



Control Types or Complement Types? On the Licensing of Overt Controlees in Mandarin Chinese

Hao Pan, Ruiyang Chen, Xiaoshi Hu*
Tsinghua University

Abstract

Aligning with other languages, Mandarin Chinese allows overt controlees in control constructions. A debate on the status and licensing of overt controlees has arisen recently. D. Li (2024) argues that the distinction between exhaustive control and partial control is closely related to the occurrence of overt controlees, whereas only partial control verbs allow overt controlees. On the contrary, following the Implicational Complementation Hierarchy (ICH) framework, He (2024) proposes that only *Situation* complements allow overt controlees. In this study, we argue against D. Li's (2024) conclusions and provide counterexamples to her findings. We find that some exhaustive control verbs allow overt controlees as well, and in Mandarin Chinese an utterance with a control verb is not always an obligatory control construction. Therefore, our new observation supports He's (2024) proposal, and we further argue that ICH is a better way to describe the distribution of overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese, and coercion makes it possible for a sentence with a control verb to change into a non-control construction.

Keywords

control, partial control, overt controlee, ICH, Mandarin Chinese

* Xiaoshi Hu is the corresponding author.

1 Introduction

In usual cases, control construction involves a null PRO as the subject of its embedded clause. However, a cross-linguistic observation suggests that the covert subject may be overtly spelled out in obligatory control (henceforth OC) constructions (see Szabolcsi 2009 for the discussion in Italian; Park 2018 for the discussion in Korean). Researchers have long noticed a similar control pattern in Mandarin Chinese (C.-T. J. Huang 1989; Y.-H. A. Li 1990; T.-H. J. Lin 2011; Grano 2015; N. Huang 2018; etc.). Some scholars noted that overt subjects can occur under a control verb in Mandarin Chinese as well (Hu et al. 2001; He 2020, 2024; Zhang 2016; D. Li 2024). A relevant case is presented in (1), where the verb *zhunbei* ‘prepare’ is considered as a control verb (N. Huang 2018).

- (1) Wo zhunbei mingtian xiaowu tian hei yihou wo
 I prepare tomorrow afternoon sky dark after I
 yi ge ren lai.
 one CL man come
 ‘I plan to come alone tomorrow afternoon after it gets dark.’
 (Hu et al. 2001: 1131)

A recent debate on the licensing of the overt controlee is raised in the literature. Under the Implicational Complementation Hierarchy (ICH) framework (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023), some scholars argue that overt controlees appear under *Situation* complements only (He 2020, 2024). In contrast, others attribute the licensing of overt controlees to a specific type of control construction: partial control (D. Li 2024). He (2024) divides clausal complements in Mandarin Chinese into three types, *Event*, *Situation*, and *Proposition*. *Proposition* complements are free on temporal and subject reference. They license non-controlled overt embedded subjects, modals, and embeddable SFPs. *Event* complements require temporal simultaneity with matrix events and only allow null form PRO. *Situation* complements differ from them in licensing overt controlees, though they prohibit the occurrence of aspect markers and SFPs. D. Li (2024) explains the distribution of overt controlees in a different way. She relates the presence of overt controlees to the theories of partial control (Landau 2013, 2015; Pearson 2016). Her core ideas are as follows:

- (i) The control constructions with overt subjects are indeed obligatory controls (henceforth OC). (ii) The overt controlees are not lexicalized PROs for the fact that they only follow partial control (henceforth PC) verbs but not exhaustive control (henceforth EC) verbs. (iii) Based on the fact that EC fails to license overt controlees, PC and EC constructions are different in Mandarin, and the partial reading comes from the associative marker (henceforth AM) which is consistent with investigations of PC in other languages (e.g., Madigan 2008). To summarize, to explain the occurrence of the overt controlee *wo* ‘I’ in (1), He (2024) attributes it to the fact that the verb *zhunbei* ‘prepare’ selects a *Situation*

complement. On the contrary, D. Li (2024) argues that it is because *zhunbei* is a PC verb.

In this study, we argue that D. Li's (2024) findings are misled by her limited choices of control verbs. Taking more verbs into consideration, we find that (i) some overt subjects are not overt controlees in that they have no subject referential dependence and fail the OC tests (adopted from Hornstein 1999). (ii) It is not PC verbs that license overt controlees, but verbs selecting *Situation* complements that allow overt embedded subjects, and this is in line with previous studies on the manifestation of ICH in Mandarin Chinese (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023; He 2020, 2024). (iii) Our findings challenge D. Li's (2024) argument on the structural distinction between EC and PC constructions, and we have independent evidence to show that the AM approach cannot fit Mandarin data. We believe that EC/PC distinction lies in the certain semantic properties of attitude verbs instead of structural differences (Pearson 2016; Meng and Li 2019). Therefore, we argue that control is a clausal property instead of verbal property, and ICH is a better approach to capture the distribution properties of overt controlees in Mandarin. *Event* complements cannot select overt controlees, while *Situation* complements can; and with proper contexts, *Event* and *Situation* complements can be coerced into *Proposition* complements which allow lexical DPs as embedded subjects.

This article is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews two different approaches for the distribution of overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese. Section 3 argues against D. Li's (2024) conclusions that (i) control verb constructions with overt subjects are OC constructions and (ii) only PC can allow overt controlees and thus select finite clauses. In section 4 we challenge D. Li's (2024) analysis of PC construction and propose our analysis on licensing overt controlees on the basis on ICH. Section 5 concludes our findings and remarks D. Li's (2024) proposal on control phenomenon.

