_____

The case for fake partial control in French and German (and English)
Marcel Pitteroff (University of Stuttgart) & Michelle Sheehan (Anglia Ruskin University)

Main claims

- There are two distinct ways to get to an apparent partial control (PC) reading. One involves **true PC** but the other involves **fake PC** (exhaustive control with a covert comitative).

- New diagnostics show **PRO in fake PC is syntactically and semantically singular**.

- **French has only fake PC**, whereas **German (like English) has both fake and true PC**.

1   Background: partial control
Reciprocal predicates like *meet* usually require a semantically plural subject:

(1) a.   *John met at 9 this morning.
  b.   *John will meet at 9 tomorrow.
  c.   The team met at 9 this morning.
  d.   The lovers met in Paris.

- In some control contexts, these predicates can be controlled by a semantically singular subject, giving rise to 'partial control'.

Partial control: **a form of obligatory control, where PRO is a superset of the controller** (see Wilkinson 1971, Landau 2000 and many others)

(2) a. $John_1$ wants [PRO_{1+} to meet at 9am (*without him_1)]
  b. $John_1$ persuaded $Mary_2$ [PRO_{2+} to meet at 9am (*without her_2)]
  c. $John_1$ promised Mary [PRO_{1+} to meet at 9am (*without him_1)]
  d. $John_1$ asked $Mary_2$ [$PRO_{1+/2+}$ to meet at 9am]
  e.   It is annoying (*for pro_1*) [PRO_{1+} to meet at 9am]

Landau (1999, 2000, 2004) shows that PC is sensitive to the **matrix predicate**:

- **exhaustive control (EC) predicates** (aspectual, implicative, modal), which allow only EC;
- **PC predicates** (desideratives, factives, interrogatives, epistemics), which allow either exhaustive or partial control.

(3) a.   *$John_1$ started [PRO_{1+} to meet at 9].
  b.   *$John_1$ managed [PRO_{1+} to meet at 9].
  c.   *$John_1$ tried [PRO_{1+} to meet at 9].

Pearson (2015) claims that this reduces to the distinction between **attitude and non-attitude predicates** (see Landau 2015 for a control theory that adopts this distinction).

- A correlated property: PC predicates select non-finite complements with covert future modals (but see Pearson 2015 for some complications):

(4) a. *Yesterday John started/managed/tried to leave today.
  b. Yesterday John wanted/promised/asked to leave today.

2   Fake partial control in French: previous work

Landau (2000) claims that French, like Spanish and Italian has partial control.

- He further notes, however, that there are restrictions in French regarding which embedded predicates can surface in instances of PC:

(5) a. * 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.'
    b.   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)

- ➢ He proposes that PC is banned in French with pronominal verbs (marked with SE).

Sheehan (2012, 2014a, b, 2017a, b): there are **two distinct kinds of PC crosslinguistically and French has only one of them**:

A. **True partial control**: possible with any embedded predicate, but **restricted to matrix PC predicates** (attested in European and Brazilian Portuguese with inflected infinitives, and in Russian and Icelandic with case independence - see also Modesto 2010, 2016)

B. **Fake partial control**: limited to embedded predicates undergoing the **comitative alternation** (attested in French, Italian, Spanish and European and Brazilian Portuguese with **uninflected infinitives**)

Many inherently reciprocal verbs requiring a semantically plural subject participate in a **comitative alternation** (called a "discontinuous reciprocal construction" by Siloni 2012):

(6) a. [Sam and Kim] met.   reciprocal form
    b. [Sam] met [**with** Kim].   comitative alternation

- These reciprocal **[+COM]** verbs do not always require a plural subject.

In French (and other Romance languages) reciprocalisation is (often) **syntactically derived** through the addition of SE, and so is highly productive:

(7) Sam et   Kim se   sont vus/   écrits/   aimés.
    Sam and   Kim SE are   seen.PL/ written.PL/loved.PL
    'Sam and Kim saw each other/wrote to each other/loved each other.'

- Nonetheless, only **a subset of such verbs are [+COM]** on a reciprocal reading, subject to low-level lexical variation across languages.

Sheehan (2014a): In French, only **[+COM]** verbs occur in PC contexts.

(8) a. Marie **correspond** avec son copain.   **[+COM]**
        M   **corresponds** with her boyfriend
        'Marie **corresponds** with her boyfriend.'
    b. ?Marie lui   manque beaucoup. C'est   pour ça que Jean veut
        Marie him.DAT misses   much.   This.is for that that Jean wants
        correspondre tous les jours.
        write   all   the days
        'He misses Marie a lot. That's why Jean wants to **correspond** every day.'

_____

(9) a. Marie **s'est réconciliée** avec son père.   **[+COM]**
        M   **SE=is reconciled**   with her father
        'Marie made up with her father.'
    b. Kim a   pardonné à Jean.   Elle voudrait **se réconcilier**.
        Kim has forgiven to Jean   she would.like **SE=make.up**
        'Kim has forgiven Jean. She would like to **make up**.'

(10) a. *Jean **s'est embrassé** avec Marie hier.   **[-COM]**
        J   **SE=is kissed**   with Marie yesterday
     b. *Ça fait   deux semaines que Jean sort   avec Marie,
        that makes two weeks   that Jean goes.out with Marie
        et il   voudrait **s'embrasser** maintenant.
        and he   would.like **SE=kiss**   now
        'Jean's been going out with Marie for two weeks now and he would like to **kiss** soon.'

(11) a. *Marie **s'est rencontrée/retrouvée** avec   Jean.   **[-COM]**
        Marie SE=is **met   met**   with   J
     b. *Marie a   dit à Jean   qu' elle veut **se retrouver** à 6 heures. (see also (5a) above)
        Marie has said to Jean that she wants **SE=meet**   at 6 hours
        'Marie told John that she wants to **meet** at 6.'

