

The Duality of Obligatory Control: New Thoughts on an Old Theme

Idan Landau

Ben Gurion University
idanl@bgu.ac.il

Introduction

The idea that the *unitary* appearance of obligatory control into complement clauses conceals an underlying *duality* of structure and mechanism has a long history in generative grammar, starting from the earliest work.

Another idea with a long history is that complement clauses and non-complement clauses fall under different types of control – commonly called obligatory control (OC) and non-obligatory control (NOC).

These two ideas are distinct, even if their genealogies are sometimes confusingly entangled. This talk is about the *first* idea (the duality of OC).

- ❶ A brief journey through the history of this idea
- ❷ Some new thoughts on why it is right, and how.

- (1) Rosenbaum 1967: **VP**-complementation vs. **NP**-complementation
- a. Bill condescended [_S [_{VP} to stay there]].
 - b. Bill preferred [_{NP} [_S [_{VP} to stay there]]].

NP-complements can be passivized and pseudoclefted; VP-complements cannot.

- c. To stay there is preferred/*condescended by Bill.
- d. What Bill preferred/*condescended was to stay there.

A subtype of NP-complements are Oblique complements, which are dominated by PP. The preposition shows up (sometimes optionally) under displacement.

- e. What I decided (**on**) was to go sky diving.
- f. What I reminded John **of** was to visit his ailing mother.
- cf. g. * What I defied John (of) was to visit his ailing mother.

- (2) Obligatory coreference

The split between VP- and NP-complements only partially predicts whether the embedded subject must be controlled or not.

Optional coreference: NP-complements

- a. I preferred/hated [(for John) to leave]

Obligatory coreference: VP- and PP-complements

- b. I condescended [(/*for Bill) to cooperate].
- c. I persuaded John [(/*for Bill) to come].

Rosenbaum (1967:95): “There may well be an explanation for the necessary identity of erasing and erased noun phrases in the structures just presented, but this issue will not be taken up in the present study.”

- (3) A message from the future...

Rosenbaum’s dichotomy prefigures the modern cut between *tensed* and *untensed* complements, which is the crucial predictor of control type (exhaustive vs. partial in “infinitive” languages, obligatory vs. nonobligatory in “subjunctive” languages).

Rosenbaum’s class of intransitive VP-complements verbs (p. 123): *begin, cease, commence, condescend, continue, dare, decline, endeavor, fail, get, grow, hasten, manage, proceed, refuse, start*.

Note: These are all aspectual and implicative verbs (Landau’s “EC class”).

In contrast, the distinction between complements that “*can* take a disjoint lexical subject” vs. those that “*can’t* take a disjoint lexical subject” proved to be peripheral to a genuine understanding of control mechanisms. Unfortunately, it dominated and *baised* the literature up until the 1990s, due to the focus on the English-particular (and quite unstable) construction of “*for* NP to VP”.

(4) Chomsky and Lasnik 1977: Obligatory control vs. *Refl*-deletion (=Equi)

OC is triggered by (i) syntactic context, e.g., [_S [_{Comp} [+wh]] [_S NP *to* VP]];

(ii) certain verbs (e.g., *tell*, *promise*, *persuade*).

The OC rule can only apply to an “unexpanded NP”, namely PRO. Therefore, a lexical NP is ruled out (the rule *must* apply).

- a. It is unclear [what (*John) to do].
- b. I told/promised/persuaded Bill [(*)John to leave].

want/prefer-type verbs are exempt from OC, which is why they allow an embedded lexical subject (c) (with *for* surfacing or not, a dialectal issue). If the embedded subject is a reflexive (d), it optionally deletes; *for*-deletion is then forced by the *[*for-to*] filter, resulting in a “control” semblance (e); but this is *not* OC.

- c. We want very much [for Bill to win].
- d. ? We want very much [for ourselves to win]. *refl+for* deletion →
- e. We want to win.

(5) Williams (1980): Obligatory vs. non-obligatory control

The observational criterion was the ability of the complement to host a lexical subject. If it can host such a subject, it can’t be a predicate (even when it doesn’t host a subject...).

- a. Bill tried [PRO/*Mary to sing]. *OC*
- b. Bill wanted [PRO/Mary to sing]. *NOC*

OC is a species of predication, which derives the following properties:

- (i) PRO does not alternate with a lexical DP.
- (ii) There must be a syntactically overt controller.
- (iii) The controller is unique.
- (iv) The controller c-commands the infinitive (and PRO).

