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1. Introduction

Much attention within the generative tradition has focused on the contrast between raising and control. While both involve a relationship between an overt and a null NP, crucial differences have been noted, requiring two separate analyses. In particular, within the Principles and Parameters approach, control is a non-derivational relation between an overt NP and a special type of null pronoun (PRO). Raising, on the other hand, involves movement with the null NP a trace. Recently, Hornstein (1999) has challenged the P&P view, claiming that both raising and control are derived via movement, eliminating the need for PRO. In this paper, we examine facts from Malagasy, a Western Austronesian language, that require that the traditional distinction between raising and control be maintained. We consider subject-to-subject and subject-to-object raising and contrast these types of structures with control.

2. Subject-to-subject raising versus subject control

We begin with a discussion of subject-to-subject raising (SSR) versus subject control constructions in Malagasy. Both standard and Malagasy-specific tests can separate verbs which take clausal complements into two classes: start and intend. The start verbs are SSR verbs, while the intend verbs are control verbs.

2.1. Initial similarities and differences

Certain verbs in Malagasy take as their objects clausal complements without complementizers; these clauses appear between the verb and the subject of the verb. These verbs appear to act the same way with respect to yes-no question formation and wh-extraction.

Ve, the yes-no question particle, may appear either immediately before the clause-final NP (the canonical position for it (Keenan (1976))) or sentence-finally.

(1) a. Manomboka manasa ny lamba ve i Bakoly?
   AT.start AT.wash DET clothes Q DET Bakoly
   ‘Does Bakoly start washing the clothes?’

   b. Manomboka manasa ny lamba i Bakoly ve?
   AT.start AT.wash DET clothes DET Bakoly Q
   ‘Does Bakoly start washing the clothes?’
c. Mikiry manasa ny lamba ve i Bakoly?
   AT.intend AT.wash DET clothes Q DET Bakoly
   ‘Does Bakoly intend to wash the clothes?’
d. Mikiry manasa ny lamba i Bakoly ve?
   AT.intend AT.wash DET clothes DET Bakoly Q
   ‘Does Bakoly intend to wash the clothes?’

Clause-final NPs may be *wh*-extracted and do not license *wh*-in-situ.

(2)  
   a. Iza no manomboka manasa ny lamba?
       who FOC AT.start AT.wash DET clothes
       ‘Who starts washing the clothes?’
   b.*Manomboka manasa ny lamba iza?
   c. Iza no mikiry manasa ny lamba?
       who FOC AT.intend AT.wash DET clothes
       ‘Who intends to wash the clothes?’
   d.*Mikiry manasa ny lamba iza?
       AT.intend AT.start DET clothes who

These clause-final NPs act the same way as they do in monoclausal sentences.

(3)  
   a. Manasa ny lamba ve i Bakoly?
       AT.wash DET clothes Q DET Bakoly
       ‘Is Bakoly washing the clothes?’
   b. Manasa ny lamba i Bakoly ve?
       AT.wash DET clothes DET Bakoly Q
       ‘Is Bakoly washing the clothes?’
   c. Iza no manasa ny lamba?
       who FOC AT.wash DET clothes
       ‘Who is washing the clothes?’
   d.*Manasa ny lamba iza?
       AT.wash DET clothes who

These initial data are misleading; further tests show that there are important differences between these classes.

2.1.1. Multiple overt subjects

In *intend* sentences it is possible to add an overt subject to the complement clause; in *start* sentences this is not possible.

(4)  
       AT.start TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly DET clothes 1SG
b. Mikiry sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba aho.³
   AT.intend TT.wash GEN’DET Bakoly DET clothes 1SG
   I intend that the clothes be washed by Bakoly.

This suggests that there is a θ-role available in (4b) which is not available in (4a).

2.1.2. Embedded idioms

When the embedded clause is a subject idiom, only the start class verbs keep the idiomatic reading.

(5) a. Manomboka tsy vakin’amboa ny akanga maro.
   AT.start NEG TT.catch GEN’DOG DET guinea-hen many
   (lit.) ‘Many guinea-hens started not to be caught by a dog’
   (fig.) ‘Strength in numbers started.’

b. Mikiry tsy vakin’amboa ny akanga maro.
   AT.intend NEG TT.catch GEN’dog DET guinea-hen many
   (lit.) ‘Many guinea-hens intended not to be caught by a dog’
   *(fig.) ‘Strength in numbers intended’

This too suggests that intend verbs have an external θ-role, but that start verbs do not.

