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

1 Introduction

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

\[(1) \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{The couple / John and Mary / *John broke up.} \\
\text{b.} & \text{John didn’t want to break up.}
\end{array} \]

\(^1\)In fact, even non-reciprocal verbs can be “coerced” into the PC interpretation, e.g. John wanted to apply for the grant together. We limit ourselves to reciprocal verbs here as it makes PC into a matter of grammaticality rather than interpretation.
Whereas both the semantically plural group noun the couple and the syntactically plural co-ordination John and Mary can function as the subject of ‘break up’ in a simple monoclausal environment, the semantically and syntactically singular John cannot. This restriction is suspended in the control context in (1b), however, where the interpretation of the embedded null subject (PRO) is such that it comprises John plus some other unspecified person or persons, recovered from the context. PC has been described in a number of languages (e.g. Russian, European Portuguese, Icelandic, German and more controversially French and Italian) as illustrated by the following examples:

(2) Russian (Landau 2008: 909)

Ona poprosila predsedatelja [ sobrat’sja vsem/*vsex v šest’ ].
she.NOM asked chair.ACC gather.INF all.DAT/*ACC at six

‘She asked the chair to all gather at six.’

(3) European Portuguese (Sheehan 2018b: 34)

Os professores persuadiram o director [ a reunir(em)=se
The teachers persuaded the headteacher A meet.INF.3PL=SE.3
more late
mais tarde].

‘The teachers persuaded the headteacher to meet later on.’

(4) Icelandic (Sheehan 2018b: 149)

Hann bað Ölaf [að hittast eina] he asked Olaf.ACC to meet.ST alone.NOM.M.PL alone.ACC.M.PL

‘He asked Olaf to meet alone.PL.’

(5) German (Landau 2000: 45)

Hans sagte der Maria dass er es bedauerte letzte Nacht [ gemeinsam
Hans said the Maria that he it regretted last night together
gearbeitet zu haben ]
worked to have

‘Hans told Maria that he regretted having worked together last night.’

(6) French (Landau 2000: 85)

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.’
Italian, adapted from (Landau 2000: 46)
Maria pensava che Gianni avesse dimenticato di esser=si baciati alla festa.
‘Maria thought that Gianni had forgotten having kissed at the party.’

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

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

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

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

There is a class of languages, however, which is claimed not to permit PC at all, namely those languages which make extremely restricted use of non-finite complementation and instead display finite control. Amongst these are the languages

---

2 The controversy surrounding the status of PC in French and Italian concerns the fact that in addition to being sensitive to the matrix control predicate, these languages also show sensitivity to the embedded controlled predicate. In French at least the generalisation seems to be that PC is only possible where the embedded verb is comitative (Sheehan 2014; Authier & Reed 2018; Pitteroff & Sheehan 2018). Pitteroff, Alexiadou & Fischer (2017); Pitteroff, Alexiadou, Darby, et al. (2017) argue that German also shows such a sensitivity.
of the Balkan Sprachbund (e.g. Greek, Romanian, Bulgarian etc.). In this paper, we re-evaluate this claim, providing data which calls it into question. While it is generally the case that obligatory control in finite-control languages is limited to the complements of ExC predicates, we nonetheless show that, under the root modal ‘can’, obligatory control complements permit PC for many speakers. The structure of the squib is as follows. §2 reviews the treatment of finite control in previous analyses, notably Landau (2004; 2015). §3 reviews the evidence for PC in Greek. §4 identifies similar such cases in Romanian. §5 concludes by discussing the theoretical implications of the existence of partial control in finite control languages.

2 Finite control in previous approaches

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

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

\[(10) \text{The obligatory control–no control generalisation} \]

\[\text{In a fully specified clause (in a clause in which the I head carries slots for both [T] and [Agr])} \]

\[\text{a. If the I head carries both semantic tense and agreement, [no control] obtains.} \]

\[\text{b. Elsewhere, [obligatory control] obtains.}\]

\(^3\)When discussing Greek, we refer to Standard Modern Greek, unless stated otherwise.
He presents evidence in support of this prediction from finite control in Balkan languages. Building on Varlokosta (1994), he argues that Balkan subjunctives come in two types: controlled and free subjunctives (C- and F-subjunctives respectively, exemplified below) distinguished by the interpretation of their subjects, expressed here as the distinction between PRO and pro. As Landau (2004: 827) further notes, C-subjunctives display the diagnostic properties of obligatory control, despite their finiteness:

