Some Partial Considerations on Partial Control Instances in Romanian

Maria Aurelia Cotfas

University of Bucharest, Romania

Abstract

The paper looks at the possibility of Partial Control (henceforth, PC) instances in Romanian, a language which uses finite (subjunctive) complements in typical control contexts and where PC has therefore been deemed impossible. We show that PC effects can indeed be manifested in Romanian under *a putea* 'can', which we analyze as a neutral circumstantial modal in these contexts. We show, following Matsuda (2021), that these PC instances are sensitive to indexicality (viz., the current speech situation) and represent an interplay of (inclusion of) [+Speaker], [+Addressee] or both. We therefore identify three typical PC instances: a) 1st singular antecedent + 1st plural embedded reference (inclusion of current speaker); b) 2nd singular antecedent + 2nd plural embedded subject (inclusion of Addressee) and c) 2nd singular antecedent + 1st plural embedded subject (inclusion of both). This shows that in spite of the raising behaviour of most O(bligatory)C(ontrol)/E(xaustive) C(ontrol) verbs in Romanian (cf. Alboiu 2007, Cotfas 2012), there are contexts for which a control analysis needs to be maintained, and, more broadly, that PRO is to be maintained as an empty category and cannot be reduced to raising/movement.

Keywords: Romanian; finite control; partial control; infinitive complement; subjunctive complement; indexicality; associative semantics

1. Introduction

The present paper aims to consider apparent Partial Control instances in Romanian with the ability verb *a putea* 'can'. Such instances are quite intriguing and interesting to look at from (at least) two perspectives. Firstly, Romanian is a 'finite control' language (cf. Landau 2004 and seq.) – or a raising language, lacking proper control instances (cf. Alboiu 2007, Cotfas 2012)[1], so PC is theoretically unlikely. Secondly, even allowing for PC effects, the trigger is

---

[1] Alboiu (2007) has argued earlier for a control-as-raising analysis, whereby the shared subject (first merged with the lower predicate) enters backward Agree with the matrix predicate – when C_{Low} subjunctives are at stake. For more details on her control-as-raising analysis, as well as the differences between what she calls Clow and Chigh subjunctives, we refer the reader to her work. Cotfas (2012) shows that typical OC triggers

unexpected, since modal verbs are non-attitudinal predicates which, according to the theory one chooses to adopt, either instantiate Exhaustive Control (cf. Landau 2000) or raising (Wurmbrand 2000, a.o.), but definitely not PC. Our aims are therefore to challenge these claims and to look at PC instances in Romanian, showing that they *are* allowed – albeit in limited circumstances. We propose to narrow down the exact constraints regulating these PC instances and show, following Matsuda (2021), that they are linked to indexicality.

The paper is structured as follows: in *Section 2*, we set the stage and discuss briefly what Partial Control is all about. We then move on, in *Section 3*, to look at finite control languages and discuss the possibility of PC in these languages. *Section 4* takes a closer look at the Romanian data with the modal *a putea* 'can', addressing issues concerning its selectional restrictions, the exact type of modality involved in PC constructions and attempting to delimit the (person and number) constraints on PC effects. *Section 5* draws the conclusions.

2. What is Partial Control?

Landau (2000) is the first to have discussed Partial Control (mainly for English), as a phenomenon whereby a syntactically singular subject (*John* in (1b)) functions as the controller of the (semantically) plural embedded PRO, when the infinitival clause contains a collective verb. The proof that PRO is (semantically) plural comes from independent clauses, where collective predicates (*gather, convene, meet, separate, break up*, etc.) require (at least) a semantically plural subject (1a).

(1)   a. Trump and Elon/The committee/*John *convened/met/gathered* at 6.
        b. John$_i$ *wanted/was hoping/promised* [PRO$_{i+}$ to *convene/meet* at 6].

PC effects are instantiated with matrix 'attitude' verbs, i.e., predicates reporting on the mental state or a communicative act of some individual (Pearson 2016). As such, PC refers to a control .controlee (PRO), which need not be identical to its controller, but merely include its reference. PC has been observed and analyzed in a number of (unrelated) languages (e.g. Russian, European Portuguese, Icelandic, German, French and Italian), where PC verbs take infinitival complements.

Ever since Landau (2000, 2004, 2013, 2015 & seq.), the literature on control has made a distinction within the O(bligatory) C(ontrol) class between PC (Partial Control) predicates and EC (Exhaustive Control) predicates. The two types of OC differ along two dimensions: a) the type of relation between PRO and its antecedent and b) the temporal reference of the embedded (non-finite) clause.

With respect to the first, EC predicates are non-attitudinal obligatory control predicates (implicative 'manage', modals, aspectuals) where PRO must match the reference of its

---

such as (subject and object) implicatives (i.e., *a reuşi* 'manage', *a încerca* 'try'; *a obliga/forţa* 'oblige/force', *a încuraja* 'encourage', *a convinge* 'convince/persuade', etc.) can actually preclude control readings (i.e., allow disjoint embedded subjects), arguing for a tri-partite classification of Romanian subjunctives into Free (with desiderative verbs), Restricted (with subject and object implicatives) and Anaphoric subjunctives (with aspectual and modal predicates), which she argues are largely amenable to a (clasical) raising analysis.

controller entirely (i.e., PRO ≡ controller), so no collective predicates are allowed (2a). Conversely, PC predicates (desideratives, factives, interrogatives and epistemics) are attitudinal predicates which allow both EC readings, but also allow a superset-subset relation between PRO and its controller (PRO ⊆ controller), thereby allowing collective predicates in the complement clause (as in (1b) & (2b)).

(2)   a. John$_i$ *managed* [PRO$_i$ to write a poem] /*[PRO$_{i+}$ to <u>meet</u> at 6.]
         b. John$_i$ *hoped* [PRO$_i$ to write a poem.] /[PRO$_{i+}$ to <u>gather</u> at 5.]

