moreover, the verb which follows ?an does not inflect for tense, but shows features of aspect (Abdul-Ghany, 1980). So, the verb that follows ?an is marked as [ -tense] [ + aspect ]. As a pro-drop language, Arabic language has a rich system of inflection that reflects on the verb. The verb can inflect for features of tense , number, person and gender to agree with its subject which may be overtly or covertly expressed. The verb which follows ?an , though it is subjunctive and marked as [ \_ tense] , is inflected for gender, number and person to achieve agreement with the subject or the object of the matrix S. The PRO , which is the covert subject of the ?an complement is controlled either by the subject or the object of the matrix S . These features can be observed in the following example:-

8- ?araada      al-?aulaad-u      [ ?an PRO yusaafir-uu]  
       want-past def-boys-nom.-pl.      to travel- they  
 (lit.)The boys wanted to travel.

---

We notice in the above example that The complementizer ?an is followed by the verb `yusaafir-uu` (to travel) which is infinitive. The verb is marked for number and person to agree with the subject in the matrix S, `?al-?aulaad-u` (the boys) which acts as the controller of PRO. We notice, also, the contrast between the verb of the matrix S and the verb of the ?an complement. The first is indicative and marked for tense while the second is marked as subjunctive and [- tense]. The subject of the ?an complement is covertly expressed and PRO is controlled by the subject of the matrix s.

In SWA, there are certain verbs which are subcategorized with the complementizer ?an. These verbs can be classified as follows:

1-after predicates which express wish or activity of will such as `?afjaba` (to love), `faDDala` (to prefer), `tamanna` (to wish), `?intaDara` (to expect), `wafada` (to promise) and `Talaba` (to ask).

2- after predicates of command or request such as `?amara` (to order), `Talaba` (to ask), `taraJJa` (to implore) and `?ista?đana` (to ask for permission).

3- after predicates which express possibility or capability such as `?araada` (to want), `?istaTaafa` (can), `wafada` (to promise), `tamakkana` (to be able to) and `fjaawala` (to try).

4- After predicates which express obligation, acceptance or refusal such as `yajibu` (to have or must), `yanbayi` (ought to), `qabila` (to accept), `taraddada` (to hesitate) and `rafaDa` (or refuse).

It can be observed that these predicates reflect marks for tense and inflection: so, they are subcategorized for [ + tense ] and [ + AGR ]. Moreover, subjects or objects of these predicates are to be co indexed with the PROs of their ?an complements and control them. These observations can be observed in the following example;-

9- ?araada a -- ttilmiid-u ?an PRO yu?aakira fi huduu?-in

Wanted def. pupil to study in quietness

(lit.) The pupil wanted to study quietly.

The verb in the matrix S is in the form of the simple past and shows marks of person number and gender. Whereas, the verb in the ?an complement is unmarked for tense ,but

reflects the marks of person , number and gender which agree with the subject of the matrix predicate , `?a-ttelmeed-u` .

### 2-1 Subject control predicates

Subject control predicates refer to those verbs which are subcategorized for complements headed by PROs which are controlled by the subjects of those verbs. It can be observed that SWA has two types' subject control predicates . The first type includes intransitive predicates whereas the second type includes transitive predicates. In both cases , The subject of the predicate is the controller of PRO in the ?an complement. In the following examples :-

10- turiid-u    l-bint- u    [?an PRO talʕaba ]  
                    1                    1  
                    wants    def. girl- nom.    to    play

(lit.) The girl wants to play.

11- ʕaawala al- walad-u [?an PRO yalʕa ba]  
                    1                    1  
                    tried- past def. boy- nom.    to play

(lit.) The boy tried to play.

In both (11) and ( 12 ), PRO is co indexed with the subject of its matrix S. This is shown in the specified features of number , person and gender which the infinitive verb in the



?an complement shows. In ( 10 ), the verb ` talʕaba ` agrees with the subject ` ?al- bint-u`. Also, in (11), The subject ` ?al-walad-u` agrees with its verb in features of number, person and gender.

