Rethinking Partial control: new evidence from finite control languages

Christina Sevdali, Ulster University and Michelle Sheehan, Anglia Ruskin University

Abstract

In this squib, we provide evidence that finite control languages like Greek and Romanian display Partial Control (PC), albeit in very limited contexts, contrary to what has previously been claimed in the literature. This fact poses problems for existing theories of control which predict a fundamental incompatibility between PC and [+Agr] complements. These finding can be considered welcome, however, inasmuch as the ban on PC in [+Agr] contexts appears stipulative in the context of Landau's (2015) approach. They are also consistent with the claim that European Portuguese inflected infinitives, which are also [+Agr] also permit obligatory control (Sheehan, 2018, to appear).

1   Introduction

Partial control (PC) is a phenomenon whereby a singular subject is able to function as the controller of a reciprocal verb which, where matrix, would require a semantically plural subject (see Landau 2000).[1] Consider the contrasts in grammaticality in (1a-b):

(1)   a. The couple/John and Mary/*John broke up.
    b. John didn't want to break up.

Whereas both the semantically plural group noun *the couple* and the syntactically plural co-ordination *John and Mary* can function as the subject of 'break up' in a simple monoclausal environment, the semantically and syntactically singular *John* cannot. This restriction is suspended in the control context in (1b), however, where the interpretation of the embedded null subject (PRO) is such that it comprises John plus some other unspecified person or persons, recovered from the context. PC has been described in a number of languages (e.g. Russian, European Portuguese, Icelandic, German and more controversially French and Italian) as illustrated by the following examples:

(2)   Ona   poprosila   predsedatelja [sobrat'sja   vsem/*vsex   v šest'].
    she.NOM asked   chair.ACC   gather.INF   all.DAT/*ACC at six
    'She asked the chair to all gather at six.'   [Russian, Landau (2008, 909)]

(3)   Os professores   persuadiram o director   [a   reunir(em)-se   mais tarde].
    The teachers   persuaded   the headteacher A   meet.INF.3PL=SE.3   more late
    'The teachers persuaded the headteacher to meet later on.'
                                   [E. Portuguese, Sheehan (2018, 23]

(4)   Hann bað Ólaf   [að   hittast   einir/*eina]
    he   asked Olaf.ACC   to   meet.ST   alone.NOM.M.PL/ACC.M.PL
    'He asked Olaf to meet alone.PL.'   [Icelandic, Sheehan (2018, 15]

---

[1] In fact, even non-reciprocal verbs can be "coerced" into the PC interpretation, eg. "John wanted to apply for the grant together" (Landau, 2013). We limit ourselves to reciprocal verbs here as it makes PC into a matter of grammaticality rather than interpretation.

(5) Hans sagte der Maria dass er es bedauerte   letzte Nacht
    Hans said the Maria that he it regretted   last night
    [gemeinsam   gearbeitet   zu haben]
    together   worked   to have
    'Hans told Maria that he regretted having worked together last night.'
                                    [German, based on Landau (2000, 45)]

(6) Jean a   dit   à Marie qu' il veut   correspondre plus souvent.
    Jean has said   to Marie that he wants correspond   more often
    'John told Mary that he wants to correspond more often.' [French, Landau (2000, 85)]

(7) Maria pensava che Gianni avesse dimenticato di essersi baciati alla festa.
    Maria thought that Gianni had.SUBJ forgotten of be=SE.3 kissed.PL at.the party
    'Maria thought that John had forgotten having kissed at the party.'
                                    [Italian, adapted from Landau (2000, 46)]

In all of these languages the acceptability of PC appears to be sensitive to the matrix control predicate.[2] Following Landau (2000, 2004, 2013), we can thus make a distinction between *PC predicates*, which permit either partial or exhaustive control into their complements and *exhaustive control predicates*, which permit only exhaustive control (ExC).