Authier and Reed (2017a, b): *se réunir* 'to meet' behaves differently from the other French verbs
meaning 'to meet' in this regard:

(12) a. Eric **s'est   réuni**   avec ses amis.   **[+COM]**
        Eric **SE=is   met**   with his friends
        'Eric met with his friends.'
     b. Eric voulait [**se réunir** dans la cuisine].
        Eric wanted **SE=meet** in   the kitchen
        'Eric wanted to **meet** in the kitchen.' (example (3) in Authier and Reed 2017a)

They further note that *se battre/s'entendre* which, as Siloni (2008, 2012) notes, have both a **regular
meaning** derived from the transitive verb and an **idiosyncratic** 'lexical' meaning (13a), retain only
the idiosyncratic reading in both the comitative alteration (13b) and PC contexts (14):

(13) a. Paul et   son père   **s'entendaient** mal.
        Paul and his father **SE=heard.3PL** poorly
        'Paul and his father **got along** poorly.'   (lexical reciprocal=**idiosyncratic**)
        'Paul and his father could barely **hear each other**.'   (syntactic reciprocal= **regular**)
     b. Paul **s'entendait**   mal   avec son père.   **[+COM]**
        Paul **SE=heard.3SG** poorly with his father
        'Paul **got along** poorly with his father.'   (**idiosyncratic only**)
                                                         (example (23) from Authier and Reed 2017a)

(14) a. Il$_j$ se rappelle [**s'être entendu** là-dessus] (avant de signer le contrat). (**idiosyncratic**)
        He SE=remembers **SE=be agreed**   there-upon before of sign.INF the contract
        'He remembers **agreeing** on this (prior to signing the contract).'
     b. *Il$_j$ se rappelle [PRO$_{j+}$ **s'être entendu** à travers le mur de sa chambre].
        He SE=remembers   **SE=be heard**   at through the wall of the bedroom
        Lit.'He remembers **hearing one another** through his bedroom wall.'
                                                         (example (22) from Authier and Reed 2017a)

Proposal: the French examples do not involve true partial control, but rather a kind of '**fake partial control**'.

Possible (descriptive) analysis: exhaustive control with a covert comitative (see Boeckx et al. 2010).

(15) **Marie_i** voulait [**PRO_i** se réunir *pro*_{comitative} dans la cuisine]
     Marie   wanted   SE=meet   in   the kitchen

    <u>Aside:</u> We are not dedicated to an analysis of fake PC as involving a syntactically present covert comitative. Our main aim is to show that this alternative way of arriving at a PC reading exists.

Landau (2016) argues that fake PC does not exist, claiming that PRO is never singular in potential fake PC contexts (i.e. contexts where the embedded predicate licenses comitative PPs).

Before providing new evidence in favor of fake PC, we review and discuss Landau's arguments.

3 Landau's (2016) critique

Landau (2016) argues against the existence of *fake PC*.[1]

- PRO in French PC, he claims, does not behave as singular (Landau 2016: 17):

(i)   It cannot bind a singular 'personal reflexive' (16a);
(ii)   It does not license the NP-dependent reading of *séparément* 'separately' (16b);
(iii)   It cannot license a singular secondary predicate (16c).

(16) a. Jean a dit à Marie qu'il préférait ne pas se réconcilier (***lui-même**) ce soir.
       John has said to Mary that-he preferred NEG not SE reconcile   himself   this evening
       'John said to Mary that he preferred not to reconcile (*himself) tonight.'
   b. Marie a dit à son père et à sa mère   qu'elle   préfèrerait se réconcilier
       Mary has said to her father and to her mother   that.she   preferred SE to.reconcile
       (***séparément**) avant Noël.
       (separately)   before Christmas
       'Mary told her father and her mother that she preferred to reconcile (*separately) before Christmas.'
       [the relevant reading is the one where she holds separate meetings with the two parents]
   c. Jean a dit à Marie qu'il   était content de se promener ensemble, enfin,
       John has said to Mary that.he   was happy   to-have-a-walk together   finally
       (***en homme libre**).
       (as man   free)
       'John told Mary that he was happy to finally have a walk together (*as a free man).'

We argue that there are issues with all of these examples and arguments.

3.1 Singular personal reflexives

(16a) remains strange even if an overt comitative is added, where PRO is undeniably singular (tested on four speakers):

---

[1] It is a bit unclear, however, how he proposes to analyse PC. His initial approach was to say that it involves cases where PRO behaves like a group noun (Landau 1999, 2000). In his recent monograph on control, PC is notable for its absence (Landau 2015). In more recent work, he has proposed that it comes about because of the presence of an associative marker (Landau 2016a).

_____

(17) */??/OK Jean a   dit à Marie qu'il   préférait ne   pas se réconcilier **lui-même** avec
          Jean has said to Marie that he   preferred NEG NEG SE make.up   him-same with
     elle ce soir.
     her this evening

- Even in the comitative construction, the presence of *lui-même* is strange.

- The personal reflexive implies that Jean has control over 'making up', and he does not.

➢ For the argument to go through, we need minimal pairs where *lui-même* is grammatical with an overt comitative and not without. We have not been able to find any such example.[2]

3.2 NP-dependent reading of *séparément* 'separately'

In relation to (16b), Landau also fails to provide the baseline showing that these examples work with an overt comitative. It turns out there is sensitivity to the **type of overt comitative**.

We tested this reading of *séparément* experimentally with different kinds of overt comitatives vs. PC as part of a larger online survey containing 24 test questions and 20 fillers in random order (n=38) (see 4.1). All examples were provided in the same context, forcing an NP-dependent reading.

Contexte : Les parents de Marie ont récemment divorcé et Marie essaye d'éviter qu'ils soient dans la même salle. Elle doit diner avec eux deux pour fêter son anniversaire.

Context : Marie's parents recently got divorced and Marie is trying to avoid them being in the same room. She must have dinner with both of them to celebrate her birthday.