2.1.3. Impersonal sentences

When the clause-final NP is inanimate, start verbs have the expected meaning. Intend verbs have an unexpected impersonal reading.

(6) a. Manomboka sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba.
   AT.start TT.wash GEN’DET Bakoly DET clothes
   ‘The clothes started to be washed by Bakoly.’
   cannot mean: ‘It was started that the clothes be washed by Bakoly.’

b. Mikiry sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba.
   AT.intend TT.wash GEN’DET Bakoly DET clothes
   cannot mean: ‘The clothes intended to be washed by Bakoly.’
   ‘It was intended that the clothes be washed by Bakoly.’

There is a selectional restriction on the subject of intend verbs⁴: the agent must be animate. This raises the question of what the impersonal reading is in intend verbs.

The subject of the embedded verb is string-adjacent to the subject of the matrix verb (7,8a). If one of them is phonetically null, then it is not possible to know, a priori, which clause the overt element is in (8b,b’); further tests are necessary to determine its position.
A few predictions can be made if the clause-final NP were in the matrix clause (8b). It would act as the subjects of monoclausal verbs do (3), in particular, it would obey the restrictions in (9).

(9)  

a. It could be *wh*-extracted.  
b. It would not license *wh*-in situ.  
c. It could appear before or after *ve*.

All of these predictions are fulfilled when the clause-final NP is animate, as in (1.2), where it appears to be in the matrix clause.

Different predictions can be made if the clause-final NP is in the embedded clause, as in example (8b’).

(10)  

a. It could not be *wh*-extracted.  
b. It would license *wh*-in situ.  
c. It could only appear before *ve*.

The behaviour of *start* and *intend* sentences with respect to these predictions will show that they have different structures: *start* verbs have a structure as in (8b) while *intend* verbs have a structure as in (8b’).

2.1.4. *Wh facts*

When the clause-final NP is inanimate, only *start* verbs allow *wh*-extraction; it is ungrammatical in *intend* verbs.

(11)  

a. Inona no manomboka sasan’i Bakoly?  
   what FOC AT.start TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly  
   ‘What started being washed by Bakoly?’  
b. *Inona no mikiry sasan’i Bakoly?  
   what FOC AT.intend TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly?
The reverse is true for wh-in situ: it is grammatical only in intend verbs.\(^5\)

(12)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Manomboka sasan’i Bakoly inona?} \\
& \quad \quad \text{AT.start TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly what}
\end{align*}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Mikiry sasan’i Bakoly inona?} \\
& \quad \quad \text{AT.intend TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly what}
\end{align*}\]

‘It was intended that Bakoly wash what?’ (this is not an echo question)

For all start verbs and intend verbs with animate clause-final NPs, the sentences act as expected with respect to wh-questions. For intend verbs with inanimate clause-final NP, the sentences act in an atypical manner. We conclude that the clause-final NP of these sentences is not in the subject position of the matrix clause.

2.1.5. Two positions for ve

The final test distinguishing the two classes of verbs is the possible positions for ve. Only the start verbs allow ve to appear both before and after the clause-final NP; the intend verbs allow only the sentence-final position.

(13)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Manomboka sasan’i Bakoly ve ny lamba?} \\
& \quad \quad \text{AT.start TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly Q DET clothes}
\end{align*}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Manomboka sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba ve?} \\
& \quad \quad \text{AT.start TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly DET clothes Q}
\end{align*}\]

‘Are the clothes starting to be washed by Bakoly?’

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c.} & \quad \text{*Mikiry sasan’i Bakoly ve ny lamba?} \\
& \quad \quad \text{AT.intend TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly Q DET clothes}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{d.} & \quad \text{Mikiry sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba ve?} \\
& \quad \quad \text{AT.intend TT.wash.GEN’DET Bakoly DET clothes Q}
\end{align*}\]

‘Is it intended that the clothes be washed by Bakoly?’

Ve can appear on either side of the matrix subject; if the subject is phonologically null, there is no difference if it appears on one side versus the other.

(14)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Mikiry [sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba] ve Δ?} \\
& \quad \quad \text{b.} \quad \text{Mikiry [sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba] Δ ve?}
\end{align*}\]

So in sentences like (6b), the clause-final NP is not in the matrix clause.\(^6\)

2.2. Subject of intend verbs

What, then, is the subject of the matrix clause in sentences like (15) (= (6b))?
(15) Mikiry sasan’i Bakoly ny lamba Δ.
   It was intended that the clothes be washed by Bakoly.

