time of the author, the dominant ideology of the time, and words with implications proper to the time they were written should be taken into consideration. Nevertheless there have always been disputes over whether to take the text as a single identity standing for itself, or to interpret it according to the influences of the time.

Though the biographies of authors and the socio-cultural setting cannot be ignored, the text itself as a single identity should be of high importance to the translator. This reminds us of the New Critics who were also in favor of the text as being "self-sufficient," "independent," and "objective" (Abrams 1988, 247). Here much emphasis is placed on the close reading of the text to work out the figures of speech with their multiple meanings which are at the service of each other yielding in the final unified picture of the work: The idea of all parts of a poem being interrelated and supporting the central idea. From Eliot and Richards the emphasis on the text as an object, and not the poet, is borrowed. Therefore, the translator should get to the underlying structure and see how elements are bound together, and then by finding the proper equivalences and substitutions render the text in SL.

With a Marxist view of literature as being the product of the dominant ideology and "ideological determinants specific to that era" (Abrams 1988, 242) it is obvious that sign systems cannot be taken on as understood by every one, for language is dynamic and apt to change quite rapidly. Language is dynamic, so is literature, and from time to time and ideology to ideology old signs are substituted by new ones. By new signs what is meant is signs capable of reflecting the reality as it is known to be so in a specific time and place. Therefore, interpretation becomes important requiring the translator to be able to

three points of author, reader, and the text. A literary translator has to be familiar with the critical approaches as well as their underlying structures, and a bulk of other issues significant in both interpretation and translation. A literary translator, who tries to remain loyal to the author, in order to be loyal to his own translation at the same time, finds entering the mind of the author impossible to see what the real intention of the written text was. It is interesting to notice that literary texts cannot be planned to be written. No exact design or outline of the work can exist in the mind of its author, and when a work gets to paper then the claim of its existence can be made.

If readership is paid attention to and reader-response theories become the center of attention, then he knows that there might be more than one interpretation of the text: to go further, as many interpretations as there are readers, and this is due to the qualities of a literary text being open to many interpretations on different levels—thanks to the use of such elements as symbol and irony considered superior to other figures of speech and capable of reflecting the many-sidedness of life. What remains is the text and the translator who has to explore the intricacies of the text and reconstruct it in a way so as to be not different from the original and be interpreted appropriately and be "in large part found again and repainted by the translator" (Vahid 2004, 1). Each of the three points mentioned is defended by some approaches in literary criticism for yielding the meaning closest to the not-really-known term 'truth.'

Unable to enter the mind of the author and have access to the intentions of the author for writing the text, all the translator can deal with is the text itself to be explored. The true meaning should be elicited and then translated in TL. To first interpret the text in SL, the

2.1. A General View of Literary Translation and Significance of the Literary Text

Apropos of literary translation many theories have been proposed and some have been preferred to others. However, no single theory seems to be paying-off enough to displace others. Therefore, many translators espouse the idea that an eclectic approach works much better than sticking to one specific theory. Clifford E. Landers is one of those who in his influential book *Literary Translation, A Practical Guide* (2001), mentions the difficulties of literary translation with a look at the issues involved in such a craft. The major reason the eclectic approach is preferred is that texts have influence on each other and a translator dealing with a literary text, prior to anything, should be aware of the influence of writers and texts upon each other. Julia Kristeva has a notion of "intertextuality" and sees a nexus between all texts. She believes that no text can remain unaffected by other texts the idea of which reminds us of what Harold Bloom, a critic and historian of literature, coined: "The Anxiety of Influence," i.e., to emphasize the influence of writers on each other. He believes that later authors are influenced by the form and style of an earlier writer. The influence is "inescapable" and involves "a drastic distortion of the work of a predecessor" (Abrams 239-40). The same is viewed to be the case with different texts regarded as being translations of translations. Although there are different texts such as technical, legal, or medical, the main emphasis is laid on literary texts and their influences on each other.

The other point with regard to the systematic way of translating a text is that in each period of time the degree of loyalty with regard to interpretation and translation of literary texts varies regarding the

many features and tends to change a lot from the ordinary language. The ordinary language with the purpose of communicating every day facts differs from novels, poems, plays, and other literary genres, which present, in symbolic form, the desires, wishes, and aspirations of human beings, in close relation with their lives. In order to express something different, a different language with idiosyncratic characteristics is needed and that is the literary language.

From period to period, every society undergoes many changes and the dominant ideology, different from the previous, changes as well which does not leave the language unaffected. The change shows itself, strikingly, in the canon of literature, which gives birth to the emergence of sundry critical looks at language and literature. This results in the variant interactions between the three sides of the triangle of author, reader, and text. Accordingly, the translator's degree of loyalty may vary from one to another yet there exist shared problems with regard to each. This study is an attempt to shed light on some major problems and obstacles translators confront in translating literary texts, regardless of whether the author, the text, or the reader is focused. The literary text, though many have claimed otherwise, is not untranslatable provided that the translator is armed with a good knowledge of literary schools to grasp the meaning of the text as well as creativity to render literary masterpieces. "The evidence of past masterly achievements [in this respect] indicates that a skilled translator with a poetic taste can achieve [the] … end with the necessary literary features and devices of the source text kept intact" (Vahid 2004, 3).

2. Obstacles to Literary Translation

34:471 – 498.

Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:203 – 238. In Růžička, Rudolf.

1999. *Control in Grammar and Pragmatics. A Cross-Linguistic Study.* Linguistics

Today. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Architectures. Oxford

University Press.

Roeper, Thomas. 2000. Inherent Binding and the Syntax/Lexicon Interface.

Distinguishing DP, NP, and N. In Coopmans, Peter, Martin Everaert, and Jane

Grimshaw. 2000. *Lexical Specification and Insertion. Current Issues in*

Linguistic Theory. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Růžička, Rudolf. 1999. *Control in Grammar and Pragmatics. A Cross-Linguistic Study.*

Linguistics Today. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Safir, Ken. 2004. *The Syntax Of Anaphora. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax.*

Oxford University Press.