(18) Marie a   dit qu'elle préférerait   diner séparément **avec sa mère et   son père**.
     Marie has said that she prefer.COND dine   separately   with her mother and her father
     'Marie said that she would prefer to have dinner separately with her mother and father.'
                                                              (item mean 5.50 ; SD 1.76)
(19) ?Marie a   dit qu'elle préférerait   diner séparément **avec ses parents**.
      Marie has said that she prefer.COND dine   separately   with her parents
     'Marie said that she would prefer to have dinner separately with her parents.'
                                                              (item mean : 3.34, SD 2.58)
(20) ?Marie a   dit à ses parents divorcés qu'elle préférerait   diner séparément **avec eux**.
      Marie has said to her parents divorced that she prefer.COND dine   separately   with them
     'Marie said to her divorced parents that she would prefer to have dinner separately with them.'
                                                              (item mean : 4.43 ; SD 2.3)
(21) ?Marie leur   a   dit qu'elle préférerait   diner séparément.
      Marie them=has said that she prefer.COND dine separately
     'Marie said that she would prefer to dine separately.'   **(item mean : 3.53, SD : 2.41)**

The NP-dependent reading is only widely accepted with an overt comitative containing a co-ordination (18).

All of the other sentences receive similar scores, supporting the covert comitative approach.

_____

[2] Furthermore, *lui-même* appears to be compatible with group noun subjects (*Finalement, le couple s'est réconcilié (lui-même)*; Fabienne Martin, p.c.). Thus, even if (16a) were a case of true PC, as Landau argues, the unacceptability of *lui-même* would remain unexpected his original analysis.

The PC example in (21) is acceptable (5-7 on an 8-point Likert-scale) for 15 speakers, marginal (3-4) for 8 and ungrammatical for the rest. It has a similar profile to (19) and (20)).

3.3 Singular secondary predicates

- **Other singular secondary predicates are permitted in both comitative and PC contexts**, based on judgments from four speakers:[3]

(22) Jean a   dit   à Marie qu'il   espérait se   réconcilier (avec elle) en bon ami.
     Jean has said to Marie that-he hoped   SE make.up.INF with her   in good friend
     'Jean told Marie that he hoped to make up (with her) as friends.'

Authier and Reed (2017b) show that this holds for **embedded depictives**:

(23) Manon$_j$ se   rappelle [PRO$_{j+}$ s'être   réunie   **soûle**/*soûls].
      Manon SE remembers   3SG-be met.F.SG   **drunk.F.SG**/*F.PL
      'Manon remembers meeting **drunk**.'   (example (28) in Authier and Reed 2017b)

Crucially, as they note, not only is *soûle* (like the past participle) inflected as F.SG, **it also only has the interpretation whereby Manon alone was drunk at this meeting**. This is unexpected if (23) involves true PC, i.e. if PRO is syntactically/semantically plural.

➢ The morphological and semantic properties of the depictive speak in favor of fake PC.

What about Landau's (16c) example, repeated here?

(16) c. Jean a   dit à Marie qu'il   était content de se promener ensemble, enfin,
         John has said to Mary that.he   was happy   to-have-a-walk together   finally
         (***en homme libre**).
         (as man   free)
         'John told Mary that he was happy to finally have a walk together (*as a free man).'

Adding an overt comitative to (16c) is stylistically marked, as *ensemble* does not combine with *avec* in Standard French.

(24) ?Jean a   dit à Marie qu'il   était content de se promener **ensemble avec elle** en homme
     Jean has said à Marie that he was   happy   of SE walk   together   **with her** in man
     libre.
     free
     'Jean told Marie that he was happy to take a walk with her as a free man.'

☞ **Landau's example involves a non-reciprocal, non-comitative embedded predicate, where PC is triggered by the presence of *ensemble* 'together'**. Note that *se promener* 'to walk' is not a reciprocal verb, and it allows a singular subject.

This **kind of PC is much less acceptable than PC with [+COM] verbs**. The four parallel examples in our experiment got a mean acceptability rate of only **2.14** (n=38):

_____

[3] Interestingly, the following is also more marginally acceptable for 3/4 speakers:
   (i) ?Le couple s'est réconcilié en bon ami.
         the couple SE-is reconciled in good friend
         'The couple made up as friends.'

_____

Contexte : Jean vit tout seul comme sa voisine, Marie. Un jour, ils se parlent dans la rue et…
Context : Jean lives all alone like his neighbour, Marie. One day, they are speaking in the street and…

(25) Marie dit   à Jean qu'elle serait   contente de se promener ensemble de   temps en temps.
 Marie says to Jean that she be.COND happy   of SE=walk   together from time   on time
 Marie says to Jean that she would be happy to walk together from time to time'

(item mean: 2.61; SD: 2.16)

> ➢ Predicates marked with *ensemble* 'together' do not generally permit PC in French.

> ➢ This may be due to the fact that *ensemble* does not combine with a comitative in Standard French (though it does in some non-standard varieties).[4]

> ➢ There are confounds in Landau's example.

4   New evidence for fake PC from French

4.1   Insensitivity to the matrix predicate

Contrary to what was claimed in Sheehan (2014a), experimental data from online surveys shows that, in French, **PC is possible with both EC and PC matrix predicates**, though it is more acceptable with PC predicates.[5]

(26) **Study Design** (following Pitteroff et al 2017a, b)
  Task: Acceptability Judgment Task; 8-point Likert scale (0=unacceptable; 7=acceptable)
  Participants: 38 French native speakers
  Test Items: belong to 4 classes, depending on the value of the two variables (matrix & embedded predicate):
   (1) EC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate (-COM)
   (2) EC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate (+COM)
   (3) PC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate
   (4) PC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate

- All test items were provided in a context which made the intended plurality of PRO contextually salient, and in random order.

- 24 test items (of which 12 tested PC/EC, +/-COM) and 20 fillers giving 44 sentences in total.

Result: All three sets showed the same profile, though acceptability of individual examples varied.