Regarding the second difference, EC predicates impose strict temporal restrictions on the infinitival tense, disallowing any temporal mismatch ([-T]) (3a), whereas PC predicates allow independent temporal reference in their non-finite complement ([+T]).

(3)   a. **Yesterday*, Mary managed$_{+past}$ [PRO to arrive *tomorrow*.]
         b. *Yesterday*, Mary hoped$_{+past}$ [PRO to arrive *tomorrow*.]

Summing up, EC represents direct control of PRO by an antecedent in the main clause, due to the [-T], [-Agr] specification of the embedded infinitival, while PC are instances of control of PRO via the C head of the embedded clause, which is specified as [+T], [-Agr]. In English (and languages where these predicates select infinitive complements), the embedded clause is [-Agr] by virtue of its non-finiteness, which leaves the tense specification (the [+/-T] feature] as the key factor distinguishing EC from PC.

3. (Partial) Control in finite control languages

3.1. What are finite control languages?

Cotfas (2012) makes a distinction between 'infinitive' and 'subjunctive' languages. The former (English, German, Romance, etc.) select infinitive complements ([**-Agr**; +/- T]) in EC and PC contexts (4a), while the latter (languages belonging to the 'Balkan Sprachbund', Romanian included, as Balkan or East Romance) select subjunctives (with EC), sometimes even the indicative with some PC verbs ([**+Agr**; +/- T]) – due to diachronic (partial or total) loss of infinitives in object position (cf. Joseph 1983, Jordan 2009) – see (4b).

(4)   a. John managed/hoped [**to** write a novel.]

         b. Ion   a reușit/speră   [**să**   scri**e**   un   roman.]
            Ion   managed/hopes   **sbj**   write.**sbj-3sg**   a   novel[2]

---

[2]   Here is a list of the abbreviations used in the paper:
      Acc – Accusative case; [+Agr] – agreement; C-subjunctive = Controlled Subjunctive; Dat – Dative; DD – Direct Discourse; EC – Exhaustive Control; F-subjunctive = Free-subjunctive; ID – Indirect Discourse; Inf –infinitive; NC – No Control; NOC – Non-Obligatory Control; OC – Obligatory Control; PC – Partial Control; PE – preposition, pl – plural; sbj – the subjunctive particle *să* (or subjunctive inflection); sg – singular; refl –reflexive or the pronominal form *se* used with collective predicates, as in *a se întâlni* 'to meet'; *a se aduna* 'to gather/convene'.

Addressing the issue of finite control, Landau (2004) distinguishes between two types of Balkan subjunctives: Controlled (C) and Free (F). C-Subjunctives are selected by EC predicates and exhibit temporal anaphoricity and a complete match between PRO and its antecedent (so no PC allowed). F-subjunctives are instantiated with some PC verbs (mostly volitionals/desideratives), they exhibit temporal independence, and a *pro* type of subject, thereby they are able to obviate OC readings.

(5) a. Ieri,   Maria   a reușit/   a început   să   scrie   *Ana   *mâine.
         yesterday Maria   managed/ began   sbj   write-3sg   Ana   tomorrow

     b. Ieri,   Maria   spera   să   scrie   (sora ei)   (mâine)   o   scrisoare.
         yesterday Maria   hoped   sbj   write-3sg (her sister)   (tomorrow)   a   letter

Later on, Cotfas (2012) challenged this classification and argued instead for a tri-partite classification into Anaphoric vs Restricted vs Free Subjunctives. Of these, the author shows that only Anaphoric Subjunctives (selected by aspectual and modal verbs) display EC properties, but these lend themselves to a raising analysis (see also fn. 1). Landau (2013, 2015 & seq.) revisits his earlier claims and argues that the more traditional C- vs F-Subjunctives distinction can more accurately be expressed as a dichotomy between obligatory/exhaustive control (with EC verbs) and No Control (NC), i.e., instances where OC is not at stake.

Regardless of the approach one adopts, PC is deemed impossible in finite control languages first and foremost because of the [+Agr] specification of Balkan subjunctives. Moreover, since PC predicates select F-subjunctives (N(O)C), apparent instances of PC can always be cases of accidental (partial) co-reference between the main and the embedded subject, see (6).

(6) (Irina$_i$ a sosit în țară și)   Maria$_j$ speră [să se   întâlnească pro$_{i+j/j+k/j+(i)+k}$] (cu fratele$_k$ ei).
     (Irina arrived from abroad and) Maria   hopes sbj se.refl-3sg meet-3sg   (with her brother)
     'Irina$_i$ has arrived from abroad and Maria$_j$ hopes [PRO$_{j(+i)}$ to meet] /[her$_i$ to meet] her$_{i/j/(k)}$ brother.'

PC has been considered impossible in Romanian (Alboiu 2007, Cotfas 2012, Alexiadou et al. 2010, a.o), cf (7), from Alboiu (2007: 10), featuring *împreună* 'together' in the complement, which can also instantiate PC effects, on a par with collective predicates.

(7) a. *Eu vreau   [să   plec   *împreună.*]
         want-1sg   sbj   leave-1sg   together

     b. *Vreau   [să   plecăm   eu *împreună.*]
         want-1sg   sbj   leave-1pl   I   together

There are, of course, independent explanations for why the examples under (7) are ungrammatical. In (7a), the collective *together* is incompatible with the 1st pers. singular marking on the embedded verb; in (7b), likewise, the singular pronominal subject ('I') is incompatible with the plural marking on the embedded predicate. The problem therefore seems to come down to the fact that subjunctives are always [+Agr], hence there is morphological mismatch between the singular controller and a plural-marked embedded (albeit covert) subject.

3.2. PC instances in unexpected circumstances

In spite of the evidence above, it has been recently shown that a finite control language like Greek may sometimes display PC with the modal *mporo* 'can', which typically selects a C-subjunctive.

(8)   Mporusa   na   sinandithume   tin   alli   Triti   (slightly adapted from Sevdali & Sheehan 2021: 330)
       could-**1sg**   sbj   meet-**1pl**   the   other   Tuesday

The authors claim that the same can happen in Romanian, in limited circumstances, i.e., with a 1sg or 3sg subject controlling a 1pl verb form (see Section 4.3 below for refinements regarding PC instances in Romanian).