Sag, Ivan., A., and Tom Wasow. 1999. *Syntactic Theory: A Formal Introduction.*

CSLI Publications.

Sigurðsson, Halldór, A. 1991. Icelandic Case-marked PRO and the Licensing of Lexical

Arguments. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9:327 – 363. In Landau, Idan.

2003. Movement Out of Control. Remarks and Replies. *Linguistic Inquiry*

34:471 – 498.

Landau, Idan. 2004. *Movement-Resistant Aspects of Control*. Landau's website.

Lregendre, Géraldine, Jane Grimshaw, and Sten Vikner. 2001. *Optimality-*

Theoretic Syntax. The MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England.

Lightfoot, David, W. 2002. *Effects Syntactic of Morphological Change*. Oxford

University Press.

Manzini, Rita, M. 2000. *Sentential Complementation. The subjunctive*. In Coopmans,

Peter, Martin Everaert, and Jane Grimshaw. 2000. *Lexical Specification*

and Insertion. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. John Benjamins Publishing

Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:241 – 267.

Miller, D., Gary. 2002. *Nonfinite Structures in Theory and Change*. Oxford University

Press.

Panagiotidis, Phevos. 2002. *Pronouns, Clitics and Empty Nouns. 'Pronominality' and*

Licensing in Syntax. Linguistic Today. John Benjamins Publishing Company,

Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in Languag:Interactions and*

Remarks and

Replies. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:431 – 452.

Janke, Vikki. 2003. *A PRO-less Theory of Control.* The 6th Durham Postgraduate

Conference in Linguistics.

Kahnemuyipour, Arsalan. 2001. *A Unified Account of Persian Stress.* Paper Read at the

Modern Trends in Linguistics Workshop, Tehran. In Ghomeshi, Jila. 2001. Control

and Thematic Agreement. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 49:6 – 40.

Koster, Jan, and Robert May. 1982. On the Consistency of Infinitives. *Language*

58:117 – 143. In Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement Out of Control. Remarks and

Replies. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:471 – 498.

Kroeger, Paul, R. 2004. *Analyzing Syntax. A Lexical-functional Approach.* Cambridge

University Press.

Landau, Idan. 1999. *Elements of Control.* Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute

Of Technology. In Ghomeshi, Jila. 2001. Control and Thematic Agreement.

Canadian Journal of Linguistics 46:9 - 40.

Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement Out of Control. Remarks and Replies. *Linguistic Inquiry*

2002. *Dimensions of Movement. From Features to Remnants. Linguistic Today.*

John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam / Philadelphia.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. *Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework.* In Landau, Idan. 2004.

Movement –Resistant Aspects of Control. Landau's website.

Coopmans, Peter, Martin Everaert, and Jane Grimshaw. 2000. *Lexical Specification*

and Insertion. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. John Benjamins Publishing

Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Culicover, Peter, W., and Ray Jackendoff. 2001. Control is Not Movement. Remarks and

Replies. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:493 - 512.

Ghomeshi, Jila. 2001. Control and Thematic Agreement. *Canadian Journal of*

Linguistics 46:9 - 40.

Hashemipour, Margaret, M.1989. *Pronominalization and Control in Modern Persian.*

Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69 – 96.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Cedric Boeckx. 2003. Reply to "Control is Not Movement."

Remarks and Replies. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:269 – 280.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Cedric Boeckx. 2004. Movement under Control.

control ones, do not have external arguments; therefore, they are unaccusative, and the Persian data confirms the validity of this test. The third test was test of *each-association*, which was not run in Persian since Persian seems to lack such constructions. The fourth test was *case concord*, which implies that PRO bears Case in some languages. Persian data proved that Persian is one of those languages. The fifth test was test of *partial control*, which states that partial control exists, while partial raising does not. Persian data verified this test. Still another issue raised by Landau is the temporal considerations for gerunds and infinitives. He proposes that some gerunds and infinitives are tensed, while some are untensed. Having investigated this issue in Persian, I propose that it is the features of the matrix verb, which allow or disallow such constructions to be tensed or untensed rather than the gerund or the infinitive being tensed or untensed.

Having discussed control in Persian and compared and contrasted two of the most prominent theories of control, I discovered some consistencies and some inconsistencies between the Persian data and the claims of the proponents of these two theories. However, Landau's Agree-based Approach to Control seems to be more in accordance with the Persian data. Nevertheless, no theory is perfect, and I hope this paper would shed some light on the universal properties of Control, in particular, and Syntax, in general.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sjef Barbiers, and Hans-Martin Gaertner.

under ellipsis, while sentential control does not. However, in Persian data, no difference was observed between nominal and sentential control. In fact, they both yield sloppy readings as well as strict ones as explained earlier in the evaluation of Hornstein's criteria for OC / NOC.

Having run control tests presented by Hornstein, I then evaluated Landau's view of control. Landau has made different criticisms regarding Hornstein's Movement Theory of Control, most of which were verified by Persian data. For instance, it was concluded that neither English nor Persian implicit controllers allow a reflexive interpretation; however, this is incompatible with Hornstein's theory. Afterwards, Landau's account on "*promise*" kind of control verbs was investigated in Persian, and his assertion that languages vary in this regard was supported by Persian data. Then Landau's partial control, in which the controller is the matrix subject together with some other people and appears in special cases, was studied in Persian and verified by Persian data. Furthermore, Landau's argument against Hornstein's split antecedents is also supported by Persian data as discussed in the evaluation of Hornstein's criteria for OC / NOC. Another criticism to Hornstein's theory made by Landau is his account of reflexive verbs. The Persian data verify Landau's claim in this regard too.

