

**Implicit arguments under control**  
(Florian Schäfer; joint work with Marcel Pitteroff)

We investigate obligatory control into complement clauses by the implicit external argument of passives in eight languages (Dutch, English, German, Icelandic, Norwegian, French, Hebrew, Russian). Following Landau (2015), we distinguish two types of obligatory control: *logophoric*, and *predicative* control. (Logophoric control corresponds to Landau's 2000 partial control, predicative control corresponds to Landau's exhaustive control). The two types of control differ in terms of the matrix predicate involved (an attitude vs. non-attitude verb; Pearson 2016), and the way in which the control relation is established: logophoric control involves variable binding, whereas predicative control builds on a predication relation between the infinitival complement and the controller (cf. Williams 1980, Chierchia 1984).

Based on questionnaire studies, we show that all languages above allow Implicit Logophoric Control (**ILC**, (1a), (2a)). Implicit Predicative Control (**IPC**) is rejected in English (1b), French, Hebrew and Russian, but is accepted in German (2b), Dutch, Icelandic, and Norwegian.

- (1) a. It was decided/agreed/preferred to raise taxes again. (ILC)  
b. \*It was managed/tried/dared/stopped to raise taxes again. (IPC)
- (2) a. Heute wurde beschlossen/zugestimmt/vorgezogen die Steuern zu erhöhen. (ILC)  
today was decided/ agreed/ preferred the taxes to raise  
b. Heute wurde versucht/gewagt/aufgehört die Steuern zu erhöhen. (IPC)  
today was tried/ dared/ stopped the taxes to raise

Landau argues that implicit arguments do not enter predication. Consequently, IPC should be impossible across languages, contrary to fact. One way of accounting for this cross-linguistic split is to assume that in some languages, the implicit agent of passives may be predicated over because it is syntactically projected in Spec,vP/VoiceP (as PRO (Collins 2005), a covert  $\phi$ P (Landau 2010) or covert DP (van Urk 2013)). However, we show that such an explanation in terms of the syntactic status of the implicit argument fails. Besides the licensing of IPC, there are no further arguments that would suggest that the agent of the relevant passives is syntactically projected. Furthermore, we show that the implicit arguments of passives of all languages above enter predication in the case of adjectival or prepositional depictives such as (3). Interestingly, (3) is out in languages where adjectival depictives overtly agree with their antecedent, suggesting again that the implicit argument of passives is not projected.

- (3) La lettre a sans doute été écrite saoul. (French)  
the letter has without doubt been written drunk  
'The letter was clearly written drunk.'

We conclude that the contrast between (1b) and (2b) is not to be related to properties of the implicit agent. Instead, our data set suggests that only languages allowing for strict impersonal passives allow IPC. We propose to relate this to the semantic type of the infinitival complement and its ability to indirectly function as the structural subject. 'it' in (1a, b) is not an expletive but a full pronoun that must be semantically linked to the complement clause. Such linking is possible only with the complement clause of attitude verbs (denoting a proposition according to Landau 2015), but not with the complement clause of non-attitude verbs (denoting a property according to Landau 2015). (1b) is out because linking 'it' is not possible and (2b) is in because German has real impersonal passives.

**References:**

- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1984. *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives and Gerunds*. Ph.D. dissertation, UMASS, Amherst.
- Collins, Chris. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in english. *Syntax*, 8: 81–120.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Landau, Idan. 2010. The explicit syntax of implicit arguments. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41: 357–388.
- Landau, Idan. 2015. *A Two-Tiered Theory of Control*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pearson, Hazel. 2016. The semantics of partial control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34: 691–738.
- Urk, Coppe van. 2013. Visser's generalization: The syntax of control and the passive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44: 168–178.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203-238.