Partial control in Romance languages

The covert comitative analysis

Michelle Sheehan
University of Cambridge

This article considers the availability of partial Control in European Portuguese, French, Spanish and Italian and argues that many apparent examples of partial Control actually involve exhaustive control with a covert comitative, along the lines proposed by Boeckx, Hornstein & Nunes (2010) for English. The low level differences between French, Spanish, Italian and European Portuguese are argued to reduce to lexical differences concerning which verbs happen to be comitative in these varieties. This is the case even though the covert comitative approach is actually problematic as an analysis of partial Control in English. The implication for theories of Control is that surface instances of partial Control can have different underlying analyses.

1. Introduction: The challenge posed by partial control

Landau (1999, 2000) first drew attention to the phenomenon of Partial Control (PC), whereby PRO is anaphorically dependent on, but not exhaustively controlled by, a higher DP:[1]

(1) a. *John met/kissed/parted company early this morning.
     b. John$_i$ would like [PRO$_{i+}$ to meet/kiss/part company].
     c. *John$_i$ would like [PRO$_{i+}$ to meet/kiss/part company without him$_i$].

Crucially, the embedded predicates in (1) require a semantically plural subject (1a). Example (1b) is nonetheless grammatical despite the fact that the controller is (both syntactically and semantically) singular indicating that this is an instance of PC: the referent of PRO must include the controller (*John*) plus some other contextually determined referent(s). The ungrammaticality of (1c) is thus

---

due to condition B, as PRO, which is local to the pronoun, is necessarily partially co-referential with it.

Landau (2000) provides the following generalisation concerning PC:

(2)   The PC-generalisation (Landau 2000, 60)
      In tensed complements, PRO inherits all phi-features from the controller, including semantic plurality, but not necessarily semantic singularity.

This generalisation captures two crucial properties of PC, according to Landau. Firstly, only "tensed" [+T] non-finite clauses are compatible with PC in a number of languages. Non-finite complements of implicative, aspectual and (certain) modal predicates permit only Exhaustive Control (EC), where PRO is fully bound by/co-referent with its controller in English and other languages. Unlike the complements of factive, propositional, desiderative and interrogative predicates, which permit either EC or PC and are tensed [+T], the complements of these implicative, aspectual and (certain) modal predicates are untensed [−T], as diagnosed by their inability to support independent temporal adverbials:[2]

(3)   a.   *Yesterday, John$_i$ managed/began/had [PRO$_i$ to solve the problem tomorrow]. (Landau 2000,57)

      b.   *The chair$_i$ managed/began/had [PRO$_{i+}$ to gather at 6].

(4)   a.   Yesterday, John$_i$ hoped/wondered how [PRO$_i$ to solve the problem tomorrow]. (Landau 2000, 57)

      b.   The chair$_i$ hoped/wondered how [PRO$_{i+}$ to meet the next day].

Secondly, (2) implies that in instances of PC, PRO inherits all its features from its controller with the exception of semantic singularity. The implication is that in [+T] embedded contexts PRO can be semantically plural even if its controller is semantically singular. As Landau shows, verbs like *meet* require their subject to be only *semantically* plural in English, and not necessarily *syntactically* plural:[3]

---

2.   As Landau notes, this cuts across the raising/control divide as well as the restructuring/non-restructuring divide.

3.   For Landau, this mismatch is permitted between controller and PRO because the control relation into [+T] non-finite complements is mediated by C, which is unspecified for semantic plurality (see Landau 2000, 2004 for different implementations of this idea). In these terms then, PC results where the controller is semantically singular and PRO is semantically plural but the two share all other phi-features. As we shall see in Section 3.3, there are potential empirical problems with such an account (but see Landau 2013 for a defence).

(5)   The committee meets in the morning.[4]

As Landau has often pointed out, the properties of PC make it apparently problematic for the Movement Theory of Control (MTC – Hornstein 1999; Boeckx & Hornstein 2004, 2006a, 2006b; Boeckx, Hornstein & Nunes 2010). This is because, he claims, PC is a subtype of obligatory Control (OC):

> PC verbs show all the familiar characteristics of OC: The controller must be local, cannot be arbitrary, PRO is interpreted *de se* and allows only a sloppy reading under ellipsis.   (Landau 2004, 834)