1.1 Restriction by complement type (He 2024)

As a language lacking overt morphological inflection, there has been a long debate on whether Mandarin sets a distinction between finite and infinite clauses, and whether it has control constructions (C.-T. J. Huang 1982, 1989, 2022; Y.-H. A. Li 1985, 1990; T.-H. J. Lin 2012; He 2020, 2024; D. Li 2024; N. Huang 2024 argue for the finiteness distinction, while Hu et al. 2001; J.-W. Lin 2006, 2010 argue against it). He (2020, 2024) argues that most of the diagnostics for finiteness in Mandarin Chinese align with ICH (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023). On the basis of Givón 1980 and Ramchand and Svenonius 2014, Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023) propose that clausal complements can be divided into three classes based on their dependence, transparency, and integrity: *Propositions*, *Situations*, and *Events*. As shown in Table 1, complements on the right side of the scale are more dependent, transparent, and integrated compared with those on the left.

Table 1 *Implicational Complementation Hierarchy (ICH)*

MOST INDEPENDENT	LEAST INDEPENDENT
LEAST TRANSPARENT	PROPOSITION >>> SITUATION >>> EVENT
LEAST INTEGRATED	MOST TRANSPARENT
	MOST INTEGRATED

(Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023: 188)

Previous studies have provided a classification of verbs depending on types of complements they can select as in (2) (C.-T. J. Huang 2017, 2022; He 2020).

- (2) a. *Proposition* Class: *faxian* ‘find out’, *fouren* ‘deny’, *gaosu* ‘tell’, *huaiyi* ‘suspect’, *jide* ‘remember (factive)’, *juede* ‘think’, *queren* ‘confirm’, *renwei* ‘believe’, *shengcheng* ‘claim’, *shengming* ‘declare’, *shuo* ‘say’, *zhidao* ‘know’, *wangji* ‘forget (factive)’, *xiwang* ‘hope’, *xiangxin* ‘believe’...
- b. *Situation* Class: *bi* ‘force’, *baituo* ‘ask someone to do a favor’, *dasuan* ‘plan, intend’, *houhui* ‘regret’, *jihua* ‘plan’, *jueding* ‘decide’, *qing* ‘invite’, *quan* ‘urge, persuade’, *mingling* ‘order’, *xiangyao* ‘want’, *yinyou* ‘lure’, *zhengqu* ‘strive’, *zhidao* ‘instruct’, *zhunbei* ‘prepare’...
- c. *Event* class: *changshi* ‘try’, *gan* ‘dare’, *jide* ‘remember (implicative)’, *jixu* ‘continue’, *kaishi* ‘begin’, *ken* ‘be willing’, *neng* ‘be able to’, *qitu* ‘intend’, *tingzhi* ‘stop’, *wangji* ‘forget (implicative)’, *xiguan* ‘be accustomed to’, *xihuan* ‘like’...

As Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023) proposed, the independence of temporal interpretations and subject reference is the guideline for classifying the three broad classes of complements. Temporal independence refers to the temporal relation between the matrix and the complement. *Proposition* complements are flexible in temporal interpretations, and they allow different time adverbs in the matrix clause and the complement clause. *Situation* complements differ in that although they also allow time adverbs, the temporal relation is fixed. Most *Situation* complements can only be interpreted as future irrealis, thus they disallow adverbs denoting the past. *Event* complements disallow overt time adverbs, showing that the embedded event must occur with the matrix event simultaneously, as is shown in (3). In (3a), the verb *shuo* ‘say’ selects a *Proposition* complement, and it allows an embedded past-time adverb *shang-ge xingqi* ‘last week’. In (3b), the verb *dasuan* ‘plan’ selects a *Situation* complement, though future-time adverb is allowed, an adverb denoting the past is prohibited. In (3c), the verb *kaishi* ‘begin’ selects an *Event* complement, and no temporal adverb is allowed.

- (3) a. **Zuotian** Yuehan shuo [Mali **shang-ge xingqi** qu-le Shanghai].
yesterday John say Mary last-CL week go-PFV Shanghai
‘Yesterday, John said that Mary went to Shanghai last week.’
- b. **#Zuotian** Yuehan {dasuan/quan} Mali [**shang-ge xingqi**]
yesterday John plan/urge Mary last-CL week

- qu Shanghai].
 go Shanghai
 #‘Yesterday, John {planned / urged Mary} to go to Shanghai last week.’
 c. #**Zuotian** Yuehan kaishi/changshi [**mingtian** likai Beijing].
 yesterday John begin/try tomorrow leave Beijing
 #‘Yesterday, John {began / tried} to leave Beijing tomorrow.’
 (Adapted from He 2024: 267)

Subject referential independence refers to the relation between the embedded subject and the matrix subject and is closely related to the syntactic forms of the embedded subject. *Proposition* complements are free on the interpretations and forms of embedded subjects. They can either be overt proper names or free pronouns, as in (4a). *Situation* complements prefer null PROs as embedded subjects, though they still allow the forms of reflexives *ziji* ‘self’, CPros (complex complemented pronouns, pronouns with “numeral + classifier + noun” complements), and bound pronouns as instances of overt controlees (Hu et al. 2001; Zhang 2016), as in (4b). *Event* complements are more restricted on their embedded subjects, as only null PROs are available, as shown in (4c).

- (4) a. Zhangsan_i shuo [**Lisi/ta_{ij}/tamen_{i+j+}** chi-le fan].
 Zhangsan say Lisi/3SG/3PL eat-PFV food
 ‘Zhangsan_i says that Lisi/he_{ij}/they_{i+j+} ate.’
 b. Wo dasuan [tian hei yihou {**PRO/wo-men**} yiqi qu].
 1SG plan sky dark after PRO/1-PL together go
 ‘I’ve made the plan that we go there together after it gets dark.’
 c. *Zhangsan kaishi [jintian **ziji** chifan].
 Zhangsan begin today self eat
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan begins that he eats today.’
 (Adapted from He 2024: 271–272)

In conclusion, He (2024) explains the distribution of overt controlees in terms of complement types defined under ICH framework. *Proposition* complements allow free subjects. *Situation* complements allow null PROs and overt controlees. *Event* complements only allow null PROs.