(27) [PC, +COM] > [EC, +COM] > *[EC/PC, -COM]

_____

[4] See the Académie Française's pronouncement on the issue: http://www.academie-francaise.fr/ensemble-avec
[5] EC predicates : *essayer* 'try', *avoir pu* 'manage', *arrêter* 'stop'. PC predicates : *espérer* 'hope', *préférer* 'prefer', *penser* 'think', *vouloir*, *avoir envie* 'want'.

_____

Table 4: Mean acceptability of Matrix and Embedded Predicate in French (n=38)[6]

	+COM	-COM
EC	3.60	0.84
PC	5.16	1.02

Contexte : Pierre et sa copine se disputent très souvent à propos de la politique, comme aujourd'hui.
Context : Pierre and his girlfriend very often argue about politics, like today:

(28) Mais cette fois-ci,   Pierre   ne   veut   plus se disputer.   **[PC; +COM]**
      but   this time-here Pierre   NEG wants more SE=argue
      'But this time, Pierre does not want to argue with each other.'   **(item mean: 6.16, SD: 1.57)**

(29) Mais cette fois-ci,   Pierre   va   arrêter de   se disputer.   **[EC; +COM]**
      but   this time-here Pierre   goes stop   of   SE=argue
      'But this time, Pierre is going to stop arguing with each other.'   **(item mean: 4.03, SD: 2.42)**

(30) *Mais cette fois-ci,   Pierre va   arrêter de se crier   dessus.   **[EC; -COM]**
       but   this time-here Pierre goes stop   of SE=shout over
      'But this time, Pierre is going to stop shouting at each other.'   **(item mean: 0.47, SD: 0.51)**

(31) *Mais cette fois-ci,   Pierre ne   veut pas se crier   dessus.   **[PC; -COM]**
       but   this time-here Pierre NEG wants not SE=shout over
      'But this time, Pierre does not want to shout at each other.'   **(item mean: 0.82, SD: 0.93)**

Our results show that, in French, **PC readings are acceptable as long as the embedded predicate is comitative**.[7]

- The PC/EC distinction is generally taken to be deep and semantically based (see Landau 2000, 2015, 2016; Pearson 2015). **No matter how *true PC* is ultimately derived, the mechanism is not expected to apply in the context of EC-type matrix predicates.**

- Given that French displays an additional sensitivity to comitativity (see section 2), it is more attractive to take **French PC to be fake (e.g., EC with a covert comitative)**.

4.2   First and second person reflexives
The phi-features of SE can be used as a diagnostic for the features of PRO.

Sheehan (2014a) claims that, in French, **a first or second person singular controller in a PC-context requires a first or second person singular embedded reflexive**.

This is strongly supported by preliminary experimental results (n=9-12):

_____

[6] We are in the process of carrying out statistical analysis of these results.
[7] Note that the acceptability of [EC, +COM] is numerically lower than the German and English results discussed below. We are yet to calculate z-scores but this is probably due to the fact that the French surveys used an 8-point scale starting at 0, whereas the German and English surveys used a 7-point scale starting at 1 (see fn. 3).

_____

Contexte : Claudia et son mari se sont disputés et Claudia s'en sent coupable. Elle dit à son mari :
Context : Claudia and her husband have argued and Claudia feels guilty. She says to her husband:

(32) Je veux   absolument **me/   *nous /*se**   réconcilier.
     I   want   absolutely **SE.1SG/ SE.1PL/SE.3** make.up.INF
     'I really want to make up.'   **(item means: 5.36/2.22/0)**

Contexte : Pierre et sa femme vont divorcer. Jean, leur ami, n'en est pas surpris. Il dit à Pierre :
Context: Pierre and his wife are getting divorced. Jean, their friend, is not surprised. He says to Pierre:

(33) J'imagine que tu   n'avais   plus envie de **te/*se/*vous**   disputer.
     I imagine that you NEG had more desire of **SE.2SG/SE.2PL/SE.3**   argue
     'I imagine that you didn't want to argue anymore.'   **(item means 6.25/1.89/0.11)**

These facts follow immediately if French PC involves exhaustive control plus a covert comitative so that **PRO is singular and shares the full feature specification of its controller**:

(34) **Je$_i$ veux** absolument [**PRO$_i$ me** réconcilier *pro$_{comitative}$*]

n.b. Landau (2017b) provides a potential account of this pattern. We return to this in section 6.1.

4.3   Animacy and non-symmetrical events

In English, the comitative alternation denotes a potentially asymmetrical event, unlike reciprocal verbs, which always denote symmetrical events (data the English survey described in the appendix).

Context: Jim is cycling along distracted when he suddenly sees a tree in front of him.

(35) *Before Jim can do anything, [they] collide head on**. [PL subject] (Item mean: 3.00, SD: 1.49)**
(36) Before Jim can do anything, he collides with it head on. [**COM**]   **(Item mean: 5.84, SD:1.55)**

French appears to have the same contrast.

Contexte : Jean aime regarder les oiseaux quand il fait du vélo. Il y a quelques jours, il faisait du vélo dans le bois, distrait, quand, soudain, il a vu (i) un arbre/(ii) quelqu'un devant lui.

Context: Jean likes looking at birds when he is cycling. A few days ago, he was cycling in the woods distracted when he suddenly saw (i) a tree/(ii) someone in front of him.

(37) #Il n' a   pas eu le temps de s'arrêter donc Jean et l'arbre sont entrés en collision.
     he NEG has not had the time of SE stop   so   Jean and the tree are entered in collision
     'He didn't have time to stop so Jean and the tree collided.' **[PL subject]**
                                                                 (item mean: 3.88, SD: 2.85)

PC containing collide are not sensitive to the tree/human distinction:

(38) Il a   du faire   une embardée à gauche parce qu'il ne   voulait pas entrer en   collision.
     he has had to make a   detour   to left   because he NEG wanted not enter   into collision
     'He was obliged to swerve to the left as he didn't want to crash.'
                        (item means: tree (i) 5, SD 1.87; human (ii) 5.6, SD 1.85)

This follows if PC involves **fake PC** with a covert comitative rather than a plural PRO (**true PC**)**.**

4.4 Subject-oriented adjunct-clauses/adverbs[8]

Our final diagnostic concerns the scope of subject-oriented adverbs.

All of the French participants who accepted examples like (39a) in context also reported the meaning to be as in (39b), whereby **Pierre alone acts as the controller of PRO**:

[PC, +COM]

Contexte : Pierre et Sylvie se sont disputés.
'Context: Pierre and Sylvie have had an argument.'

(39) a. Cette fois Pierre espère se réconcilier, sans devoir s'expliquer sur tout.
    this time Pierre hopes SE make.up without must SE explain on all
    'This time Pierre hopes to make up without having to explain everything.'
 b. Pierre espère se réconcilier sans qu'**il** (ne) doive s'expliquer sur tout.   **(15/15)**
    'Pierre hopes to make up without him having to explain everything.'
 c. #Pierre espère se réconcilier sans que **Sylvie et lui** (ne) doivent s'expliquer sur tout. (0)
    'Pierre hopes to make up without Sylve and him having to explain everything,'
 d. #Pierre espère se réconcilier sans que **Sylvie** (ne) doivent s'expliquer sur tout. (0)
    'Perre hopes to make up without Sylvie having to explain everything.'
 e. Cette phrase n'est pas acceptable pour moi! (0)
    'This sentences is not acceptable for me.'

Contexte : Claudia et son mari se sont disputés et Claudia s'en sent toujours coupable.
'Context : Claudia and her husband have argued and Claudia is feeling guilty about it.'

(40) a. Elle pense se réconcilier volontiers lorsque son mari s'excusera.
    she thinks SE make.up willingly when her husband SE=excuse.FUT
    'She plans to make up willingly when her husband apologises.'
 b. Claudia se réconciliera volontiers avec son mari **(8/11)**
 c. Cette phrase n'est pas acceptable pour moi! (3/11)
    'This sentences is not acceptable for me.'

The same pattern was observed with EC matrix predicates, wherever a partial control reading was accepted:

[EC, +COM]

Contexte : Pierre et sa copine ont l'habitude de se disputer à propos de rien. D'habitude, Pierre s'énerve beaucoup et la dispute a tendance à s'aggraver.
'Context : Pierre and his girlfriend have a tendency to argue about nothing. Usually, Pierre gets really annoyed and the argument gets serious.'

(41) a. Cette fois-ci, Pierre essaye de se disputer sans trop se fâcher.
    this time-here Pierre tried of SE=argue without too.much anger
 b. Pierre essaye de se disputer sans qu'il (ne) se fâche trop lui-même. **(10/12)**
    'Pierre tries to argue without getting too angry himself.'
 c. Cette phrase n'est pas acceptable pour moi! (2/11)
    'This sentences is not acceptable for me.'

_____

[8] We have to admit a potential caveat with this diagnostic. Landau (2017) argues that control into adjunct clauses is sometimes NOC. Our examples, however, appear to involve OC.

_____

Contexte : Richard et Lucie se sont disputés et Lucie ne pardonne pas facilement.
'Context: Richard and Lucie have argued and Lucy does not forgive easily.'

(42) a. Cette fois-ci, Richard a pu se réconcilier sans devoir s'expliquer sur tout.
         This time-here Richard has managed SE make.up without must SE explain on all.
         'Richard has managed to make up without having to explain everything.'
     b. Richard a pu se réconcilier sans qu'**il** (ne) doive s'expliquer pour tout. **(8/9)**
         'Richard managed to make up without having to explain everything.'
     c. #Richard a pu se réconcilier sans que **Lucie et lui** (ne) doivent s'expliquer pour tout.(0)
     d. Cette phrase n'est pas acceptable pour moi! (1/9)
         'This sentences is not acceptable for me.'

- This strongly suggests that **PRO is semantically singular in such contexts**, as is predicted by the covert comitative approach.

Recall also in this connection the data involving depictives from Authier and Reed (2017b) ((23), repeated here. Crucially, the embedded depictive must be interpreted in such a way that **Manon alone was drunk at this meeting**, i.e. that PRO is semantically singular:

(23) Manon$_j$ se   rappelle [PRO$_{j+}$ s'être   réunie **soûle**/*soûls].
     Manon SE remembers   3SG-be met.   **drunkF.SG**/drunk.F.SG
     'Manon remembers meeting **drunk**.'   (example (28) in Authier and Reed 2017b)

5   The more complex situation in German: previous work

Pitteroff et al. (2017a,b) provide the first experimental investigation of **partial control in German**.

(43) **Study Design**
     Task: Acceptability Judgment Task; 7-point Likert scale (1=unacceptable; 7=acceptable)
     Participants: 102 German native speakers
     Test Items: belong to 4 classes, depending on the value of the two variables (matrix & embedded predicate):
          (5) EC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate (-COM)
          (6) EC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate (+COM)
          (7) PC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate
          (8) PC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate

- All test items were provided including a context, which in the relevant cases made the intended plurality of PRO contextually salient.

- 30 test items were distributed across two questionnaires. 25 filler sentences were added to a total of 40 sentences per questionnaire.

Results: German makes available **two mechanisms to derive a partial control reading**: true *and* fake PC:

Table 3: Mean acceptability of test stimuli by Matrix and Embedded Predicate in German

	+COM	-COM
EC	5.23 (0.40)	2.62 (0.40)
PC	5.86 (0.25)	4.38 (0.26)

- **[EC, +COM] (44a)**: high degree of acceptability is clear **evidence in favour of** *fake PC*; *true PC* is ruled out by the matrix predicate.