Landau runs some tests to distinguish between raising and control. These tests were run for Persian data and were confirmed to be true. The first test is test of *complementizers*, in which he asserts control complements can be introduced by complementizers, but raising complements cannot, which was also confirmed by the Persian data. The second test was test of *unaccusative properties*, which indicated that raising predicates, unlike

Theory of Control to distinguish between raising and control in idiom chunks and expletives, where he mentions the distinction is not attributed to an inability to control PRO but to the nature of the controller. Having run this test for Persian, I noticed that both control and raising constructions allow such expressions as far as expletives were concerned; nevertheless, this was not the case for idiom chunks.

Still another issue raised by Hornstein is the "elsewhere case", which he attributes to NOC PRO and asserts that movement is not possible in these constructions. This issue was investigated in Persian through various examples. As a result, some consistencies and some inconsistencies were observed between the Persian data and what Hornstein claims to hold for the English data.

Markedness is another issue raised by Hornstein for verbs like "*promise*" that do not act in accordance with other verbs of control having the same characteristics. The Persian data illustrates the same markedness observed in the English data for verbs like "*promise*"; however, the question is whether labeling such verbs "marked" is right.

Another issue that Hornstein brings up is the contrast between nominal control constructions and sentential ones. Firstly, he asserts nominal control constructions yield arbitrary readings, while sentential ones do not. Persian data seem to be compatible with this assertion.

Secondly, he points out that nominal control can have split antecedents, while sentential control cannot. However, Persian has no restriction as far as split antecedents are concerned as tested before in the evaluation of Hornstein's criteria for OC / NOC.

Thirdly, Hornstein declares that nominal control allows strict readings

was concluded that unlike Hornstein's first criterion, that OC PRO needs an antecedent, while NOC PRO does not, Persian data indicate that neither OC PRO nor NOC PRO needs an overt antecedent.

His second criterion, stating that in OC, the antecedent has to be local, while in NOC, it does not, did not work for Persian data. The third criterion, that is, in OC, the antecedent must c-command PRO, whereas in NOC, there is no need for the antecedent to

c-command PRO, was not true for Persian data. In fact, in Persian, no difference was found between OC PRO and NOC PRO as far as the antecedent c-commanding was concerned.

The fourth criterion, which states under ellipsis, OC PRO only allows a sloppy reading, while NOC PRO allows both sloppy and strict readings, does not work for Persian since Persian allows both OC and NOC constructions to yield the sloppy reading as well as the strict one. The fifth criterion stating that OC PRO cannot have split antecedents, while NOC PRO can, is not true in Persian, where both OC PRO and NOC PRO can have split antecedents. Unlike other criteria proposed by Hornstein, the sixth criterion, that is OC PRO yields de se interpretation, while NOC PRO yields non-de-se interpretation, seems to be working for Persian. However, the seventh criterion, like the first five criteria, does not work for Persian. This criterion states that OC PRO needs to have a sole

c-commanding antecedent, whereas NOC PRO can have two readings, that is the antecedent can either be c-commanding the NOC PRO or it can be external. Nevertheless, in Persian, both OC PRO and NOC PRO can have a c-commanding antecedent as well as an external one.

The next issue raised by Hornstein was the advantage of the Movement

Yesterday Arian managed to solve the problem tomorrow.

b. Diruz Ariæn omidvar=bud mæsælæ-ro færda hæl=kon-e.

Yesterday Arian hope=be-PAST.3SG problem-OM tomorrow solve=SBJ-do.3SG.

Yesterday Arian hoped to solve the problem tomorrow.

As (77) and (78) indicate, Persian acts like English as far as temporal sequence is concerned in gerunds and infinitives. Nevertheless, I do not agree with Landau, who believes some gerunds and infinitives are tensed, while others are untensed. (Landau, 2004:13) I believe it is not the gerund or the infinitive, but the matrix verb that plays a role in grammaticality or ungrammaticality of these sentences, that is, "avoid" and "manage" in ((75) a) and ((76) a) indicate something has already been done, whereas, "prefer" and "hope" in ((75) b) and ((76) b) imply something to be done in the future; therefore they would go with the future adverb "tomorrow" The same explanation holds for the Persian data. Consequently, both syntactic and semantic factors are involved in grammaticality and ungrammaticality justifications.

Conclusion

This paper aimed at discovering more truth in the domain of control by scrutinizing how Persian data yield themselves to two distinct theories of control at the two ends of control theory continuum. In so doing, first, Hornstein's (1999, 2003, 2004) Movement Theory of Control was assessed to investigate whether its tenets go with the Persian data or not. Hence, the seven criteria proposed by Hornstein to distinguish OC from NOC were tested to see if they could be generalized to Persian data. It

Sir-SM-EZ boss appear=reach-PAST.3SG one-time in week gather=SBJ-be.3PL.

The boss appeared to be gathering once a week.

As (73) and (74) illustrate, neither English, nor Persian have partial raising.

Temporal Considerations

Landau (2004) raises another issue regarding gerunds and infinitives. He proposes that some are tensed and some are untensed.

(75) a. *Yesterday, John avoided leaving tomorrow.

b. Yesterday, John preferred leaving tomorrow.

(76) a. *Yesterday, John managed to solve the problem tomorrow.

b. Yesterday, John hoped to solve the problem tomorrow.

(Landau, 2004:13)

The same distinction can be seen in Persian too.

(77) a. *Diruz Ariæn æz ræftæn-e færda særfenæzær=kærd.

Yesterday Arian from going-EZ tomorrow avoid=do-PAST.3SG.

Yesterday Arian avoided leaving tomorrow.

b. Diruz Ariæn tærjih=dad færda be-re.

Yesterday Arian prefer=give-PAST.3SG tomorrow SBJ-go.3SG.

Yesterday Arian preferred to leave tomorrow.

(78) a. *Diruz Ariæn tunest mæsælæ-ro færda hæl=bo-kon-e.

Yesterday Arian manage-PAST.3SG problem-OM tomorrow solve=SBJ-do.3SG.

This test cannot be run for Persian since in Persian, both "one" and "each" cannot be used together to modify a noun.