These properties, and others identified by Hornstein (1999) are illustrated in (6), based largely on the examples in Landau 2000. Example (6a) shows that PRO is obligatorily controlled by a local DP (in the next-clause-up); (6b) shows that this DP must be c-commanding (one of Hornstein's tests);[5] (6c) shows that PC gets a sloppy reading under ellipsis; (6d) gets only a *de se* reading whereby the amnesiac holds a belief about himself and not the stranger he sees in the mirror; finally (6e) gets only a bound variable reading whereby (in the relevant context) Mrs. Shufflebotham is the only teacher x who wonders where x and x's class must assemble in the event of a fire (i.e. all the other teachers know the fire drill):

(6)   a. $\underline{John_i}$ thinks that [$\underline{Mary_j}$ wants [$\underline{PRO}_{j+}$ to meet without $\underline{him}_i/\underline{*her}_j$]].
       b.   [$\underline{John_i's\ boss}$]$_j$ expects [$\underline{PRO}_{j+}$ to meet without $\underline{him}_i/\underline{*her}_j$ tomorrow].
       c. $\underline{John_i}$ would perfer [$\underline{PRO}_{i+}$ to meet after breakfast] and Bill$_j$ would too (but without $\underline{*him}_j/\underline{John}_i$) (Landau 2000, 42)
       d. $\underline{The\ amnesiac_i}$ wants [$\underline{PRO}_{i+}$ to meet tomorrow].
       e.   Only $\underline{Mrs.\ Shufflebotham_i}$ wondered [where $\underline{PRO}_{i+}$ to assemble in the event of a fire]

As Landau (2003, 2004, 2007) has repeatedly pointed out and as Boeckx, Hornstein and Nunes (2010, 183) (henceforth BHN) acknowledge, the properties of PC raise

---

4.   He also discusses more microparametric variation concerning the ability for semantic plurality to control syntactic morphological agreement, with many varieties of British English permitting this (see Sauerland & Elbourne 2002 for discussion):

   (i)   The committee/team/couple meet at 5 each day.   (British English: ✓)

5.   Landau (2000) rejects c-command as a necessary condition for OC because of examples like:

   (i)   Yesterday, it spoiled Mary's mood [PRO to listen to the news]

However, where two animate DPs are present in the next-clause-up, it is always the c-commanding DP which serves as a controller, so I retain the diagnostic here for completeness, putting to one side the derivation of (i).

a serious challenge for the MTC: PC conforms to almost all of the diagnostics used by Hornstein (1999, *et seq*) to argue for a movement account of exhaustive control (EC) with one exception: in instances of PC, the relationship between the controller and PRO appears to be a subset-superset relation, wholly unlike movement-derived chains.[6] There is neither partial raising, as Landau (2003, 493) notes, nor partial passivisation:

(7)   a.   *The chair seemed to meet at 6.
      b.   *The chair was brought together.

The instances of A-movement in (7) fail to mitigate the requirement for a plural subject/object respectively, unlike the control examples above. These facts thus pose an undeniable challenge for the MTC, as here we have an instance of OC which looks like it *should* be derived by movement but simply *cannot* be. Landau (2004, 833) goes so far as to claim that PC "challenges (and in fact, refutes) most existing accounts of control".

2.   The covert comitative analysis

Landau takes the existence of PC to be fatal for the MTC, for the reasons just discussed. BHN (2010, 185), however, propose an analysis of PC compatible with the MTC, which essentially eliminates the PC problem. What they propose is that apparent instances of PC in (American) English actually involve EC (derived by movement) plus a null comitative object *pro* (replacing a withP):

(8)   a.   The chair$_i$ hoped [t$_i$ to meet *pro*$_{\text{comitative}}$ at 6].
      b.   The chair$_i$ hoped [t$_i$ to apply together *pro*$_{\text{comitative}}$ for the grant].

To capture the limited availability of *pro*$_{\text{comitative}}$, they stipulate that the latter is licensed only in [+T] non-finite clauses, as described by Landau (and discussed above).[7] In this section, I show that BHN's approach faces certain serious problems as an analysis of English PC. In the remainder of the paper, however, I argue that it

---

6.   The MTC is also challenged by the familiar differences between raising and control concerning reconstruction, the possibility of expletives, and other semantic differences. These plausibly reduce to the differing thematic roles involved in the two contexts (cf. BHN 2010, 45 for discussion).

7.   This is, admittedly, a fairly unattractive stipulation. A reviewer suggests that it is even more problematic given that there can be no conceivable connection between none-finiteness, a property of the functional domain, and covert commitatives, a property of the thematic domain. Given that (descriptively, at least) null arguments often need to be licensed by functional heads, however, this problem may not be as serious as it first seems. I return to this issue briefly below.

may be the correct analysis of PC in a number of Romance languages. As such, the problem posed by PC for the MTC remains in English (and Brazilian/European Portuguese – see Modesto 2000; Sheehan 2012, 2013) but BHN correctly identify a subtype of PC which proves pervasive in Romance languages, and which is compatible with the MTC. The implication is that surface instances of PC more generally may have different syntactic derivations.