(44) a. Hans versucht, sich bis   Weihnachten wieder zu versöhnen.   **[EC, +COM]**
       Hans tries   SE   until Christmas   again to reconcile
       'Hans tries to reconcile by Christmas.'   **(item mean: 5.81, SE: 0.22)**
   b. Hans versucht, sich den Ball zuzuspielen.   **[EC, -COM]**
       Hans tries   SE   the ball to.pass.INF
       'Hans tries to pass the ball to each other.'   **(item mean: 2.57, SE: 0.29)**

- **[EC, -COM] (44b; 45b)**: neither *true* nor *fake PC*; former is ruled out by the matrix predicate, the latter by the embedded predicate. No way a PC-reading can be derived -> **unacceptability**

- **[PC, -COM] (45a)**: intermediate degree of acceptability signals the **marked, but acceptable status of** *true PC* **in German**; *fake PC* is ruled out by the embedded predicate.

(45) a. Silvy beschließt, sich wieder zu begrüßen.   **[PC, -COM]**
       Silvy decides   SE again to greet.INF
       'Silvy decides to greet each other again.'   **(item mean: 4.42; SE. 0.26)**
   b. Harald hat angefangen, sich zu begrüßen.   **[EC, -COM]**
       Harald has begun   SE   to greet.INF
       'Harald has begun to great each other.'   **(item mean: 1.73; SE: 0.16)**

- **[PC, +COM] (46)**: sentences of this type generally received the **highest ratings**, just as we found for French.

(46) Peter befürchtet, sich   bei diesem Thema wieder zu verkrachen.   **[PC, +COM]**
     Peter fears   SE   with this   topic   again   to quarrel.INF
     'Peter is afraid to quarrel again because of this topic.'   **(item mean: 5.77; SE: 0.22)**

> **Conclusion**: The acceptability of **[EC, +COM]** sentences supports the existence of *fake PC* in German. The acceptability of **[PC, -COM]** sentences supports the existence of *true PC in German.*

6   New evidence for fake PC in German

6.1   First and second person reflexives

Recall the French patterns from section 4.2 (32), repeated here:

(32) Je veux   absolument **me/   *nous /*se**   réconcilier.
    I want   absolutely SE.1SG/ SE.1PL/SE.3 make.up.INF
    'I really want to make up.'   **(item means: 5.36/2.22/0)**

_____

> **Note:** Landau (2016a) proposes to analyze such examples as involving *true PC*, revising his earlier account of PC somewhat. On this new approach, PRO itself is singular, and the plurality in PC arises due to a VP-adjoined *associative morpheme*.

German casts doubt on such a solution (i.e. the reduction of fake to true PC) and provides evidence that there must be two <u>different </u>ways to derive a PC-reading.

Pitteroff et al. (2017b) introspectively observe the following contrast:

(47) a. Du versprichst mir also, **?euch/*dich** heute abend zu küssen?   **[PC, -COM]**
    you promise me thus **SE.2PL/2SG** today evening to kiss
    'So you promise me to kiss each other tonight?'
  b. Du versuchst also, **?dich/*euch** rechtzeitig zu treffen?   **[EC, +COM]**
    you try thus **SE.2SG/2PL** in.time   to meet
    'So you try to meet each other in time?'

- This suggests that in **true PC PRO is plural**, whereas, in **fake PC PRO is singular**
- Modesto (2010) and Sheehan (2017a, b) show similar syntactic number mismatches in PC-contexts in other languages, e.g. Portuguese, Icelandic:

(48) %Hann bað Ólaf [að PRO$_{NOM}$ hittast **einir**]   (Sheehan 2017b)
    he asked Olaf.ACC to   meet.ST alone.NOM.M.PL
    'He asked Olaf to meet alone.PL.'

- We investigated the claim that *true* and *fake PC* correlate with a difference in the number feature of the embedded reflexive (and thus, PRO) by **comparing [EC, +COM] and [PC, -COM]-sentences** in contexts where **the embedded reflexive is either an agreeing singular reflexive, or a non-agreeing plural one**.

(49) **Study Design**
    Task: Acceptability Judgment Task; 7-point Likert scale (1=unacceptable; 7=acceptable)
    Participants: 70 German native speakers
    Test Items: belong to 4 classes:
        (1) EC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate (+COM); SE.SG
        (2) EC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate (+COM); SE.PL
        (3) PC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate (-COM); SE.SG
        (4) PC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate (-COM); SE.PL

- All test items were provided with a **first or second person singular controller** and included a context, which in the relevant cases made the intended plurality of PRO contextually salient.

- 20 test items were distributed across two questionnaires. 20 filler sentences were added to a total of 30 sentences per questionnaire.

Results:[9]

- Participants used the 7-point scale as expected:

_____
[9] Many thanks to Jeannique Darby for her statistical help.

Table 5: Raw means and z-scores for filler items

	Mean raw rating (SE)	**Mean z-score (SE)**
Good fillers	6.27 (0.06)	1.06 (0.02)
Intermediate fillers	4.30 (0.09)	0.22 (0.03)
Bad fillers	1.26 (0.03)	-1.05 (0.01)

- **[EC, +COM] was significantly better with an embedded singular reflexive** (significance at p<0.016).

Table 6: Raw means and z-scores for [EC, +COM] test items

	Mean raw rating (SE)	**Mean z-score (SE)**
[EC, +COM]; SG	4.49 (0.16)	0.29 (0.06)
[EC, +COM]; PL	2.76 (0.13)	-0.41 (0.05)
Difference	1.72, t(362.3) = 8.36, p < .0001	0.69, t(367.0) = 9.36, p < .0001

- **[PC, -COM] was significantly better with an embedded plural reflexive** (see also Gerstner 2017) (general acceptability of these test items was low, but still higher than the ungrammatical fillers; we speculate this has to do with the controller being non-third person).