(9)   a.   Pot   să   ne   căsătorim   doar   la anul   [..]   (Sevdali & Sheehan 2021: 334)
             can-**1sg**   sbj   us-**1pl**   marry-**1pl**   only   at (next) year

       b.   Ea   poate   să   ne   căsătorim   doar   la anul
             she   can-**3sg**   sbj   us-**1pl**   marry-**1pl**   only   at (next) year

PC is unexpected in such environments, since we are dealing with a typical non-attitude EC matrix predicate which selects anaphoric subjunctives (i.e., with no temporal or subject reference mismatch, as shown in (5) above). Such evidence therefore seems to weaken the link between PC, attitudinal triggers and temporal independence in the complement clause.

The proof that we are in the presence of true (Partial) Control comes first and foremost from the fact that – in spite of the possibility of superset-subset relations (see (8) and (9) above) – (totally) disjoint subjects are disallowed, as can be seen in (10) and (11).

(10)   *poro   na   fas   (Sevdali & Sheehan 2021: 330)
        can-**1sg**   sbj   eat-**2sg**

(11)   a.   *Pot   să   mănânci
              can-**1sg**   sbj   eat-**2sg**

        b.   *Poți   să   mănânc(e).
              can-**2sg**   sbj   eat-**sbj.1sg/3sg**

Moreover, raising cannot be at stake, due to the obvious disjoint morphological marking (1**sg** > 1**pl**), which precludes the type of raising analyses that can be argued for in some English infinitives. (e.g., subject-to-subject raising constructions with matrix unaccusatives like 'seem' and even with modals, cf. Wurmbrand 2000)

Another line of analysis would be to see whether the PC examples in (8) and (9) involve a covert comitative in the complement, along the lines proposed by Poole (2015: 15) for apparent instances of PC with 'meet' under 'can' in English. The author actually analyzes instances such as (12a) as raising, featuring the schema in (12b), and argues that the PC reading derives from the fact that the collective predicate 'meet' allows for a covert comitative (i.e., meet *with*), which thus gives us the superset reading.[3]

---

[3]   While this analysis may work for 'meet', it does not with other collective predicates like 'gather' or 'convene', which do not allow such comitatives, cf. *John convened/gathered/assembled with his sister*. The type of

(12) a. John can <u>meet</u> tomorrow.
      b. XP₁ can [t₁ meet <u>*(with y)*</u>]

While the covert comitative analysis might work for English, let us not forget that Romanian (and Greek) use finite complements (subjunctives), so in typical PC instances (subset>superset), the embedded predicate is morphologically marked as plural, such that the plural reading is due to morphology rather than a covert comitative.[4]

(13) Aș putea   să   ne   vedem/întâlnim   mâine.
      could-**1sg** sbj us-**1pl** see/meet-**1pl**   tomorrow
      'I could meet tomorrow.' (lit. 'I could that we meet/see each other tomorrow.')

4. Partial Control instances in Romanian

4.1. A brief look at selectional and semantic properties

Before we look at PC instances, let us have a brief look at the semantic and syntactic behaviour of *a putea* 'can'. As a 'subjunctive language', Romanian has limited usage of infinitive complements, but one environment where the infinitive freely alternates with the subjunctive is with *a putea* (see (14)). The (bare) infinitives, present in (15a, a'), involve restructuring (clitic climbing of the direct object feminine pronoun *o* 'her-Acc' in (15a) and long passive (15a')), unlike the subjunctive in (15b), which disallows clitic climbing.

(14) Maria poate   **veni**   la cină   / **să** **vină**   la cină.
      Maria can-3sg come-**Inf** to dinner / **sbj** come-**sbj**.3sg to dinner
      'Mary can come to dinner.'

(15) a. Maria **o**   poate   suna   (pe Ana).   / a'. Ana poate   **fi**   sunată.
         Maria her-Acc can-3sg call-**Inf** (PE-Acc Ana)   Ana can-3sg be-Inf called-fem.sg

      b. *Maria **o**   poate   să   sune   (pe Ana)
         Maria   her-Acc can-3sg **sbj** call-sbj.3sg (PE Ana)

---

collective predicate used in the complement is another variable for PC, for there are languages where it seems that only reciprocals allow such effects. But looking at such restrictions from within is not the purpose of the present article.

[4] Collective predicates in Romanian allow the comitative alternation, but the comitative phrase is *obligatory* (both in simple clauses and in control environments)

(i)   a. Eu și Maria ne   -am întâlnit ieri.
         I and Maria us-1pl   meet-1pl   yesterday

      b. Eu m   -am întâlnit ieri   *(cu Maria)
         I   me-**1sg** met-**1sg**   yesterday   with Maria

(ii) a. Vreau/Aș putea   să   mă   întâlnesc mâine   *(cu ea).
         want / could-**1sg** sbj me-1sg   meet-1sg   tomorrow   with her

      b. Vrei/Ai putea   să   te   întâlnești mâine   *(cu mine/ea)?
         want/could-**2sg** sbj you-2sg meet-**2sg**   tomorrow   with me/her

Whether can + subjunctive instantiates Control or Raising arguably depends on the type of modality at stake. Following Wurmbrand (2000), who convincingly argues that (epistemic and deontic) modals display raising (vs control) behaviour, we take *a putea* in both (16a) and (16b) to behave as raising predicates (note that either the higher or the lower copy of the shared subject can be lexicalized). In both examples, the modal takes scope over the subjects ('the boy' or 'the cake'), as expected with raising verbs.[5] With root possibility (i.e., Subject-oriented ability), an Exhaustive Control analysis seems more plausible, since there are (thematic) restrictions on the type of matrix subject ([+person], alongside temporal anaphoricity and obligatory co-referent subjects in the complement in (17).