As evidence for their account, BHN claim that PC is only possible in English with those embedded predicates which can take a comitative PP:

(9) a. *The chair sang alike/was mutually supporting with Bill.
     b. *The chair hoped [PRO to sing alike/be mutually supporting].
     c. John met/collided/agreed/gathered/interacted with Bill.
     d. John doesn't want [PRO to meet/collide/agree/gather/interact today].

Landau (2007, 298–301) has already raised some problems with the accuracy of this claim in relation to English. A complicating factor is that the predicates in (9a) seem to require a *syntactically*, rather than a *semantically*, plural subject:

(10) a. *The choir sings alike.
      b. They/John and Sue/the choristers sing alike.
      c. ??The team is mutually supporting.[8]

According to Landau, such predicates do not typically participate in PC for this reason (Landau 2007, 300). A more relevant test, then, is what happens with predicates requiring semantically plural subjects which are not comitative. Based on Levin (1993, 59–63), I identify three distinct classes of verbs requiring semantically plural subjects in English: (I) together reciprocals (*collide, meet* etc.), (II) apart reciprocals (*separate, diverge* etc.), and (III) symmetrical activities (*kiss, hug, court* etc.). In both British and American English, most class I predicates are comitative, as indicated in (9c). Class II predicates, on the other hand, usually surface with a PP object introduced by *from* in English (*differ, diverge, divide, divorce, part, separate*). A first problem for the covert comitative account is that, while some speakers allow these predicates to co-occur with a comitative PP, most do not and yet all speakers allow these predicates in PC constructions (see also Landau 2007, 300 on *disperse*):

(11) a. %Because of Mary's behaviour, John separated with her last year.[9]
      b. *Because of Mary's behaviour, John separated last year.
      c. Because of Mary's behaviour, John wants to separate.

---

8. Note that in British English these examples are fully acceptable with plural agreement on the verb.

9. As an anonymous reviewer notes, the sentence is more generally acceptable if *with* is replaced with *from* but what is relevant is that event those speakers who require *from* in (11a) also accept (11c).

Class III predicates denote reciprocated actions (*court, embrace, hug, kiss, nuzzle, pet*). Again, these predicates can freely participate in PC in English, even for those speakers who reject comitative uses of them:[10]

(12)   a.   %John has been seeing Mary for a while and he wants to kiss with her soon.
       b.   *John has been seeing Mary for a while now and he finally kissed last night.
       c.   John has been seeing Mary for a while now and he wants to kiss soon.[11]

What is crucial in these examples is the clear difference in acceptability between (11/12a) and (11/12c), indicating that covert comitatives are unlikely to be responsible for the grammaticality of the (c) examples.

BHN's second piece of evidence for the covert comitative analysis of English PC relies on the claim that where an overt comitative PP is present only an EC reading is possible:

(13)   The chair hoped to meet with the president.

While an EC reading is certainly favoured in (13), it is not clear that a PC reading is altogether ruled out. Both (British and American) speakers permit a PC reading whether or not a *with*P is present in (14):

(14)   Do you$_i$ want PRO$_{i+}$ to meet (with the client) tomorrow?

In (14), a salient reading involves PC whereby PRO is interpreted as the addressee plus the speaker. The facts in (14), however, are not necessarily problematic for the covert comitative account as English clearly permits double *with*Ps in such cases:

(15)   Do you want PRO to meet (with the client)(with me) tomorrow?

Even if one *with*P is present, then, it follows that another may be covert leading to an apparent instance of PC. More problematic is the fact that, even in such cases, a PC reading is still possible: PRO can be interpreted as 2PL even where you is interpreted as 2SG in (15), whereas a third overt comitative sounds very clumsy at best.

As such, there is little evidence that PC in English reduces to EC plus a null comitative and the challenge for the MTC remains. Another challenge arises from PC with an inflected infinitive in Brazilian and European Portuguese (see Modesto

---

10.   Though there are members of this class which are comitative such as *shake hands*, *go out*, etc.

11.   An anonymous reviewer raises the possibility that such examples might involve ECM of a covert plural *pro* which in turn exhaustively controls PRO. The fact that 'hope' which is not an ECM verb, can replace 'want' here show that this cannot generally be the case.

