The case for fake partial control in French and German [*]

Marcel Pitteroff & Michelle Sheehan

Universität Stuttgart, Anglia Ruskin University

1.   Introduction

Reciprocal predicates like *meet* usually require a semantically plural subject:

(1)   a.   The team/*John met at 9 this morning.
        b.   The lovers/*John met in Paris.

In some control contexts, however, the controller of these predicates can be semantically singular, giving rise to 'partial control'(PC), a form of obligatory control, where PRO is a semantically plural 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$_1$)]

Landau (1999, 2000, 2004) shows that PC is sensitive to the matrix predicate. Aspectual, implicative and modal verbs permit only exhaustive control, whereas desiderative, factive, interrogative and epistemic control predicates allow also PC.

(3)   a.   *John$_1$ started/managed/tried [PRO$_{1+}$ to meet at 9].
        b.   John$_1$ wanted/hated/intended [PRO$_{1+}$ to meet at 9].

Pearson (2016) claims that this reduces to the distinction between attitude and non-attitude predicates (see Landau 2015 for a control theory that adopts this distinction).

Previous work has argued that apparent cases of PC in French and German are sensitive to the embedded predicate, with PC being most acceptable with embedded comitatives (Sheehan 2014a, Pitteroff et al. 2017a, b). In this paper, we briefly review these facts and then present a series of novel arguments, backed up by experimental data, that both languages have instances of PC which involve an exhaustively controlled PRO which can be semantically and syntactically singular. In this way, both languages have what Sheehan (2014a, b) calls Fake PC, which we take, descriptively, to be exhaustive control plus a covert comitative. In section 2, we recap the French facts and respond to Landau's (2016b) critique of the Fake PC proposal, based on singular personal reflexives, readings of *séparément* 'separately' and singular secondary predicates. In section 3, we then present novel evidence in favour of the Fake PC proposal from insensitivity to the matrix predicate, first and second person reflexives, non-symmetrical events and subject-oriented adjunct clauses/adverbs. In section 4, we then turn to the situation in German, which is more complex, as this language appears to have both True and Fake PC. In section 5, we present novel evidence from first and second person reflexives and subject-oriented adjunct clauses/adverbs in support of the existence of both True and Fake PC in German. Finally, section 6 concludes.

2. French has only Fake PC

Many inherently reciprocal verbs requiring a semantically plural subject participate in a comitative alternation (called discontinuous reciprocals by Dimiatridis 2004, Siloni 2012):

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

Sheehan (2014a) notes that only these [+COM] verbs appear to permit PC in French:

(5) a.   Marie   **s'est**   **réconcilée**   avec   son père.   **[+COM]**
             Marie   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**.'

(6) a.   *Jean **s'**   est embrassé avec Marie hier.   **[-COM]**
             Jean 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'd like to **kiss** now.'

Authier and Reed (2017, 2018) note that *se réunir* 'to meet' is minimally different from the other French verbs meaning 'to meet' in this regard (*se rencontrer, se retrouver*), which are [-COM] and disallow PC:

(7) 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.'   (Authier and Reed 2018: 380)

Authier and Reed (2017, 2018) 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 (8a), retain only the idiosyncratic reading in both the comitative alteration (8b) and PC contexts (9):

(8) a. Paul et son père **s' entendaient** mal.
        Paul and his father **SE= heard.3PL** poorly
        'Paul and his father **got along** poorly.'   (idiosyncratic=lexical)
        'Paul and his father could barely **hear each other**.' (regular = syntactic)

     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)
                                (Authier and Reed 2018: 388)

(9) a. Il$_j$ se rappelle [**s' être entendu** là-dessus] (idiosyncratic=lexical)
        he SE= remembers **SE= be agreed** there-upon
        'He remembers **agreeing** on this.'