1.2 Restriction by control type (D. Li 2024)

Control constructions fall into two major classes: OC and non-obligatory control (NOC) (Hornstein 1999). In OC constructions, the controlee has to be bound by a controller in the matrix clause. OC can be further classified into EC and PC. The distinction between them is first noted by Landau (2000). EC constructions require the controlee to be identical to the controller, while the controlee is a group containing the controller and other members in PC constructions. The distinction is shown in (5)–(6), where the predicate *gather* can only occur under PC verbs but not EC verbs for it requires its subject to be plural. Scholars such as N. Huang (2018), Zhang (2016), and D. Li (2024) also argue for the distinction between EC and PC in Mandarin Chinese. As shown in (7), *shefa* ‘try’ is an EC predicate,

and *dasuan* ‘decide’ and *zhunbei* ‘prepare’ are PC predicates (N. Huang 2018). Accordingly, only the latter class allows embedded verbs like *jihe* ‘gather’.

- (5) a. Subject EC verb:
The Chair_i tried PRO_i to set off/*gather at six o’clock.
b. Subject PC verb:
The Chair_i planned PRO_{i(+)} to set off/gather at six o’clock.
- (6) a. Object EC verb:
The Chair_i asked John_j PRO_{*i/j} to set off/*gather at six o’clock.
b. Object PC verb:
The Chair_i urged John_j PRO_{*i/j(+)} to set off/gather at six o’clock.
(Landau 2000: 3)
- (7) a. *Zhangsan gaosu Wangwu Lisi {shefa/changshi/qitu}
Zhangsan tell Wangwu Lisi try
jiu dian jihe.
nine o’clock gather
*‘Zhangsan told Wangwu that Lisi tried to meet up at 9 o’clock.’
b. ??Zhangsan gaosu Wangwu Lisi {dasuan/zhunbei}
Zhangsan tell Wangwu Lisi plan/get.ready
jiu dian jihe.
nine o’clock gather
‘Zhangsan told Wangwu that Lisi planned/got ready to meet up at 9 o’clock.’
c. Wo dasuan tian hei yihou zai huoche-zhan jihe.
I plan sky dark after at train-station gather
‘I’ve made the plan that [we] meet up at the train station after it gets dark.’
(N. Huang 2018: 356)

According to D. Li (2024), the distinction between EC and PC further leads to a distinction between overt and covert controlees. She argues that only PC verbs allow embedded overt controlees, and EC verbs only allow null PROs as their embedded subjects, as illustrated in (8). The PC verb *dasuan* ‘plan’ allows the bound pronoun *ta* ‘he’, but the EC verb *shefa* ‘try’ disallows it.

- (8) a. Lisi dasuan mingnian xiatian (ta) qu lüyou.
Lisi plan next-year summer he go travel
‘Lisi plans to go travel next summer.’
b. Lisi shefa mingnian xiatian (*ta) qu lüyou.
Lisi try next-year summer he go travel
‘Lisi tries to go travel next summer.’
(D. Li 2024: 347)

1.3 Interim summary

In this section we have reviewed the two different viewpoints on the licensing of overt controlees. D. Li (2024) argues that the acceptance of overt controlees

depends on different control types, and only PC predicates allow overt controlees; He (2024) starts from ICH which set criteria to classify different types of complement clauses, and proposes that the occurrence of overt controlees is determined by complement types. In this paper, we argue for the latter view of control, and we propose that the acceptance of overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese is a syntactic property of control constructions, while PC is a semantic property of certain predicates. We will start from our reanalysis on D. Li's (2024) observations.

2 Arguments against (D. Li 2024)

In this section we will begin with an overview on D. Li's (2024) arguments, and challenge her findings with new observations. D. Li (2024) argues that (i) with an overt embedded subject, a construction with control verbs is still an OC construction; and (ii) only PC verbs allow overt controlees. We will provide evidence to show that (i) overt embedded subjects are not always overt controlees; and (ii) not only PC verbs select overt controlees.

2.1 Overt subjects are not always overt controlees

D. Li (2024) uses three tests to examine the OC status of a control verb with an overt embedded subject. She claims that the interpretation of overt subjects (i) only has sloppy reading, denying strict reading, (ii) only has *de se* reading but has no *de re* reading, and (iii) has no long-distance control reading. In this section, we provide counterexamples to show that some overt subjects are not OC bound. Therefore, the presence of overt subjects might change the control status of the original construction. We further argue that the control status should not be determined by the matrix predicate, whether the overt subject occurs or not.

2.1.1 Sloppy versus strict reading

The first test is based on the fact that in VP ellipsis constructions, the OC PRO only permits sloppy reading but not strict reading, as shown in (9). As for the non-control verb *say*, both readings are available, hence the bound pronoun *he* could refer to either *John* or *Bill*, as in (9a). Meanwhile, for the control verb *expect*, only sloppy reading is allowed, thus the null PRO cannot get its reference from *John*, as in (9b).

- (9) a. John said that he would win and Bill does too.
 Sloppy reading: Bill said that Bill would win. (True)
 Strict reading: Bill said John would win. (True)
 b. John expects PRO to win and Bill does too.
 Sloppy reading: Bill expects Bill to win. (True)
 Strict reading: Bill expects John to win. (False)
 (Hornstein 1999: 73)

Now we can apply this diagnosis to Mandarin data. D. Li (2024) finds that when an overt subject is embedded under a control predicate, only sloppy reading

is available. For the non-control predicate *xiwang* ‘hope’, both sloppy reading and strict reading are possible. The bound pronoun *wo* ‘I’ or the reflexive *ziji* ‘self’ can refer to either the former subject *wo* ‘I’ or the latter subject *wo jiejie* ‘my sister’, as shown in (10a). However, strict reading is prohibited for a control predicate like *dasuan* ‘plan’. Therefore, the latter sentence in (10b) can only bear the meaning that my sister also plans for herself to go study in this school.