2000; Sheehan 2012, 2013), a discussion of which is, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this paper.[12] Nonetheless, in the following section, I argue that BHN's analysis *does* actually account well for PC in a number of Romance languages, suggesting that PC is not a unified phenomenon across (or even within) languages.

3.   Covert comitatives in Romance

There has been little dedicated discussion of PC in Romance languages. Alboiu (2007) claims that Romanian, like Greek, lacks PC and Landau (2000) notes that Spanish, French, Catalan and Italian have it.[13] Modesto (2010) and Rodrigues & Hornstein (2013) discuss PC in Brazilian Portuguese, and Sheehan (2012, 2013) extends the discussion to European Portuguese, focusing mainly on inflected infinitives. As Landau notes, however, there are certain differences between the major Romance languages which have thus far resisted explanation. In this section, I provide an overview of the situation in a number of Romance languages, arguing that in many cases, such examples actually involve null comitatives of the kind proposed by BHN (somewhat problematically) for English.

3.1   European Portuguese

European Portuguese (EP) permits what looks like PC with both inflected and uninflected infinitives. While around half of those speakers surveyed reject inflection in such examples, however, almost all those surveyed allow PC without inflection:[14]

(16)   O   João$_i$ preferia   [PRO$_{i+}$ reunir(%em)=se   mais   tarde].
        the João   preferred.3SG   meet.INF.(%3PL)=SE more late
        'John would prefer to meet later on.'

---

12.   In such cases, the embedded controlled non-finite clause can be inflected for person and number distinct from that of its controller, while the diagnostics for OC are still satisfied, raising some non-trivial problems for the MTC. Sheehan (2012, 2013) nonetheless proposes an account of these facts in line with the spirit of the MTC whereby PC arises from 'failed movement'.

13.   See Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, Iordachioaia & Marchis 2010, 95, citing Varlokosta 1994 on Greek.

14.   Actually matters are more nuanced than this. While many speakers reject PC with an inflected infinitive in instances of local subject PC, most speakers accept inflection with object PC (e.g. *convince*) and non-local subject PC (e.g. *promise*) (see Sheehan 2013 for discussion).

We focus here on PC with uninflected infinitives; for a discussion of PC of inflected infinitives see Sheehan (2012, 2013). PC with an uninflected infinitive satisfies all the diagnostics of Obligatory Control, as noted by Sheehan (2012, 2013). Thus a controller: is obligatory (17); must be c-commanding (18), must be local (in the next-clause-up) (19); gets a sloppy reading under ellipsis (20). PRO, in such cases, gets a *de se* (21) and bound (22) reading:

(17) *O João$_i$ preferia   reunir=se   sem   ele$_i$ às   6.
       the João preferred.3s meet.INF=self.3 without him at.the 6
       Lit. 'João$_i$ preferred/would prefer to meet without him$_i$ at 6.'

(18) a. A   chefe do   João$_i$ preferia   reunir=se   sem   ele$_i$.
          the boss of.the João preferred meet.INF=SE without him
          'João$_i$'s (female) boss wants to meet without him$_i$.'

      b. *[A   chefe do   João]$_i$ preferia   reunir=se   sem   ela$_i$.
          the boss of.the João   preferred meet.INF=SE without her
          'João's (female) boss$_i$ wants to meet without her.'

(19) *O   Pedro acha   que eu preferia   reunir=se   mais cedo[15]
        the Pedro believes that I preferred meet.INF=SE more early
        'Pedro believe that I would prefer to meet earlier on.'

(20) O   João preferia   reunir=se   de manhã, e   a
      the João preferred meet.INF=SE of morning, and the

      Maria$_i$ também preferia   (*mas sem   ela$_i$).
      Maria also   preferred (but without her)

      'João would prefer to meet in the morning and so would Maria (but without her).'

(21) O   amnésico preferia   reunir=se   no   hospital.
      the amnesiac preferred meet.INF=SE in.the hospital
      'The amnesiac would prefer to meet in the hospital' (*de se* only)

(22) Só   o   director   preferia   reunir=se   fora   no
      only the headmaster preferred meet.INF=SE outside in.the

      caso de um incêndio.
      case of a   fire

      'Only the headmaster would prefer to meet outside in the case of a fire.' (bound reading only)

---

15.   This is ungrammatical because *se* indicates that PRO is 3rd rather than 1st person, and as illustrated below, PRO must share all the syntactic phi-features of its controller.

It would seem that the phenomenon in question, then, must be a form of OC, either EC or PC.