The fourth test is "case concord", in which Landau (2003) quotes from Sigurðsson (1999) that PRO in Icelandic bears Case.

As (70) illustrates, the embedded control clause contains an object with an overt Object Marker (ketab-o, book-OM) as well as a subjunctive verb that illustrates Agree with the PRO and consequently, the controller.(be-xun-e, SBJ-read.3SG) Therefore, PRO in Persian *is* Case-marked.

Ghomeshi (2001) proposes that control verbs take vP complements. She admits that her proposal is compatible with Hornstein's (1999) claim that OC PRO is actually a trace. Still, if PRO is a trace, how is it Case-marked?

It seems to me that Landau's justification is more logical in this case. He asserts like any other DP, PRO, too, is Case-marked. He bases his proposal on evidence coming from languages that show subject-oriented case concord in controlled infinitives (Russian, Icelandic) or subjunctives (Persian, Hebrew, Greek, Romanian, etc.). (Landau, 2004:13)

The fifth and the last test Landau runs to distinguish control and raising is "partial control", where he proposes that the reference of PRO does not need to be restricted to the reference of the controller. He asserts even though partial control exists, there is no partial raising. As illustrated in (63) and its corresponding Persian (64), in both English and Persian, partial control exists. Now let's run the test for partial raising.

(73) *The chair appeared to be gathering once a week.

(Landau, 2003:493)

(74) *Aqa-y-e ræis be-næzær=resid ye-bar dær hæfte jæm=be-šæn.

Raising:

(71) Mesle-in-ke [dust-a-mun inja-æn].

Seems [friend-PL.1PL.CL here.3PL].

It seems/looks as if our friends are here.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:34)

As (70) and (71) illustrate, (COMP) is only used in the control case, but not in the raising one. This confirms Landau's assertion.

The second test is test of "unaccusative properties", in which he points out raising predicates do not have external arguments, that is, they are unaccusative; however, control predicates are not so.

As illustrated in (70) and (71), Persian data confirm the second claim Landau makes, that is, (70), which is a control construction, has an accusative predicate, while (71), which is a raising construction, has an unaccusative predicate.

The third test proposed by Landau, is "each-association". Unlike the first two tests, this test is carried out in English. Landau points out that NP-trace allows each-association, while PRO, like an overt pronoun, does not allow such constructions.

(72) a. One interpreter$_i$ each was assigned t_i to the visiting diplomats.

b. One interpreter$_i$ each seemed [t_i to have been assigned t_i to the visiting diplomats].

c. *One interpreter$_i$ each tried [PRO$_i$ to be assigned t_i to the visiting diplomats].

d. *One interpreter$_i$ each said that [he$_i$ had been assigned t_i to the visiting diplomats].

(Landau, 2003:491)

reflexive reading must be allowed; however, Landau notes, this is wrong as the verbs in (68) do not allow a reflexive reading.

(68) John ate/watched/cursed/taught/preached/drew/cleaned.

(Landau, 2003:485)

(69) Ariæn xord / did / kešid.

Arian eat-PAST.3SG / see-PAST.3SG / draw-PAST.3SG.

Arian ate / saw / drew.

None of the verbs in (69) has a reflexive reading, which confirms Landau's criticism.

Raising Versus Control

To distinguish raising and control, Landau (2003) runs some tests, most of which are done in languages other than English.

The first test he runs is "complementizers". He states control complements can be introduced by complementizers, but raising complements cannot.

To run these tests, I would use Ghomeshi's (2001) examples of control and raising.

Control:

(70) Bižæn mi-tun-e (ke) [ketab-o be-xun-e].

Bijan DUR-be.able.3SG (COMP) [book-OM SBJ-read.3SG].

Bijan [can/is able to] read the book.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:27)

Sir-SM-EZ boss decide=get-PAST.3SG O'clock-EZ seven-EZ gather=SBJ-be.3PL.

The boss decided to gather at 7:00.

As (64) illustrates, there is Partial Control in Persian too; therefore, Landau's classification of partial control seems to be working in Persian.

Split Antecedents

As for split antecedents, Landau argues against Hornstein's claim, stating that not only NOC but also a few OC verbs allow split antecedents.

(65) John$_i$ proposed to Mary$_j$ [PRO$_{i/j}$ to help each other].

(Koster and May, 1982, cited in Landau, 2003:484)

(66) Ariæn be Armin pišnehad=dad (ke) be ham komæk=bo-kon-æn.

Arian to Armin propose=give-PAST.3SG (COMP) to each other help=SBJ-do.3PL.

Arian proposed to Armin to help each other.

Therefore as (66), ((56) a), ((56) b), ((56) c), ((38) a), and ((38) b) illustrate, Persian data are compatible with Landau's assertion regarding both OC control and NOC control having both sloppy and strict readings.

Reflexive Verbs

Another criticism Landau presents to Hornstein's control theory is the way he treats reflexive verbs.

(67) a. Mary washed.

b. Mary washed herself.

(Landau, 2003:485)

Hornstein believes if the object is dropped in a transitive verb, then a

in accordance with MDP is that there are other factors involved, that is, semantic, pragmatic, and parametric factors also affect the choice of controller. (2003:481)

Still for some other verbs of control, such as *ask, beg, plead, and petition*, Landau believes control shift causes ambiguity since there are some pragmatic factors involved

(for example, authority relations). Moreover, he adds, the level of this ambiguity varies from language to language, and truly it does, since in Persian, even the verb "*want*" can have control shift leading to ambiguous controllers.

(62) Šah mi-xad PRO be-mir-e.

King DUR-want.3SG PRO SBJ-die.3SG.

The king wants to die.

In English, (62) has only one interpretation, in which the controller is "*the king*"; nevertheless, in Persian, the controller can be "*the king*" or some unfortunate person that the king wants *him* to die.

Partial Control

A special kind of control that Landau speaks of is Partial Control in which the controller is the matrix subject together with some other people. Partial Control, Landau asserts, can be found with the majority of control verbs (2003:482); however, the infinitival is to have a collective meaning or accompanied by a collective adverb such as *"together"*.