Problems (commonly observed): (i) the observational criterion is English-specific (*for*-infinitives being a rare possibility crosslinguistically); (ii) the “OC properties”

do not cluster (e.g., c-command is forced even in split control, control can be *both* obligatory and implicit, PRO/DP alternations exist, true NOC is genuinely different from control in (b) above, etc.).

(6) Bresnan (1982) / Mohanan (1983): Functional vs. anaphoric control

In LFG, control is established at f-structure, the level where grammatical functions are encoded, and not at c-structure, the level of syntactic constituency.

Functional control: The controller and controllee share a single value at f-structure (hence, have identical grammatical features). Prototype: Raising.

Anaphoric control: The controller and controllee are coindexed but distinct elements at f-structure (as in a pronominal dependency). Prototype: NOC.

OC constructions split between functional and anaphoric control - according to Williams’ criteria, which are derived from conditions on f-structures.

- a. John promised Mary [(*)for the kids to be on time]. *functional control*
- b. John signaled Mary [(for the kids) follow her]. *anaphoric control*

While anaphoric control into adjunct and subject clauses is pragmatically determined, anaphoric control into complements is subject to obviation and further semantic selection.

Problems: (i) all the problems with Williams’ theory carry over (i.e., false taxonomy); (ii) a subclass of OC is made equivalent to raising - both involving functional control (“structure sharing”). This overlooks many empirical contrasts (Landau 2003, 2007, Bobaljik and Landau 2009); (iii) for most languages, there is no reliable criterion to tell whether a given complement falls under functional or anaphoric control.

(7) More theories of control that posit a split between two types of complements:

PRO = anaphor / pronoun: Bouchard 1984, Koster 1984, Hornstein and Lightfoot 1987,
Complement = VP-property / IP-proposition: Wurmbrand 2002
Controllee = PRO / Agr: Landau 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008.

(8) The Agree theory of control

A matrix probe (T or v) matches both a matrix goal (=controller) and an embedded goal (=controllee). Agree-chain → variable binding at LF.

PRO-control: C is [-T].

C-control: C is [+T,+Agr].

- a. Yesterday, John planned/*managed to surprise me today.

Control of PRO entails strict antecedence; *exhaustive control* (EC).

Control via C allows mismatch in semantic plurality; *partial control* (PC)

- b. Our chair planned/*managed to gather in the new conference room.

Note: In “subjunctive” languages (e.g., Balkan languages), the [±T] distinction governs the split between OC complements and uncontrolled complements (Varlokosta 1993, Krapova 2001, Landau 2004). See also the extensive typological work of Stiebels (2007), whose results align with mine.

(9) A sample of EC-predicates (untensed complement)

Implicatives

dare, manage, make sure, bother, remember, get, see fit, condescend, avoid, forget, fail, refrain, decline, neglect, force, compel.

Aspectual

begin, start, continue, finish, stop, resume.

Modal

have, need, may, can, should, is able, must.

Evaluative (adjectives)

rude, silly, smart, kind, (im)polite, bold, modest, cruel, cowardly, crazy.

(10) A sample of PC-predicates (tensed complements)

a. Factives

glad, sad, regret, like, dislike, hate, loath, surprised, shocked, sorry.

b. Propositional

believe, think, suppose, imagine, say, claim, assert, affirm, declare, deny.

c. Desideratives

want, prefer, yearn, arrange, hope, afraid, refuse, agree, plan, aspire, offer, decide, mean, intend, resolve, strive, demand, promise, choose, eager, ready.

d. Interrogatives

wonder, ask, find out, interrogate, inquire, contemplate, deliberate, guess, grasp, understand, know, unclear.

Summary and a look ahead

- (11) a. It is clear that OC embraces *two types* of grammatical dependencies.
b. It is likely that the right cut is keyed to semantic tense ([±T]).
c. It is also likely that the technical distinction between PRO-control and C-control is a placeholder for a deeper explanation.

Towards a deeper understanding of the duality of OC

(12) The basic picture

- a. There is *only* C-control (= (Agree(T/v, C)), no PRO-control.
b. C-control is binding of logophoric features in C (Speaker/author and Addressee), packaged with Tense-binding.
c. EC-complements are construed by *predication*.
d. EC complements are either bare TPs or degenerate CPs.

Note: This is a synthesis and extension of ideas developed in Wurmbrand 2002, Bianchi 2003, Sigurðsson 2004 and Kratzer 2009.

(13) The challenge

To make a convincing case that EC and PC fall under different mechanisms – even more different than previously envisaged.