In Landau's Agree-based model (2000, 2004 et seq.) the difference between PC and ExC predicates is regulated by their ability to support independent temporal reference in their non-finite complement: PC predicates (including desideratives, factives, interrogatives and epistemics) allow this and so are [+T], whereas ExC predicates (aspectuals, modals and implicatives) do not and so are [-T]. Pearson (2016) however, claims that PC predicates are better defined as attitude predicates reporting on the mental state or a communicative act of some individual (e.g. *believe, want, hope* but also *say, promise* and *claim*):

Non-attitude predicates
(8) a. *John started to break up.   [aspectual]
     b. *John must break up.   [modal]
     c. *John managed to break up.   [implicative]

Attitude predicates
(9) a. John hoped to break up.   [desiderative]
     b. John hated to break up.   [factive]
     c. John wondered whether to break up.   [interrogative]

There is a class of languages, however, which is claimed not to permit PC at all, namely those languages which make extremely restricted use of non-finite complementation and instead display finite control. Amongst these are the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund (e.g. Greek, Romanian, Bulgarian etc.). In this paper, we re-evaluate this claim, providing data which calls it into question. While it is generally the case that obligatory control in finite-control languages is limited to the complements of ExC predicates, we nonetheless

---

[2] The controversy surrounding the status of PC in French and Italian concerns the fact that in addition to being sensitive to the matrix control predicate, these languages also show sensitivity to the embedded controlled predicate. In French at least the generalisation seems to be that PC is only possible where the embedded verb is comitative (Sheehan 2014). Pitteroff et al. (2017a, b) argue that German also shows such a sensitivity.

show that, under the root modal 'can', obligatory control complements permit PC for many speakers. The structure of the squib is as follows. Section 2 reviews the treatment of finite control in previous analyses, notably Landau (2004, 2015). Section 3 reviews the evidence for PC in Greek. Section 4 identifies similar such cases in Romanian. Section 5 concludes by discussing the theoretical implications of the existence of partial control in finite control languages.

2 Finite control in previous approaches

It is often claimed that Balkan languages lack PC (see Alboiu 2007 on Romanian). With the exception of Spyropoulos 2007 to whom we will return shortly, this claim is echoed with respect to Modern Greek (see Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, Iordachioaia and Marchis 2010: 95, citing Varlokosta 1994 on Greek).[3] Indeed, Landau's (2004, 2015) analyses of obligatory control attempts explicitly to derive the fact that PC is not possible in these languages.

In all of its instantiations, Landau's (2000, 2004, 2015) model distinguishes two types of control: PC and ExC. In earlier versions of the theory, these are the result of two different operations: direct control of PRO by an antecedent from the main clause in the cases of ExC, and control of PRO via C in the cases of PC. Crucially, the distribution of the two kinds of control is claimed by Landau to be regulated by the features [+/-T] and [+/-Agr]. ExC arises in [+/-Agr, -T] contexts and PC in [-Agr, +T] contexts. As finite complements in languages like Greek and Romanian are characterised by being [+Agr], these languages are therefore expected to lack PC as they lack [-Agr] clauses altogether. Landau (2015:7) summarises the findings of his early work in the "Obligatory Control – No Control" generalization in (10):

(10) The obligatory control-no control generalization
   In a fully specified clause (in a clause in which the I head carries slots for both [T] and [Agr])
   a. If the I head carries both semantic tense and agreement, [no control] obtains.
   b. Elsewhere, [obligatory control] obtains.

He presents evidence in support of this prediction from finite control in Balkan languages. Building on Varlokosta (1994), he argues that Balkan subjunctives come in two types: *controlled* and *free* subjunctives (C- and F-subjunctives respectively, exemplified below) distinguished by the interpretation of their subjects, expressed here as the distinction between PRO and *pro.* As Landau (2004: 827) further notes, C-subjunctives display the diagnostic properties of obligatory control, despite their finiteness:

(11) I Maria$_1$ kseri PRO$_{1/*2}$ na   diavazi   *C-subjunctive*
     the Mary   know.3SG   PRT   read.3SG
     'Mary knows how to read'   [Greek]

(12) O Yanis$_1$ elpizi   *pro*$_{1/2}$ na   figi.   *F-subjunctive*
     the John   hopes.3SG   PRT   wins.3SG
     'John$_1$ hopes that he$_{1/2}$ will win'   [Greek (Varlokosta 1993, ex. 21)]

(13) Victor$_1$ încearcă   [să   PRO$_{1/*2}$ cânte].   *C-subjunctive*
     Victor   try.pres. 3sg   subj   sing.subj.3sg]

'Victor is trying to sing.'   [Romanian (Alboiu 2007, 6)]

(14) Ionuț$_I$ vrea   [să   *pro$_{i/j}$* cânte].   *F-subjunctive*
     Ionuț wants   subj   play.subj.3sg
     'Ionuț wants him/PRO to sing.'