Recall from Section 2 the three classes of verbs requiring a semantically plural subject in English (based on Levin 1993, 62–63):

I.   together reciprocals (*collide, meet, come together, make up*)
II. apart reciprocals (*differ, diverge, divide, divorce, part, separate*)
III. other symmetrical activities (*kiss, hug, shake hands, disagree, pet*)

Many (but not all) of the verbs in all three classes are translated into EP as pronominal verbs (e.g. *reunir-se* 'meet', *divorciar-se* 'to get divorced', *bejiar-se* 'kiss'). In EP, as in English, only class I predicates are generally comitative:

(23)   *O   Pedro   reconciliou=se/reuniu=se/envolveu=se   com   a   Maria*
      the   Pedro   made.up=SE/met=SE/got.involved=SE   with   the   Maria
      'Pedro made up/met up/got involved with Maria.'

Interestingly, with uninflected infinitival complements, only these verbs can participate in PC. Example (24) shows that in finite contexts, the verb *reconciliar-se* requires a s emantically plural subject, and (25) shows that this requirement is suspended in OC contexts:[16]

(24)   **O   Pedro   esteve   a   discutir   com   a   Maria   mas*
      the   Pedro   was   at   argue.INF   with   the   Maria   but

      hoje   reconciliou=se.
      today   made.up=SE

(25)   *O   Pedro   está   farto   de   discutir   com   a   Maria.*
      the   P   is   sick   of   argue.INF   with   the   Maria

      Queria   reconciliar=se.
      wanted   make.up=SE
      'Pedro is sick of arguing with Maria, He wants to make up.'

The same pattern is observed with the verbs *reunir-se* 'to meet' and *envolver-se* 'to get involved', both of which are comitative, as illustrated in (23). Class II verbs do not require a semantically plural subject in EP and so cannot easily be used to test for PC:

(26)   *O   Pedro   separou=se/divorciou=se   recentemente.*
      The   Pedro   separated=SE/divorced=SE   recently
      'Pedro recently got divorced/separated.'

---

16.   This contrast was tested for all predicates discussed in this section.

Finally, class III verbs *do* require a semantically plural subject but are *not* comitative and, as predicted, cannot surface in instances of PC:

(27) *A   Maria tem saudades do   filho. Queria escrever=se
    the Maria has missings of.the son   wanted write=SE

    (**com ele**)   todos os dias.
    with him all the   days

Other class III verbs which pattern like *escrever-se* include: *beijar-se* 'to kiss', *abraçar-se* 'to hug', *corresponder-se* 'to correspond', *falar-se* 'to speak to one another', *perceber-se* 'to understand each other'. As such, in EP, there is a strong correlation between the possibility of a comitative complement and the ability to participate in PC (with uninflected infinitives), lending strong support to the covert comitative account.[17]

3.2   Spanish, Italian and French

A consideration of Spanish, Italian and French suggests that the covert comitative analysis of PC applies more generally in Romance languages. Spanish patterns basically like EP in that class I verbs like *reunirse* 'to meet' are generally comitative and can participate in PC:[18]

(28) [?]*Juan necesita hablar   con   su   jefe. Quisiera*
    Juan needs   speak.INF with his boss would.want

    reunir=se mañana.
    meet=SE   tomorrow

    'Juan needs to talk to his boss. He'd like to meet tomorrow.'

Likewise, as in EP, class II verbs like *divorciarse* 'to divorce/get divorced' do not require a plural subject and so are difficult to test in PC contexts.

An interesting difference between the two languages is that some class III verbs are comitative in Spanish and as a result permit PC (as predicted). The verb *cartearse* 'to correspond' for example, is comitative in Spanish and can also participate in PC:

(29) *Juan echa.de.menos a María. Quiere cartear=se   [?](con ella).*
    Juan misses   A Maria wants   correspond=SE   with her
    'Juan misses Maria. He wants to write.'

---

17.   As noted above and as discussed at length in Sheehan (2012), the covert comitative analysis cannot be extended to PC with inflected infinitives in EP.

18.   Of the four Spanish speakers I consulted, however, three found PC quite marginal, more so than the EP speakers, and one uniformly rejected all examples.

Most class III verbs, however, are not comitative, as was the case in EP, and as such cannot surface in instances of PC, this is true of *besarse* 'to kiss', *conocerse* 'to meet', *hablarse* 'to speak':[19]

(30) *Hace   dos   semanas   que   Juan   sale   con   María   y   ya   quiere*
     makes   two   weeks   that   Juan   goes   with   Maria   &   now   wants

     besar=se (con   ella)
     kiss=SE   with   her

     'Juan's been going out with Maria for two weeks and he wants to kiss now.'