Table 7: Raw means and z-scores for [PC, -COM] test items

	Mean raw rating (SE)	**Mean z-score (SE)**
[PC, -COM]; SG	2.12 (0.12)	-0.67 (0.05)
[PC, -COM]; PL	3.13 (0.16)	-0.27 (0.06)
Difference	-1.01, t(343.7) = -5.17, p < .0001	-0.40, t(356.7) = -5.30, p < .0001

(50) **[EC, +COM]**

Kontext: Paul hat sich regelmäßig mit seiner Exfreundin getroffen, was seiner Ehefrau aber nicht passte. Gestern sagte sie zu ihm:

'Paul regularly met his ex-girlfriend, which annoyed his wife. Yesterday she told him:'

a. Ich hoffe, **du** hast jetzt aufgehört, **dich** zu verabreden.
I hope **you.2SG** have now stopped **SE.2SG** to make.a.date
'I hope you have stopped making dates (with her).' **(raw mean: 6.31)**

b. Ich hoffe, **du** hast jetzt aufgehört, **euch** zu verabreden.
I hope **you.2sg** have now stopped **SE.2PL** to make.a.date
'I hope you have stopped making dates (with her).' **(raw mean: 1.91)**

(51) **[PC, -COM]**

Kontext: Du hast einen Arbeitskollegen in deinem Team, ihr könnt euch jedoch nicht ausstehen. Dein bester Freund gibt Dir einen guten Rat.

'There is a colleague of yours and you just can't stand each other. Your best friend, however, gives you a good piece of advice:'

a. Er hat **dir** empfohlen, **dich** wenigstens zu begrüßen.
He has **you.2SG** recommended **SE.2SG** at.least to greet
'He gave you the recommendation to at least greet (your colleague).' **(raw mean: 2.11)**

_____

    b. Er hat **dir**   empfohlen,   **euch**   wenigstens   zu begrüßen.
      He has **you.2SG** recommended **SE.2PL** at.least   to greet
      'He gave you the recommendation to at least greet (your colleague).'   **(raw mean: 4.88)**

Interpretation of results**:**
    (i)   **there must be two different ways to arrive at a PC reading**
    (ii)   the two ways **correlate with a difference in the number feature of PRO.**

- Comparing this to the French results discussed in section 4.2, this supports the claim that **French has only** *fake PC***, whereas German has both** *fake* **and** *true PC***.**

6.2 Subject-oriented adjunct clauses/adverbs

In PC-contexts, **all our participants accepted only the reading in which the PRO of a subject-oriented adjunct clause scopes over a singular entity**, indicating that they construe the embedded subject as semantically singular, just as predicted under a *fake PC* analysis (52).

(52) **Context :** Peter and his girlfriend often argue with each other. Typically, Peter gets so upset that the discussion gets totally out of control.

    Deshalb   versucht Peter dieses Mal, sich zu streiten, ohne   wütend zu werden.
    therefore tries   Peter this   time SE to argue   without angry   to become
    'Therefore, this time Peter tries to argue (with his girlfriend) without getting upset.'
    Interpretation : Peter tries to argue with his girlfriend without him getting angry. **(35/38)**

Once the matrix controller was changed into a collective singular noun, speakers accepted the reading were a semantically plural entity controls PRO in the adjunct clause (53). This shows that there is no principled ban against plural controllers of adjunct clauses.

(53) **Context :** Peter and his girlfriend often argue with each other. Typically, Peter gets so upset that the discussion gets totally out of control.

    Deshalb   versucht das Paar   dieses Mal, sich   zu streiten, ohne   wütend zu werden.
    therefore tries   the couple this   time REFL to argue   without angry   to become
    'Therefore, this time the couple tries to argue without getting upset.'
    Interpretation : The couple tries to argue without either one of them getting angry. **(33/45)**

➢ This strongly suggests that **PRO is semantically singular** in potential fake PC cases, as is predicted by the covert comitative approach.

➢ Our strong prediction is that **[PC, -COM]** contexts should pattern with (53) not (52). This is yet to be tested.

7   Conclusions

We have provided new evidence to support the view that **in French, PC-readings are derived via fake PC**, i.e. exhaustive control with a covert comitative.

- A PC-reading in French is fully dependent on the embedded predicate: if it is comitative, a PC-reading is licensed. This is even true if the matrix predicate is an EC-predicate.

- PRO in PC-contexts is syntactically singular: embedded reflexives fully agree with the controller in phi-features.

- PRO in PC-contexts is semantically singular:
  o No symmetry restriction with verbs of the *collide*-type
  o The subject of embedded subject-oriented adverbs is construed as identical to the controller, rather than a plurality including the controller.

We showed that the **same diagnostics can be applied to German and lead to the same results in clear or potential cases of** *fake PC* (i.e. sentences involving an embedded comitative). **Similar effects also hold for English (see Appendix).**

Do any languages have only true PC? Maybe Icelandic.

Some Icelandic speakers accept PC, but only with PC matrix predicates: *vill* (wants), (*hataði* (hated), *vonast* (hopes), *kýs* (prefers), *veit* (knows):

(54) a. Borgarstjórinn   vill   giftast/berjast/bítast/sættast/vingast/faðmast/heilsast
          the.mayor   wants marry/fight/compete/be.reconciled/make.friends/embrace/greet
      b. *Borgarstjórinn fékk /byrjaði   að hittast   klukkan fimm.
          the.mayor   managed/started to meet   clock   five

While some of these reciprocal verbs undergo the comitative alternation, others do not (based on Wood 2012: 290-300):

  i.   Comitative: berjast (fight), bítast (compete), sættast (be reconciled) vingast (make friends),
  ii.   Non-comitative: hittast (meet), faðmast (embrace), heilsast (greet)

As such, Icelandic appears to have only true PC, but this should be tested experimentally (see appendix on English).

Open issues

- Test subject-oriented adjunct clauses in German [EC, +COM] vs. [PC, -COM].

- Provide an analysis of Fake PC; Issue for the comitative analysis: why should a covert comitative be more acceptable in infinitival complements than in root clauses?

- Investigate how and why languages differ in the availability of true/fake PC.

8   References

Alexiadou, Artemis, and Florian Schäfer. 2006. Instrument Subjects Are Agents or Causer. In Donald Baumer, David Montero and Michael Scanlon (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 40-48.