The process of co indexation between PRO of the ?an complement and the subject of the matrix S can be justified and account for the model as suggested in ( 1-3 ). PRO , as the syntactic component of the model states , must not be controlled locally its complement, and to achieve grammaticality and acceptability it is to be obligatorily co indexed with the subject of the matrix S. So, PRO is in both (10 ) and ( 11 ) is controlled by the subjects of the matrix Ss.

However, the syntactic component of the model is inadequate to provide an account or justification for the subject – PRO control relationship when the predicate has two arguments. In the following examples:-

12- Waʕada al-ʕaamil-u al-mudiir-a [ ?an PRO  
                   1                                  2                                  1 /\*2  
 promised def. worker-nom. def.manager-acc [to  
 yaʕti mubakir-an]  
 come early-adv.]

(lit.) The worker promised the manager to come early.

---

13-ʔistaʔðana a-JJundi-u al-qaaʔid-a [ʔan PRO yuhaajim ]  
                                   1                  2                  1/2\*  
                                   asked          def.soldier-nom def. leader-acc. [ to attack ]

(lit.) The soldier asked his leader for the permission to attack  
 We notice in (12) that co indexation between PRO and the subject `ʔal walad-u` is well-acceptable and grammatical. Whereas, co indexation is banned between PRO and the object `ʔal- mudiiir-a`. The same case is drawn to (13) .Co - indexation of PRO with the subject `ʔa- JJundi-u` is allowed , whereas, co indexation with the object `ʔal-qaaʔid-a` is ruled out.

The problem with the syntactic component of the model is its inadequacy to provide an account for the process of co indexation and control as surveyed above. The syntactic component can tell us that PRO must be free in its governing category, and to be controlled from outside not from inside its category. However, the syntactic component cannot tell as why the subjects in (12) and (13) are taken as the appropriate antecedents of PRO but the objects are banned to controllers of PROs in these sentences. The semantic component of the model as suggested in (1-3) can provide an account for this problem. As stated by the semantic component the controller

of PRO either to be the doer or the supposed to be the doer of the action. In (12) the one who is responsible for the action of promising is the argument `ʔal- walad-u` that occupies the subject position of the matrix S . Also it is the subject who is going to initiate the action or he supposed to do it in ʔan complement. In (13) , as well, The subject of the main clause predicate , `ʔa- JJundi-u ` is the one that initiates the act of taking a permission and the same subject is going to do the action of attacking. So, in both the matrix clause and the ʔan IP the doer or the supposed to be the doer of the action is the argument that occupies the subject position of the matrix S.

So , the semantic component can justify the control relationship between the subject entities and PROs in (12) and (13), and to rule out any relationship between the object entities and PROs in the same sentences.

## **2-2 Object control predicate**

Object control predicates refer to those predicates that are followed by two arguments ; one argument occupies the subject position while the other occupies the object position. The difference between the subject control predicates and object control predicates is that the argument in the object

---

position is the controller of PRO in ?an complement. Also, the verb in ?an complement agrees with the object, not with the subject, of the verb in the matrix S in number, gender and person. In the following examples :-

14-naSafja al-ʔab-u ibna-hu [ʔan PRO yuḏaakira]  
                                 1          2                  1\* /2  
 advised-past def.father-nom. son-acc-his [ to study ]

(lit.) The father advised his son to study.

15-naSafjat al-ʔum-u ʔibnata-ha [ʔan PRO tuḏaakira]  
                                 1          2                  1\* /2  
 advised- past def. mother-nom. daughter acc.her-[to study]

(lit.) The mother advised her daughter to study.

The predicate `naSafja` in the above examples have two arguments. The arguments in the object positions are the controllers of PROs. Whereas, co-indexation between the subjects of these arguments with PROs of the ?an IP complements are judged as ungrammatical and unacceptable, although these subjects are identical to the predicates of ?an IP complements in number, person and gender. This observation clarifies the fact that Arabic is similar to English in having object control predicates.

