1. Implicit Control and the RVG

implicit control = control by an implicit argument, see (1).

- In the recent control debate: mainly on complement control (see (3))
- Previous approaches: Revised Visser's Generalization (RVG) seems to hold (see (2)); accounts for the contrasts in (3)

(3a): violates RVG (der Lehrer agrees with T)
(3b): RVG satisfied (due to lexical Case no agreement with T)

Licensing of control according to van Uruk (2013):
mediated Agree relation between the implicit argument, T, and PRO

(1) controller = implicit agent of the matrix verb
The boat was sunk [PRO to collect the insurance]. (Manzini 1983)

(2) Revised Visser's Generalization (RVG)
OC by an implicit subject is impossible if an overt DP agrees with T.

(3) a. (original object) DP bears structural Case
The teacher must be allowed to tickle him.

b. (indirect object) DP bears lexical Case
He must be allowed to tickle her.

License: (cf. van Uruk 2013: 171)

3. Our Claims & Observations

CLAIM 1: Implicit adjunct control is OC

OC tests:
Not all standard tests for OC are applicable in the case of implicit adjunct control for independent reasons (e.g., non-human PRO is ruled out since the controller is typically an implicit agent = human); but we show in (6) that

(i) the controller must be an argument of the adjunct's matrix clause;
(ii) arbitrary control is ruled out, as inserting a by-phrase shows; see (6b)
(iii) LD control is ruled out (see (6c)/(6d))

> These are all hallmark of OC

CLAIM 2: Why should implicit adjunct control be different from implicit complement control?

CLAIM 2: It is not!

(i) Licensing takes place in the same way; (ii) the RVG does not hold.

6. SUMMARY

In order to fully understand implicit control, we also have to look at implicit adjunct control:

CLAIM 1: Implicit adjunct control involves OC

BUT: It violates the RVG!

CLAIM 2: (i) Implicit adjunct and implicit complement control is licensed in the same way.
(ii) The RVG as stated in (2) cannot hold.

Licensing: v licenses the implicit adjunct argument, which licenses PRO under (upward) Agree.

4. Licensing Implicit Adjunct Control

Background assumptions:
(in line with Wurmbrand 2021 a.o.)

• The implicit argument q(P) is syntactically encoded as a φ-feature without a D-layer.
• position: specifier of some functional verbal projection (for the sake of simplicity, we will stick to little vP)
• q(P) is the controller in implicit OC-relations, but...
• It must be licensed (= “supplied with a D-property”, Wurmbrand 2021: 318) to be able to control

We assume in addition:

licensing of q(P) does not proceed via T but via v = the head that is associated with the external theta-role in the active counterpart
a direct control relationship (without mediation of a functional head) also if the by-phrase is absent

Licensing configuration:
Following Fischer (2018), Fischer & Hayem (2022) and Brodahl et al. (2022), we assume that OC is licensed via upward Agree between PRO and the controller, in this case the implicit argument q(P); see configuration in (7).
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