(16)   a. (Băiatul) poate   să fie   bolnav (băiatul). / Tortul   poate   să fie   stricat (tortul).
           boy-the can.3sg sbj be-3sg sick   (boy-the) / cake-the can.3sg sbj be-3sg off   (cake-the)
           'The boy may be sick.' / 'The cake may be/have gone off.'

       b. (Tortul) poate   să   fie   de ciocolată (tortul).   *(Maria nu se va supăra)*
           cake-the can-3sg sbj   be-3sg of chocolate (cake-the)
           'The cake can/may be chocolate cake.'   *(Mary won't mind)*

(17)   Ion / Băiatul / *Tortul   poate   să   rezolve   ecuații de gradul2.
       Ion / boy-the / cake-the can-3sg sbj solve-3sg 2nd degree equations.
       'Ion/The boy/ *The cake can solve 2nd degree equations.'

The possibility of PC effects reinforces the Control analysis. Importantly, PC interpretations are impossible with (restructuring) infinitives; they can only occur with subjunctives containing plural-marked collective predicates (which in Romanian feature the *se* clitic, i.e., *a se întâlni* 'meet', *a se aduna* 'gather/convene', *a se vedea* 'see (each other)', *a se căsători* 'marry', etc.). Moreover, as suggested by one reviewer, these PC subjunctives also allow for a full-fledged CP, with an articulated left-periphery where the specific subjunctive complementizer *ca* is lexicalized with topicalized material, see (18), which is a modified version of (9) above.

(18)   Ea   ar putea   **ca**   *abia la anul*   să   ne   căsătorim.
       she could-**3sg** that-sbj only (next) year sbj us-**1pl** marry-**1pl**

4.2. The type of modality in PC instances in Romanian

Having briefly discussed in 4.1 above the type of modality involved with a *putea* 'can', one question to address with respect to instances such as (9) and (13) above is whether the modality involved is truly that of ability – as in (17), which is what Sevdali & Sheehan (2020) seem to claim for the Greek *mporo*. However, rather than being purely abilitative (mental or physical), *a putea* 'can' in (9), (13) and (18) above does not focus on internal/intrinsic abilities of the main clause subject, but on external circumstances affecting the Main Clause subject

---

5   For (16a), the paraphrase would be: "In view of the available body of evidence, there is a possibility that the
    boy is sick/is at home". For (16b), "In view of the (contextually-established) norms/requirements, it is
    allowed/permitted for the cake to be (made of) chocolate".

(which can be the speaker or otherwise). These 'circumstances', as they stand at the relevant Reference Time, might facilitate the embedded event for (at least) the (referent of) the main clause Subject.

It is therefore our intuition that what we are dealing with here in terms of modal semantics is the 'neutral/circumstantial use' of 'can', in the sense of Palmer (1990), who claims that 'neutral (or circumstantial) possibility' simply indicates 'the circumstances in which an event is possible' (Palmer 1990: 83)[6]. We thus argue for a circumstantial modal base (= what the state of the world is at a certain Reference Time (and conceivable ways in which it might evolve), seconded by a 'stereotypical' ordering source' illustrating 'the normal/expected course of events').

Unlike dynamic *a putea* 'can' in (17), circumstantial *a putea* 'can' in PC constructions does not seem to impose strict temporal anaphoricity either (next to also relaxing the embedded subject reference for an inclusion relation), allowing disjoint (future-oriented) adverbs, as shown in (19):

(19)   [La cum arată programul meu **acum**],   aş putea   să   ne   vedem   **săptămâna   viitoare**.
        [judging by my schedule **right now**],   could-**1sg** sbj   us-**1pl** meet-**1pl** **week   next.**
        ' … I$_i$ could meet$_{i+j}$ next week.'

4.3. Delimiting the exact constraints on PC instances in Romanian

The claim that we would like to put forth is that PC instances in Romanian seem to be sensitive to the current speech act event, since they seem to be allowed as long as embedded PRO includes the Speaker or the Addressee (or both).

The three PC patterns we identify in Romanian are the following (the first notation refers to the main clause subject specification, the second to the embedded one):

I. 1SG > 1PL → (Eu > Noi // I > We), where PROwe   =   Speaker + Addresee / Speaker + others
                                                         (- Addressee) / Speaker + Addressee +Others[7]

---

[6]   Note also, from this perspective, the quite frequent use of the conditional on *a putea* in many naturally-occurring examples featuring PC effects (see the examples quoted in fn.7-9 below).

[7]   Here are more naturally-occurring examples:
      (i) […] [o sa fiu varza cu timpul si nu stiu cat de mult] **as putea să ne vedem /could-1sg sbj see-1pl**
                   https://beforeandafterbrides.wordpress.com/2010/07/23/23-iulie-2010-cafeaua-de-vineri/
      (ii) […] [am curs de dans [joi]]. **As putea sa ne vedem** vineri sau duminica/ **could-1sg sbj see-1pl**
                   https://tainacasatoriei.wordpress.com/2014/12/06/
      (iii) Dacă aveţi nevoie, **aş putea să ne întâlnim în holul hotelului dvs.** dacă …. / **could-1sg sbj see-1pl**
                   https://www.getyourguide.com/ro-ro/bari-l721/bari-tur-de-la-port-la-orasul-vechi-plimbare-si-
      (iv) […] i-am spus că **nu pot să ne vedem** pentru că am musafiri / **can-1sg sbj see each other-1pl**
                   https://www.tpu.ro/dragoste-si-sex/heii-am-din-nou-o-intrebare-astazi-fratele-fostului-meu-iubit-
      A reviewer mentiones that examples (iii) and (iv) sound odd. Be that as it may, they are naturally occuring examples found online (see the sources).
      (v) se supara dacă aude ca **nu pot sa ne vedem** […] / **can-1sg sbj see each other-1pl**
                   https://www.tpu.ro/dragoste-si-sex/buna-am-20-de-ani-si-sunt-cu-prietenul-meu-de-3-ani-insa-