Once again, The syntactic component of the model states that PRO must be free in its governing and its controller must

be from without not from within. But the choice of the object , not the subject, as the controller of PRO cannot be justified or accounted for by syntax. The semantic component of the model suggested in this study can account for this obligatory control between the objects and PROs in (14) and (15). As outlined in (1-3) , PRO is to be controlled by the doer or supposed to be the doer of the action. In (14), the giver of advice is the argument which occupies the subject position, `ʔal-ʔab-u` ( the father ) , nevertheless , it is ruled out to be the controller of PRO in ʔan complement. This is due to the fact that the action of studying will be undertaken by the entity that occupies the subject position of the matrix S. It is the subject ` ʔal-ʔibn-a `who will be the doer or the performer the action. Hence, he is the controller of PRO. The same case is in (15). Although the argument ` ʔal- ʔum-u` gives the advice and it agrees with the verb of ʔan IP in the features of tense, number and person, it is ruled out to be the controller of PRO. The argument that will initiate the action and will do it is the argument that falls in the object position. The object ` ʔal-bint-a ` is the doer of the action of studying and accordingly, it must be the controller of PRO.

---

It can be concluded , then, that the model can adequately account for the relation of control and co indexation in object control predicates.

### 2-3 Objective subject control predicates

There are predicates in SWA that can be used either intransitively or transitively. So, in one context, such predicates can be followed by ?an complements with PROs that are controlled externally by the subjects of these predicates. In a second context, These predicates can be followed by ?an IP complements that have their own lexical arguments. In a third context, The these subjects of ?an complements can be raised to occupy the object positions of their matrix Ss and be the controllers of PROs of their ?an IP complements. These observations can be illustrated in the following examples:

16 yatawaqqfu      muƣamad-un      [ ?an PRO yanJafja ]  
  1  1  
  expect      Mohamed      to succeed.

(lit.) Mohamed expects to succeed.

17 ytawaqqfu      muƣamad-un      [ ?an yanJafja ?axaa- hu ]

expect Mohamed to succeed brother- his  
 (lit.) Mohamed expects his brother to succeed.

18- yatawaqqafu mofjamad-un ?axaa-hu [ ?an PRO  
 yanJafja ]

1 2 1\*/2  
 expect Mohamed brother- his-acc. to succeed

(lit.) Mohamed expects his brother to succeed.

In (16), PRO is externally controlled by the subject of the matrix S, 'Mohamed'. The predicate 'yatawaqqafu' is similar to subject control predicate, as it has only one argument. Accordingly, the syntactic component of the model (1-3) can assign the co reference relation between the subject 'Mohamed' and PRO of ?an complement in. In (17), we have the predicate 'yatawaqqafu' with one argument, 'Mohamed' in the subject position and is followed by ?an IP which has the argument, '?axa-hu' in the subject position. In (18), the subject of the IP complement '?axaa-hu' becomes the object of the predicate 'yatawaqqafu' in the matrix S. The problem here is to determine whether the argument '?axaa-hu' is the subject of the ?an IP or the object of the predicate 'yatawaqqafu'. In

---

other words, we have two options with regard to the types of predicates such as `yatawaqqaṣu`, either (1) to regard the predicate `ʔaḡnaṣa` as an object control predicate ?, or (2) to regard it as a raising predicate similar to verbs such as believe and expect in English ?. With regard to the first option, we can notice that there are structural and semantic differences between object control predicates and raising predicates. The object control predicate has an argument which exists in the object position and cannot be deleted or be placed in the subject position of its ʔan clause. This can be shown in the following example :

19- naSafja al-ʔab-u ʔibna-hu [ʔan PRO yuḡaakira ]

advised def-father-nom. son-his to study.

(lit.) the father advised his son to study.

a)\* naSafja al-ʔab-u [ʔan PRO yuḡaakira ]

The father advised to study.

b)\* naSaha al-ʔab-u [ʔan PRO yuḡaakira ibna-hu].

The father advised to study his son.

