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It is by now well established that there are two kinds of obligatory control (OC): partial control (ParC) and exhaustive control (ExC) (see Landau 2000, 2004, 2008). In this talk I argue that in Russian, Icelandic and (with some complications) European Portuguese, these two kinds of OC have distinct syntactic derivations. On the one hand there are instances of OC in which PRO shares all of the (case and phi-) features of its controller and as such only an ExC reading is possible. On the other, there are contexts where PRO has its own feature specification (in terms of phi-features and/or case) and ParC then also becomes possible. In European Portuguese, the two kinds of OC involve uninflected/inflected infinitives and in Russian/Icelandic secondary predicates reveal PRO to have independent or controller-marched Case. Crucially, although surface case/agreement patterns differ radically across these languages, the same basic pattern holds: only in instances where PRO has its own features is (true) ParC possible.

I then propose an analysis of these two kinds of OC in terms of phase theory. ExC is derived via movement (Hornstein 1999), but this movement is triggered by an instance of Agree [D: ] associated with an EPP feature. If the goal occupies a visible and accessible position then it raises to a second thematic position and all is well. ParC results were this preliminary Agree relation takes place and the goal is visible but not accessible for movement (because of the ban on improper movement). In such cases an additional DPj must be externally merged to receive the matrix theta-role and ParC becomes possible. This proposal makes a number of empirical predictions, regarding the interaction of A-bar movement and Control, which seem supported in as far as they can be tested. I also discuss these results in relation to recent semantic accounts of ParC (Pearson 2015).