(63) The chair decided to gather during the strike.

(Landau, 2003:482)

(64) Aqa-y-e ræis tæsmim=gereft saæt-e hæft jæm=be-šæn.

the matrix subject, Landau believes these controllers must be disjoint from the matrix subject.

(59) a. John said to return later.

b. John said to himself to return later.

(Landau, 2003: 479)

In cases where there is an implicit controller, Hornstein's theory allows a reflexive interpretation; however, this is not true as ((59) a) and ((59) b) illustrate.

(60) a. Ariæn goft bædæn bærgærd-e.

Arian tell-PAST.3SG later SBJ-return.3SG.

Arian told to return later.

b. Ariæn be xod-e-š goft bædæn bærgærd-e.

Arian to self-EZ.3SG tell-PAST.3SG later SBJ-return.3SG.

Arian said to himself to return later.

Neither English nor Persian implicit controllers in ((59) a) and ((60) a) allow a reflexive interpretation as in ((59) b) and ((60) b). Therefore, Landau's criticism sounds fair enough.

Markedness and Promise

Furthermore, Landau is against Hornstein's labeling promise, marked, in that, it does not follow MDP.

(61) a. John wanted to leave.

b. John persuaded Mary to leave.

c. John promised Mary to leave.

(Landau, 2003:480)

To Landau, the reason why *promise, commit, vow, and threaten* do not act

throw-3SG to measure-EZ own-EZ father-EZ-3SG clever-AM[5] NEG[6]-be-PAST.3SG.

Arian's attempt to sneak himself into the party was not as clever as his father's.

b. Ariæn sæy=kærd (ke) bærænde=be-š-e væ pedær-e-š-æm hæmin-tor.

Arian try=doPAST.3SG (COMP) SBJ-win=be.3SG and father-EZ.3SG-too this-way.

Arian tried to win and his father did too.

Unlike the English control that acts differently under ellipsis in the nominal domain and the sentential domain, the Persian control yields both sloppy and strict readings under ellipsis in the nominal as well as the sentential domain as illustrated in ((36) a) and
((36) b).

Evaluation of Landau's View on Control

Having run control tests presented by Hornstein (1999, 2003, 2004), I now turn to Landau's (2003, 2004) model of control that is, the Standard Theory of Control. In this model, Landau differentiates between raising and control, stating that the former involves one argument chain and the latter involves two argument chains. He verifies the existence of PRO; however, unlike Hornstein, he believes that it is distinct from NP-trace. Unlike Hornstein, who asserts implicit dative controllers can be bound by

5. Another Adjective Marker in Persian is –ane, which is added to the end of nouns to form adjectives.
6. In Persian, prefix næ- is a verbal and sentential Negative Marker.

approve=be-PAST.3SG.

Arian approved of Armin's initially/regularly attempting to sneak each other/themselves into the party.

c. Ariæn goft (ke) Armin tælaš=kærd hæm-digær-o/xod-e-šun-o tu mehmuni bendaz-æn.

Arian say-PAST.3SG (COMP) Armin attempt=do-PAST.3SG too-other-OM/self-EZ.3PL-OM in party SBJ-throw.3PL.

Arian said that Armin attempted to sneak each other/themselves into the party.

As ((56) a), ((56) b) and ((56) c) indicate, Persian data are incompatible with Hornstein's assertion about split antecedents in nominals versus those in sententials. It seems that Persian has no restriction as far as split antecedents are concerned as it was illustrated otherwise in ((38) a) and ((38) b).

Thirdly, Hornstein points out that in the nominal domain, control allows strict readings under ellipsis unlike control in the sentential domain.

(57) a. John's attempt to sneak himself into the party was not as clever as Bill's.

(Bill's attempt to get John to sneak himself into the party)

b. John tried to win and Bill did too.

(Hornstein, 2003:277)

(58) a. Tælaš-e Ariæn ke xod-e-š-o tu mehmuni bendaz-e be ændaze-ye mal-e pedær-e-š ziræk-ane næ-bud.

Attempt-EZ Arian COMP self-EZ.3SG-OM in party SBJ-

Persian lacking true passive constructions (Ghomeshi, 2001:27).

Secondly, Hornstein asserts that constructions in nominals can have split antecedents.

(55) a. John approved Bill's initial/regular attempts to sneak each other/themselves into

the party.

b. *John approved of Bill's initially/regularly attempting to sneak each other/themselves into the party.

c. *John said that Bill attempted to sneak each other/themselves into the party.

(Hornstein, 2003:277)

(56) a. Ariæn ba tælaš-e ebteda-i-e/mostæmær-e Armin ke hæm-digær-o/xod-e-šun-o

tu mehmuni bendaz-æn movafeq=bud.

Arian with attempt-EZ initial-SM-EZ/regular-EZ Armin COMP too-other-OM/

Self-EZ.3PL-OM in party SBJ-throw.3PL approve=be-PAST.3SG.

Arian approved Armin's initial/regular attempts to sneak each other/themselves

into the party.

b. Ariæn ba tælaš=kærdæn-e ebteda-i-e/mostæmær-e Armin ke hæm-digær-o/xod-e-šun-o tu mehmuni bendaz-æn movafeq=bud.

Arian with attempting-EZ initial-SM-EZ/regular-EZ Armin COMP too-other-OM/self-EZ.3PL-OM in party SBJ-throw.3PL

(2003:274)

(52) a. John promised [P_{null} Mary] [to leave early].

b. John vowed/committed [to Mary] [to leave early].

And he seems to be quite right since in Persian this null preposition is not null, but overt "be", which means "to" in English.(as in (49) and (50)) Therefore, Persian data in this regard verify Hornstein's proposal.

Nominal Control Versus Sentential Control

Hornstein (2003) compares and contrasts control in nominals versus control in verbals.

Firstly, he states that in nominals, control constructions can have obligatory readings unlike those in sentential control.