(11) C-subjunctive, Greek
I the Maria know.3sg PRO1/*2 na diavazi read.3sg
‘Mary knows how to read’

(12) F-subjunctive, Greek (Varlokosta 1994: (21))
O the John hopes.3sg PRO1/2 na figi. wins.3sg
‘John hopes that he will win’

(13) C-subjunctive, Romanian (Alboiu 2007: 6)
Victor try PRS.3sg PRO1/*2 cânte. sing.SBJV.3sg
‘Victor is trying to sing.’

(14) F-subjunctive, Romanian
Ionuț wants SBJV play.SBJV.3sg
‘Ionuț wants him/PRO to sing.’

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

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

(15) The OC–NC generalisation (final)
[+Agr] blocks logophoric control but not predicative control.
Landau proposes to derive (15) from the fact that variable binding requires feature sharing and this is blocked where a pronoun is involved. In finite control languages, then, logophoric control will always be blocked as every clause is [+Agr].

3 Partial control in Greek

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

(16) Greek
\[
\text{o Yiannis} _i \text{ epise} \text{ ti Maria} _j \text{ na pane ec}_i^{+j} \text{jia psonia} \text{ tin Triti shopping the Tuesday}
\]
\‘John persuaded Mary to go (John and Mary) shopping on Tuesday.\’

(17) Greek (Spyropoulos 2007: (34a), ((35a))
\[
\text{epise} \text{ ti Maria} _i \text{ na pane ec}_i^{+j} \text{jia psonia} \text{ tin Triti for shopping the Tuesday}
\]
\‘I persuaded Mary that they should go for shopping on Tuesday.’

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

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

(18) Greek
    Chthes *mporusa akoma na sinandithume tin alli Triti
    yesterday could.1SG still SBJV meet.SBJV.1PL the other Tuesday
    ‘Yesterday I was still able for us to meet next Tuesday.’

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

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

(19) Greek
    *Mporo na fas
    can.1SG SBjv eat.2SG
    intended: ‘I can you to eat.’

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

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

In fact, an anonymous reviewer suggests that this is even possible in (21) if we add ‘at my home’ to the example:
One possible conclusion, then is that *mporo* allows for a complement clause with a disjoint reference subject, and therefore an F-subjunctive, so that (18) is not an instance of PC after all. There are however, two objections to this line of argumentation: firstly such examples are indeed quite labored and require a very elaborate context. As an anonymous reviewer notes, such contexts usually involve some relationship between a matrix argument and something in the embedded clause, something which is not required with verbs which freely select for F-subjunctives. Moreover, partial control verbs always seem to allow coercion of this kind with overt subjects: unlike ExC predicates. Consider for example the following example from English:

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

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

4 Partial control in Romanian

In Romanian too, the vast majority of matrix verbs selecting a C-subjunctive (with forced co-reference) are ExC predicates in Landau’s (2000) sense (*şti* ‘know’, *începe* ‘begin’, *încearcă* ‘try’ and *reuşi* ‘manage’). Conversely, the vast majority

---

5 An anonymous reviewer notes that if languages with finite control permit coercion more easily than languages with non-finite control, then this might be taken to support a weakened version of Landau’s (2015) proposal. The facts are not so clear to us, though, as English appears to allow coercion with PC verbs just as easily as Greek does. In any case, a problem remains for Landau’s general approach if there is a [+Agr, +T] context in which the default reading is control.
of PC predicates select an *F-subjunctive* in Romanian with a referential subject, which, given the lack of obviation effects, can also be co-referential with the matrix subject, but need not be (see Alboiu 2007; Alexiadou et al. 2010; Hill 2012; Nicolae 2013 on Romanian and examples (13) and (14) above). *F*-subjunctive complements can optionally be introduced by the subjunctive complementiser *ca* (cf. Grosu & Horvath 1987; Hill 2012). The *ca* să subjunctive complements display typical Romance obviation effects but, the bare să complements do not (Alexiadou et al. 2010):

(23) Romanian

- a. Ionuț vrea să EC\textsubscript{i/j} cânte la violoncel
  Ionuț wants sbjv play.sbjv.3sg at cello
- b. Ionuț vrea *ca* să EC\textsubscript{i/j} cânte la violoncel
  Ionuț wants that sbjv play.sbjv.3sg at cello

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

(24) Romanian

*Victor încearcă [ Mihai să cânte ]
Victor try.prs.3sg (*Mihai) sbjv sing.sbjv.3sg

‘Victor is trying (*Mihai) to sing.’

