This presentation aims at showing a common core element in the following three (somewhat related) phenomena: (A) **plain object constructions involving Subject Control across an Object**, which are problematic for syntactocentric views of control that expect all syntactic relations to be sensitive to Minimal Link Condition; (B) **Visser’s Generalization** (Visser 1973) holding that the passive transformation is compatible with Object Control (cf. 2b) but incompatible with Subject Control (cf. 2a):

(1)  
a. Mark$_1$ promised Betty$_2$ [PRO$_1$ to take out the garbage].
b. Mark$_1$ persuaded Betty$_2$ [PRO$_2$ to take out the garbage].

(2)  
a. *Betty$_2$ was promised t$_2$ PRO$_1$ to take out the garbage by Mark.
b. Betty$_2$ was persuaded t$_2$ PRO$_2$ to take out the garbage by Mark.

Interestingly, when the passive does not involve promotion of the object to the subject position (as in German and Dutch, cf. 3 and Polish cf. 4), Subject Control and the (impersonal) passive construction are compatible:

(3)  
a. Erverdmijbeloofd om me op de hoogtetehouden.  
there was me$_{DAT}$promise$_{PAST}$ Comp$_{me_{DAT}}$ on the height to keep$_{INF}$  
‘It was promised to me to keep me informed.’
b. Mir wurde versprochen, mir noch heute den Link fur das Update zu schicken.  
me$_{DAT}$ was promise$_{me_{DAT}}$ still today the link for the update to send$_{INF}$  
‘It was promised to me to send me the link for the update today.’

(4)  
Po odkryciu przesyłki z bombą,  
after discovery$_{LOC}$package$_{GEN}$with bomb$_{INST}$  
‘After the discovery of a letter bomb
a. …wczoraj pro$_{arb,1}$ kazano sekretarce$_2$ [PRO$_2$ otwierać wszystkie listy]  
…yesterday tell$_{IMP}$secretary$_{DAT}$open$_{INF}$ all letters  
‘…yesterday they told the secretary to open all letters.’
b. wczoraj pro$_{arb,1}$ obiecano sekretarce$_2$ [PRO$_1$ otwierać wszystkie listy]  
…yesterday promise$_{IMP}$secretary$_{DAT}$open$_{INF}$ all letters  
‘…yesterday they promised the secretary to open all letters.’

Finally, (C) **the pattern of control into prepositional gerunds is preserved under the passive in Polish:**

(5)  
a. Szef$_1$ zwolnił swojego najlepszego pracownika$_2$ [za PRO$_{1/2}$ picie w pracy]  
boss fired his best worker for drinking at work  
‘The boss fired his best worker for drinking at work.’
b. Najlepszy pracownik$_2$ został pro$_{1}$ zwolniony [za PRO$_{1/2}$ picie w pracy]  
best worker was fired for drinking in work  
‘The best worker was fired for drinking at work.’

All the three phenomena can be explained through an application of the smuggling derivation (Collins 2005a-b).