(53) a. any attempt to conceal oneself

b. *It was attempted to conceal oneself.

(Hornstein, 2003:277)

(54) a. hær tælæš-i bæraye mæxfi=kærdæn-e xod

any attempt-SM for concealing-EZ self

any attempt for concealing oneself

b. *Bæraye mæxfi=kærdæn-e xod tælaš=šod.

For concealing-EZ self attempt-be-PAST.3SG.

It was attempted to conceal oneself.

As ((54) a) and ((54) b) illustrate, Persian data is compatible with the English ones, that is, ((53) a) and ((53) b). However, since there is no verbal infinitive in Persian (Ghomeshi, 2001:12), the long infinitive (gerund or nominal verb) is used instead; nevertheless, the results are the same.

Moreover, the ungrammaticality of ((54) b) can also be attributed to

scrambling that might vary from language to language. However, this can motivate another interesting paper in Syntax.

Markedness and Promise

Another argument that is raised in Hornstein (2003) is markedness of "promise". Let's see if in Persian, this verb is marked too.

(48) John$_i$ promised Mary$_j$ [PRO$_{i/*j}$ to leave].

(Hornstein, 2003:273)

(49) Ariæn$_i$ be Armin$_j$ qol=dad (ke) [PRO$_{i/*j}$ be-re].

Arian$_i$ to Armin$_j$ promise=give-PAST.3SG (COMP) [PRO$_{i/*j}$ SBJ-go.3SG].

Arian$_i$ promised Armin$_j$ [PRO$_{i/*j}$ to go].

As (49) illustrates, Persian seems to be marked as far as promise and subjunctive embedded verb is concerned. However, if a future (+Tense) verb is used in the embedded clause, then PRO can be coreferenced with both the object and the subject as in (50).

(50) æmir$_i$ be pesær$_j$-e-š qol=dad ke [PRO$_{i/j}$ mi-bær-e].

Amir$_i$ to son$_j$-EZ-3SG promise=give-PAST.3SG COMP [PRO$_{i/j}$ DUR-win.3SG].

Amir$_i$ promised his son$_j$ [PRO$_{i/j}$ to win].

However, the corresponding English sentence can be (51) where the embedded clause does not contain an infinitival and a PRO.

(51) John$_i$ promised his son$_j$ that [he$_{i/j}$ will win].

Consequently, Persian and English both would yield markedness as far as promise is concerned. Hornstein proposes that the reason why promise is special might be the existence of a null preposition that heads the object.

possible(1999:90)

(46) a. It is believed that Bill's/pro shaving is important.

b. *Bill's is believed that shaving is important.

(Hornstein, 1999:92)

(47) a. Eteqad bær in-e ke eslah=kærdæn-e Ariæn mohem-e.

Belief on this-be.3SG COMP shaving-EZ Arian important-be.3SG.

It is believed that Arian's shaving is important.

However, there is a slight difference in Persian data when "pro" is used instead of "Bill's".

(47) a'. Eteqad bær in-e ke eslah=kærdæn mohem-e.

Belief on this-be.3SG COMP shaving important-be.3SG.

It is believed that pro shaving is important.

In Persian, possessors are linked to the head noun with EZ; therefore, there is a slight difference between ((47) a) and ((47) a').

(47) b. *Ariæn eteqad bær in-e ke eslah=kærdæn-e mohem-e.

Arian belief on this-be.3SG COMP shaving-EZ important-be.3SG.

Arian is believed that shaving is important.

((47) b) is a very ungrammatical sentence both syntactically and semantically. It is much more ungrammatical than its English counterpart ((46) b) since when "Arian" is moved, "EZ" remains where it was, that is, attached to the previous noun; however, in English,

('s) is attached to "Bill" and not to "shaving".

Nevertheless, movement does have some restrictions and so does

(45) a. Ræng-e-t be=næzær=mi-res-e (ke) [t pærid-e baš-e]. Color-EZ.2SG to=look=DUR-reach.3SG (COMP)[t jump.3SG SBJ-be.3SG].

Your color seems [t to be pale].

b. Engar [t tu xune ye xæbær-a-i-e].

Seem [t in house one news-PL-SM[4]-be.3SG].

There seems [t to be something fishy in the house].

c. *Ræng-e-t entezar=dar-e (ke) [PRO pærid-e baš-e].

Color-EZ.2SG expect=have.3SG (COMP) [PRO jump.3SG SBJ-be.3SG].

Your color expects [PRO to be pale].

d. Entezar=mi-r-e (ke) [PRO tu xune ye xæbær-a-i baš-e].

Expect=DUR-go.3SG (COMP) [PRO in house one news – PL-SM SBJ-be.3SG].

There expects [PRO to be something fishy in the house].

As for expletives in Persian, it seems that both control and raising allow expletives; however, this is not the case for idiom chunks. As expected, idioms are fixed chunks that cannot be expressed any other way; therefore, this might be the reason why ((45) a) is grammatical, while ((45) c) is not.

Elsewhere Case

In NOC, the "elsewhere case", Hornstein asserts that movement is not

4. SM stands for Specific Marker. In Persian, -i is added to nouns to make them specific. However, the difference between SM and AM (footnote 3) is in the way they are pronounced. In AM –i, the stress is on

–i, but in SM, this is not the case, and the stress remains where it was before adding –i to the noun.

holding-EZ

speech-EZ BST history-AM[3] be-PAST.3SG].

Only Churchill remembers that PRO giving the BST speech was historical.

In Persian, unlike in English, both OC PRO and NOC PRO can have a c-commanding antecedent as well as an external one. However, the word order is scrambled in ((43) a) in order for it to sound natural since Persian is an SOV language. However, embedded clauses can well follow the verb as in ((43) b).

Idiomatic Chunks and Expletives

Hornstein (1999) asserts that the Movement Approach to OC PRO could distinguish between raising and control in idiom chunks and expletives. However, as Hornstein puts it, the distinction is not attributed to an inability to control PRO but to the nature of the controller.