The sentence suggests that people in general are doing the intending: $pro_{arb}$. There is an extremely limited set of verbs that $pro_{arb}$ may appear with, as Malagasy is not generally a *pro*-drop language. This limited distribution must be explained.

The related sentences in English have passive matrix verbs (in Malagasy the matrix verb is active). Only certain verbs in English allow this construction.

(16) a. It was intended that Alexandra would wash the clothes. (cf. (14))
    b. *It was washed the clothes. (cf. (16a))
    c. *It was started Matilda to wash the clothes. (cf. (16b))

The class of verbs that allow this construction in English is similar to that in Malagasy.

    AT.wash DET clothes
    b. *Manomboka ny lamba Bakoly pro.
    AT.start DET clothes Bakoly

We therefore suggest that $pro_{arb}$ is semantically licensed by a class of verbs; in particular, verbs which can refer to a state of mind of a group of people. Further confirmation of this is left to future research.

2.3. Some ambiguities.

Some *intend* clauses with animate clause-final NPs have ambiguities between a standard and an impersonal reading.

(18) a. Mikiry manasa ny lamba i Bakoly.
    ‘Bakoly intends to wash the clothes.’
    ‘It is intended that Bakoly wash the clothes.’ (With pragmatic context)
    b. Mikiry manasa ny lamba i Bakoly ve?
    ‘Is it the case that Bakoly intends to wash the clothes?’
    ‘Is it intended that Bakoly wash the clothes?’ (With pragmatic context)
    c. Mikiry manasa ny lamba ve i Bakoly?
    ‘Does Bakoly intend to wash the clothes?’
    cannot mean: ‘Is it intended that Bakoly wash the clothes?’

These data are unsurprising. In (17a) and (17b), the sentences are ambiguous between having *pro* in the matrix clause and PRO in the embedded clause.

‘Bakoly intends to wash the clothes.’

a’. Mikiry [manasa ny lamba i Bakoly] pro.
   ‘It is intended that Bakoly wash the clothes.’

b. [Mikiry [manasa ny lamba PRO] i Bakoly] ve?
   ‘Is it the case that Bakoly intends to wash the clothes?’

b’. [Mikiry [manasa ny lamba i Bakoly] pro] ve?
   ‘Is it intended that Bakoly wash the clothes?’

These alternative structures for each sentence give the interpretations available. The second interpretation is generally dispreferred, as it requires both the non-canonical position for ve and the limited pro.

The impossibility of the interpretation in (17c) is also as expected. For the impersonal reading, pro must appear in the final position of the sentence. Ve must appear in the second position, after either the predicate or the entire clause.

(20) a. Mikiry [manasa ny lamba i Bakoly] ve pro?
   b. Mikiry [manasa ny lamba i Bakoly] pro ve?
   c. *Mikiry [manasa ny lamba ve i Bakoly] pro?

2.4. Interim conclusion

We have shown that verbs of the intend class are control verbs: it is possible for all arguments of both verbs to appear overtly, there is loss of an idiomatic reading, and the semantics of sentence changes when the embedded clause is passivised.

When it is possible, there is control of PRO in the embedded clause, from the subject of the matrix clause. Both PRO and the overt subject receive θ-roles, one from the embedded clause, one from the matrix clause.

Selectional restrictions sometimes prevent the overt subject from being in the matrix clause. In these cases, as the θ-criterion still requires that the matrix clause have an external argument to receive the external theta-role, the subject of the matrix clause is forced to be proAb. This contrasts with start verbs, which are raising and do not have an external θ-role which could have selectional restrictions.

The distinction between raising and control is both syntactically and semantically marked in Malagasy.

3. Part Two

We now turn to subject-to-object raising constructions (henceforth SOR). We propose that SOR is in fact a kind of Exceptional Case Marking, where the “raised” NP is not in the matrix clause, but remains on the edge of the embedded clause (Chomsky 1973; Massam 1985; Travis 1998). Importantly, there is movement to this position rather than base generation. Raising contrasts with what we call “prolepsis” (after Higgins ?), where the apparently raised NP is base-
generated in the matrix clause and controls a null element in the embedded clause. It is the contrast between raising and prolepsis (a kind of control) that is the focus of this section, rather than a detailed analysis of the structure of either. We set aside these (admittedly important) details for further research.

3.1. The SOR data

We begin with an overview of the properties of SOR. First, although most clausal complements are extraposed to the right of the subject (21a), the complement clause in SOR appears in its base position, between the matrix verb and the subject (21b) (the brackets in (21b) are for expository purposes rather than showing actual constituency).