(20) a. [Zilele astea am un program cam haotic și] nu   prea   pot   să   ne   întâlnim
               [these days I have a hectic schedule and]   not   really can.**1sg** sbj us-**1pl** meet-**1pl**
                                           (https://www.reno.ro/Led-It-Up-Atelierul-de-LED-uri-auto-t306625.html)

II. 2SG > 2PL → (Tu > Voi // YouSG > YouPL), where PROyou   =   Addressee + others (- Speaker)[8]

       b. […] **ai putea   să   vă   întâlniţi** la   cină   […]
                 could.**2sg** sbj you.**2pl** meet.**2pl** for   dinner
                              (https://jurnalul.ro/amp/horoscop-saptamanal-26-februarie-3-martie-2024-957432.html)

III. 2SG > 1PL → (Tu > noi // You > We), where PRO$_{We}$ =   Addressee + Speaker (+ others)[9]

       c. Dacă **poti**   **să**   **ne**   **întâlnim** în urmatoarele zile, [astept un răspuns]
               if   can.**2sg** sbj us-**1pl** meet-**1pl** in the next   days   [I'm waiting for an answer]
                                    (https://diacritica.wordpress.com/2010/07/11/intrebari-si-raspunsuri/)

We draw on Matsuda (2021), who looks at PC in Japanese and contends that PC (and Split Control) derive not so much from the constraints imposed by the selecting predicate, but from the internal properties of PRO (though the semantics of the matrix predicate may still play a role). Drawing on Vassilieva (2005), who discusses associative plurals in various languages, Matsuda (2021) shows that PRO shares the same associative semantics as 1st and 2nd person pronouns: they both have *de se* readings and must be [+human]. More precisely, *we* in English does not necessarily signal a plurality of speakers, but it refers to the Speaker (*I*) + other individuals.

---

[8]   Here are more naturally-occurring examples. Quite interestingly, some of them do not even involve collective predicates in the complement, even though it is worth mentioning that such instances (see (i) & (ii)) are 'saved' or 'legitimated' by collective secondary predicates such as *împreună* 'together' or *amândoi* 'both':
      (i) […] **ai putea   să _mergeţi_** cu maşina în ţară   **sau** pur şi simplu **să petreceţi timp *împreună***
           could-**2sg** sbj drive-**2pl** through the country or   simply   spend-**2pl** time together
                                         https://jurnalul.ro/amp/horoscop-zilnic-5-iunie-2024-966662.html
      (ii) […] **ai putea sa _mergeţi_** un weekend undeva frumos ***amândoi*** […]
             could-2sg sbj **go-2pl** away for the weekend somewhere nice just the two of you
                                         https://www.tpu.ro/adolescenti/buna-tpu-peste-ceva-vreme-iubita-mea-o-sa-faca-18-ani-
      (iii) **ai putea să vă întâlniţi la cină şi să ajungeţi să vorbiţi** toată noaptea / **could-2sg sbj meet-2pl/talk-2pl**
                                         https://jurnalul.ro/amp/horoscop-saptamanal-26-februarie-3-martie-2024-957432.html
      (iv) **ai putea sa va întâlniti cu alţi părinţi** care au copii de varsta lui …/ **could-2sg sbj meet-2pl**
                                         https://ghindoc.ro/acomodare-copil-gradinita/
[9]   Here are more naturally-occurring examples:
      (i) Dacă **poţi să ne întâlnim** in urmatoarele zile, astept un raspuns / **can-2sg sbj meet-1pl**
                                         https://diacritica.wordpress.com/2010/07/11/intrebari-si-raspunsuri/
      (ii) Dacă poţi săptămâna viitoare luni, **ai putea să ne întâlnim de la 7 sau 8 seara? / can-2sg sbj meet-1pl**
                                         http://koala.cs.pub.ro/pipermail/bit-projects/2014-May/000020.html
      (iii) Mihai, ce zici, **miercuri ai putea sa ne intalnim** la un suc? / **could-2sg sbj meet-1pl**
                                         https://www.subarufanclub.ro/forum/index.php?topic=1880.40
      (iv) Dacă eşti din Iaşi, **ai putea sa ne vedem?** […] / **could-2sg sbj see each other-1pl**
                                         https://www.mygarage.ro/jurnal-de-bord/525568-peugeot-508-rxh-4.html
      (v) vin la Londra, **dacă ai putea să ne vedem**, aş vrea să-ţi propun.. / **could-2sg sbj see each other-1pl**
                                         https://www.andreearosca.ro/razvan-rusu-reteta-de-zacusca-de-100-000-de-euro-si-cum

There are two types of *we*: inclusive *we* (Speaker + Addressee + others) and exclusive *we* (Speaker + others, excluding the Addressee). Regardless of which type is at stake, this 'inclusion of others' presupposed in the meaning of the 1st person plural pronominal guarantees its associative semantics. PC PRO behaves in a similar way: just as *I* (= Speaker) is a subset of *we*, the controller (antecedent) in a control construction is a subset of PRO.

(21)   a. We are leaving   (*we* = I (+you) + others)
        b. I want/John wants [PRO to meet]   (PRO = I/John (+you)+ others)

Matsuda's analysis argues therefore for more independence for PRO, which is to say that control readings do not depend only on selectional restrictions from outside, but also on the associative semantics of PRO itself.

Let us first briefly look at Matsuda's (2021) claims for Japanese and then see how these can be adapted for the Romanian data (via English). The author discusses the phenomenon of force embedding in Japanese, whereby specific suffixes (optative, intentive, promissive, imperative, exhortative) are used on the embedded verbs selected by matrix attitude predicates (CP-level indexical agreement). We do not quote the exact examples here, for lack of space, but we give the relevant schema in (22), which should suffice for the argument at hand. The verbs on the left represent the matrix attitude verbs, and the notations to their right stand for the particular suffix which surfaces in the complement clause.[10] Note that the same predicate may be compatible with more force types (i.e., there is no bi-unique relation)

(22)   a. *Hope*   > OPT (optative suffix)
        b. *Decide* > INT (intentive)   →   these instantiate *Subject Control*
        c. *Order*   > IMP (imperative)   →   *Object Control*
        d. *Promise* > PRM (promissive)   →   *Subject Control*
        e. *Propose* > EXH (exhortative)   →   *Split Control*

While Matsuda's study focuses on Japanese, he does make some claims about English, arguing that force embedding also exists in languages where suffixes are not overtly lexicalized. Thus, the claim is that English PC complements also involve (non-declarative) force embedding, but covertly, triggered by virtue of the matrix control verbs. As such, the control constructions in (23a') and (23b') are the indirect discourse (ID) versions of the direct discourse (DD) structures in (23a, b).