The ungrammaticality of (19-a,b) reflects that fact that the argument `ʔal-ʔibn-u` is the object of the matrix S and cannot



of PRO as the action of achieving success is not initiated or supposed to be initiated by him. As a result, co reference between the lexical entity 'ʔaxaa-hu' and the PRO of ʔan IP is allowed by the semantic rule of the suggested model , whereas, the same relation between the lexical entity 'Mohamed' and PRO is ruled out as ungrammatical.

#### **2-4 Conclusion**

The study investigates types of control predicates in SWA . The study shows that in SWA we have three different types of control predicates. The study classifies the predicates in SWA into three different types. The first type is Subject control predicates. The argument that is in the subject position of that type of predicates is to be the controller of PRO in its ʔan complement. The second type is Object control predicates. The argument that is in the object position in that type is the controller of PRO in the ʔan complement that follows the predicate. The third type which the study investigates is the objective subject control predicates. This type of predicates allows S' deletion, similar to S' deletion in English such as expect , seem and believe. The deletion of S' in these structures allow rising of the subject that exists in

---

an complement to be raised to be the object of the matrix clause.

The study suggests a model of analysis to account for and justify the relation of co reference and control in control predicates in SWA. The study argues that the syntactic component as suggested by Chomsky and others , is not adequate to explain the feature of control in SWA or even in English. Moreover, the semantic approach , as outlined by Jackendoff and Culicover, and others is also adequate to account for the feature of control in SWA. The model which is suggested in this study is eclectic. It is based on the syntactic rule of the condition B of the Binding theory , as introduced by Chomsky. As the rule states PRO must be uncontrolled from within, but it can be controlled from without by an entity that exists in a different clause. The model also is based on the semantic principle that is outlined by Culicover and Jackendoff that the controller of PRO must be the doer or supposed to be the doer of the action. The model of analysis ,as introduced in this study, consists of two major components :-1-the syntactic component and 2- the semantic component .The analysis, as conducted in this study, proves the adequacy of the model suggested to account for the feature of control in SWA.

be deleted or to exist originally in the subject position of ?an IP complement . However, the case is different with the predicate ` yatawaqqafu ` . As we notice in ( 17-18), the argument ` ?axaa-hu` can either exists as the subject of ?an IP or raised to be the object of the matrix S, and the outcome derivations are still grammatical.

Another difference between object control predicates and objective subject control predicates is the semantic content of each type. The object control predicate has restrictions on its argument in the object position must be [+animate]. But the objective subject control predicate does not impose this restriction on its argument that exists in the object position. This can be shown in the following examples :-

20-a- tawaqqaf mufamad-un [ ?an PRO yakoon al-  
?ixtibaar Sa?b-an ]

b\*?-?aqna?a mufamad-un [?an PRO yakoon al-?ixtibaar  
Sa?b-an ]

So , from the semantic and structural differences between the predicates `naSa?ja` and `tawaqqafa` it can be concluded that the predicate ` tawaqqafa` is an objective subject control

---

predicate. This predicate belongs to a class of predicates such as `yatamanna` ( to wish ), `yaʔmulu` ( to hope ) and `yaḌunu` ( to doubt). These predicates , similar to S' deletion predicates in English<sup>10</sup> , allow extraction and movement from within their ʔan complements (Chomsky 1981,1986). Accordingly, their second arguments belong to their ʔan IP complements, then they are raised to the object position of their matrix Ss.

The model , as suggested in (1-3 ) , can justify the relation of control in Example (18). As stated by the syntactic component of the model, PRO must always be free in its clause and to be controlled from without not within. In (18 ) , PRO is free in its government and is not controlled by an entity that exists in its clause. The choice of the entity that exists in the object position of the matrix S is also justified by the semantic component of the suggested model. The semantic component dictates that the control relation is allowed as the controller is the doer or supposed to be the doer of the action. Accordingly, the argument `ʔaxa-hu` in (18) is the controller of PRO in ʔan IP as it is the doer of achieving success. But `Mohamed` cannot be the controller

The study also shows that the classification of predicates into subject control predicates, object control predicates and objective subject control predicates are not essential for the theory of control. As we have noticed , the model suggested in this study with its two components mainly focuses on two major facts 1) that PRO must be free in its category and 2) who is the doer of the action or supposed to be the doer of the action without reference to the grammatical function of the controller of PRO.