(21)  
a. Mihevitra Ramatoa [fa tsara tarehy Rasoa].  
AT.think Ramatoa good face Rasoa  
‘Ramatoa thinks that Rasoa is good looking.’

AT.think ACC-Rasoa good face Ramatoa  
‘Ramatoa thinks Rasoa is good looking.’

As shown in (21b), the embedded subject appears to the left of embedded predicate and special complementizer (ho), marked with accusative Case. Only subjects can undergo SOR, hence the ungrammaticality of (22).

(22) *Mihevitra an-dRasoa ho nidera (azy) i Bakoly Ramatoa.  
AT.think ACC-Rasoa AT.praise 3ACC DET Bakoly Ramatoa  
‘Ramatoa thinks of Rasoa that Bakoly praised her.’

No overt pronoun may surface in the base position of the embedded clause (compare (21b) with (23)).

(23) *Mihevitra an-dRasoa ho tsara tarehy izy Ramatoa.  
AT.think ACC-Rasoa good face 3NOM Ramatoa  
‘Ramatoa thinks Rasoa is good looking.’

Although not much is known about the complementizer ho, it appears to be an irrealis comp (in contrast with fa) (Rajaona 1972: 285). Thus although the SOR construction in (24a) allows the continuation, the regular complement clause in (24b) does not. (24b) sounds like a contradiction.

(24)  
a. Nihevitra azy ho adala aho … fa tsy adala velively izy.  
PST.AT.think 3ACC HO crazy 1SG.NOM but NEG crazy at-all 3NOM  
‘I thought he was crazy, but he isn’t crazy at all.’
b. #Nihevitra aho fa adala izy ... fa tsy adala velively izy.
PST.AT.think 1SG.NOM C 3ACC crazy but NEG crazy at-all 3NOM
‘I though he was crazy, but he isn’t crazy at all.’

In sum, SOR appears to be triggered by the irrealis complementizer ho, which heads a CP that does not undergo extraposition and where the embedded subject is marked with accusative Case.

3.2. The structure of SOR

At this point, the obvious question to ask is where is the accusative NP? Unfortunately, the data give a mixed answer. We review the data here with the caveat that a definitive analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.

As an initial observation, the raised NP is not in a regular subject position or even in a special leftward subject position (contra Massam 1984). The following data show that the raised NP has very different properties, both syntactic and semantic from a subject. First, the raised NP is out of the scope of negation, unlike subjects (25a) and topics (25b). Thus in (25), negation scopes over the subject, allowing the disjunctive reading.

(25)  
   a. Tsy lasa any an-dafy na an-dRabe na an-dRasoa.
       NEG gone there ACC-side or ACC-Rabe or ACC-Rasoa
       ‘Neither Rabe nor Rasoa went overseas.’
   b. Na an-dRabe na an-dRasoa dia tsy lasa any an-dafy.
       or ACC-Rabe or ACC-Rasoa TOP NEG gone there ACC-side
       ‘Neither Rabe nor Rasoa went overseas.’

In (26a), however, the wide-scope disjunctive is not possible with negation on the embedded verb; negation must be on the matrix verb, as shown in (26b).

(26)  
   a. *Mino na an-dRabe na an-dRasoa ho tsy lasa i Koto.
       AT.believe or ACC-Rabe or ACC-Rasoa HO NEG gone DET Koto
   b. Tsy mino na an-dRabe na an-dRasoa ho lasa i Koto.
       NEG AT.believe or ACC-Rabe or ACC-Rasoa HO gone DET Koto
       ‘Koto believes that neither Rabe nor Rasoa left.’

Similarly, there is no one-to-one mapping between elements in the subject position and the accusative NP in SOR. Reflexives can be subjects, bound by the genitive agent, as shown in (27a), but a reflexive in an SOR context cannot be bound by the genitive agent, as illustrated in (27b).

(27)  
   a. Hajain’i Bakoly ny tenany.
       TT.respect’DET Bakoly DET self.3
       ‘Bakoly respects herself.’
b. Mino ny tenany*i/i ho hajain’i Bakoly, i Soa_i.  
AT.believe DET self.3 HO TT.respect’DET Bakoly DET Soa  
‘Soa believes herself to be respected by Bakoly.’

Wh-elements are excluded from the subject position, but allowed in SOR.

(28)  
a. *Efa lasa iza?  
already left who  
‘Who already left?’

b. Mino an’iza ho efa lasa i Bakoly?  
AT.believe ACC’who HO already left DET Bakoly  
‘Who does Bakoly believe to have already left?’

Subjects must be definite, but the raised NP need not be.

(29)  
FUT,AT.get number good student two  
‘Two students will get good grades.’

PST,AT.hope student two HO FUT,AT.get number good Ramatoa  
‘Ramatoa hoped two students would get good grades.’

Thus whatever the position of the accusative NP, it is not in a subject position. The question now arises as to its position in the matrix or embedded clause. The data, unfortunately, do not point the way to a simple answer.

First, binding data suggest that the raised NP is not in the matrix clause. These data include typical condition A and B effects as illustrated below. The raised NP is “too far” to be an anaphor coindexed with the matrix subject (30a), and “far enough” to be a pronoun (30b)

(30)  
AT.say self HO good face Ramatoa  
‘Ramatoa says she is good looking.’

b. Milaza azy_i ho tsara tarehy Ramatoa_i.  
AT.say 3ACC HO good face Ramatoa  
‘Ramatoa says she is good looking.’

Similarly, the raised NP can antecede an object anaphor in the embedded clause (31a), but not a pronoun (31b).

(31)  
a. Mihevitra an’i Soa_i ho manaja tena,*i Be_j.  
AT.think ACC’DET Soa HO AT.respect self DET Be  
‘Be thinks that Soa respects herself.’
Other data, however, suggest that the raised NP is indeed in the matrix clause. As seen above, the raised NP is marked with accusative case, like direct objects. Moreover, it can undergo further A-movement, such as the voice alternation illustrated in (32)

(32)  Heverin-dRamatoa  ho tsara tarehy Rasoa.
     TT.think.GEN.RamatoaHo good face Rasoa
     ‘Ramatoa thinks Rasoa is good looking.’

Certain positional data indicate the accusative NP has raised out of the embedded clause. Matrix adverbs may precede or follow the accusative NP. The word order in (33b) is surprising if the raised NP is in the embedded clause.

(33)  a.  Mino  [amin'ny fony manontolo] an'i Soa ho hahazo
       AT.believe with.DET heart AT.whole  ACC’DET Soa HO FUT.AT.get
       valisoa i Be.
       reward DET Be
       ‘Be believes with all his heart that Soa will get a reward.’

b.  Mino  an'i Soa [amin'ny fony manontolo] ho hahazo
       AT.believe ACC’DET Soa with.DET heart AT.whole HO FUT.AT.get
       valisoa i Be.
       reward DET Be
       ‘Be believes with all his heart that Soa will get a reward.’

Similarly, the accusative NP may launch floating quantifiers on the matrix verb (34b) (this contrasts with embedded wh-elements (34c)).

(34)  a.  Mihevitra ny mpianatra ho efa lasa daholo i Bakoly.
       AT.think DET student HO already left all DET Bakoly
       ‘Bakoly thinks that all the students have already left.’

b.  Mihevitra daholo ny mpianatra ho efa lasa i Bakoly.
       AT.think all DET student HO already left DET Bakoly
       ‘Bakoly thinks that all the students have already left.’

c.  Mahatadidy daholo an’izay efa lasa aho.
       AT.remember all ACC’REL already left 1SG.NOM
       ‘I completely remember who left.’

≠ ‘I remember who all left.’

To resume, the raised NP is not simply a subject, but it has properties of being both in the embedded and matrix clauses. We suggest that it is in fact on the edge of the embedded clause, giving rise to these mixed properties. Importantly, the raised NP has moved to this position, rather than being base-generated, as shown
by typical movement diagnostics (restriction to subjects, lack of resumptive pronouns).

3.3. Prolepsis

The basic properties of SOR can be shown to contrast with prolepsis. In prolepsis, there is base generation of an argument in the main clause which binds a pro/PRO in the embedded clause. In other words, prolepsis is a kind of control structure.

As a first distinction, prolepsis always involves extraposition of the embedded CP.

(35) Mino an-dRabe Rasoa [ho nandrafitra ny trano (??izy)].
\[ \text{AT}.\text{believe ACC-Rabe Rasoa HO PST.AT.build DET house (3NOM)} \]
‘Rasoa believes Rabe to have built the house.’

Second, extraposition changes binding relations in the clause. In particular, negative polarity items in the embedded clause are no longer licensed by negation on the matrix verb. The grammaticality of the SOR example in (a) contrasts with the ungrammatical prolepsis in (b).