- (10) a. *Wo xiwang wo/ziji yihou qu zhe suo xuexiao shangxue.*
 I hope I/self after go this CL school study
Wo jiejie ye shi.
 I sister also be
 ‘I hope I will go study in this school in the future. So does my sister.’
 Yes Sloppy: ‘My sister also hopes she will go study in this school.’
 Yes Strict: ‘My sister also hopes I will go study in this school.’
- b. *Wo dasuan wo/ziji yihou qu zhe suo xuexiao shangxue.*
 I plan I/self after go this CL school study
Wo jiejie ye shi.
 I sister also be
 ‘I plan PRO to go study in this school in the future. So does my sister.’
 Yes Sloppy: ‘My sister also plans PRO to go study in this school.’
 No Strict: ‘My sister also plans for me to go study in this school.’
 (D. Li 2024: 339)

Though seemingly convincing, we argue that this conclusion is not plausible. First, if we change to another context, both strict and sloppy readings are possible for a control verb. We will continue to use *dasuan* ‘plan’ as an instance of control verbs. In (11), if Lisi himself has no need to go to Beijing but he is rather trying to help Zhangsan go to Beijing, the strict reading is possible for the latter clause, meaning that Lisi plans to have Zhangsan go to Beijing instead of himself. In such a case, the seemingly control verb *dasuan* ‘plan’ is located in a non-control construction instead, in that both the strict and the sloppy reading are allowed.

- (11) *Zhangsan dasuan mingnian wulun-ruhe ta dou yao*
 Zhangsan plan next-year no-matter-what he all will
qu Beijing. Lisi ye zheme dasuan.
 go Beijing Lisi also so plan
 ‘Zhangsan plans PRO to go to Beijing no matter what happens. Lisi also plans so.’
 Yes Sloppy: ‘Lisi plans PRO to go to Beijing no matter what happens.’
 Yes Strict: ‘Lisi plans to have *Zhangsan* go to Beijing.’
 (Context: Lisi is helping Zhangsan go to Beijing.)

Similar cases can be found with object control predicates as well. Take (12) as instance, which contains the object control verb *quan* ‘urge’. Our background knowledge tells us that it is more likely for a suspect to confess, hence the second clause has the strict reading where I urge the suspect’s mother to have her son

confess. (Also with a sloppy reading if we know that the suspect's mother has also committed crimes.)¹

- (12) Wo quan xianyiren wulun-ruhe ta dou yao zishou.
 I urge suspect no-matter-what he all should confess
 Wo ye zheme quan le xianyiren de mama.
 I also so urge ASP suspect DE mother
 'I urge the suspect PRO to confess no matter what happens. I also urge the suspect's mother so.'
 Yes Sloppy: 'I urge the suspect's mother PRO to confess no matter what happens.'
 Yes Strict: 'I urge the suspect's mother to have the suspect confess no matter what happens.'

2.1.2 *De se* reading versus *de re* reading

The second test concerns the interpretation of the controlees in OC constructions. As observed by Hornstein (1999) and Landau (2013), a controlee only allows *de se* (self) reading but not *de re* (person) reading. For instance, given the scenario in (13), a free pronoun *he* has both *de se* and *de re* readings. It is both true for John to hope that he himself will win and that the candidate on TV will be defeated, as in (14). However, as for the interpretation of PRO, only the *de se* reading is allowed, hence (15b) is false according to the context in (13).

- (13) John is a candidate. He is watching himself giving a talk on TV, but he is too drunk to recognize himself, and he thinks the man on TV is a terrible candidate.
 (D. Li 2024: 340)
- (14) a. John hopes that he will win.
 True (*de se*)
 b. John hopes that he will be defeated.
 True (*de re*)
 (D. Li 2024: 340)
- (15) a. John hopes PRO to win.
 True (*de se*)
 b. John hopes PRO to be defeated.
 False (no *de re*)
 (D. Li 2024: 340)

¹ A reviewer pointed out that *quan* 'urge' has a non-control reading, as in (i). Obviously, this case is not a control construction, in that the complement clause has a past tense reading. This suggests our main argument here that the matrix predicate cannot determine the control property of the whole construction. It is worth noticing that *quan* here no longer means 'urge', but 'suggest'. We will explore this coercion phenomenon in Section 4.

(i) Lisi quan Zhangsan (shuo) fanren zao gai zai shang yi ci tingshen
 Lisi urge Zhangsan say prisoner early should at last one CL trial
 de shihou jiu bei chujue le.
 DE time JIU BEI execute SFP
 'Lisi suggested to Zhangsan that the prisoner should have been executed in last court trial.'

As for Mandarin, D. Li (2024) argues that when an overt subject is embedded under a control predicate, only the *de se* reading is possible. She shows that the overt subject embedded under such non-control predicates as *xiwang* ‘hope’ has both *de se* and *de re* readings. According to D. Li (2024), given such a context in (16), the pronoun *ta* ‘he’ in (17) can have both *de se* and *de re* readings. If *ta* refers to *Lisi* (*de re* reading), (17a) will be true. For the *de se* reading, where *ta* refers to *his son*, (17b) will be true. However, the *de re* reading prohibits an overt controlee to be embedded under the control predicate *dasuan* ‘plan’, as in (18). Given that the embedded subject *ta* can only refer to *Lisi* (*de se* reading), (18b) is false according to the scenario in (16).