As Landau notes, many ExC predicates seem to require C-subjunctives whereas PC predicates usually take F-subjunctives and hence fail to display obligatory control. This follows if their complements are [+Agr, +T], leading to the possibility of referential subjects.

> Landau (2015) revises his early approach to the PC/ExC distinction, drawing on Pearson's (2016) idea that the defining property of PC predicates is that they are attitudinal (hope, want, regret) unlike ExC predicates which are not (start, manage, try). He proposes that whereas attitude predicates select a larger non-finite complement containing a logophoric *pro* in its edge which mediates control, ExC predicates select a smaller complement and control arises from direct predication. The generalization in (10) now equates to that in (15):

(15) The OC-NC Generalization (final)
     [+Agr] blocks logophoric control but not predicative control.

Landau proposes to derive (15) from the fact that variable binding requires feature sharing and this is blocked where a pronoun is involved. In finite control languages, then, logophoric control will always be blocked as every clause is [+Agr].

3 Partial control in Greek

The phenomenon of PC in Greek has been discussed very little in the literature. This is because, as noted above, PC predicates tend to select F-subjunctives and so apparent instances of PC can always in principle be cases of accidental (partial) co-reference between main and embedded subject.[4] Consider, by way of example, the apparent cases of PC given by Spyropoulos (2007), cited also by Kapetagianni (2010), with object control verbs like *pitho* 'to persuade' and *diatazo* 'to order':

(16) o yanis$_i$ epise   ti maria$_j$ na   pane ec$_{i+j}$ gia psonia
     the John.NOM   persuade.3SG.PAST   the Mary.ACC   subj go.3PL for shopping
     tin Triti
     the Tuesday

---

[4] The following Greek verbs take what Landau calls **F-subjunctive complements**: *elpizo* 'to hope', *pistevo*, 'believe', *nomizo* 'think', *apofasizo* 'to decide', *protimo* 'to prefer', *thelo* 'to want', *perimeno* 'to expect', *efxome* 'to wish', *sxediazo* 'to arrange', *prospatho* 'try', *frontizo* 'arrange' *kataferno* 'to succeed', *pitho* 'to persuade', *zito* 'to ask', *apagorevo* 'to forbid', *diatazo* 'to order'. Verbs taking **C-subjuctive** complements include aspectuals (*arxizo* 'start', *teliono* 'finish', *sinexizo* 'continue') and other EC verbs (*distazo* 'to hesitate', *dokimazo* 'to try', *matheno* 'to learn',), but also a set of verbs which one expect to be PC predicates, including: *xerome* 'to be pleased', *ipofero* 'to suffer', *fovame* 'to fear', *ksero* 'to know', *erxome* 'to come', *ime ipochreomenos* 'to be obliged', *ekana to lathos* 'to make the mistake' (Varlokosta 1994: chapter 4).

'John persuaded Mary to go (John and Mary) shopping on Tuesday'

(17) episa   ti maria$_i$ na   pane ec$_{i+}$ gia psonia tin Triti
persuade.1SG.PAST   the Mary.ACC subj   go.3PL   for shopping the Tuesday
'I persuaded Mary that they should go for shopping on Tuesday'
[Greek (Spyropoulos 2007, his (34a)/(35a))]

The problem with these examples is that, as Varlokosta (1994) notes, these verbs take F-subjunctive rather than C-subjunctive complements: they permit overt nominative subjects, strict and sloppy readings under ellipsis, and non de se readings.

Looking beyond these examples, however, we find that Greek displays PC with modal *mporo* 'can' and which selects a C-subjunctive:

(18) Chthes   **mporusa** akoma na   sinandithume tin alli Triti
yesterday could.1S still   SUBJ   meet.SUBJ.1P the other Tuesday
'Yesterday I was still able for us to meet next Tuesday'

In (18), we see not only that the embedded subject of the subjunctive clause can be interpreted as partially controlled by the main subject, but also that the two clauses are indeed temporally distinct, as they allow two separate temporal adverbials "yesterday" modifying the main clause event, and "the following Tuesday" modifying the embedded clause event. Data like this appear to challenge the link between PC and attitude-predicates: example (18), an apparent case of PC in a finite control language is found in a case of temporal independence (and therefore a +T environment) under a non-attitude predicate.