Again, then, there is a strong correlation between those verbs which are comitative and those which can surface in PC.[20]

Italian, is slightly more liberal in its use of comitatives (subject to dialectal variation).[21] The speakers I have consulted who accept PC nonetheless display a correlation between those verbs which permit an overt comitative and those which can surface in PC. Class I verbs, as in Spanish and EP are generally comitative and so can participate in PC:

(31) *Gianni   ha   bisogno   di   vedere   Maria. Vorrebbe   riunir=si*
     Gianni   has   need   of   see.INF   Maria. Would.like   meet.INF=SE

     ?(con   lei)   domani.
      with   her   tomorrow

     'Gianni needs to see Maria. He'd like to meet ?(with her) tomorrow.'

Class II verbs, as in Spanish and EP, do not require a plural subject and so cannot be tested. Finally, many verbs in class III are comitative for the speakers I consulted, including *baciarsi*. As expected, these verbs also surface in instances of PC for those speakers who accept PC:

(32) *Gianni   esce   con   Maria   da   due   settimane   e   vorrebbe*
     Gianni   goes.out   with   Maria   from   two   weeks   and   would.like

---

19.   There appears to be some variation with *besarse*, with some speakers accepting a comitative use, however.

20.   There is an apparent counterexample from the verb *encontrarse* 'to meet' which is comitative but cannot surface in instances of PC. A similar effect is observed in Italian with *incontrarse*. In Spanish, the explanation seems to be to do with the very salient instransitive reading of this verb ('to find oneself) which is compatible with a singular subject and blocks the postulation of a covert comitative.

21.   Of the four Italian speakers I consulted, one found PC quite acceptable, two found it marginal and the other uniformly rejected it.

> *baciar=si*   ?(*con   lei*)   *adesso.*
> kiss.INF=SE   with   her   now
> 'Gianni has been going out with Maria for two weeks and he would like to
> kiss now.'

Other comitative verbs which can participate in PC include: *litigare* 'argue', *sentirse* 'to call', *scriversi* 'write' (somewhat marginally) and *concordare* 'to agree'. Those Italian/Spanish speakers who reject PC, I assume, simply fail to permit covert comitatives.

Landau (2000) notes that French, like Italian, Spanish and Catalan has PC, but, he claims, disallows PC with se-predicates, as suggested by the following contrast:

(33)   **Jean a   dit   à   Marie qu'   il   veut   se rencontrer à   6 heures.*
     Jean has   said   to   Marie that   he   wants   SE meet   at   6   hours
     'Jean told Mary that he wants to meet at 6.'

(34)   *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.'   (Landau 2000, 85)

This difference between French and the other Romance languages upon closer inspection reduces to the comitative/non-comitative distinction and is independent of the presence of *se*: French does *not* ban PC with all *se*-predicates, only those which are non-comitative (as is the case with *se rencontrer* 'to meet'):[22]

(35)   **Jean a   dit   à   Marie qu'il veut   se   rencontrer avec elle   à*
     Jean   has   said   to   Marie that   he   wants SE meet   with   her   at
     6   heures.
     6   hours

(36)   *Jean adore   sa femme. Il   ne   veut   plus   se disputer*
     Jean likes a.lot his   wife   he   NEG   wants   more   SE argue
     ?(*avec   elle*).
      with   her
     'Jean loves his wife. He doesn't want to argue (with her).'

French has fewer comitative verbs in class I than Italian, Spanish and EP, but again the correlation with PC holds: *se croiser* 'to meet unexpectedly' is also non-comitative and thus banned in PC, whereas *converger* 'to converge' is comitative and possible in PC. Class two predicates (Fr. *divorcer* 'to divorce/get divorced'), like in EP, Spanish and Italian, do not require a plural subject, and so cannot be

---

22.   Again, PC in French was slightly marginal for the speakers I consulted.

easily tested. Of the class III verbs, those which are comitative can participate in PC and those which are not cannot, regardless of whether they are pronominal or not. Comitative verbs include *correspondre* 'to write', *se disputer* 'to argue', *converger* 'to converge' and *se réconcilier* 'to make up':[23]

(37) *Jean a   pardonné à Marie. Il s' est réconcilié *(avec elle).*
      Jean has forgiven to Marie he SE is made.up   with her

(38) *Jean a   pardonné à Marie. Il voudrait se réconcilier ?(avec elle)*
      Jean has forgiven to Marie he would.like SE make.up   with her
      'Jean has forgiven Marie. He would like to make up (with her).'