- (16) Lisi is too drunk to recognize himself in a photo and thinks that it is his son, and he hopes and plans for his son but not for himself to go to college.
(D. Li 2024: 340)

- (17) a. Lisi xiwang ta bu yao qu shang daxue.
Lisi hope he not will go attend college
‘Lisi does not hope he will go to college.’
True (*de re*)
b. Lisi xiwang ta yao qu shang daxue.
Lisi hope he will go attend college
‘Lisi hopes he will go to college.’
True (*de se*)
(D. Li 2024: 340)

- (18) a. Lisi dasuan ta bu yao qu shang daxue.
Lisi plan he not will go attend college
‘Lisi does not plan he will go to college.’
True (*de se*)
b. Lisi dasuan ta yao qu shang daxue.
Lisi plan he will go attend college
‘Lisi plans PRO to go to college.’
False (no *de re*)
(D. Li 2024: 340)

We argue that Di Li’s (2024) observation is not comprehensive. With a proper context, a seemingly control predicate with an overt embedded subject still allows *de re* reading. Again, we will test the two verbs in her own analysis: *dasuan* and *quan*. Given the context in (19), both propositions in (20) are true. The embedded pronoun *ta* ‘he’ can either refer to the matrix subject *Lisi* as in (20a), denoting the *de se* reading, or *the young man* as in (20b), denoting the *de re* reading. The same holds for the object control verb *quan*. In (21), both propositions are true under the scenario in (19), indicating that both *de se* and *de re* readings are possible.

- (19) Lisi is the CEO of a company and he decides to retire next year. Now he is selecting a proper candidate for his position. One day he noticed a smart young man on a lecture. He believes that this young man is the best candidate for the CEO, but he is too old to recognize that the young man is just himself at a younger age.

- (20) a. Lisi *dasuan* *mingnian* *ta* *yao* *xieren* *zongjingli*.
 Lisi plan next-year he will retire CEO
 ‘Lisi plans PRO to retire from the CEO position next year.’
 True (*de se*)
- b. Lisi *dasuan* *mingnian* *ta* *qu* *dang* *zongjingli*.
 Lisi plan next-year he will become CEO
 ‘Lisi makes the plan that he will become the CEO next year.’
 True (*de re*)
- (21) a. Lisi *quan* *ziji* *mingnian* *ta* *yao* *xieren* *zongjingli*.
 Lisi urge self next-year he will retire CEO
 ‘Lisi urges himself PRO to retire from the CEO position next year.’
 True (*de se*)
- b. Lisi *quan* *dongshihui* *mingnian* *ta* *qu* *dang* *zongjingli*.
 Lisi urge board next-year he will become CEO
 ‘Lisi urges the board that he will become the CEO next year.’
 True (*de re*)

2.1.2 Long distance control

The third test shows that a controlee cannot be bound in long-distance (Landau 2013). In English, a pronoun *he* embedded under such non-control verbs as *say* can refer to both *John* or *Tom*, while the covert controlee PRO embedded under *promise* can only be interpreted as *Tom*, but not as the matrix subject *John*, as in (22).

- (22) a. John_i knows that Tom_j said he_{ij} will come.
 b. John_i knows that Tom_j promised PRO_{*ij} to come.
 (D. Li 2024: 342)

D. Li (2024) shows that the control verb *dasuan* rejects long distance control. In (23b), the embedded subject *ta* ‘he’ under the control predicate can only be controlled by the local controller *Lisi*. On the contrary, the non-control verb *shuo* ‘say’ allows its embedded subject to be bound through the embedded clause boundary into the matrix clause. As shown in (23a), the embedded subject *ta* can refer to any reference outside the embedded clause.

- (23) a. Zhangsan_i *zhidao* Lisi_j *shuo* *ta*_{ij} *yao* *qu* *lüyou*.
 Zhangsan know Lisi say he will go travel
 ‘Zhangsan_i knows that Lisi_j said that he_{ij} will go travel.’
- b. Zhangsan_i *zhidao* Lisi_j *dasuan* *ta*_{*ij} *yao* *qu* *lüyou*.
 Zhangsan know Lisi plan he will go travel
 ‘Zhangsan_i knows that Lisi_j planned that he_{*ij} will go travel.’
 (D. Li 2024: 342)

We agree on D. Li’s (2024) judgments on (23), but we argue that the restriction of long distance control is applied on semantics instead of syntax. We first use *dasuan* ‘plan’ and *quan* ‘urge’ as subject control and object control examples. Given our general knowledge, only one person can become CEO instead of the

whole board. Therefore, the embedded pronoun *ta* ‘he’ can only be bound by the matrix subject *Zhangsan*, as in (24a). Likewise, the embedded subject under *quan* ‘urge’ also has the long distance control reading. Given our general knowledge, it is more possible for a lawyer to urge the judge to execute a prisoner, thus the overt embedded pronoun *ta* ‘(s)he’ naturally refers to the long distance argument *fanren* ‘prisoner’, as in (24b). For an object control predicate, the matrix subject can be the bound reference as well. In (24c), the embedded subject *ta* naturally refers to *Lisi*, the matrix subject.

- (24) a. Zhangsan_i zhidao dongshihui_j yijing dasuan mingnian
 Zhangsan know board already plan next-year
 ta_{i/#j} dang zongjingli.
 he be CEO
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan_i knows that the board_j has already planned that he_{i/#j} will be the CEO next year.’
- b. Fanren_i zhidao Lisi_j quan faguan_k wulun-ruhe ta_{i/#j/#k} dou
 prisoner know Lisi urge judge no-matter-what he all
 yinggai bei chujue.
 should be execute
 Lit.: ‘The prisoner_i knows that Lisi_j urges the judge_k that he_{i/#j/#k} should be executed no matter what happens.’
- c. Lisi_i quan laoban_j wulun-ruhe ta_{i/#j} dou yinggai shengzhi.
 Lisi urge boss no-matter-what he all should promote
 Lit.: ‘Lisi_i urges his boss_j that he_{i/#j} should be promoted no matter what happens.’