One of the key diagnostics that we use to distinguish between F-subjunctives and C-subjunctives and hence between PC and accidental partial co-reference (NC), following Varlokosta (1994) and Landau (2004) is the possibility of an overt or covert nominative subject with disjoint reference from any matrix argument. Example (19) is ungrammatical in Greek (as it is in Romanian, cf. section 4), suggesting that (18) is a genuine instance of PC:

(19) *Mporo   na   fas
Can.1sg   SUBJ eat.2 sg
'*I can you to eat.'

There is certainly a difference between *mporo* and verbs which freely permit an F-subjunctive complement, such as those listed in footnote 4. It is possible, however, to coerce a disjoint reading with *mporo*, as suggested to us by Vina Tsakali and Despoina Oikonomou (p.c.):

(20) Mporis na   erthi   i Pinelopi   sto   parti   tu Felix?
can.2SG SUBJ   come.3SG   the Penelope.NOM   to.the   party   the Felix.GEN
'Can you arrange /allow for Penelope to come to Felix's party?'

In fact, an anonymous reviewer suggests that this is even possible in (19) if we add 'at my home' to the example:

(21) Mporo   na   fas   spiti mu
     can.1sg   SUBJ   eat-2   home my
     'It is possible for me that you eat at my place.'

One possible conclusion, then is that *mporo* allows for a complement clause with a disjoint reference subject, and therefore an F-subjunctive, so that (18) is not an instance of PC after all. There are however, two objections in this line of argumentation: firstly such examples are indeed quite labored and require a very elaborate context. As an anonymous reviewer notes, such contexts usually involve some relationship between a matrix argument and something in the embedded clause, something which is not required with verbs which freely select for F-subjunctives. Moreover, partial control verbs always seem to allow coercion of this kind with overt subjects: unlike ExC predicates. Consider for example the following example from English:

(22) I persuaded Mary for her children to wear a coat.

In (22), persuade, which usually favours an obligatory control reading, permits disjoint reference in exactly the same kind of context discussed as in (20) and (21). The fact that *mboro* permits coercion of this kind therefore actually makes it look like a PC predicate from a comparative perspective. To this extent, then, examples like (20) and (21) do not undermine the point made here about a finite control language exhibiting PC. A remaining question is why can PC be coerced into allowing for disjoint reference whereas ExC cannot. This seems to point towards treating the two phenomena as distinct, and not one as a subclass of the other, but a detailed formulation of this intuition lies beyond the scope of this work for reasons of space (though see Cinque 2006, Landau 2000, 2008, 2015, Sheehan 2018 for different implementations of this idea).[5]

4   Partial control in Romanian

In Romanian too, the vast majority of matrix verbs selecting a ***C-subjunctive*** (with forced co-reference) are ExC predicates in Landau's (2000) sense (*şti* 'know', *începe* 'begin', *încearca* 'try' and *reuşi* 'manage'). Conversely, the vast majority of PC predicates select an ***F-subjunctive*** in Romanian with a referential subject, which, given the lack of obviation effects, can also be co-referential with the matrix subject, but need not be (see Alboiu 2007, Alexiadou et al. 2010, Hill 2012, Nicolae 2013, Dindelegan 2013 on Romanian)(see

---

[5] An anonymous reviewer notes that if languages with finite control permit coercion more easily than languages with non-finite control, then this might be taken to support a weakened version of Landau's (2015) proposal. The facts are not so clear to us, though, as English appears to allow coercion with PC verbs just as easily as Greek does. In any case, a problem remains for Landau's general approach if there is a [+Agr, +T] context in which the default reading is control.

examples (13)-(14) above). F-subjunctive complements can optionally be introduced by the subjunctive complementiser **ca** (cf. Grosu & Horvath 1987, Hill 2012). The **ca să** subjunctive complements display typical Romance obviation effects but, the bare **să** complements do not (Alexiadou et al. 2010):