(44) a. The shit seems [t to have hit the fan].

b. There seems [t to be a man in the garden].

c. *The shit expects [PRO to hit the fan].

d. *There expects [PRO to be a man in the garden].

(Hornstein, 1999:82)

In fact, the external θ-role of "expect" is not checked in ((44) c) and ((44) d); therefore, the derivation fails to converge since there is an unchecked θ-feature at LF. Now, let's see if Persian data can yield themselves to those examples.

3. AM stands for Adjective Marker. In Persian, -i can be added to nouns in order to form adjectives.

(41) Žian$_i$ mi-xa-d (ke) [un$_{*i/j}$ be-re].

Jian DUR-want.3SG (COMP) [he SBJ-go.3SG].

Jian wants him to go.

(Ghomeshi, 2001:17)

Well, Ghomeshi talks about Obviation Effect in cases where an overt pronoun is present, whereas, in neither of Hornstein's (1999) examples can we see an overt pronominal in the control construction. Therefore as ((40) a) and ((40) b) illustrate, this criterion works for Persian data, that is, the OC PRO yields a de se interpretation, while NOC PRO yields a non-de-se interpretation.

6. OC PRO needs to have a sole c-commanding antecedent, while NOC PRO can have two readings (The antecedent can either be c-commanding the NON PRO or it can be external).

(42) a. Only Churchill remembers PRO giving the BST speech.

b. Only Churchill remembers that PRO giving the BST speech was momentous.

(Hornstein, 1999:73)

(43) a. Fæqæt Čerčil [PRO bærgozar=kærdæn-e soxænrani-e bi-es-ti-o yad-e-š-e].

Only Churchill [PRO holding-EZ speech-EZ BST-OM remember-EZ.3SG-be.3SG].

Only Churchill remembers PRO giving the BST speech.

b. Fæqæt Čerčil yad-e-š-e (ke) [PRO bærgozar=kærdæn-e soxænrani-e

bi-es-ti tarix-i bud].

Only Churchill remember-EZ.3SG-be.3SG (COMP) [PRO

agreement, while in ((38) b), as well as in ((30) b), ((32) b), and ((34) b), the subjunctive verb of the embedded control clause agrees with the long infinitive since as Kahnemuyipour (2001, cited in Ghomeshi, 2001) states, long infinitives are nominals. Persian, like any other language, follows Locality as Ghomeshi (2001) declares. Therefore, the closest nominal for the subjunctive verb to agree with is the long infinitive in these constructions, that is, [3SG].

5. *OC PRO yields de se interpretation, while NOC PRO yields non-de-se interpretation.*

(39) a. The unfortunate expects PRO to get a medal.

b. The unfortunate believes that PRO getting a medal would be boring.

(Hornstein, 1999:73)

(40) a. Bičare entezar=dar-e (ke) [PRO ye medal be-gir-e].

Unfortunate expect=have.3SG (COMP) [PRO one medal SBJ-get.3SG].

The unfortunate expects to get a medal.

b. Bičare eteqad=dar-e (ke) [PRO gereftæn-e medal kesel=kon-ænd-æs].

Unfortunate believe=have.3SG (COMP)

[PRO getting-EZ medal boring=do-be.3SG].

The unfortunate believes that PRO getting a medal is boring.

Ghomeshi (2001) assumes that the Obviation Effect in Persian complicates de se versus de re interpretations. She considers Obviation Effect to be the idea that the pronoun cannot be interpreted as coreferential with the matrix subject.

sentences.

4. OC PRO cannot have split antecedents, while NOC PRO can.

(37) a. *John$_i$ told Mary$_j$ PRO $_{i+j}$ to wash themselves / each other.

b. John$_i$ told Mary$_j$ that PRO$_{i+j}$ washing themselves / each other would be fun.

(Hornstein, 1999:73)

(38) a. Ariæn$_i$ be zæn$_j$-e-š goft (ke)[PRO$_{i+j}$ xod-e-šun-o/hæm-digær-o be- šuræn].

Arian$_i$ to wife$_j$-EZ.3SG tell-PAST.3SG (COMP)

[PRO$_{i+j}$ self-EZ.3PL-OM / too-other-OM SBJ-wash.3PL].

Arian$_i$ told his wife$_j$ PRO$_{i+j}$ to wash themselves/each other.

b. Ariæn$_i$ be zæn$_j$-e-š goft (ke)

[PRO$_{i+j}$ šostæn-e xod-e-šun / hæm-dige lezæt=bæxš-e].

Arian$_i$ to wife$_j$-EZ.3SG tell-PAST.3SG (COMP)

[PRO$_{i+j}$ washing-EZ self-EZ.3PL / too-other enjoy=give-be.3SG].

Arian$_i$ told his wife$_j$ that PRO$_{i+j}$ washing themselves/each other is enjoyable.

Ghomeshi (2001) points out since subjunctive verbs bear agreement, they complicate the issue of split antecedents. Nevertheless, ((38) a) and ((38) b) indicate that both OC PRO and NOC PRO can have split antecedents.

It is true that in English control constructions, the verb in the embedded clause does not bear agreement; however, this does not mean that all languages act like English in such constructions. Nevertheless, there is a difference between the subjunctive verb in the embedded control clause in ((38) a) and that in ((38) b). In ((38) a), the subjunctive verb bears the

Grammaticality of both ((34) a) and ((34) b) shows that there is no difference in the way OC PRO and NOC PRO act as far as the antecedent's c-commanding PRO is concerned. Therefore, the third criterion does not seem to be working for Persian.

3. *Under ellipsis, OC PRO only permits a sloppy interpretation, whereas, NOC PRO allows both sloppy and strict readings.*

(35) a. John expects PRO to win and Bill does too.

b. John thinks that PRO getting his resume in order is crucial and Bill does too.

(Hornstein, 1999:73)

(36) a. Ariæn entezar=dar-e (ke) [PRO be-bær-e væ pedær-e-š-æm hæmintor].

Arian expect=have.3SG (COMP)

[PRO SBJ-win.3SG and father-EZ.3SG.too this-way].

Arian expects to win and his father does too.

b. Ariæn fekr=mi-kon-e (ke)[PRO monæzæm=kardan-e rezum-æ-š zæruri-e væ pedær-e-š-æm hæmin-tor].

Arian think=DUR-do.3SG (COMP) [PRO organize=doing-EZ resume-EZ.3SG crucial-be.3SG and father-EZ.3SG-too this-way].

Arian thinks that PRO organizing his resume is crucial and his father does too.

Therefore, as ((36) a) and ((36) b) show, both OC and NOC constructions yield both sloppy and strict readings. However there might be a sequence involved in these readings. In Persian, it seems that native speakers think of the sloppy reading before the strict one when encountered with such

Persian data. However, it should be noted that this might be due to the fact that Persian is a null subject language, and since there is no overt dummy subject to confuse PRO, it chooses the matrix subject as its antecedent in both cases.

2. *In OC, the antecedent must c-command PRO, while in NOC, there is no need for the antecedent to c-command PRO.*

(33) a. *John's campaign expects PRO to shave himself.

b. Clinton's$_i$ campaign believes that PRO$_i$ keeping his sex life under

control is necessary for electoral success.

(Hornstein, 1999:73)

(34) a. Setad-e Ariæn entezar=dar-e (ke) [PRO xod-e-š-o eslah=kon-e].

Campaign-EZ Arian expect=have.3SG (COMP)

[PRO self-EZ.3SG-OM shave=do.3SG].

Arian's campaign expects PRO to shave himself.

b. Setad-e Kilinton$_i$ fekr=mi-kon-e (ke)

[PRO$_i$ tæht-e=kontorol=dær=avordæn-e zendegi-e seks-i-š bæraye

movæfæqiæt dær entexabat mohem-e].

Campaign-EZ Clinton$_i$ think=DUR-do.3SG (COMP)

[PRO$_i$ under-EZ=control=in=bringing-EZ life-EZ sex-EZ.3SG-OM

for success in election important-be.3SG].

Clinton's$_i$ campaign believes that PRO$_i$ keeping his sex life under control is necessary for electoral success.

important-be.3SG].

It is believed that PRO shaving is important.

As ((30) a) and ((30) b) indicate, in Persian, neither OC nor NOC needs an antecedent, instead the antecedent can be implied rather than stated.

2.In OC, the antecedent must be local, whereas, in NOC, there is no need for the antecedent to be local.

(31) a. *John thinks that it was expected PRO to shave himself.

b. John$_i$ thinks that it is believed that PRO$_i$ shaving himself is important.

(Hornstein, 1999:73)

(32) a. Ariæn fekr=mi-kon-e (ke) entezar=mi-raft (ke)

[PRO xod-e-š-o eslah=kon-e].

Arian think=DUR-do.3SG (COMP) expect=DUR-go.3SG (COMP)

[PRO self-EZ.3SG-OM shave=do.3SG].

Arian thinks that it was expected PRO to shave himself.

b. Ariæn$_i$ fekr=mi-kon-e (ke) æqide bær in-e ke

[PRO$_i$ eslah=kærdæn mohem-e].

Arian$_i$ think=DUR-do.3SG (COMP) idea on this-be.3SG COMP

[PRO$_i$ shaving important-be.3SG].

Arian$_i$ thinks that it is believed that PRO$_i$ shaving himself is important.

Therefore, the second criterion, proposed by Hornstein, to distinguish between OC and NOC does not seem to be working for

that of Landau's (2003, 2004). Based on whether the Persian data fits in Hornstein's MTC or Landau's Agree-based approach to control, I will support one and refute the other.

I will start with Hornstein's model first. Hornstein (1999) discusses control theory in Minimalism. Since D-structure is removed in Minimalism, Hornstein argues that Obligatory Control structures are the result of movement. He begins by William's (1980) classification of control into Obligatory Control (OC) and Nonobligatory Control (NOC). He highlights the properties of each type of control by some examples. I am going to see if his method works for Persian data as well.

Evaluation of Hornstein's Criteria for OC/NOC

1. *OC PRO needs an antecedent, while NOC PRO does not.*

(29) a. *It was expected PRO to shave himself.

b. It was believed that PRO shaving was important.

(Hornstein, 1999:73)

(30) a. Entezar=mi-ræft (ke) [PRO xod-e-š-o eslah=kon-e].
Hope=DUR-go.PAST.1SG (COMP)
[PRO self-EZ[1].1SG-OM[2] shave=do.3SG].
It was expected PRO to shave himself.

b. æqide bær in-e ke [PRO eslah=kærdæn moheme].
Idea on this-be.3SG COMP [PRO shaving

1. EZ stands for EZAFE, which is an unstressed vowel that comes between the elements of an NP in Persian.

2. OM stands for Object Marker. In Persian, it is formally expressed by (ra) and literally by the vowel (o).

Control in Persian

Pouneh Shabani Jadidi*

(Part 2)

Abstract

This paper investigates control constructions in Persian by running various tests of control offered by Hornstein (1999, 2003, 2004) in his Movement Theory of Control. And those proposed by Landau (2003, 2004) in his Agree-based Approach to OC under Standard Theory of Control.

The Persian data show consistency with Landau's tests of control, whereas, they prove to be inconsistent with those of Hornstein's. Therefore, Hornstein's theory that OC PRO is the residue of movement is refuted, while Landau's Agree-base Approach is supported by the data in this paper, including Persian showing case concord in its subjunctive control construction.

Key Words: Control constructions – Agree-base Approach – Minimalist perspective – Movement Approach.

Testing and Analyzing Persian Data

In this section, I will test Persian data in the two theories at two ends of the Control Theory continuum, that of Hornstein's (1999, 2003,2004) and

---

* University of Ottawa.