Like in EP and Spanish, and unlike in Italian, the verb 'to kiss' (*s'embrasser*) is not comitative in French, and hence fails to participate in PC:[24]

(39) **Ça fait   deux semaines que Jean sort   avec Marie,*
        that makes two   weeks   that Jean goes.out with Marie

      et   il voudrait   s'embrasser (avec elle) maintenant.
      and he would.like SE kiss   with her   now

3.3 Further support for the analysis

Further support for a covert comitative approach to these data comes from the pattern observed with 1st/2nd person controllers. Wherever a controller is 1st/2nd person, the SE-pronominal must share all the phi-features of that controller (the data are illustrated for EP, but Italian, Spanish and French pattern in the same way):

(40) a. *Preferias   reunir=te/*se/*nos   mais tarde?* [EP]
          prefer.2SG meet.INF=SE.2SG/SE/SE.1PL more late
          'Would you prefer to meet later on (with me/us/him/her/them)?'

---

23. An anonymous reviewer asks why such differences would exist and whether there is any semantic basis for them. I assume that languages simply carve up semantic notions semi-arbitrarily into lexical items with their associated grammar, giving rise to such differences.

24. An anonymous reviewer notes that the choice of control verb appears to affect the acceptability of the covert commitative/PC reading in such cases, providing the following examples:

   (i) *Jean adore Marie. Il est content de s'être marié   *?(avec elle).*
        Jean adores Marie. He is happy to SE be married   with her.

The fact that the matrix predicate is factive in (i) appears to be the relevant factor. Although factive predicates are classified as [+T] by Landau, they do display some interesting properties with respect to PC, which merit further research.

b. *Eu preferia   reunir=me/*se/*nos   mais   tarde.*
    I   preferred.1SG meet.INF=SE.1SG/SE/SE.1PL more   late
    'I preferred/would prefer to meet later.'

This is exactly what is predicted if (40a–b) are instances of EC with the addition of covert comitatives. As illustrated by the glosses for (40), moreover, the participants of the meeting event can have any person/number combination which includes the exhaustive controller. This again follows from a covert comitative account, but is potentially problematic for Landau's (2000, 2004) Agree-based approach (though see Landau 2013 for a possible account). As expected, the same effect is observed with 3SG controllers:

(41)   *O João preferia   reunir=se   às   6*   [EP]
       the João preferred.3SG meet.INF=SE at.the 6
       'João would prefer to meet at 6 (with me/us/him/her/them).'

Now consider what happens where the controller is 1PL:

(42)   *Nós preferiamos   reunir=nos/*se   mais   cedo*   [EP]
       we preferred.1PL meet.INF=SE.1PL/SE more   early
       'We would prefer to meet early (with him/her/you/them).'

As expected, the SE-pronominal (*nos*) must again share all of the features of its controller but a partial control reading is nonetheless optionally possible as *reunir-se* is a comitative predicate. The same cannot be said of PC in (American or British) English. In English, only the anaphor *oneself* is (marginally) possible in instances of PC, according to Landau:

(43)   *John$_i$ wondered [how PRO$_{i+}$ to talk to him$_i$ about oneself].
       (Landau 2000, 40)

If PC in English involved EC plus a covert comitative, then (44a) with an agreeing anaphor would be grammatical, contrary to fact:[25]

(44)   a.   *John wants PRO$_{i+}$ to reunite himself soon.
       b.   John wants to reunite himself with Mary soon.

Another way in which PC of an uninflected infinitive in EP patterns (at least partially) with EC is with respect to restructuring. Sheehan (2013) shows that PC with inflected infinitives is only possible with non-restructuring predicates.

---

25.   Hornstein (2003, 44) notes that the following example is possible in American English:

      (ii)   John wants to talk about himself all together at dinner tonight.

It is not clear what is different about this example, but it appears to be exceptional.