(23) a. Ionuț$_i$ vrea   **să**   EC$_{i/j}$ cânte   la violoncel
      Ionuț   wants   SUBJ   play.SUBJ.3S   at cello

   b. Ionuț$_i$ vrea **ca**   **să**   EC$_{*i/j}$ cânte   la violoncel
      Ionuț   wants   that   SUBJ   play.SUBJ.3S   at cello

As in Greek, the C-subjunctives display the properties of obligatory control (Landau 2004, Alboiu 2007, Alexiadou et al. 2010, Hill 2012, Nicolae 2013):

(24) a. *Victor încearcă   [Mihai   să   cânte]
      Victor   try.PRES.3SG   [(* Mihai)   SUBJ   sing.SUBJ.3SG]
      'Victor is trying (*Mihai) to sing.'

This is not restructuring, however: the embedded clause can contain negation, can be modified by an adverb and does not permit clitic climbing (Alboiu 2007, Alexiadou et al. 2010):

(25) a. Li=a   putut   vedea ?
      CL.3SM.ACC=AUX.3S   could.PART   see.3SG
      'Could s/he see him?'

   b. Nu (*li)-a   încercat   [să-li   vadă].
      not (*CL.3SM.ACC)=AUX.3SG try.PART [SUBJ=CL.3SM.ACC see.3SG]
      'S/he didn't try to see him.'   (Alboiu 2007: 8)

There is disagreement in the literature over whether this is raising or control (see Nicolae 2013). We assume they at least *can* be obligatory control contexts here, partly on the basis of the PC evidence below.

      It has been claimed that Romanian lacks partial control. Alexiadou et al. (2010) claim that Romanian lacks partial control based on the following data ('learn' is an obligatory control verb, as in Greek):

(26) a. *Eu   am   învătat să   inotăm
      I   have   learnt   SUBJ   swim.SUBJ.1Pl

   b. *Ion a   zis   ca   **tu**   ai   învătat să   inotati.
      John has   said   that   you.S   have   learnt   SUBJ   swim.SUBJ.2Pl

Alboiu (2007: 10) claims the same thing on the basis of the following examples:

(27) *Eu vreau   [să   plec   împreună]
   I want.1SG   SUBJ   leave.SUBJ.1SG   together

(28) *Vreau   [să   plecăm   eu   împreună]
     want.1SG   SUBJ leave.SUBJ.1PL   I   together

There are, however, independent explanations as to why these examples are ungrammatical. In (27), a predicate with a singular subject is modified by together and in (30) there is a mismatch between the plural verb form and singular subject. Alboiu also notes that the following is permitted:

(29) Eu vreau   [să   plecăm   împreună]
    I want.1SG   SUBJ leave.SUBJ.1PL   together
    'I want (us) to leave together.'   (Alboiu 2007: 10)

The problem is that, as noted in relation to Greek, and as she notes, we cannot tell whether (29) involves partial control or accidental co-reference as *a vrea* 'to want' (like other desiderative predicates) takes an F-subjunctive which does not force obligatory coreference:

(30) *Pro₁*   vrea   [*pro₁/₂* să   plece]
             want.PRES.3SG   [SUBJ leave.SUBJ.3]
    'S/he wants (for her/him/them) to leave.'   (Alboiu 2007: 11)

The problem, then, is that the vast majority of obligatory control verbs in Romanian happen to be exhaustive control predicates, which fail to allow partial control in any language (see Landau 2000, 2004, 2015 and the discussion above).

Like in Greek, however, there is one ExC predicate which takes C-subjunctive complements and nonetheless permits PC: the modal *putea* 'can'. Example (31) shows that *putea* takes a C-subjunctive and not an F-subjunctive. Examples (32)-(33) show that partial control is nonetheless permitted here with either a 1S or 3S subject controlling a 1PL verb form (based on judgments from four speakers):

(31) *Tu   poți   să   meargă   mâine.
     you   can.2S SUBJ go.SUBJ.3   tomorrow

(32) Pot   să   ne   întâlnim   mâine.
    Can.1S   SUBJ SE.1PL   meet.SUBJ.1PL   tomorrow
    'I can meet tomorrow.'

(33) Pot   să   ne   căsătorim   doar la anul,   când fac   18 ani.
    can.1S   SUBJ SE.1PL marry.SUBJ.1PL only to year.DEF when make 18 years
    'I can marry only next year, when I turn 18.'

(34) Ea poate să   ne   căsătorim   doar la anul,   când face   18 ani.
    she can   SUBJ SE.1PL marry.SUBJ.1PL only to year.def   when makes 18 years
    'She can marry only next year, when she turns 18.'

This is particularly interesting because, unlike Greek, Romanian retains limited usage of non-finite clauses and one context where the latter occur is precisely under this same verb:

(35) El poate alerga
    he can run.INF
    'He can run'   (Dindelegan 2013: 136)

Bare infinitives of this kind probably involve restructuring as clitic climbing and long passives are permitted here (Dindelegan 2013: 181):

(36) Cartea   o   pot   citi   acum
    book.DEF.ACC   CL.ACC.F.3SG   (I)can   read.INF now
    'I can read the book now'

(37) Cartea   se   poate   citi   de către oricine într-o zi
    book.DEF.NOM   CL.REFL.PASS can. 3SG read.INF   by anyone   in=one day
    'The book can be read by anyone in one day'

Until the 19th century, *putea* also freely selected an infinitive complement introduced by *a,* but nowadays this possibility is restricted to complements which are negated (Dragomirescu 2013). No clitic climbing is possible where *a* is present:

(38) El putea   a   nu-l   primi
    he can.IMPERF.3SG   A   not=CL.ACC.M.3SG receive.INF
    'He could not receive it.' (Dindelegan 2013: 182, citing Jordan 2009: 60)

Even where *a* is present, however, PC is not possible with a non-finite complement:

(39) *Tu   poți   a vă   căsători   la anul.
    you   can.2S A SE.2PL   marry.INF   to year.def
    'You can marry next year.'

This minimal contrast between finite and non-finite complements suggests that this is a matter of syntax and not semantics as presumably the modal has the same meaning in both contexts. Like in Greek, then, there is at least one EC predicate which appears to permit PC in finite control contexts.

5   Theoretical discussion and tentative conclusions

A very important question is whether the examples of PC in Greek and Romanian mentioned above are genuine instances of PC. Poole (2014) notes that a similar phenomenon is possible also in English with the root modal 'can', but he claims that it is not an instance of PC (pace Rodrigues 2007). He proposes, rather, that apparent instances of PC under 'can' in English

actually involve a covert comitative, based on the fact that only comitative verbs can surface in the complement to *can* in instances of PC:

(40) a. *John can gather tomorrow.
　　 b. *John can disperse next week.　　　　　　　(Poole 2015, 14)

He therefore proposes the following analysis (see also Sheehan 2014 on 'fake PC' in some Romance languages):

(41)　Modal–meet construction schema
　　　XP_1 can [t_1 meet (with y)]　　　　　　(Poole 2015, 15)

The core idea here is that the plural reading of *meet* arises from the exceptional possibility of a covert comitative and not from partial control. In fact, *can* is analysed as a raising predicate on his analysis.[6]

This account however clearly does not carry over to the Romanian and Greek facts. In these languages, the embedded subject clearly differs in *phi*-features from the matrix subject so the effect cannot reduce to raising (or ExC). Moreover, the plural reading of the embedded predicate marry/meet cannot be attributed to the presence of a covert comitative as the embedded verb is itself inflected as plural. Finally, note that examples involving an overt comitative are possible with these verbs, but the comitative cannot be omitted in these contexts.

　　Many verbs in Romanian undergo the comitative alternation (*a se certa* 'to argue', *a se întâlni* 'to meet', *a se săruta* 'to kiss' *a se împăca* 'to make up'):

(42) *Alex　　　　se　　întâlnește
　　　Alex　　　　SE　　meet.3SG
(43) Alex　　　　se　　întâlnește　　cu　　Adina
　　　Alex　　　　SE　　meet.3SG　　with　Adina
(44) Alex și Adina　　se　　întâlnesc
　　　Alex and Adina　SE　　meet.3PL

These verbs can occur in control contexts with a singular antecedent, but the 3S and 3PL forms of the subjunctive are identical, so it is impossible to tell whether the comitative can be omitted in the equivalent to (45):

(45) Vrea　　　　să　　se　　întânească　　mâine　　　(cu　　ea)
　　　wants.3SG　SUBJ　SE　　meet.SUBJ.3　tomorrow　　with　　her
　　　'He wants to meet (with her) tomorrow.'

(46) Vrea　　　　să　　se　　certe　　din　când　în　când　(cu　　ea)
　　　wants.3SG　SUBJ　SE　　argue.SUBJ.3 from　when　to　when　with　her
　　　'He wants to argue (with her) from time to time.'

---

[6] See also Pitteroff and Sheehan (2018), who show that this is possible with other EC verbs in English.

(47) Vrea   să   se   sărute   curând   (cu   ea)
     wants.3SG SUBJ SE   kiss. SUBJ.3 soon   with   her
     Lit. 'He wants to kiss (with her) soon.'

(48) Vrea   să   se   împace   (cu   ea)
     wants.3SG SUBJ SE   make.up. SUBJ.3   with   her
     'He wants to make up (with her) soon.'

If the subject is 1st or 2nd person, however, the number distinction is morphologically expressed and it is clearly not possible to omit the comitative in such cases (based on a survey of 21 speakers):

(49) Vreau   să   mă   întâlnesc   mâine   *(cu ea)
     want.1SG SUBJ SE.1SG meet.SUBJ.1SG   tomorrow   with her
     'I want to meet (with her) tomorrow.'

(50) Vrei   să   te   întâlneşti   mâine   *(cu ea)
     want.2SG SUBJ SE.2SG meet.SUBJ.2SG   tomorrow   with her
     'You want to meet (with her) tomorrow.'

This shows that the kind of PC observed in Romanian does not involve a covert comitative. The situation in Greek is exactly the same, with agreement interacting with the comitative alternation where the presence of a comitative phrase induces singular agreement on the verb (49), but the lack of the comitative phrase is only allowed when the verb has plural agreement (50):

(51) *O Jiánis sinantithike
     The John met.3 sg

(52) O Jiánis sinantithike me ton Pétro
     The John met.3sg   with the Peter
     'John met with Peter.'

(53) O Jiánis ki o Pétros sinantithikan
      The John and the Peter met.3pl
      'John and Peter met.'

Greek has the full agreement paradigm in subjunctive forms, so examples like Romanian (47) – (52) display no ambiguity. Indeed, PC cases with *thelo* 'want' cannot involve a covert comitative exactly because the embedded verb appears in the singular when there is a comitative phrase and in the plural without it.[7]

---

[7] We use a verb which selects an F-subjunctive here because it is our intention to show that comitatives cannot be omitted in subjunctive contexts. The patterns are the same if the matrix verb is can. Thanks to an anonymous

(54) Thelo /mporo   na   sinantithume   avrio
     want.1sg /can.1sg   SUBJ   meet.1pl   tomorrow
     'I want to meet (plural) tomorrow./I can meet (plural) tomorrow.'

(55) Thelo   / mporo   na   sinantitho   me tin Stefania   avrio
     want.1sg   can.1sg   SUBJ   meet.1sg   with the Stefania   tomorrow
     'I want to meet with Stefania tomorrow./I can meet with Stefania tomorrow'

Even if the Greek and Romanian examples do not involve covert comitatives, it is still possible that they involve some other phenomenon rather than PC. Indeed, this is the real challenge put forward by languages that display finite control: with the presence of agreement in the subjunctive complement, how can grammar suspend the possibility of n F subjunctive, given that agreement is traditionally linked to finiteness and the possibility of a referential subject?

To sum up, in this squib we have provided some preliminary evidence that finite control languages like Greek and Romanian display PC in very limited contexts, contrary to what has previously been claimed in the literature. Moreover, the very existence of this phenomenon inside [+Agr], [+T] complements of non-attitude predicates is incompatible with any mainstream theory of PC that predicts it to be incompatible with [+Agr]. Data problematic for this claim can also be found in European Portuguese, which appears to permit obligatory control into inflected infinitives, at least for some speakers (Sheehan 2018, to appear), though this is somewhat controversial (see Landau 2016). We have dismissed, somewhat tentatively, the idea that apparent cases of PC in Greek and Romanian might be instances of coercion of a C-subjunctive into an F-subjunctive or of ExC with a covert comitative. The next step for this investigation is to survey the extent of this phenomenon in Greek and Romanian and establish whether it can be unambiguously found with predicates other than 'can'. Once this has been established, an alternative theory of control must be explored which captures the fact that PC is in fact compatible with [+Arg] clauses, without overgenerating. It is worth noting in this regard that the incompatibility is somewhat stipulative in Landau's (2015) approach, so this may not be as difficult as first appears.[8]

References

Alboiu, Gabriela. 2007. Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising. In *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, eds. William Davies & Stanley Dubinsky, 187–211. Amsterdam: Springer Netherlands.

reviewer for querying this.

[8] There are, for example, other verbs which Varlokosta claims take C-subjunctives which appear to allow PC:
    (i)   Tha   xaro   na   vrethume
           Fut   please-1sg   SUBJ   meet.1pl
           'I will be pleased us to meet tomorrow…'

Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordachioaia & Mihaela Marchis. 2010. No objection to Backward Control. In *Movement theory of Control*, eds. Norbert Hornstein & Maria Polinsky, 89-118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and functional heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grano, Thomas. 2012. *Control and restructuring at the syntax-semantics interface*, University of Chicago, Illinois: PhD thesis.

Grosu, Alexander. & Julia Horvath. 1987. On non-finiteness in extraction constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 181-196.

Hill, Virginia. 2012. Romanian 'can': changes in parametric settings. In *Parameter theory and linguistic change*, eds. Charlotte Galves, Sonia Cyrino, Ruth Lopes, Filomena Sandalo, Juanito Avelar, 265–280. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The synchrony and the diachrony of the Balkan infinitive* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kapetangianni, Konstantia. 2010. *The minimalist syntax of control in Greek*. PhD dissertation: University of Michigan.

Landau, Idan. 1999. *Elements of Control*. MIT: PhD dissertation.

Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811-877.

Landau, Idan. 2008. Two routes of control: evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 877–924.

Landau, Idan. 2015. *A Two-Tiered Theory of Control*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Landau, Idan. 2016. Agreement at PF: an argument from partial control. *Syntax* 19: 79-109.

Pearson, Hazel. 2016. The semantics of partial control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34:691–738.

Pitteroff, Marcel, Artemis Alexiadou & Silke Fischer. 2017a. two mechanisms to derive partial control - evidence from German. In *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 23.1: 201-210.

Pitteroff, Marcel, Artemis Alexiadou, Jeannique Darby & Silke Fischer. 2017b. on partial control in German. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 20.2: 139-185.

Pitteroff, Marcel & Michelle Sheehan. 2018. The case for fake partial control in French and German. To appear in *Proceedings of NELS 48*.

Poole, Ethan. 2015. Implicit arguments. Unpublished ms. Amherst: UMass.

Roussou, Anna. 2000. On the left periphery: modal particles and complementizers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1: 65-94

Roussou, Anna. 2009. In the mood for control. *Lingua*, *119*: 1811-1836.

Sevdali, Christina. 2007. *Infinitival clauses in Ancient Greek: overt and null subjects, the role of Case and Focus*. PhD dissertation: University of Cambridge.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2014. Partial Control in Romance Languages: the covert comitative analysis. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory,* eds. Karen Lahousse & Stepanie Marzo, 181-198. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2018. On the difference between exhaustive and partial control. To appear in F. Cognola & J. Casalicchio (eds.), *Understanding Null Subjects: a Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective, 141-170*. Oxford: OUP.

Sheehan, Michelle. To appear. Control of inflected infinitives in European Portuguese. To appear in *Complement clauses in Portuguese: syntax and acquisition*, eds. Anabela Gonçalves & Ana-Maria Santos. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Spyropoulos, Vassilios. 2007. Finiteness and control in Greek. In *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, eds. William Davies & Stanley Dubinsky, 159-183. Amsterdam: Springer Netherlands.

Terzi, A. 1992. *PRO in Finite clauses: a study of the inflectional heads of the Balkan languages.* Ph.D. dissertation: City University of New York.

Terzi, A. 1997. PRO and Null Case in finite clauses. *Linguistic Review 14:* 335-360

Varlokosta, Spyridoula. 1994. *Issues on Modern Greek sentential complementation*. PhD dissertation: University of Maryland.