
Landau: OC is formed by an abstract Agree relation mediated by functional heads.

Locality

Locality constraints in MTC: the strictly configurational character of the MLC makes it look like an accident that the same semantic verb classes violate the MDP cross-linguistically.

Hornstein (2003): object control verbs: subject control ok when object missing:

(1) John asked/begged/got PRO₁ to leave.

But:

(2) Mary said/shouted PRO₁ to leave.

MLC explanation(?): pro vs. null object not represented syntactically. No independent evidence. Controller choice should be contingent on lexical and contextual factors.

(4) John₁ asked X for [X’s permission to him₁ PRO₁ to leave].
→ X controls external arg of permission, John the internal arg.

(5) Mary₁ said to X [her₁ instruction to X₁ PRO₁ to leave].
→ Mary controls external arg of instruction, no co-indexation with internal arg (Cond B).

MTC: alternative: lexical control exists along with syntactic control → weakens the theory.

Landau: “This position indicates a willingness to sacrifice well-known facts on the altar of ‘restrictiveness’.”

Further problem: null pronouns are visible to condition A, they can bind anaphors (Rizzi 1986)

(6) a. We all heard the amazing story about [Bill and Kevin].
   John said to them₁ at each other’s₁ parties to take off their clothes.

   b. We all heard the amazing story about [Bill and Kevin].
   *John said to pro₁ at each other’s₁ parties to take off their clothes.

Binding/control asymmetry: ‘An anaphor cannot be lexicalized if its antecedent is not’ (Boeckx and Hornstein 2004:439).’ Disconfirmed in NOC:

(7) a. [PRO praising oneself/myself] wouldn’t be polite.

   b. John was furious. [PRO to get himself a new CD-player like the one stolen] would cost a fortune.
→ *pro* controller in implicit control: does not block control shift when it should, it does not bind reflexives when it could.

Acquisition data:
(i) late acquisition of *promise*-type constructions: not necessarily markedness (passive, parasitic gaps also acquired late);
(ii) systematic delay in the acquisition of OC into adjuncts as well (cannot be the same mechanism as OC into complements then?);
(iii) age 3: *tell/remind* with incorrect subject control, progression from more to fewer MDP-violations.

**Split control**
banned in OC in Hornstein (1999, 2003), problem for the Agree-based analysis as well, but still exists:

(8)  
\[ a. \text{John proposed to Mary to help each other.} \]
\[ b. \text{Ich habe ihm angeboten einander zu helfen.} \]

(9)  
\[ \text{a. The chair preferred [PRO1 to gather in the conference room].} \]
\[ \text{b. [CP DP .. F .. [CP [T-Agr+C0-T] [TP PRO [I' tT-Agr [VP tPRO |-]]]]] } \]
\[ \text{Agree2 Agree3 Move Agree1} \]

Agree3: a PC infinitive is tensed, headed by C with an uninterpretable Tense feature. Embedded T-Agr raises to check off this feature, ends up in an edge position → visible to matrix operations → the link generating OC can be established.

**Semantic plurality**: Landau (2000): similarly to lexical nouns, PRO can be inherently specified for either value (not contextually acquire it as in Landau (1999), no Inclusiveness or copying capacity for Agree-type of problem). Non-standard Agree: assignment, not checking (Hornstein 2003). Matching, valuation, deletion. Does valuation violate Inclusiveness?

PRO in PC: semantically plural, syntactically singular.

(10)  
\[ a. \text{The committee gathered before the vote.} \]
\[ b. *\text{The committee consulted each other before the vote. (in AmE)} \]

(11)  
\[ a. \text{The chair preferred to gather before the vote.} \]
\[ b. *\text{The chair preferred to consult each other before the vote. (in AmE)} \]

Reciprocal phrase licensed by syntactic plurality in AmE, semantic plurality in BrE (variation also found cross-linguistically). Specific requirements should always be established first!

(12)  
\[ a. *\text{John wants/decided to be similar/sing alike/be mutually supporting.} \]
\[ b. *\text{John is similar/sings alike/is mutually supporting with Bill.} \]
Hornstein: no comitatives allowed. Landau: in AmE syntactic plurality needed: *This couple is/are similar vs. John and Mary are similar
Comitative paraphrase not necessary: The chair decided to disperse until next week.

Minimality in 9b: an attracting head first Agrees with a close target, then with a remote one.

Hornstein: the Agree relations in 9b do not guarantee control, Agree has to be symmetric.
Landau: Agree is asymmetric, but its output (agreement) is symmetric.

Null case: Hornstein: Landau’s theory not consistent with the theory of null case. Should it be?
Landau: several reasons to reject it. PRO is case-marked (cf. languages with subject-oriented case concord in control infinitives).

Gerund and tense: Hornstein: gerundive complements tolerate PC: no tense (Stowel 1982), no CP. Landau: some gerunds can be tensed: Yesterday, John preferred leaving tomorrow.
Gerunds as CPs? Lack of interrogative gerunds can be handled on the featural, and not on the categorial level (for-infinitives are never interrogative either; from as a negative complementizer after remain/prevent?).

T-to-C: Hornstein: movement may overgenerate to EC-complements (strict tense-depency). Landau: yes, but harmless. C can be [-Tense] or tenseless (direct selectional relation bw matrix verb and embedded T), no movement needed.

Meaning postulate for PC (the subject of the non-finite complement may refer to the controller or a group containg a controller and some contextually specified others): Landau: why is the presence (not the absence) of embedded tense relevant, why no PC in raising? Too unrestricted. Hornstein: meaning postulates can only be imposed on arguments → no PC in adjuncts. Landau: Agree sets adjunc control apart from complement control, lack of PC in tensed temporal adjuncts explained. Right-adjoined adjuncts are predicates: they can support PC no more than secondary predicates (OC also explained):

(20) a. *John called Mary before meeting in the restaurant.
b. *John called Mary together/while together/as a team/extremely polarized.

Non-obligatory control
Rationale clauses, left-adjoined temporal adjuncts: NOC, logophoric nature. Hornstein: why does OC hold whenever it can? Landau: some economy metric: “Try to establish control syntactically (by Agree/Move) before you resort to pragmatics (logophoric/pronominal coreference).”

Case percolation
Landau: contrast between raising and control constructions: inherent (quirky) case shows up on matrix subject in raising, not in control → one chain in raising, two in control.

Hornstein: Chilean Spanish: quirky dative may show up on controller.

(22) a. Marta le quiere gustar a Juan.
   Marta CL.DAT wants to-please to Juan
   ‘Marta wants for Juan to like her’ (Marta wants to be liked by Juan).
b.  *A Juan le quiere gustar Marta.
   to Juan CL.DAT wants to-please Marta
   ‘Juan wants to like Marta’
Very restricted (querer ‘want’, tratar ‘try’), non-iterative (OC-dependencies can be chained):

(25) *A Marta le quieren tratar de gustar los gatos.
   to Marta CL.DAT wanted to-try of to-please the cats
   ‘Marta wants to try to like cats’.

Alternatives offered by Landau:
   (i) querer as a modal (semantic import from lexical entailments, not θ-role
       assignment). Raising analysis, only one modal/sentence.
   (ii) querer as a standard subject control verb. How is the Case feature of PRO valued?

T-Agr with valued case feature Agreeing with PRO (or lexical predicate in case of quirky case

(28) Case Independence

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Subj. T-Agr ... [}_{\text{CP}} \text{T-Agr+C [}_{\text{TP}} \text{t-T-Agr [}_{\text{VP}} \text{PRO ... ]]}}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\phi\text{-set} \rightarrow \phi\text{-set} \\
\text{Case} \rightarrow \\
\end{array}
\]

Chilean Spanish: case feature of the matrix functional head can optionally be unvalued, the
value of PRO’s case feature percolates to the controller via matrix T-Agr. Icelandic: fintie T-
Agr obligatorily bears a valued nominative case feature (functional head as the locus for this
difference makes it a natural parameter).

(29) Case Percolation

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Subj. T-Agr ... [}_{\text{CP}} \text{T-Agr+C [}_{\text{TP}} \text{t-T-Agr [}_{\text{VP}} \text{PRO ... V ... ]}]
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\phi\text{-set} \rightarrow \phi\text{-set} \\
\text{Q.Case} \rightarrow \text{Q.Case} \\
\text{Q.Case} \rightarrow \text{Q.Case} \\
\end{array}
\]

Prediction of another possibility: case of embedded T-Agr unvalued, PRO inherits case from
controller, a case of case transmission: Latin (also attested in Icelandic). This prediction lost
under the MTC account(?)

**Backward control**

Under the MTC it is “nothing but covert movement of the ‘controller’ DP to its matrix
*thematic* position; if OC is A-movement and A-movement can be covert, then backward
control is an inevitable possibility.”

Farrell (1995): Brazilian Portuguese causatives with fazer/mandar: ECM syntax, object control semantics: no passive, causee cannot be a clause or an expletive, with mandar has to be animate. No matrix object position realized. Any syntactic approach to control is misguided.