(23)   a. 'You, leave!', Harry ordered Betty   (DD)
        a'. Harry$_i$ ordered Betty$_j$ [PRO$_j$ to leave.]   (ID)
        b. 'I will leave', Harry promised Betty   (DD)
        b' Harry$_i$ promised Betty$_j$ [PRO$_i$ to leave.]   (ID)   (Matsuda 2021: 152)

Covert force embedding is possible because the semantic features of [Speaker] ([S]) and [Addressee] ([A]) do not necessarily correspond to those of Speaker and Addressee of the Utterance context; they shift from root to embedded context. Whereas the values for the

---

[10] The author shows that these complements are truly instances of embedding, in spite of the presence of these suffixes. For more details on the Japanese data, we prompt the readers to Matsuda's (2021) article.

subject in roots is anchored to Utterance/Speech Time ('you', addressee in (23a), 'I', Speaker in (23b)), the values for PRO are anchored to the reported speech event and the matrix attitude holder ('Betty' as the (shifted) addressee in (23a'), 'Harry' as the (shifted) Speaker in (23b')).

The notion of Speaker (as well as Addressee, for that matter) should therefore be taken to refer not merely to the actual Speaker of the speech event, but also, as a semantic feature, to the attitude holder of various mental states. Consequently, therefore, in English, PRO with a [S] or [A] feature does not fall under 1st or 2nd person, but 3rd (a 'shifted speaker'). In (23a'), a case of Object Control, the [A] feature on PRO is controlled by the 3rd person matrix direct object 'Betty', and in (23b'), a case of Subject Control, the [S] feature on PRO is co-referenced to the 3rd person matrix subject 'Harry'. All these features are specified as indexical features on a projection internal to PRO.

Under this view, the typology of Control structures in English would be the one in (24) below, broadly adapted on the basis of Matsuda's classification in (his) (35) (2021:149) and the author's examples (39) – (43) (Matsuda 2021:153).

(24)   ***Subject Control*** > OPT (optative) force embedding (with *hope, want*)
                                    > INT (intentive) force embedding (with *decide*)
                                    > PRM (promissive) force embedding with *promise*)
                                    → **[+S] on PRO = MC Su (3rd person)** (*shifted speaker*)

        Object Control   > IMP (imperative) force embedding (with *force, oblige, order*, etc.)
                                    → **[+A] on PRO = MC D.O. (3rd person)** (*shifted addressee*)

        Split Control   > EXH (exhortative) force embedding (with *propose, suggest*)
                                    → **[+S], [+A] on PRO**

Bearing in mind the typology in (24) above, in PC instances (with matrix attitude predicates and embedded collective predicates), the [+S] specification on PRO does not indicate identical reference to the (actual or shifted speaker, *but mere inclusion*. Similarly, [- S] indicates exclusion of the (current or shifted) Speaker, [+A] indicates inclusion of the (actual or shifted) Addressee and [-A] indicates exclusion of the (actual or shifted) Addressee. In (25) below, both featuring PC, embedded PRO bears a [+S] feature which signals inclusion of either the actual Speaker (25a) or the shifted Speaker ('John').

(25)   a. $I_{i(=actual\ S)}$ want [PRO_{i+} to break up.]
        b. $John_{i(=shifted\ S)}$ wants [PRO_{i+} to meet]

Let us now take a look at Romanian. Romanian seems to be an in-between case. On the one hand, it differs from both Japanese and English in that PC instances are not manifested with attitude predicates, as expected, but with a modal, which is a typical EC verb. On the other, like English, but unlike Japanese, there are no overt force embedding suffixes in the subjunctive complement. However, these instances show clear sensitivity to indexicality (that is, the actual conversational situation). As the examples below show ((26a-c)), these PC instances in Romanian involve an interplay between the [+S] and [+A] specification on embedded PRO.

The three patterns we have identified above may be equated to Matsuda's typology as follows:

I.   1SG > 1PL → PRM (promissive or INTentive)

(26)   a.   Aş putea   [PRO$_{+current S}$ să   ne   vedem   abia   pe   14.]
              could-**1sg**   sbj   us-**1pl**   see-**1pl**   only   on   14
              'I could meet on the 14th (not before).'

II.   2SG > 2PL → IMP (imperative)

        b.   Poţi/Ai putea   [PRO$_{+ current A}$ să   vă   întâlniţi   mâine(./!/?)
              can/could-**2sg**   sbj   you-**2pl**   meet-**2pl**   tomorrow
              'Could you$_{sg}$ meet tomorrow?'

III.   2SG > 1PL → EXH (exhortative)

        c.   Poţi   (sau nu)   [PRO$_{+ current S \& A}$ să   ne   vedem/adunăm   în   weekend   la   mine?
              can-**2sg**   (or not)   sbj   us-**1pl**   see/gather-**1pl**   at   weekend   at   mine
              'Can you meet up at my place at the weekend?'