One empirical contrast is of course already given by the labels: exhausive vs. partial control. But this cannot rule out a more sophisticated predicational analysis of PC-complements; nor did it rule out an Agree analysis of EC-complements (in my own earlier work).

⇒ We need an independent empirical criterion that groups EC but not PC with predication.

The criterion: the visibility of implicit arguments as controllers.

(14) Claim

- a. The controller with EC verbs must be *explicit*;
- b. The controller with PC verbs may be *implicit*.

(b) is well-known; a vast literature on implicit control has established it (see Landau 2010 for references and implications). What has gone unnoticed is that EC verbs are a systematic exception in *not* tolerating implicit control.

Note: The split between (a) and (b) is inexplicable on nearly all current theories of control. Bresnan 1982 is exceptional in taking it to be a principled result of the distinction between functional and anaphoric control. But that distinction, in itself, cuts the OC pie at the wrong place (see (6)).

Visser’s generalization: misconceptions and facts

(15) The standard statement

Subject control verbs do not passivize.

[See: Visser 1963, Chomsky 1965:229, 1977, 1980, Jenkins 1972, Anderson 1977, Bach 1979, Williams 1980, Bresnan 1982, Růžička 1983, Koster 1984, Chierchia 1984, Farkas 1988, Larson 1991, Sag and Pollard 1991, Farrell 1993].

- a. John was persuaded/*promised to leave.

Countless accounts took this to be a fundamental fact that provides a window into the very way control is represented in the grammar. Unfortunately...

(16) VG is false!

[See Landau 2000, van Urk 2011]

- (i) Impersonal passives are acceptable, more so in languages that use them productively (e.g., Germanic); the implicit agent is the understood controller of the complement ((b-c) are from Růžička 1983, van Urk 2011).

- a. It was decided / agreed / preferred to raise taxes again.

- b. ihm war versprochen worden [PRO Hans in die *German*
him was promised been PRO Hans into the
Auswahlmannschaft aufzunehmen].
select-team to.include
'It had been promised to him to include Hans in the select team.'

- c. Er werd geweigerd om het verdachte appelsap *Dutch*
there was refused COMP the suspicious apple.juice
op te drinken.
up to drink
'(lit.) There was refused to drink the suspicious apple juice.'

- (ii) Implicit agents can “control” into adjuncts.

- d. The ship was sunk to collect the insurance.
- e. % Changes were made before getting proper feedback from the customers.

(17) The true VG (revised VG, RVG) [van Urk 2011]

Implicit subjects cannot control if T agrees with a referential DP.

A new observation

(18) There is a subclass of subject control verbs that do not even allow impersonal passives (i.e., they go beyond the coverage of the RVG). Strikingly, this is the same subclass that disallows partial control: The EC class (aspectuals, implicatives).

Note: This cannot be a side-effect of unaccusativity. All the examples below contain transitive or unergative control verbs. It is the *constructions* that are missing, the passive verbs exist elsewhere.

(19) Hebrew

Note: Here and below, the (omitted) active counterparts are all grammatical.

a. huxlat / tuxnan le'hitkadem ba-projekt. *PC-verbs*
was.decided / was.planned to.move.forward in.the.project
'It was decided/planned to move forward with the project.'

b. * hufsak / nusa / niškax le'hitkadem ba-projekt. *EC-verbs*
was.stopped / was.tried / was.forgotten to.move.forward in.the-project
'It was stopped/tried/forgotten to move forward with the project.'

(20) German (Peter Herbeck, Uli Sauerland p.c.)

a. ?? Es wurde aufgehört Zigaretten zu rauchen.
it was stopped cigarettes to smoke
'It was stopped to smoke cigarettes.'

b. ?? Es wurde geschafft / gewagt den Gefangenen zu helfen.
it was managed / dared the prisoners to help
'It was managed/dared to help the prisoners.'

(21) Dutch (Marcel den Dikken, p.c.)

a. *Er werd begonnen (om) sigaretten te roken.
there was begun (COMP) cigarettes to smoke
'It was begun to smoke cigarettes.'

b. *Er werd erin geslaagd (om) de gevangenen te helpen.
there was therein succeeded (COMP) the prisoners to help
'It was succeeded to help the prisoners.'

Problem: Implicative *forget* is not too bad in the impersonal passive, factive *forget* is bad.

Extension: Object control EC verbs

(14a) repeated:

The controller with EC verbs must be *explicit*;

⇒ *object drop in object EC.

(22) Candidates: Implicative verbs of manipulation (*force, compel, coerce*).