(31) a. *A mulher fez o nenê dormir.
   ‘The woman made the baby sleep’.
   
   b. *Eu mandei o sapateiro concertar esse sapato.
   ‘I had the cobbler fix these shoes’.

Overt causee in embedded subject position: can be a nominative pronoun, can follow the embedded verb.

(33) A professora mandou/fez eu apagar o quadro.
   the teacher had/ made I.NOM erase the board.
   ‘The teacher had/made me erase the board’.

Landau: the causee can be realized as an object clitic on the main verb. Why no passive?

(34) O professor os fez estudar mais.
   The professor CL-3.MASC.PL made study more
   ‘The professor made them study more’.

(35) a. *O nenê foi feito dormir.
   (The baby was made sleep)

   b. Os alunos foram forçados a estudarem mais.
   ‘The students were forced to study more’.

Farrell/Hornstein: the causee does not occupy a matrix object position. Landau: matrix passivization should be possible (with ACC withdrawn (?), raising to the matrix subject position, potentially picking up a θ-role on its way. Evidence not conclusive.

Polinsky and Potsdam: a more persuasive case for BC from Tsez.

(37) Δ₁  
   [kid-ba₁  ziya  b-išra]  y-oq-si.
   II.ABS girl.II-ERG cow.III.ABS III-feed.INF II-begin-PAST.EVID
   ‘The girl began to feed the cow’.

Problems:
(i) rarity (only two verbs in Tsez, at most five in other languages). Aspectuals like begin, continue, can be raising, too. Matrix V-to-T satisfies EPP (a stipulated lexical feature of the verbs in question);
(ii) Case of matrix DP: to explain the agreement facts, absolutive case has to be allowed in matrix clause. To explain OC, it has to be excluded: “the actual analysis P&P end up with […] deprives the control verb -oqa ‘begin’ of its case assigning capacity. The lack of absolutive case in the matrix clause is in fact crucial: It explains the very effect of OC. If an independent DP were merged as the external argument of –oqa, its case feature would remain unchecked.” Two distinct cases by the same DP: no explanation for why a second DP cannot be merged in the matrix clause. The effect of OC hangs on a problematic technical assumption.
Finite control
More common than assumed. BP: embedded topic drop contingent on the presence of a
coreferent matrix topic? (Modesto 2008) Even if OC PRO, no evidence for the alleged lack of
case.

(39) Greek (Philippaki-Warburton and Catsimali 1999)
a. Anangasan tin Eleni [PRO na milisi afti i idhja].
   forced.3PL the Eleni.acc PROnom PRT speak.3sg she herself.nom
   “They forced Helen to speak herself”.

Hungarian (J. Horvath, personal communication)
b. János biztatta Marit [hogy PRO maga/ *magát
   John.nom urged.3sg.def Mary.acc that PROnom herself.nom/*acc
   beszéljen az orvossal).
   talk.subj.3sg the doctor-with
   ‘John urged Mary to talk to the doctor herself’.

PRO-gate
Hornstein: an A-movement analysis of control is an elegant account of the PRO-gate effect:
“a PRO subject in a gerundive subject clause allows a pronoun to be A-bound even to the left
of a variable (the wh-trace), in contrast to a lexical subject in the same position, which gives
rise to the familiar WCO violation.” Reason: A-movement circumvents WCO (i.e. a pronoun
bound by an A-trace will not violate WCO: Who, seemed to his, wife t, to be clever?), PRO in
subject gerunds displays OC. Landau: if this is so, the PRO-gate is explained.

(40) a. Who1 did [PRO1 kissing his1 mother] upset t1?

   b. *Who1 did [Mary’s/his1/him1 kissing his1 mother] upset t1?

PRO in gerunds does not fall under OC:

H: *Shaving himself impressed Mary. L: Shaving myself impressed Mary.
   → no local antecedent required.

H: *John1 said that PRO1+2 shaving themselves upset everyone.
L: That [PRO1+2 covering themselves with mud] disturbed Spiro1 amused Dick2.
   The Hornstein sentence also improves when preceded by John told Bill that...
   → split control is not blocked, but subject gerunds are subject to logophoricity constraints.

L: Flirting around amused only Bill. → strict reading possible.

H: *PRO1 shaving himself made Mary believe John1
   → antecedent must be the most prominent DP, cannot be buried inside another DP.
   L: Mary is a potential logophoric antecedent, control by John ruled out.
[PRO\textsubscript{1} storming out of the room that way after losing the game] convinced everyone that John\textsubscript{1} is very immature.

(50) a. John\textsubscript{1} finally got what he wanted. PRO\textsubscript{1} shaving himself made Mary believe him\textsubscript{1}.  
b. John\textsubscript{1} knew that [PRO\textsubscript{1} shaving himself] made Mary believe him\textsubscript{1}.

→ what matters is not locality but logophoricity.

Sideward movement: look-ahead problem, a local DP can be skipped if it is an expletive:

(51) a. [PRO\textsubscript{1} getting himself a new pair of trekking shoes] made it look like John\textsubscript{1} was about to leave on a journey.  
b. *[PRO\textsubscript{1} getting himself a new pair of trekking shoes] made Mary realize John\textsubscript{1} was about to leave on a journey.

(52) a. PRO\textsubscript{1} finishing his work on time is important to John’s\textsubscript{1} development/*friends.

→ logophoric extensions of the possessor ok, potential controller individual-referring nouns are not. Sideward movement analysis?!

→ on every single criterion PRO in subject gerunds displays NOC

H: Sideward movement blocked in islands: NOC + WCO expected not supported either:

(53) The fact that PRO\textsubscript{1} losing his\textsubscript{1} life is a distinct possibility frightens every soldier\textsubscript{1}.

→ PRO-gate effects found even in gerunds inside islands.

PRO-gate also in environments of arbitrary control:

(54) a. PRO\textsubscript{arb} calling him\textsubscript{1} an idiot would upset any/?every professor\textsubscript{1}.

Hornstein’s NOC PRO is pro, predicted to trigger WCO violations.

\textit{Wh-infinitives}

L: OC misclassified as NOC based on the islandhood of \textit{wh}-complements.

(55) a. John wondered what to do.  
b. ?What did John say how to cook?

L: \textit{wh}-complements show OC: partial control (sloppy reading, no long-distance control etc.) Boeckx and H (2004): very weak islands blocking \textit{wh}-movement (Relativized Minimality), unclear whether they should block A-movement.

Agree-based account: Agree targets the C head (accessible to the higher phase), \textit{wh}-phrase in spec immaterial, the dependency is between φ-features.

\textbf{Control across passive}

(58) a. *John was hoped to leave.  
b. John was persuaded to leave.  
c. John was expected to leave.
B&H: *hope* does not passivize (with a non-expletive).

L: No subject control verb may promote the embedded subject to the matrix subject position via passivization – not even verbs that *do* passivize their DP objects (Visser’s Generalization):

(61)  a. The decision was regretted/hated.
      b. They regretted/hated to have passed the decision.
      c. *They were regretted/hated to have passed the decision.

Passive ECM obscures this in English:

(62)  b. *John was decided to be our representative.
→ tense restrictions of ECM attested.
(63)  b. *John was decided to apologize to Mary tomorrow.

**Sideways movement from complements**

Overgeneration problem:

(64) *John’s1 friends prefer [t1 to behave himself].

B&H: (i): *John* is a predicate in a small clause, cannot be an argument of *behave himself*;
(ii): possessive DPs are adjuncts, movement to adjoined positions is blocked.

(65) a. *John’s1 examination of the patient convinced Mary [t1 to applaud himself].
     b. *John’s1 examining the patient convinced Mary [t1 to applaud himself].

**Novel raising-control contrasts (Postal 2004)**

1. *be the matter/wrong with*: subject position antipronominal

(66) a. *Something1 is the matter with my transmission, but that sort of thing/*it1 is not the matter with his.
     b. *He said something1 was wrong with her values, and it1 was wrong with them.

Ok inside raising, not in control. PRO a null pronominal, raised DP a silent copy.

(67) a. *Lots of things seem to be the matter with your transmission.
     b. *Such a thing is bound to be wrong with someone’s liver.

(68) a. *Lots of things can be the matter with your transmission without being the matter with mine.
     b. *That can be detectable without being wrong with your liver.

2. Antecedence relations between certain DPs and their metonyms: no uniform behaviour:

(69) I am parked on 26th Street./Microsoft went up.
(70) John claimed that he was parked on 26th Street/*Microsoft claimed that it would go up.

Same contrast in raising vs. control:

(71) John plans to be parked on 26th Street/*Microsoft plans to go up.
(72) John seems to be parked on 26th Street/Microsoft seems to go up

→ null subject of control complement more like a pronoun than a copy. Metonimous shift has been shown to be restricted for pronouns and reflexives: *Microsoft believes itself to have gone up.