As also noted by Matsuda (2021) (for English and Japanese), in Romanian, too, these patterns nicely correlate with Portner's (2004) 'To-Do List' proposed for the correlation between various (root) forces and subject reference (see also Zanuttini et al. 2012). The pattern in (26a) (1sg>1pl) resembles a promissive force, which is about adding a property to the To Do List of the Speaker (+ associates); the pattern in (26b) (2sg>2pl) resembles an imperative force, whose role is to add the property denoted by the predicate to the To Do List of the Addressee (+ associates); the pattern in (26c) (2sg>1pl) is reminiscent of an exhortative, whose purpose is to add a property to the To Do List of both Speaker and Addressee (+ possible associates)

Even though a syntactic analysis of these constructions is not the immediate aim of this paper (we leave this for future research), the evidence discussed above could motivate a syntactic account of PRO along the lines proposed by Zanuttini et. al (2012) for Jussives, whose subjects are shown to correlate with imperative, promissive and exhortative forces. As such, PRO could reside in the Specifier position of a JussP between CP and TP and, as a minimal pronoun lacking person specification, receive its features under binding from the Juss° head ([+S] / [+A] / [+S, +A]).[11]

(27)   [CP C [PRO Juss**°** [TP T [vP ....]]]]

---

[11] Juss comes in three varieties [1stpers/+S] / [2nd pers/+A] / [1st, 2ndpers /+S, +A], with a variety of C heads above (C$_{imperative}$, C$_{promissive}$, C$_{exhortative}$….) (cf Matsuda 2015a, b, 2017). Possible downsides of this account could be that there are too many varieties of Juss & C, as well as, as far as the minimal pronoun view (i.e., PRO devoid of person features), it is not clear why such a pronoun would be merged in the derivation before the merger of the Jussive head. We leave these issues for further investigation.

Before we conclude, let us briefly look at some examples involving non-deictic (3rd person) antecedents. Firstly, it is important to note that the **3sg > 3pl** pattern is not really relevant in Romanian, as subjunctive inflection for 3rd person is underspecified for number. That is, singular and plural subjunctive forms are identical, so there is no way of checking for embedded plurality morphologically. Moreover, as already shown above (see fn. 2), a comitative phrase is obligatory in such contexts.

(28) Maria nu poate   să   se   întâlnească mâine   *(cu Ana.)
      Maria not can-**3.sg** sbj refl-3sg/pl meet-**3sg/pl** tomorrow   (with Ana)
      ??/*'Maria cannot meet tomorrow' / √ 'Maria cannot meet (with Ana) tomorrow.'

Taken in isolation, (28) is ungrammatical (without the comitative), though it could be coerced, given an appropriate context (but still, the PC reading may be accidental). That is, in (29), unlike (28), the collective predicate could work without the comitative phrase, as long as the wider context facilitates the identification of the *with*-PP (under the interpretation that 'Mary cannot meet with Ana'). Obviously, the context becomes perfectly grammatical in the presence of any comitative phrase, identifying either a discourse-salient DP or not.

(29) [Ana_i i-a spus Mariei_j   [**că** nu poate   *pro_i*
      Ana   told   Mary-Dat that not can-**3sg**
      [PRO_{i+j(+…)} **să** se   vadă   mâine   (cu ea_j / cu Paul)]]
                sbj refl-3sg/pl see-sbj.3sg/pl tomorrow   (with her / with Paul)
      'Ana_i told Mary_j that she_i cannot meet tomorrow (with her_j/with Paul).'[12]

Other possible patterns involving 3rd person antecedents are the ones where the embedded verb is marked for either 1st person plural (**3Sg > 1Pl**)[13] or 2nd person plural (**3Sg > 2Pl**)[14]. In these cases, unlike the ones above, plurality is visibly (morphologically) marked in

---

[12] The different notations for the empty subjects in (29), i.e, *pro* and PRO, are due to the fact that the first one (i.e., *pro*) is the empty subject of a finite (that/*că*) complement featuring 'can', selected by a verbum dicendi (*say*), so it can freely alternate with overt (disjoint) DP (here it retrieves *Ana* in the main clause), whereas the second one (PRO) is the null subject of a PC subjunctive selected by 'can', and is therefore able to retrieve both (necessarily) the matrix antecedent (i.e., the *pro* bound by Ana), as well as other relevant participants in the discourse situation (i.e., Mary, Paul, etc.) – as shown by the indices.

[13] Here are other naturally-occurring examples:
      (i) Mi-a spus ca **nu poate sa ne vedem**
          He told me that **cannot-3sg sbj us-1pl see-1pl**
                              https://www.gazetademaramures.ro/nu-i-poet-si-nu-l-inspira-catalin-chereches-1075
      (ii) […] voiam sa cumpar ceva, l-am sunat [….] *a zis* ca **nu poate sa ne vedem**
          I wanted to buy sth, I called him   **said-3sg that cannot-3sg sbj us-1pl see-1pl**
                              https://www.mygarage.ro/componente/214301-discutii-cele-mai-bune-oferte-ale-zilei-995.html
      (iii) Dupa ce […], **s-a dat lovit**   **că**   **nu poate sa ne vedem**   decat sapt viitoare
          After ….   He just lay low and (said that) **cannot-3sg sbj us-1pl see-1pl** only next week
                              https://www.avocatnet.ro/forum/discutie_192859/Constatare-amiabila.html
[14] More naturally-occurring examples:
      (i) de fiecare dată găseşte un motiv pentru care **nu poate să vă vedeți**
          Every time s/he finds a reason for which   **cannot-3sg sbj you-2pl see-2pl**
                              https://www.fiibarbat.ro/cum-aduci-femeie-facebook-lumea-reala/

the complement clause. In the former, the Speaker feature is included on the embedded subject, in the latter, there is Addressee inclusion.