2.1.3 Interim summary

In this section, we have reviewed three tests given by D. Li (2024), sloppy versus strict reading, *de se* versus *de re* reading, and long distance control. D. Li (2024) attempts to prove that the overt subjects embedded under control predicates behave identically to their null form counterpart PRO, hence demonstrating that the constructions with overt subjects embedded under control verbs are cases of OC construction. However, we challenge her points by testing verbs she selected in novel scenarios, showing that the behaviours of overt subjects embedded under control verbs sometimes deviate from that of PROs. Therefore, we further argue that under certain circumstances a supposed control verb can select a finite proposition, and the whole construction is not a control construction anymore. It is worth mentioning that we have no intention to deny the existence of overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese (see Zhang 2016; He 2024 for a detailed discussion on overt controlees in Mandarin), but overt subjects embedded under control verbs are not always overt controlees. For the counterexamples we presented, some overt subjects behave like an ordinary pronoun. Thus, we need to carefully examine other control properties, e.g., temporal dependence to see whether a control predicate with an embedded subject still holds to be a control construction. In the next section, we will turn to D. Li’s (2024) central proposal that only PC verbs select overt controlees, and pose our evidence to argue against it.

2.2 Not only PC verbs allow overt controlees

In this section we investigate the properties of PC verbs and the licensing of overt controlees. D. Li (2024) presents her observation that only PC verbs allow overt controlees. However, we argue that besides PC verbs, some EC verbs can also license overt controlees. Our findings show that the conditions on licensing overt controlees do not lie in the distinction between EC and PC verbs.

Previous studies on overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese have found that overt subjects such as *ziji* ‘self’, CPros (*ta-yigeren* ‘he alone’), and bound pronouns are able to be embedded under both EC and PC verbs. However, there are some cases of overt controlees e.g., *ziji* having the adverbial use, meaning ‘on one’s own’ (Ussery *et al.* 2016; C.-T. J. Huang 2022). D. Li (2024) challenged those works by pointing out that they have not fully tested whether the controlees are used as DPs or adverbs. With her data, D. Li (2024) proposes that only PC verbs allow real overt controlees, while the supposed controlees embedded under EC verbs are adverbials instead of DPs. Still, her observation is not complete.

Before a further discussion, we will first justify the EC status of the following verbs: *bimian* ‘avoid’, *beipo* ‘be compelled’, and *rang* ‘ask’. The fundamental distinction between PC and EC verbs is the licensing of collective predicates, e.g., *jianmian* ‘meet’, *jihe* ‘gather’, etc. Collective predicates require plural DPs as their subjects, hence (25a) is ungrammatical because the matrix subject *Zhangsan* is singular. PC verbs allow collective predicates to be embedded under them because the PRO of a PC verb has a plural interpretation, and thus only the PC verb *dasuan* ‘plan’ licenses the embedded collective predicate *jian-mian* ‘meet’ in (25c), but (25b) is ungrammatical because the control verb *shefa* ‘try’ is an EC predicate. As shown in (26), all of these verbs we have mentioned above prohibit collective predicates like *jianmian* ‘meet’.

- (25) a. **Zhangsan mingtian jianmian.*
 Zhangsan tomorrow meet
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan will meet tomorrow.’
 b. **Zhangsan shefa mingtian jianmian.*
 Zhangsan try tomorrow meet
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan tries to meet tomorrow.’
 c. *Zhangsan dasuan mingtian jianmian.*
 Zhangsan plan tomorrow meet
 ‘Zhangsan plans to meet tomorrow.’
- (26) a. **Zhangsan bimian mingtian jianmian.*
 Zhangsan avoid tomorrow meet
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan avoids to meet tomorrow.’
 b. **Zhangsan beipo mingtian jianmian.*
 Zhangsan be-compelled tomorrow meet
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan is compelled to meet tomorrow.’

- c. *Zhangsan rang Lisi jintian xiaowu jianmian.
 Zhangsan ask Lisi today afternoon meet
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan asks Lisi to meet this afternoon.’

In what follows, we will use these words as counterexamples to show that some EC verbs also allow overt controlees. Thus, the licensing of overt controlees cannot be accounted for by the control properties of the verbs.

Focus marker *lian...dou...* In Chinese, the reflexive *ziji* ‘self’ has two distinctive uses. It can be treated either as a reflexive DP (27a) or an adverb meaning ‘alone, by oneself’ (27b). Zhang (2016) argues that only a true argument can be focused by the focus marker *lian...dou...* ‘even’. If the focused element is adverbial, the sentence would crash, as shown in (28b). In control construction, she shows that the overt controlee embedded under a control verb *dasuan* ‘plan’ can be focused by *lian...dou...*, hence the overt controlee is indeed a lexicalized DP, as in (29).

- (27) a. A-Lin piping-le ziji.
 A-Lin criticize-PFV self
 ‘A-Lin criticized himself.’
 b. A-Lin {ta yi ge ren/ziji} qu-le duchang.
 A-Lin 3SG one CL person/self go-PFV casino
 ‘A-Lin went to a casino by himself.’
 (Zhang 2016: 281)
- (28) a. Lian Lili dou qu-le duchang.
 even Lili also go-PRF casino
 ‘Even Lili went to a casino.’
 b. *Lili lian {ta yi ge ren/ziji} dou qu-le duchang.
 Lili even 3SG one CL person/self also go-PRF casino
 (Zhang 2016: 281)
- (29) Baba he Mama dasuan wanshang lian {tamen liang ge ren/ziji} dou qu duchang.
 Dad and Mom plan evening even 3PL two CL person/self also go casino
 ‘Dad and Mom made the plan that even they two go to a casino this evening.’
 (Zhang 2016: 287)

D. Li (2024) argues that the flaws of this previous work are that it only tested PC verbs, but neglected EC verbs. She uses the EC verb *shefa* ‘try’ to show that the embedded element under EC verbs is used as an adverb instead of a DP, hence it cannot be focused by the *lian...dou...* construction, as shown in (30). The same judgment is confirmed from He 2024, as in (31).

- (30) *Baba he Mama shefa wanshang lian {tamen liang ge ren/ziji}
 Dad and Mom try evening even 3PL two CL person/self

dou qu duchang.

also go casino

Int.: ‘Dad and Mom even tried for the two of them to go to a casino this evening.’

(D. Li 2024: 344)

- (31) *Lili changshi [jintian lian {ta yi ge ren/ziji} dou chi-fan].

Lili try today even 3SG one CL person/self also eat-meal

Lit.: ‘Lili even tries for himself to eat today.’

(He 2024: 272)

We argue that her conclusion is too arbitrary. At the very least there are some EC verbs that still allow true overt controlees. Take *bimian* ‘avoid’ as an example. Recalling the example in (26), we have shown that it is an EC predicate. Interestingly, *bimian* shows its tolerance to a true embedded subject. Given (32) as a scenario, it is fully grammatical to focus *ziji* ‘self’ by *lian... dou...* in (33).

- (32) Zhangsan is a group leader in a company. Most of the time only his crew members need to go on business trips. This time all of his crew members are forced to go on a business trip to Beijing. Therefore, Zhangsan is trying to avoid to go to Beijing.

- (33) Zhangsan pin-jin-quan-li bimian mingtian lian ziji dou qu Beijing.
Zhangsan do-one’s-best avoid tomorrow even self all go Beijing
Lit.: ‘Zhangsan did his best to avoid that even he himself will go to Beijing tomorrow.’

Modal *yao* The second test on the status of the overt element is using modal *yao* ‘will’. D. Li (2024) claims that *yao* is lower than the subject, and higher than adverbial *ziji*, as seen in (34). Therefore, if *ziji* is lower than modal *yao*, then it should be an adverb, and it is a subject if *yao* follows it.

- (34) a. Zhangsan yao ta-yi-ge-ren/ (ta-)ziji qu.
Zhangsan will he-one-CL-person/ (he-)self go
‘Zhangsan will go by himself.’

- b. *Zhangsan ta-yi-ge-ren/ (ta-)ziji yao qu.
Zhangsan he-one-CL-person/ (he-)self will go
Int.: ‘Zhangsan will go by himself.’

(D. Li 2024: 345)

D. Li (2024) tests the position of *yao* in control constructions. She finds that only PC verbs allow *yao* to appear lower than CPro or *ziji*, as seen in (35a) and (35b). To obtain an adverbial interpretation, they have to come next to *yao*, as in (35c). On the contrast, EC verbs only allow *yao* to appear in front of CPro or *ziji*, resulting in an adverbial interpretation as in (35d).

- (35) a. Zhangsan dasuan (ta-yi-ge-ren/ziji) yao zaodian
Zhangsan plan he-one-CL-person/self will early

- wancheng baogao.
finish report
'Zhangsan plans to finish the report early.'
- b. Zhangsan shefa (*ta-yi-ge-ren/*ziji) yao zaodian
Zhangsan try he-one-CL-person/self will early
wancheng baogao.
finish report
Int.: 'Zhangsan tries to finish the report early.'
- c. Zhangsan dasuan yao (ta-yi-ge-ren/ziji) zaodian
Zhangsan plan will he-one-CL-person/self early
wancheng baogao.
finish report
'Zhangsan plans to finish the report early (by himself).'
- d. Zhangsan shefa yao (ta-yi-ge-ren/ziji) zaodian
Zhangsan try will he-one-CL-person/self early
wancheng baogao.
finish report
'Zhangsan tries to finish the report early (by himself).'
- (D. Li 2024: 345)

However, other EC verbs, e.g., *beipo* 'be compelled', also pass this test. The embedded overt controlee can appear before the modal *yao*, and according to D. Li (2024), it should be treated as a real subject DP, as shown in (36). This indicates that EC verbs are compatible with overt controlees.

- (36) Zhangsan beipo mingtian **ziji** you yao
Zhangsan be-compelled tomorrow self again will
yi-ge-ren qu Beijing.
alone go Beijing
'Zhangsan is compelled PRO to go to Beijing tomorrow again.'

High adverbs N. Huang (2018) finds that *ye* is placed at a high position, which is lower than the subject and higher than functional heads like the future morpheme *jiang*, modal auxiliaries, and aspect markers, as in (37). Recalling the last section, we have shown that adverbial *ziji* 'self' appears after the futurate modal *yao*, hence the subject *ziji* should be higher than adverb *ziji*, while the adverb *ye* should be lower than subject *ye*. Therefore, D. Li (2024) compares the relevant positions between *ye* and embedded elements *ziji* and CPros to see whether they are subjects or adverbs. The reflexives *ziji* or CPros should occur before the adverb *ye* if they are subjects, whereas those used as adverbs should be lower, as in (38).

- (37) a. Lisi mingtian jiang hui qu Riben. (*ye) Zhangsan mingtian
Lisi tomorrow FUT will go Japan also Zhangsan tomorrow
(ye) jiang (??ye) hui (*ye) qu Riben.
also FUT also will also go Japan
'Lisi will go to Japan tomorrow. Zhangsan will also go to Japan tomorrow.'