_____

Authier, Marc, and Lisa Reed. 2017a. Symmetric reciprocal semantics as a predictor of partial control. To appear in *Linguistic Inquiry.*

Authier, Marc, and Lisa Reed. 2017b. Symmetry, agreement and their implications for partial control. *Paper to appear in proceedings of LSRL* (Delaware).

Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010a. *Control as movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Dimiatridis, Alexis. 2004. *Discontinuous Reciprocals*. Manuscript, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS.

Gerstner, Mira. 2017. *True Partial Control vs. Fake Partial Control – A Syntactic Analysis based on Reflexive Pronouns.* Zulassungsarbeit, Universität Stuttgart.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96.

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* 22.4: 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. 2016a. Agreement at PF: An Argument from Partial Control. *Syntax* 19(1): 79-109.

Landau, Idan. 2016b. Against the Null Comitative Analysis of Partial Control (a squib). *Linguistic Inquiry*.

Landau, Idan. 2017. Adjunct Control Depends on Voice. In *A Pesky Set: Papers for David Pesetsky*, ed. C. Halpert et al., 93-102. MITWPL.

Modesto, Marcello. 2010. What Brazilian Portuguese Says about Control: Remarks on Boeckx & Hornstein. *Syntax* 13: 78-96.

Pearson, Hazel. 2015 The Semantics of Partial Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* Online First, 1-48.

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.

Siloni, Tal. 2008. The Syntax of Reciprocal Verbs: An Overview. In *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations*, ed. by Ekkehard König and Volker Gast, 451-498. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Siloni, Tal. 2012. Reciprocal verbs and Symmetry. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30, 261-320.

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

Sheehan, Michelle. 2014a. 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. 2014b. Portuguese, Russian and the theory of control. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society 43 volume 2,* eds. H. Huang, Ethan Poole & Amanda Rysling, 115-126. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2017a. Control of inflected infinitives in European Portuguese. To appear in *Complement clauses in Portuguese: syntax and acquisition*, ed. Anabela Gonçalves & Ana-Maria Santos. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2017b. On the difference between exhaustive and partial control. To appear in F. Cognola and J. Casalicchio (eds.), *Null Subjects*, OUP.

Wood, Jim. 2012. Icelandic Morphosyntax and Argument Structure. New York: NYU.

Appendix

9 What about English?

English, somewhat surprisingly, turns out to be like German in having **both fake and true PC**.[10]

(55) **Study Design**

      Task: Acceptability Judgment Task; 7-point Likert scale (1=unacceptable; 7=acceptable)
      Participants: 71 English native speakers
      Test Items: belong to 4 classes, depending on the value of the two variables (matrix & embedded predicate):

            (9) EC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate (-COM)
            (10) EC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate (+COM)
            (11) PC matrix predicate; non-comitative embedded predicate
            (12) PC matrix predicate; comitative embedded predicate

- All test items were provided including a context, which in the relevant cases made the intended plurality of PRO contextually salient.

- 38 test items (of which 16 tested the PC/EC, +/-COM variables) were distributed across two questionnaires. 50 filler sentences were added to a total of 44 sentences per questionnaire.

Table 5: Mean acceptability of test stimuli by Matrix and Embedded Predicate in English

n=33/37	+COM	-COM
EC	5.08 (0.20)	3.57 (0.20)
PC	5.68 (0.16)	5.29 (0.16)

- ➤ EC predicates like *can, try, need, avoid* permit PC only when combined with a comitative predicate.
- PC predicates permit PC regardless of their complement.
- Difference between **[EC, +COM]** and **[EC, –COM]** is highly significant ($p<.0001$)[11]
- Difference between **[EC, +COM]** and [**PC, +COM**] is also significant ($p=.005$)
- Difference between **[PC, +COM]** and [**PC, -COM**] is approaching significance ($p=.02$)

Context: John has just had his first date with a new girlfriend.
[PC, +COM]
(56) At the end of the night, he tells her that he hopes to meet again soon.

                                      (item mean: 6.21, SD: 1.27)
[PC, -COM]
(57) At the end of the night, he nervously tells her that he hopes to kiss soon.

                                      (item mean: 4.94, SD: 1.52)
[EC, +COM]
(58) At the end of the night, he tells her that he can meet again next Saturday, if she's free.

                                      (item mean: 5.86, SD: 1.54)
[EC, -COM]
(59) *At the end of the date, she tells him that he can kiss next time, if he likes.

                                      (item mean: 2.86, SD: 1.93)

---

[10] Thanks to Jim Wood, who distributed our English questionnaire amongst his students at Yale University.
[11] Many thanks to Jeannique Darby for her statistical help.

_____

- The [EC, -COM] examples are closer in value to the non-plural subject controls (which were also provided with an equivalent context):

(60) This time Peter might not make up.   **(item mean: 2.62, SD: 1.36)**

Note: The unexpectedly high acceptability of [EC, -COM] in Table 5 is arguably due to the special behavior of two of the non-comitative predicates: *hug* and *separate*. Consider the data in (64), (65):

Context: Sue and her boyfriend have been arguing a lot recently.

[PC, +COM]
(61) Sue decides that, despite their differences, she wants to make up.

(item mean: 5.81, SD: 1.37)

 [EC, +COM]
(62) Sue decides that, despite their differences, she will try to make up.

(item mean: 4.55, SD: 1.78)

Context: Sam and Max have been having some problems over the past year.

[PC, -COM]
(63) Sam says to Max that, even though it is hard, he would hate to separate over this.

(item mean: 6.09, SD: 1.14)

 [EC, -COM]
(64) ?Sam says to Max that he'll avoid separating if it's the last thing he does.

(item mean: 4.14, SD: 1.90)

- Plausibly, the unusually high acceptability of *separate* even in the context of true PC (e.g., (63)) suggests that (some) participants allow *separate* as an intransitive with a singular subject. Whence the rather high acceptability of (64).

➢ A filler containing *divorce* with a 3SG subject was rated highly **(item mean: 4.57, SE: 0.30)**, but there was no such example with separate in the survey.