Testing ground: Languages that do not abhor object drop as much as English. Such languages should reveal a contrast in the omissibility of object controllers of *persuade/ask* verbs (desideratives, irrealis complement) vs. *force* verbs (implicatives, realis complement). Note: Put aside object *pro*.

⇒ This will be the true core of Bach's generalization ("Object control verbs do not detransitivize").

[For evidence against the standard version, see Sag & Pollard 1991, Larson 1991, Williams 1991, Landau 2000:161, Jackendoff and Culicover 2003].

(23) Object controller drop in Polish

Stodowicz (2008:130-133): controller DPs can be freely dropped - except with implicative verbs. A minimal pair is provided by the contribution of aspect: perfective *namówić* 'persuade' is implicative but imperfective *namawiać* is not. Only the latter accepts controller drop.

a. *imperfective - non-implicative*

Stąd też będę gorąco namawiał ___
 therefore also COP.FUT.ISG warmly persuade.3SG.M
 do spędzenia tego czasu w gronie rodzinnym.
 to spend.NOML.GEN DEM.GEN time.GEN in circle.LOC family.LOC
 'Therefore I will be persuading to spend this time with the family.'

b. *Perfective - implicative*

**pro* namawię ___ do spędzenia tego czasu
 persuade.1PL to spend.NOML.GEN DEM.GEN time.GEN
 w gronie rodzinnym.
 in circle.LOC family.LOC

[Note: I hope (!) that direct objects of perfective verbs in Polish are in principle omissible.]

(24) Hebrew: Argument drop is not an artifact of grammatical function

It is indeed more common for languages to tolerate omission of dative/oblique arguments more than accusative ones. But the effect at issue is orthogonal.

Hebrew has 8 object control verbs that take an oblique controller of the form *al*-DP (*on* DP).

- (i) implicatives: *kafa* 'compel', *hikša* 'make it difficult', *hekel* 'make it easy', *hišpia* 'influence'.
 (ii) desideratives: *civa* 'order', *pakad* 'command', *asar* 'prohibit', *hetil* 'entrust'.

[Note: all the implicative verbs entail their complements; none of the desiderative verbs do].

All the implicatives resist controller drop; three of the four desideratives allow it. The single exception (*hetil* 'entrust') does not really jeopardize the generalization in (14a). While the *obligatoriness* of implicative controllers follows from general principles (soon to be discussed), the *optionality* of desiderative controllers does not; idiosyncratic lexical specifications may disallow argument drop with specific verbs.

Still, the situation is striking from the perspective of Hebrew grammar. Out of the roughly 30 Hebrew verbs that take dative/oblique controllers, perhaps one or two more resist omission. **Within non-accusative controllers, no implicative one can be dropped, and nearly all others can.**

- (25) a. Gil kafa / hikša / hekel / hišpia *(alay)
 Gil compelled/made.it.difficult/made.it.easy/influenced (on.me)
 le'hitpater etmol.
 to.quit yesterday
 'Gil compelled/made it difficult for/made it easy for/influenced me to quit yesterday.'
- b. ha-menahel civa / pakad / asar / *hetil ___
 the-manager ordered / commanded / prohibited / entrusted
 lešatef pe'ula ba-misrad.
 to.cooperate in.the-office
 'The manager ordered / commanded / forbade / entrusted ___ to cooperate in the office.'

Why is all this important?

- (26) The unavailability of implicit control with EC verbs is so striking because it is the *exception*, not the norm: Every other type of control construction – PC complements, adjunct or subject clauses – allows implicit control. A vast literature establishes beyond reasonable doubt that control, in general (and in opposition to direct predication and anaphoric binding) "sees" implicit arguments.¹

¹ See Postal 1970, Kimball 1971, Wasow and Roeper 1972, Bresnan 1982, Chierchia 1984, 1989, Epstein 1984, Koster 1984, Rizzi 1986, Williams 1985, 1987, Manzini 1983, 1986, Roeper 1987, Brody and

- a. George recommended [PRO jogging twice a week] (to Sue).
- b. It is fun (for Bill) [PRO to watch cartoons].
- c. [PRO planning the event in advance] was quite helpful (to us).

A new direction (very sketchy!)

(27) The basic picture again

- a. There is *only* C-control (= Agree(T/v, C)), no PRO-control.
- b. C-control is binding of logophoric features in C (Speaker/Author and Addressee), packaged with Tense-binding.
- c. EC-complements are construed by *syntactic predication*.
- d. EC complements are either bare TPs or degenerate CPs.