Landau (2000, 79–82) shows that, cross-linguistically, even where a restructuring predicate permits PC, PC is nonetheless incompatible with restructuring itself. In EP, however, PC with uninflected infinitives is compatible with clitic climbing for many speakers. A survey of 22 native speakers gave the following results:

(45)   %O   João   queria=se   reunir   às   6.
         the   João   wanted.3SG=SE   meet.INF at.the 6
         'João wanted/would like to meet at 6.' [*=11, ??=6, ✓=5]

Although there must be some independent reason why clitic climbing is not more generally acceptable in (45), the fact that it is acceptable for some speakers can again be taken as weak support for the position that it involves EC plus a covert comitative rather than 'true' PC.[26]

4.   Conclusions and remaining questions

It has been shown that many instances of PC in Romance plausibly involve EC with covert comitatives, as proposed by BHN (problematically) for English. The main evidence for this comes from the fact that PC is only possible with those embedded predicates which can be comitative. Further evidence comes from the behaviour of 1st/2nd person controllers and clitic climbing, which suggests that such examples actually involve EC. This does not solve the challenge posed by PC for the MTC, however, as PC in English and in EP (with inflected infinitives) cannot be analysed as involving EC. It does show, however, that some apparent instances of PC may be less problematic for the MTC than they first appear and that PC is not a uniform phenomenon cross-linguistically or even within a single language (e.g. EP).

Many questions remain, not least why covert commitatives should be limited to infinitival [+T] contexts in the way described. One way to implement this dependency is simply to stipulate that covert comitatives bear the following uninterpretable features [-fin, +T]. These features would then force a dependency between comitative *pro* and the functional head(s) in the clause bearing these features. In other clause types, one or both of these features would go unvalued and the derivation would therefore crash. While I can find no independent evidence

---

26.   An apparent problem is the claim in Landau (2000, 80, citing Martin 1996, 197–8 on Spanish) that clitic climbing is incompatible with PC in Italian and Spanish. The Spanish speakers I tested rejected clitic climbing in instances of PC, but some of the Italian speakers accepted it. Given interspeaker variation, this issue needs to be investigated quantitatively in Italian and Spanish. French lacks clitic climbing more generally.

for these features, a close link between adpositions and tense has previously been noted (cf. Pesetsky & Torrego 2004) and more generally it seems that null pronominals require "licensing" by functional heads, which in Minimalist terms means that Agree is involved. Why this should be the case remains unclear.

References

Alboiu, Gabriela. 2007. "Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising." In *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*, ed. by Stanley Dubinsky, and William Davies, 187–211. New York: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-6176-9_8

Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordachioaia, and Mihaela Marchis. 2010. "No Objections to Backwards Control." In *Movement Theory of Control*, ed. by Norbert Hornstein, and Maria Polinsky, 89–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.154.04ale

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2004. "Movement Under Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 431–452. DOI: 10.1162/0024389041402625

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2006a. "Control in Icelandic and Theories of Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 591–606. DOI: 10.1162/ling.2006.37.4.591

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2006b. "The Virtues of Control as Movement." *Syntax* 9: 118–130. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9612.2006.00086.x

Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010. *Control as Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511761997

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. "Movement and Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69–96. DOI: 10.1162/002438999553968

Landau, Idan. 1999. *Elements of Control*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*: Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. Dordrecht; Boston, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Landau, Idan. 2003. "Movement Out of Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 34 (3): 471–498. DOI: 10.1162/002438903322247560

Landau, Idan. 2004. "The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22 (4): 811–877. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-004-4265-5

Landau, Idan. 2007. "Movement Resistant Aspects of Control." *NLLT* 71: 293–325.

Landau, Idan. 2013. "Agreement at PF: An Argument from Partial Control." Unpublished ms. Available at http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001813.

Lawler, John. 1972. "A Problem in Participatory Democracy." *Studies in Generative Semantics* II.

Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: a Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.

Martin, Roger Andrew. 1996. *A Minimalist Theory of PRO and Control*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Modesto, Marcello. 2010. "What Brazilian Portuguese Says about Control: Remarks on Boeckx & Hornstein." *Syntax* 13: 78–96. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9612.2009.00136.x

Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2004. "Tense, Case, and the Nature of Syntactic Categories." In *The Syntax of Time*, ed. by Jacqueline Gueron, and Jacqueline Lecarme, 495–537. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rodrigues, Cilene, and Norbert Hornstein. 2013. "Epicene Agreement and Inflected Infinitives When the Data is "Under Control": a Reply to Modesto (2010)." *Syntax* 16 (3): 292–309. DOI: 10.1111/synt.12006

Sauerland, Uli, and Elbourne, Paul. 2002. "Total Reconstruction, PF Movement, and Derivational Order." *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 283–319. DOI: 10.1162/002438902317406722

Sheehan, Michelle. 2012. "A New Take on Partial Control: Defective Thematic Intervention." *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6: 1–47.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2013. "Portuguese, Russian and the Theory of Control." To appear in the *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society 43.*

Varlokosta, Spyridoula. 1994. *Issues on Modern Greek Sentential Complementation.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland.