

Contents

Acknowledgements — vii

1 Overview — 1

2 On the historical development of PRO approaches to Control — 6

- 2.1 Approaches to Control in Transformational Grammar — 7
 - 2.1.1 Chomsky (1965) and Rosenbaum (1967): Lexical NP Deletion — 7
 - 2.1.2 Postal (1968a, 1970): The “Doom” pronoun — 12
 - 2.1.3 Chomsky & Lasnik (1977): R-indexing, “Rules of Control,” and opaque domains — 23
 - 2.1.4 Chomsky (1980): Constraints on anaphoric relations, the Case Filter, and elaborated rules of Control — 31
- 2.2 Approaches to Control within the Government-Binding Theory — 39
 - 2.2.1 Chomsky (1981a, 1982): Theta Theory and Binding Theory — 39
 - 2.2.2 Manzini (1983): PRO is unambiguously an anaphor — 54
 - 2.2.3 Bouchard (1984): PRO is ambiguously an anaphor and a pronoun — 62
 - 2.2.4 Lasnik (1992): Evidence that PRO is licensed by a lack government and is identified by a separate Theory of Control — 72
 - 2.2.5 On Control into NP: Williams (1985) — 77
- 2.3 On Minimalist approaches to Control — 89
 - 2.3.1 On the Minimalist rejection of a binding-theoretic approach to the distribution of PRO — 90
 - 2.3.2 Case-theoretic approaches to PRO — 96
 - 2.3.2.1 Null Case approaches to PRO — 97
 - 2.3.2.2 PRO as a Caseless NP — 116
 - 2.3.3 On structural case approaches to PRO — 123
 - 2.3.4 Summary — 139

3 Movement and implicit argument approaches to Control — 144

- 3.1 Movement theories of Control — 144
- 3.2 Implicit argument approaches to Control — 171
 - 3.2.1 On some representative model-theoretic approaches to Control — 173
 - 3.2.2 On some representative argument and conceptual approaches to Control — 190

3.2.2.1	Sag & Pollard (1991): An argument structure approach to Control —	190
3.2.2.2	Jackendoff & Culicover (2003): A conceptual structure approach to Control —	201
3.3	Summary —	212
4	A critical look at some standard arguments in favor of PRO —	215
5	Remotivating a PRO approach to Control —	240
6	The syntax of Control —	256
7	On the reference of PRO —	293
7.1	On the need to recognize syntactic influences on controller resolution —	297
7.2	On the respective roles of syntax and semantics in controller resolution —	303
7.3	Summary —	322
8	On an unexpected gap in the distribution of PRO —	325
8.1	What are Facts, Eventualities, and Propositions? —	332
8.2	Explaining the gap in simple Control (ECM/small clause) complementation —	345
9	Conclusions —	353
	Bibliography —	371
	Index —	380