     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.'
                                (Authier and Reed 2018: 387)

These facts are consistent with the claim that French lacks True PC. What looks like PC in French we take (descriptively) to be Fake PC, i.e., exhaustive control with a covert comitative (see Boeckx et al. 2010):

(10) **Marie$_i$** voulait [**PRO$_i$** se réunir *pro*$_{comitative}$ dans la cuisine]
      Marie wanted SE=meet in the kitchen

        The strong prediction of this kind of analysis of French is that PRO should actually be singular wherever its controller is singular. Landau (2016b) argues explicitly against this prediction, based on the following claims, providing the data in (11)-(13):

(i)   PRO cannot bind a singular 'personal reflexive' (11);
(ii)   PRO does not license the NP-dependent reading of *séparément* 'separately' (12);
(iii)   PRO cannot license a singular secondary predicate (13).

(11)   Jean a dit à Marie qu 'il préférait ne   pas se réconcilier
        John has said to Mary that he   preferred NEG not SE=reconcile
        (*__lui-même__) ce soir.
        himself   this evening
        'John said to Mary that he preferred not to reconcile (*himself) tonight.'

(12)   Marie a dit à son père   et à sa   mère   qu' elle préfèrerait
        Mary has said to her father   and to her mother that she preferred
        se réconcilier (*__séparément__) avant   Noël.
        SE= reconcile   (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]

(13)   Jean a   dit   à   Marie   qu'il   était content de   se promener
        John has said to Mary   that.he was happy of   SE= walk
        ensemble, enfin, (*__en homme   libre__).
        together finally (as man   free)
        'John told Mary that he was happy to finally have a walk together (*as a free man).'
                                        (examples from Landau 2016b: 577-578)

We argue that there are issues with all of (i)-(iii) and (11)-(13). Firstly, (11) remains strange even
if an overt comitative is added, though this is subject to substantial variation across speakers and
has not yet been tested experimentally (data are from four native speakers):

(14)   */??/OK Jean a   dit   à   Marie qu'il   préférait   ne   pas
                 Jean has said to Marie that-he preferred   NEG   not
        se réconcilier __lui-même__ avec elle ce   soir.
        SE=make.up   him-same with her   this evening

This seems to be because 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, and such examples are not easy to construct.
        Likewise, testing the baseline for (12) is insightful as it reveals that NP-dependent reading
of *séparément* is sensitive to the type of overt comitative it occurs with, being widely available
only with a comitative containing a co-ordination. We tested this experimentally as part of a larger
online survey containing 24 test questions and 20 fillers in randomised order (n=38). All examples
were provided in the same context, forcing an NP-dependent reading, and rated on an 8-point
Likert scale (0-7), with a context provided in French (translated here for space reasons).

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.

(15)   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)

(16)   ?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)

(17)   ?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'd prefer to have dinner separately with them.'
                                                                      (item mean : 4.43 ; SD 2.3)

(18)   ?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)**

Although the examples are not perfect minimal pairs, and the presence of a matrix indirect object arguably improves acceptability, the PC example in (18) has a similar status to examples (16)-(17), being less acceptable and more variable across speakers. This actually supports the claim that the PC example in (16) involves a covert comitative.

In relation to (iii)/(13), we note that other singular secondary predicates are permitted in both comitative and PC contexts. Authier and Reed (2017) show that this holds for embedded depictives, for example:

(19)   Manon$_j$ se rappelle [PRO$_{j+}$ s'   être réunie   **soûle**/*soûls].
        Manon SE= remembers   SE   be   met.F.SG **drunk.F.SG**/*F.PL
        'Manon remembers meeting **drunk**.'   (Authier and Reed 2017: 10)

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 (19) involves true PC, i.e. if PRO is syntactically or semantically plural. Rather, the morphological and semantic properties of the depictive speak in favor of Fake PC. The problem with (13), it seems, is that it involves a non-reciprocal, non-comitative embedded predicate, where PC is triggered by the presence of *ensemble* 'together'. Adding an overt comitative is stylistically marked, as *ensemble* does not combine with *avec* in Standard French. Note that *se promener* 'to walk' is not a reciprocal verb, as it freely allows a singular subject. In any case, 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):

(20) Marie dit à Jean qu' elle serait   contente de
      Marie says to Jean that she be.COND happy   of
      se promener ensemble de   temps en   temps.
      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)

Examples of singular predicates with [+COM] verbs appear to be fully grammatical:

(21) 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   with her in good friend
      'Jean told Marie that he hoped to make up (with her) as friends.'