EC control: Syntactic predication

(28) Condition on syntactic predication

The argument predicated of must be syntactically represented.

- a. The room was left (*angry at the guests).
- b. John ate *(the meat) raw.
- c. I am now hiring *(people) [for John to work with].

⇒ Because EC control is syntactic predication, it fails with an implicit controller.

PC control: Logophoric anchoring

(29) Attitude verbs “induce” a Logophoric Center (LC) on the selected Comp. The coordinates of the LC are fixed by the participants of the matrix event.

LC = <Speaker_M, Addressee_M, Tense_M>

Manzini 1987, Lasnik 1988, Clark 1990, Wyngaerd 1994, Panther 1997, Bhatt and Izvorski 1998, Petter 1998, Bhatt and Pancheva 2006, Landau 2000, 2003, 2007, 2010.

Speaker_M = The author of the speech or mental matrix event.

Addressee_M = The addressee of the matrix speech event

Tense_M = The tense of the matrix event

Embedded arguments and tense may or must be bound by these coordinates. In (PC) control complements, PRO is necessarily anaphoric to either Speaker_M or Addressee_M, and T_[-fin] is anchored to Tense_M.

Syntax of control

(30) Locus of LC = C / Fin⁰ (Rizzi 1997)

- a. Speaker_M = [person:1st]
- b. Addressee_M = [person:2nd]

(31) PRO = [n]. a *minimal pronoun*, a numerical feature (Kratzer 2009).

In any given control sentence, either Speaker_M or Addressee_M is activated; rarely, both are activated, via a sum operator, yielding split control.

Semantics of control

(32) [person] features on C are interpreted as *indexical λ*-operators: context-shifters (Anand and Nevins 2004, Cable 2005, Schlenkar 2003, Kratzer 2009). Thus control CPs are interpreted as “perspectival properties”.

[[John hopes to win]]^{*.w*} = 1 iff in every context C of which John is an author and is compatible with what he hopes at time t* in w*, John has the property of winning.

(33) Note 1: This is a Chierchia-like property-theory of control, with the important proviso that controller choice is modeled on direct discourse counterparts (Kuno’s old insight) and not by any θ-hierarchy.

Note 2: Person agreement with the controller must override (or ignore) 1st/2nd features in Fin⁰ (but not so in “logophoric” languages like Amharic!). This is a well-

known issue and there are various ways to tackle it. My favorite option is to restrict Agree (DP_{Controllers}C) to the PF component.

