

## Overt Comitatives in Romance: Unravelling Partial Control

The literature on Control posits a key distinction between exhaustive control (EC) and partial control (PC) (Landau 2000 and subseq., Wurmbrand 2002, Grano 2015, Pearson 2016, a.o.): EC occurs with modals, aspectuals, implicatives, and verbs like *try*, while PC is licensed by desiderative, factive, propositional, and interrogative verbs. The main difference lies in the possibility of a mismatch between matrix and embedded subjects in PC contexts, allowing for comitative predicates (1); conversely, EC requires strict coreference between the matrix subject and the embedded subject (2).

(1) [Julia wanted [ $\text{PRO}_{i+j}$  to gather/collaborate]]

(2) [Julia managed [ $\text{PRO}_i$  to sleep/\*gather at 8]]

In this talk, I revisit this division and show that, unlike in other languages, comitative licensing in Romance is not sensitive to the matrix predicate. I argue that PC does not exist in Romance: PRO is both syntactically and semantically singular. What appears to be PC arises from an overt comitative realised by the oblique clitic *hi/i* in Catalan and Aranese Occitan. For those varieties lacking the clitic *hi*, like Valencian or Spanish, I argue that the partial reading is derived via a covert comitative, as has been proposed for other languages (Hornstein 2003, Rodrigues 2008, Sheehan 2014, Pitteroff et al. 2017, Pitteroff & Sheehan 2018). I support this view by revisiting classic arguments against the null comitative (Landau 2016, Authier & Reed 2018), and show that comitatives are not crosslinguistically uniform by examining mismatches in which verbs allow comitative interpretations across different Romance varieties.