(36) a. Tsy mihevitra azy ho antitira velively aho.
\[ \text{NEG AT}.\text{think 3ACC HO old at-all 1SG.NOM} \]
‘I don’t believe him to be old at all.’

b. *Tsy mihevitra azy aho [ ho antitra velively ].
\[ \text{NEG AT}.\text{think 3ACC 1SG.NOM HO old at-all} \]

Moreover, coreference between names and pronouns is altered by prolepsis.

(37) a. Mino azy, ho tsara tarehy i Bakoly,.
\[ \text{AT}.\text{believe 3ACC HO good face DET Bakoly}. \]
‘Bakoly believes herself to be good looking.’

b. Mino azy, i Bakoly, [ ho tsara tarehy ].
\[ \text{AT}.\text{believe 3ACC DET Bakoly HO good face} \]
‘Bakoly believes her to be good looking.’

Third, the accusative NP is not restricted to subjects and allows for a resumptive pronoun.⁷ (In (38) the embedded subject is underlined and the resumptive pronoun is in bold.) Recall that regular SOR targets only subjects and resumptive pronouns are ungrammatical (see examples ()-() in section XX).

(38) a. Nanantena an-dRabe Rasoa [ho nanasanany lovia ny savony].
\[ \text{PST.AT}.\text{hope ACC-Rabe Rasoa HO PST.CT.wash.3GEN dish DET soap} \]
‘Rasoa hoped about Rabe that he used the soap to wash the dishes.’
b. Nanampo an-dRabe Rasoa [ho naka ady azy Ramatoa].
PST.AT.expect ACC-Rabe Rasoa HO PST.AT.take spouse 3ACC Ramatoa
‘Rasoa expects about Rabe that Ramatoa will marry him.’

Fourth, idioms lose their figurative meaning in prolepsis, but maintain it in SOR.

(39) a. Mihevitra ny akanga maro ho tsy vakin’amboa aho.
AT.think DET guinea-hen many HO NEG taken.GEN’dog 1SG.NOM
(lit.)’I think that many guinea hens will not be captured by a dog.’
(fig.)‘I think there is strength in numbers.’

b. Mihevitra ny akanga maro aho [ ho tsy vakin’amboa ].
AT.think DET guinea-hen many 1SG.NOM HO NEG taken.GEN’dog
(lit.)‘I think that many guinea hens will not be captured by a dog.’
*(fig.)‘I think there is strength in numbers.’

Summing up, there are systematic differences between SOR and prolepsis. We suggest that these differences are due to structural properties: SOR involves true movement, while prolepsis involves base generation. Since the accusative NP in prolepsis is generated as an argument in the main clause, we expect differences in binding and the loss of idiomatic readings. Similarly, since there is no actual movement with prolepsis, the constraints on movement are lifted (i.e., restriction to subjects and resumptive pronouns). Thus we conclude that Davies’ (2000; 2002) analysis of Madurese raising as control cannot be maintained for Malagasy.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that the traditional distinction between raising and control must be maintained. We have shown that there are both raising and control verbs in Malagasy and that, despite surface similarities, these two classes have distinct syntactic and semantic properties.
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1 There is a predictable meaning difference between (2a,c) and (2b,d): the former involve categorical judgments and the latter thetic (as in Sasse (1987)). This difference is not relevant here.

3 We have found that Malagasy does not allow agent-agent sequences.
   i. *Mikiry manasa ny lamba Rabe aho.
      AT.intend AT.wash DET clothes Rabe 1SG
   ii. *Mikiry manasa ny lamba an-dRabe aho.
      AT.intend AT.wash DET clothes gen-Rabe 1SG

4 This difference is not due to the passive in the embedded clause; if the subject is animate, the sentence has the expected meaning.
   i. Manomboka/mikiry orahan’i Tovo i Noro.
      AT.start/AT.intend TT.kiss.GEN’DET Tovo DET Noro.
      ‘Noro starts/intends to be kissed by Tovo.’

5 This is somewhat unexpected, as in general subjects in Malagasy do not license wh-in situ. This suggests that the subject may not be in the subject position of the embedded clause (see Polinsky and Potsdam (2002) for binding facts); crucially, it is not in the subject position of the matrix clause.

6 This is not the same structure as in Polinsky and Potsdam (2002a); in particular, we will posit pro as the empty category and not PRO.

7 Resumptive subject pronouns are awkward in Malagasy, accounting for the degraded status of (xx) with an overt pronoun.