There is, thus, strong evidence that French has Fake PC. In the following section, we provide further experimental evidence to support this claim.

3.　New experimental evidence for Fake PC in French

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.[1]

(22) **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 in random order and provided in a context which made the intended plurality of PRO contextually salient. There were 24 test items (of which 12 tested PC/EC, +/-COM) and 20 fillers giving 44 sentences in total. All three sets of PC/EC, +/-COM pairings showed the same profile, though acceptability of individual examples varied. The most acceptable examples were those parallel to those provided by Sheehan (2014a), but [EC, +COM] examples were also fairly acceptable, and clearly better than both kinds of [-COM] examples.

---

[1] EC predicates : *essayer* 'try', *avoir pu* 'manage', *arrêter* 'stop'. PC predicates : *espérer* 'hope', *préférer* 'prefer', *penser* 'think', *vouloir*, *avoir envie* 'want'.

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

(24)   *Mean acceptability of Matrix and Embedded Predicate in French (n=38)[2]*

	+COM	-COM
EC	3.60	0.84
PC	5.16	1.02

Context : Pierre and his girlfriend very often argue about politics, like today:

(25)   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 doesn't want to argue.'   (**item mean: 6.16, SD: 1.57**)

(26)   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's going to stop arguing.'   (**item mean: 4.03, SD: 2.42**)

(27)   *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**)

(28)   *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's going to stop shouting at each other.'(**item mean: 0.47, SD: 0.51**)

Our results show that, in French, PC readings are (somewhat) acceptable as long as the embedded predicate is comitative.[3] This is very different from what has been reported for other languages, in which only the matrix predicate regulates the availability of PC. The PC/EC distinction is generally taken to be deep and semantically based (see Landau 2000, 2015, 2016b; Pearson 2016). 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, it is more attractive to take French PC to be Fake.

Other evidence comes from the phi-features of the reciprocal marker SE, which 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 our experimental results (n=9-12):

---

[2] We are in the process of carrying out statistical analysis of these results.

[3] Note that the acceptability of [EC, +COM] is numerically lower than the German and English results discussed below. This is 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. It is therefore not possible to compare numbers across languages.

(29) 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)**

(30) 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 are as predicted if French PC involves exhaustive control, as PRO is singular and shares the full feature specification of its controller.

Additional evidence comes from symmetrical vs. asymmetrical events. In French, as in English, the comitative alternation differs from reciprocal verbs in denoting potentially asymmetrical events. A person can collide with a tree, but a tree and a person cannot collide (27). In instances of PC, however, changing the context so that the collision is either between a human and a tree or two humans does not strongly affect grammaticality/acceptability:

> 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.

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

(32) Il a du faire une embardée à gauche parce qu'il ne voulait pas
      he has had make a detour to left because he NEG wanted not
      entrer en collision.
      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 rather than a plural PRO (True PC).

Our final diagnostic concerns the scope of subject-oriented adverbs. All of the French participants who accepted examples like (33) in context in a survey were asked to judge its meaning and the vast majority consistently selected the meaning to be as stated below (translated from the original French in the survey), whereby Pierre alone acts as the controller of PRO:

(33) 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.'
      Interpretation: 'Pierre hopes to make up without him having to explain everything.'
      (15/15)

The same pattern was observed with EC matrix predicates, wherever a partial control reading was accepted. 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 (2017), cited above.

In sum, then, we have seen extensive evidence that in instances of French PC, PRO is semantically and syntactically singular, suggesting that French has only Fake PC.