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

(25) Romanian (Alboiu 2007: 8)

- a. Li=a putut vedea?
  Cl.3sg.m.acc=aux.3sg could.ptcp see.3sg
  ‘Could s/he see him?’
- b. Nu (*li)-a încercat [ să-li vadă ].
  not Cl.3sg.m.acc=aux.3sg try.ptcp sbjv=cl.3sg.m.acc see.3sg
  ‘S/he didn’t try to see him.’

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

It has been claimed that Romanian lacks partial control. Alexiadou et al. (2010) claim that Romanian lacks partial control based on the following data (‘learn’ is an obligatory control verb, as in Greek):
Alboiu (2007: 10) claims the same thing on the basis of the following examples:

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

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

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

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

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

(30) Romanian (Alboiu 2007: 11)
\[ pro_1 vrea \ [ pro_{1/2} să plece \]
want.PRS.3SG SBJV leave.SBJV.3
‘S/he wants (for her/him/them) to leave.’

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

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

(31) Romanian
*Tu poți să meargă mâine.*
you can.2sg sbjv go.sbjv.3 tomorrow

(32) Romanian
Pot să ne întâlnim mâine.
can.1sg sbjv se.1pl meet.sbjv.1pl tomorrow
‘I can meet tomorrow.’

(33) Romanian
Pot să ne căsătorim doar la anul, când fac 18 ani.
can.1sg sbjv se.1pl marry.sbjv.1pl only to year.def when make 18 years
‘I can marry only next year, when I turn 18.’

(34) Romanian
Ea poate să ne căsătorim doar la anul, când face 18 ani.
she can sbjv se.1pl marry.sbjv.1pl only to year.def when makes 18 years
‘She can marry only next year, when she turns 18.’

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

(35) Romanian (Pană Dindelegan 2013: 136)
El poate alerga
he can run.inf
‘He can run’

Bare infinitives of this kind probably involve restructuring as clitic climbing and long passives are permitted here (Dragomirescu 2013: 194, 196):

(36) Romanian
Cartea o pot citi acum
book.def.acc cl.acc.f.3sg can.1sg read.inf now
‘I can read the book now’
(37) Romanian
Cartea se poate citi de către oricine într-o zi
book.DEF.NOM CL.REFL.PASS can.3SG read.INF by anyone in=one day
‘The book can be read by anyone in one day’

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

(38) Romanian (Pană Dindelegan 2013: 194, citing Jordan 2009: 60)
El putea a nu-l primi
he can.IPfv.3SG a not=CL.ACC.M.3SG receive.INF
‘He could not receive it.’

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

(39) Romanian
*Tu poți a vă căsători la anul.
you can.2SG a SE.2PL marry.INF to year.DEF
‘You can marry next year.’

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

5 Theoretical discussion and tentative conclusions

A very important question is whether the examples of PC in Greek and Romanian mentioned above are genuine instances of PC. Poole (2015) notes that a similar phenomenon is possible also in English with the root modal ‘can’, but he claims that it is not an instance of PC (pace Rodrigues 2007). He proposes, rather, that apparent instances of PC under ‘can’ in English actually involve a covert comitative, based on the fact that only comitative verbs can surface in the complement to can in instances of PC:

(40) Poole (2015: 14)
   a. * John can gather tomorrow.
   b. * John can disperse next week.
He therefore proposes the following analysis (see also Sheehan 2014 on “fake PC” in some Romance languages):

(41) Modal-meet construction schema (Poole 2015: 15)
XP₁ can [ t₁ meet (with y) ]

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

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

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

(42) Romanian
*Alex se întâlnește
Alex se meet.3SG

(43) Romanian
Alex se întâlnește cu Adina
Alex se meet.3SG with Adina

(44) Romanian
Alex și Adina se întâlnesc
Alex and Adina se meet.3PL

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

(45) Romanian
Vrea să se întânească mâine (cu ea)
wants.3SG sbjv se meet.sbjv.3 tomorrow with her
‘He wants to meet (with her) tomorrow.’