(30)   a.   Florin   nu   poate   să   ne   vedem   vineri   *(....așa mi-a zis ieri)*
              Florin   not   can-**3sg**   sbj   us-1pl   see-**1pl**   Friday   *(he told me so yesterday)*

      b.   Ioana   ar putea   să   vă   întâlniți   joi   *(.... m-a rugat să-ți spun)*
              Ioana   could-**3sg**   sbj   you-2pl   meet-**2pl**   Thursday   *(she asked me to tell you)*

As with the English examples in (23), (30a&b) represent Indirect Discourse (ID) variants of pattern I discussed above (1sg antecedent + 1pl embedded subject), with either inclusion or exclusion of the *current* speaker (i.e., the *I* of the current speech event). More specifically, the Direct Discourse (DD) variant of (30a) (Florin's actual words) is: *Nu pot să ne vedem vineri* 'I cannot meet$_{1pl}$ on Friday', such that the embedded 1pl/*we* here includes both the current speaker (*I*) and the shifted one (*Florin*), alongside possibly others (Addressee included or not). The DD variant of (30b) (Ioana's actual words) would be: *Spune-i Anei că aș putea să ne întâlnim joi* 'Tell Ana that I could meet$_{1pl}$ [her +] on Thursday', such that embedded 1pl/we here excludes the current Speaker (I), but includes the shifted one (Ioana) (alongside the Addressee and/or others). If anything, this interplay between current and shifted speaker features that we see in the Romanian data lends further support for Matsuda's (2021) claim that [+S] must include the speaker of *some* context (either root or shifted).

5. Conclusions

This paper has looked at Partial Control instances in Romanian, a language so far deemed to lack such interpretations. We have shown that PC effects obtain in unexpected contexts, i.e., with a matrix modal (*a putea* 'can'), a non-attitude predicate which selects untensed C-subjunctives. This seems to weaken the traditional link between PC and the type of matrix trigger (which is supposed to be attitudinal) – on the one hand, and, on the other, the correlation of PC to temporal independent embedded domains.

However, these issues needn't be problematic if we agree that in these particular contexts the modality of the trigger and the subsequent anaphoricity of the complement are not typical for OC/EC. We have argued for neutral circumstantial possibility (a la Portner 1990, 2004) (rather than dynamic ability), which seems to go hand in hand with what we might call an "appointment-like" semantics which further facilitates future temporal readings in the complement clause. Furthermore, following Matsuda (2021), the properties of PRO are (somewhat) independent from the matrix predicate and have more to do with the internal specifications on PRO and its inherent associative semantics, which it shares with 1st and 2nd person pronouns.

We have identified 3 possible PC patterns in Romanian, all sensitive to the [+S], [+A] features on the embedded subject: a) 1sg > 1pl (inclusion of current speaker, +/- Addressee,

---

(ii) … nu răspunde la telefon, sau .. <u>*zice*</u>   că   **nu poate să vă vedeți**
      (s/he) doesn't answer the phone or says that **cannot-3sg sbj you-2pl see-2pl**
                     https://www.reddit.com/r/CasualRO/comments/181egpa/help_sa_o_mai_primesc_inapoi/

+/- others); b) 2sg > 2pl (inclusion of Addressee, - Speaker, +/- others, and c) 2Sg > 1pl (inclusion of both Speaker and Addressee (+/- others). A preliminary inventory of corpora and speaker preferences seems to indicate that while the first and the last are quite unproblematic, the second is a bit more restricted– which may be indicative of the fact that the [+S] feature is stronger, when it comes to PC effects. Of course, further investigation is needed before a definite conclusion can be reached. What (we hope) can be concluded on the basis of all the above is that PC in Romanian is sensitive to the current speech event. Moreover, the availability of such instances in Romanian, a 'finite control' language, shows that a control analysis cannot be fully dismissed for subjunctive complements in control environments – even though typical control verbs have been shown either to obviate control (NC) or instantiate raising (cf. Alboiu 2007, Cotfas 2012). On a larger view, the availability of PC in Romanian brings further proof in favour of the existence of PRO as a null category and against the Movement Theory of Control (cf. Landau 2000, 2004, 2015, 2023).

References

Alboiu, G. 2007. Moving forward with Romanian backward control and raising. In W. D. Davies and S. Dubinsky (eds.), *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, 187–211. Dordrecht: Springer.

Alexiadou, A., E. Anagnostopoulou, G. Iordachioaia, and M. Marchis. 2010. No objection to backward control. In N. Hornstein and M. Polinsky (eds.), *Movement theory of control*, 89–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.154.04ale.

Cotfas, M. A. 2012. *On the syntax of the Romanian subjunctive*. Ph.D. diss., University of Bucharest.

Jordan, M. 2009. *Loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian diachronic syntax*. Ph.D. diss., University of Florida.

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

Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Landau, I. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22(4): 811–877. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-004-4265-5.

Landau, I. 2013. *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Landau, I. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Matsuda, A. 2015a. Controller restrictions and embedded force. *JELS: Papers from the Conference and from the International Spring Forum of the English Linguistic Society of Japan* 32: 77–83.

Matsuda, A. 2015b. Complement control without a DP controller. *Journal of the Ochanomizu University English Society* 5: 29–49.

Matsuda, A. 2017. Shifted indexicals in partial control. *JELS: Papers from the Conference and from the International Spring Forum of the English Linguistic Society of Japan* 34: 264–270.

Matsuda, A. 2021. Control from inside: Evidence from Japanese. In A. Mucha, J. M. Hartmann, and B. Trawinski (eds.), *Non-canonical control in a cross-linguistic perspective*, 137–167. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Palmer, F. R. 1990. *Modality and English modals*. London and New York: Longman.

Pearson, H. 2016. The semantics of partial control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34(2): 691–738. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-015-9313-9.

Poole, E. 2015. *Implicit arguments*. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Portner, P. 2004. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 14: 235–252.

Sevdali, C., and M. Sheehan. 2021. Rethinking partial control: New evidence from finite control clauses. In A. Bárány, T. Biberauer, J. Douglas, and S. Vikner (eds.), *Syntactic architecture and its consequences III: Inside syntax*, 323–340. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Vassilieva, M. 2005. *Associative and pronominal plurality*. Ph.D. diss., SUNY Stony Brook.

Wurmbrand, S. 2000. Modal verbs must be raising verbs. In S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. Haugen, and P. Norquest (eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 18*, 599–612. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Zanuttini, R., P. Miok, and P. Portner. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30(4): 1231–1274.

Cite this article as:

Cotfas, M. A. (2025). Some Partial Considerations on Partial Control Instances in Romanian. *LingBaW. Linguistics Beyond and Within, 11*, 53–68.