---

### Endnotes

1- The study investigates only the obligatory control. There are other types of control such as exhaustive, split and shift control . also there are cases of control which are determined by pragmatic or discoursal factors. See Jackendoff and Culicover (2004 ), and Stiebels and et al. ( 2003 ) for further details.

2- Control predicates refer to those predicates that are followed by infinitive complements with PROs.

3- Co reference refers to the relation that relates the PRO in the infinitive complement and an argument in the matrix S . See Halliday and Hassan (1976) for different types of co reference.

4- Condition B of the binding theory states that the pronominal must be free in its category. PRO is similar to pronominals in this distribution . see Chomsky (1980 , 1986 ), and Radford (1981, 1989 ).

5-The definition the governing category in this study is based on Chomsky' s definition as introduced in his works (1980a, 1986 b).

6- Proximate control refers to the situation where PRO, which is similar to pronoun, takes its reference from other NP that is co indexed with it.

7- Obviative control refers to the situation where PRO is independent in its reference and is not controlled by any antecedent.

9- The antecedent refers to the lexical NP or the argument that acts as the controller of PRO.

10- S-bar deletion verbs are those verbs such as believe, expect and seem where they are followed by S so, they allow extraction and movement out of their complements. See Chomsky, (1986) and Radford (1997).

---

## References

- Abdul- Ghany, M. K. ( 1980 ) government Binding in  
Classical Arabic . Ph. D. Thesis, University of Texas at  
Auston.
- Chomsky, N . (1980 ) ` On Binding` , Linguistic Inquiry, 11,  
pp. 1-46
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1981 ) Lectures on Government and Binding  
[ lectures ] . Foris Dordrecht
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1986 ) Barriers. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.
- Culicover, Peter W., and Ray Jackendoff . ( 1995 )  
` Something else for the Binding Theory` , Linguistic  
Inquiry, 28 , pp. 195-217
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1997 ) ` Something else for The Binding  
Theory` , Linguistic Inquiry, 28, 195-217
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 2001 ) ` Control is not Movement` , Linguistic  
Inquiry, 32, pp.493 – 512
- Halliday, M. & R.Hassan. ( 1976 ) Cohesion in English.  
Longman, London.
- Hornstein, N. (1999) ` Movement and Control` , Linguistic  
Inquiry , 30, pp. 69-96
- Jackendoff, R. ( 1969 ) Some Rules of Semantic  
Interpretation for English. Unpublished doctoral



- dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1972 ) Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1985 ) ` Believing and Intending : Two sides of the Same Coin` Linguistic Inquiry , pp. 445-460
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1990 ) Semantic Structures . MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 1995 ) ` The Conceptual Structure of Intending and Volitional Action ` , Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory : Studies in Honour of Carlos P. Otero, ed. by H . Campos pp. 198-227, Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC.
- \_\_\_\_\_ ( 2004 ) ` The Semantic Basis of Control in English` Language
- Kamel, S. ( 1991 ) ` On Subject- Verb Agreement in Classical Arabic` in essays in Honour of saad gamal El Din , University of Cairo.
- Larson, R. ( 1991 ) ` Promise and the Theory of Control ` Linguistic Inquiry, 22 , pp. 103-139.
- Radford, A. ( 1981 ) Transformational Syntax. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1988 ) Transformational Grammar. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
-

\_\_\_\_\_ ( 1997 ) Syntactic Theory and the Structure of  
English A minimalist approach. Cambridge, Cambridge  
University Press.

Rosenbaum, P. S . ( 1967 ) The Grammar of English  
Predicate Complement Constructions. MIT Press,  
Cambridge Mass

Stiebels, B. , Szymon S. & Yi-Chun Yang ( 2003 )  
Questionnaire for Control Verbs. 2<sup>nd</sup> version, Berlin,  
November 2003

---