(46) Romanian
Vrea să se certe din când în când (cu ea)
wants.3SG sbjv se argue.sbjv.3 from when to when with her
‘He wants to argue (with her) from time to time.’
(47) Romanian
Vrea să se sărute curând (cu ea)
wants.3sg SBJV se kiss.SBJV.3 soon with her
literally ‘He wants to kiss (with her) soon.’

(48) Romanian
Vrea să se împace (cu ea)
wants.3sg SBJV se make.up.SBJV.3 with her
‘He wants to make up (with her) soon.’

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

(49) Romanian
Vreau să mă întâlnesc mâine *(cu ea)
want.1sg SBJV se.1sg meet.SBJV.1sg tomorrow with her
‘I want to meet (with her) tomorrow.’

(50) Romanian
Vrei să te întâlnești mâine *(cu ea)
want.2sg SBJV se.2sg meet.SBJV.2sg tomorrow with her
‘You want to meet (with her) tomorrow.’

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

(51) Greek
*O Yianis sinantithike
the John met.3sg

(52) Greek
O Yianis sinantithike me ton Petro
the John met.3sg with the Peter
‘John met with Peter.’

(53) Greek
O Yianis ki o Petros sinantithikan
the John and the Peter met.3pl
‘John and Peter met.’
Greek has the full agreement paradigm in subjunctive forms, so examples like Romanian (47–52) display no ambiguity. Indeed, PC cases with _thelo_ ‘want’ cannot involve a covert comitative exactly because the embedded verb appears in the singular when there is a comitative phrase and in the plural without it.6

(54) Greek
- _Thelo / mporo na sinantithume avrio_
- want.1sg can.1sg sbjv meet.1sg tomorrow
  ‘I want to meet (plural) tomorrow,’ ‘I can meet (plural) tomorrow.’

(55) Greek
- _Thelo / mporo na sinantitho me tin Stefania avrio_
- want.1sg can.1sg sbjv meet.1sg with the Stefania tomorrow
  ‘I want to meet with Stefania tomorrow,’ ‘I can meet with Stefania tomorrow’

To sum up, in this squib we have provided some preliminary evidence that finite control languages like Greek and Romanian display PC in very limited contexts, contrary to what has previously been claimed in the literature. Moreover, the very existence of this phenomenon inside [+Agr], [+T] complements of non-attitude predicates is incompatible with any mainstream theory of PC that predicts it to be incompatible with [+Agr]. Data problematic for this claim can also be found in European Portuguese, which appears to permit obligatory control into inflected infinitives, at least for some speakers (Sheehan 2018a,b), though this is somewhat controversial (see Barbosa 2017). We have dismissed, somewhat tentatively, the idea that apparent cases of PC in Greek and Romanian might be instances of coercion of a C-subjunctive into an F-subjunctive or of ExC with a covert comitative. The next step for this investigation is to survey the extent of this phenomenon in Greek and Romanian and establish whether it can be unambiguously found with predicates other than ‘can’. If this can be established, then an alternative theory of control must be explored which captures the fact that PC is in fact compatible with [+Agr] clauses, without overgenerating. It is worth noting in this regard that the incompatibility is somewhat stipulative in Landau’s (2015) approach, so this may not be as difficult as first appears.7

---

6 We use a verb which selects an F-subjunctive here because it is our intention to show that comitatives cannot be omitted in subjunctive contexts. The patterns are the same if the matrix verb is _can_. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for querying this.

7 There are, for example, other verbs which Varlokosta claims take C-subjunctives which appear to allow PC:

(i) Greek
- _Tha charo na vrethume_
- FUT please.1sg sbjv meet.1pl
  ‘I will be pleased us to meet tomorrow…’
Abbreviations

1. first person  M. masculine
2. second person NOM. nominative
3. third person OC. obligatory control
ACC. accusative
AUX. auxiliary
CL. clitic
DAT. dative
DEF. definite
ExC. exhaustive control
F. feminine
FUT. future
GEN. genitive
INF. infinitive
IPFV. imperfective
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