4. German has both True and Fake PC

Pitteroff et al. (2017a,b) provide the first experimental investigation of partial control in German. German makes available two mechanisms to derive a partial control reading: true *and* fake PC:

(34) *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)

German differs from French in permitting three of the four combinations, i.e., in being sensitive to both the matrix and embedded predicate. Crucially, the [PC, -COM] combination which is ungrammatical in French, is fairly acceptable in German, much more so that the ungrammatical [EC, -COM] combination:

(35) 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. 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)**

They conclude that the acceptability of [EC, +COM] sentences supports the existence of Fake PC in German and the acceptability of [PC, -COM] sentences supports the existence of True PC in German. In the following section, we provide further experimental evidence that German differs from French in this respect.

5. New evidence for both True and Fake PC in German

Recall that in French, the reciprocal marker SE inflects as 1st/2nd person singular in line with its controller in apparent PC contexts. 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 different syntactic ways to derive a PC-reading. This can be seen by comparing

the number feature of the reciprocal marker (and thus, PRO) in [EC, +COM] and [PC, -COM] contexts. If [EC, +COM] forces Fake PC, then PRO in such context will be singular, if its controller is. Conversely, if [PC, -COM] forces True PC, then PRO in such contexts may be plural, if the semantic features of PRO can be realized morphologically. We tested this via the following online experiment:

(36) 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 and 20 filler sentences were added to give a total of 30 sentences per questionnaire. The results show that, as predicted, [EC, +COM] was significantly better with an embedded singular reflexive (significance at $p<0.016$).

(37) *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

Conversely, but also as expected, [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):

(38) *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

(39)   [EC, +COM]
        Context: 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)**

(40)   [PC, -COM]
        Context: 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)

The results of this experiment clearly support the claim that there must be two different ways to arrive at a PC reading and that the two ways correlate with a difference in the number feature of PRO.

Finally, consider evidence from 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:

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

(41)   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.

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

(42)   Deshalb   versucht   das   Paar   dieses   Mal,   sich   zu streiten, ohne
        therefore tries   the   couple this   time   SE   to argue   without
        wütend zu   werden.
        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 (42) not (41), but this is yet to be tested.

6.   Conclusions

We have shown that in instances of what looks like PC, French shows a sensitivity to the embedded predicate rather than the matrix predicate, with PC being possible only in [+COM] contexts. This, combined with the fact that PRO behaves as if it were syntactically and semantically singular, suggests that French lacks True PC and rather allows only Fake PC arising from exhaustive control with a covert comitative, or some other equivalent mechanism. German, on the other hand, appears to have both Fake PC, limited to [+COM] contexts, and True PC, observed in [-COM] contexts. As predicted in Fake PC contexts PRO in German is syntactically and semantically singular, just as in French. In True PC contexts, however, it appears to be plural. We do not commit ourselves here to an analysis of Fake PC, for space reasons, but note only that it must coexist with True PC, given the patterns attested in German. Our results therefore lend further support to the claim that there are two distinct kinds of PC (see Sheehan 2014a, 2018).

References

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

Authier, Marc, and Lisa Reed. 2018. Symmetric reciprocal semantics as a predictor of partial control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49:379-393.

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

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

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.

Pearson, Hazel. 2016. The Semantics of Partial Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* 34:691–738.

Pitteroff, Marcel, Artemis Alexiadou, and Silke Fischer. 2017a. Two Mechanisms to Derive Partial Control - Evidence from German. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 23:201-210.

Pitteroff, Marcel, Artemis Alexiadou, Jeannique Darby, and Silke Fischer. 2017b. On Partial Control in German. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 20:139-185.

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. 2014a. Partial Control in Romance Languages: the covert comitative analysis. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory,* ed. by Karen Lahousse and 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,* ed. by H. Huang, Ethan Poole & Amanda Rysling, 115-126. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2018. On the difference between exhaustive and partial control. In *Null subjects in Generative Grammar*, ed. by Federica Cognola and Jan Casalicchio,141-170. Oxford: OUP.

Marcel Pitteroff, Michelle Sheehan,
marcel.pitteroff@gmx.de, Michelle.sheehan@anglia.ac.uk,