References

- Anand, Pranav, and Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty Operators in Changing Contexts. In *Proceedings of SALT 16*, ed. by Robert B. Young, 20-37. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, CLC Publications.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1977. Comments on a Paper by Wasow. In *Formal Syntax*, ed. by Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow and Adrian Akmajian, 361-377. New York: Academic Press.
- Bach, Emmon. 1979. Control in Montague Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 515-531.
- Bhatt, Rajesh, and Roumyana Izvorski. 1998. Genericity, Implicit Arguments and Control. In *Proceedings of SCIL 7*, ed. by. Cambridge: MITWPL.
- Bhatt, Rajesh, and Roumyana Pancheva. 2006. Implicit Arguments. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Volume 2*, ed. by Martin Everaert and Henk Van Riemsdijk, 558-588. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2003. On Finiteness as Logophoric Anchoring. In *Temps et Point de Vue / Tense and Point of View*, ed. by Jacqueline Guéron and Liliane Tasmowski, 213-246. Université Paris X, Nanterre.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan, and Idan Landau. 2009. Icelandic Control is not A-movement: The Case from Case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 113-132.
- Bouchard, Denis. 1984. *On the Content of Empty Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982. Control and Complementation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 343-434.
- Brody, Michael, and M. Rita Manzini. 1987. Implicit Arguments. In *Mental Representations: The Interface Between Language and Reality*, ed. by Ruth Kempson, 105-130. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cable, Seth. 2005. Binding Local Person Pronouns Without Semantically Empty Features. Ms., MIT.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1984. *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives and Gerunds*. PhD dissertation, UMASS, Amherst.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1989. Structured Meanings, Thematic Roles and Control. In *Properties, Types and Meanings II*, ed. by Gennaro Chierchia, Barbara Partee and Raymond Turner, 131-166. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. *Essays on Form and Interpretation*. New York: North-Holland.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1980. On Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 1-46.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1977. Filters and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 425-504.
- Clark, Robin. 1990. *Thematic Theory in Syntax and Interpretation*. London: Routledge.
- Epstein, Samuel. 1984. Quantifier-pro and the LF Representation of PRO_{ARB}. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 499-505.
- Farkas, Donca F. 1988. On Obligatory Control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11, 27-58.
- Farrell, Patrick. 1993. The Interplay of Syntax and Semantics in Complement Control. In *Proceedings of SALT 3*, ed. by Utpal Lahiri and Adam Wyner, 57-76. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Hornstein, Norbert, and David Lightfoot. 1987. Predication and PRO. *Language* 63, 23-52.
- Jackendoff, Ray, and Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The Semantic Basis of Control in English. *Language* 79, 517-556.
- Jenkins, Lyle. 1972. *Modality in English Syntax*. Phd dissertation, MIT.
- Kimball, John P. 1971. Super Equi-NP Deletion as Dative Deletion. In *Papers from the 7th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by 142-148. Chicago, Ill: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Koster, Jan. 1984. On Binding and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 417-459.
- Krapova, Iliyana. 2001. Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek. In *Comparative Syntax of the Balkan Languages*, ed. by María Luisa Rivero and Angela Ralli, 105-126. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a Pronoun: Fake Indexicals as Windows into the Properties of Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement Out of Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 471-498.
- Landau, Idan. 2004. The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22, 811-877.
- Landau, Idan. 2006. Severing the Distribution of PRO from Case. *Syntax* 9, 153-170.
- Landau, Idan. 2007. Movement-Resistant Aspects of Control. In *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*, ed. by William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 293-325. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Landau, Idan. 2008. Two Routes of Control: Evidence from Case Transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 877-924.
- Landau, Idan. 2010. The Explicit Syntax of Implicit Arguments. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41, 357-388.
- Larson, Richard. 1991. *Promise and the Theory of Control*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 103-139.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1988. Subjects and the Theta-Criterion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 1-17.
- Manzini, M. Rita. 1983. On Control and Control Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 421-446.
- Manzini, M. Rita. 1986. On Control and Binding Theory. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of North Eastern Linguistic Society*, ed. by Stephen Berman, Joe-Woong Choe and Joyce McDonough, 322-337. UMASS: Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Mohanan, K. P. 1983. Functional and Anaphoric Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 641-674.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe. 1997. An Account of Implicit Complement Control in English and German. In *Lexical and Syntactical Constructions and the Construction of Meaning*, ed. by Marjolijn Verspoor, Kee Dong Lee and Eve Sweetser, 417-432. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Petter, Marga. 1998. *Getting PRO Under Control*. LOT International Series, Vol. 8, The Hague: HIL, Holland Academic Graphics.
- Postal, Paul. 1970. On Coreferential Complement Subject Deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 439-500.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501-557.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Roeper, Thomas. 1987. Implicit Arguments and the Head-Complement Relation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 267-310.
- Rosenbaum, Peter. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Růžička, Rudolph. 1983. Remarks on Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 309-324.
- Sag, Ivan, and Carl Pollard. 1991. An Integrated Theory of Complement Control. *Language* 67, 63-113.
- Schlenkar, Philippe. 2003. A Plea for Monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26, 29-120.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór A. 2004. The Syntax of Person, Tense and Speech Features. *Rivista di Linguistica* 16, 219-251.
- Ślodołowicz, Szymon. 2008. *Control in Polish Complement Clauses*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- Stiebels, Barbara. 2007. Towards a Typology of Complement Control. In *Studies in Complement Control: ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics 47*, ed. by Barbara Stiebels, 1-80.
- van Urk, Coppe. 2011. Visser's Generalization: A Window into the Syntax of Control. Ms., MIT.
- Varlokosta, Spyridoula. 1993. Control in Modern Greek. In *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics 1*, ed. by Carol A. Mason, Susan M. Powers and Cristina Schmitt, 144-163.
- Visser, Fredericus T. 1963. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Wasow, Thomas, and Thomas Roeper. 1972. On the Subject of Gerunds. *Foundations of Language* 8, 44-61.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 203-238.
- Williams, Edwin. 1985. PRO and Subject of NP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 297-315.
- Williams, Edwin. 1987. Implicit Arguments, the Binding Theory and Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5, 151-180.
- Williams, Edwin. 1991. The Argument-Bound Empty Categories. In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, ed. by Robert Freidin, 77-98. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2002. Semantic vs. Syntactic Control. In *Proceedings of the 15th Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax*, ed. by Jan Wouter Zwart and Werner Abraham, 93-127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wyngaerd, Guido J. vanden. 1994. *PRO-legomena*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.