- b. Lisi mingtian zhe-ge shihou hui zai paobu. (*ye) Zhangsan
 Lisi tomorrow this-CL time will PROG run also Zhangsan
 (ye) hui (*ye) zai (*ye) paobu.
 also will also PROG also run
 ‘Lisi will be running this time tomorrow. Zhangsan will also be running.’
 (N. Huang 2018: 353)

- (38) Zhangsan yao ziji/ ta-yi-ge-ren qu Faguo lüyou. Lisi (ye)
 Zhangsan will self/ he-one-CL-person go France travel Lisi also
 yao ziji/ ta-yi-ge-ren (*ye) qu.
 will self/ he-one-CL-person also go
 ‘Zhangsan is going to travel to France by himself. Lisi is (also) going by himself.’
 (D. Li 2024: 346)

As in control constructions, D. Li (2024) finds that subject-controlled PC verbs as in (39a) and object-controlled PC verbs as in (40a) allow embedded elements *ziji* ‘self’ to be higher than the adverb *ye*, while *ziji* cannot be inserted before *ye* under subject-controlled EC verbs as in (39b) and object-controlled EC verbs as in (40b). This indicates that only in PC constructions can those embedded elements be subjects, whereas those embedded under EC verbs are adverbs.

- (39) a. Zhangsan qu Faguo lüyou le. Lisi dasuan (ziji) ye qu.
 Zhangsan go France travel ASP Lisi plan self also go
 ‘Zhangsan has gone to travel to France. Lisi also plans to go.’
 b. Zhangsan qu Faguo lüyou le. Lisi shefa (*ziji) ye qu.
 Zhangsan go France travel ASP Lisi try self also go
 ‘Zhangsan has gone to travel to France. Lisi also tries to go.’
 (40) a. Zhangsan quan Lisi he Wangwu (ta-men-liang-ge) ye qu lüyou.
 Zhangsan urge Lisi and Wangwu he-PL-two-CL also go travel
 ‘Zhangsan urges Lisi and Wangwu to go travel as well.’
 b. Zhangsan rang Lisi he Wangwu (*ta-men-liang-ge) ye qu lüyou.
 Zhangsan ask Lisi and Wangwu he-PL-two-CL also go travel
 Int.: ‘Zhangsan asks Lisi and Wangwu to go travel as well.’
 (D. Li 2024: 347)

We cast doubt on the judgments given by D. Li (2024). According to our consultants, (40b) with *ta-men-liang-ge* ‘they two’ sounds natural.² Even if we put this disagreement aside, given a new scenario, *rang* ‘ask’ can still pass the high adverb test, where *ye* comes after the embedded subject *ziji*, as shown in (42).

² One reviewer pointed out that some native speakers would analyze *ta-men-liang-ge* ‘they two’ and *Lisi he Wangwu* ‘Lisi and Wangwu’ as a single constituent, hence they accept it as a null PRO control construction. However, with proper pauses between *Lisi he Wangwu* and *ta-men-liang-ge*, some consultants still judge it as grammatical. Further investigation on the overall judgment is open for future studies.

- (41) Zhangsan is a group leader in a company. He has already sent a group of people to Beijing for a business trip, but it is not sufficient. Hence, he asks another group of people to go to Beijing.
- (42) Zhangsan rang zhe bang ren mingtian ta-men-ji-ge
 Zhangsan ask this CL people tomorrow he-PL-some-CL
 ye qu Beijing.
 also go Beijing
 ‘Zhangsan asks this group of people to go to Beijing tomorrow as well.’

Pronouns The last diagnosis is to use pronouns as overt controlees, since it has been proposed that they have the ability to serve as overt controlees (Hu et al. 2001; Zhang 2016), and pronouns have no adverbial use. Li found that only PC verbs (e.g., subject-controlled PC verb *dasuan* ‘plan’, object-controlled PC verb *quan* ‘urge’) allow pronouns as embedded subjects, as in (43a) and (44a), while EC verbs (e.g., subject-controlled EC verb *shefa* ‘try’, object-controlled EC verb *rang* ‘ask’) prohibit pronoun embedded subjects, as in (43b) and (44b).

- (43) a. Lisi dasuan mingnian xiatian (ta) qu lüyou.
 Lisi plan next-year summer he go travel
 ‘Lisi plans to go travel next summer.’
 b. Lisi shefa mingnian xiatian (*ta) qu lüyou.
 Lisi try next-year summer he go travel
 Int.: ‘Lisi tries to go travel next summer.’
- (44) a. Zhangsan quan Lisi wulun ruhe (ta) dou yao lai.
 Zhangsan urge Lisi no-matter what he all will come
 ‘Zhangsan urges Lisi to come anyway.’
 b. Zhangsan rang Lisi wulun ruhe (*ta) dou yao lai.
 Zhangsan ask Lisi no-matter what he all will come
 Int.: ‘Zhangsan asks Lisi to come anyway.’
 (D. Li 2024: 347)

However, we find that some PC verbs fail to license pronoun subjects in their complements. Take *houhui* ‘regret’ as an instance. *Houhui* allows a partial reading, since it allows *jihe* ‘gather’ as its embedded predicate, as in (45). However, as shown in (46), an overt pronoun *ta* ‘he’ cannot appear under *houhui*. Therefore, the distribution of pronouns cannot distinguish EC verbs from PC verbs.

- (45) Zhangsan houhui qi dian jihe.
 Zhangsan regret seven o’clock gather
 ‘Zhangsan regrets to gather at seven.’
- (46) Zhangsan houhui qunian xiatian (*ta) qu le Beijing.
 Zhangsan regret last-year summer he go ASP Beijing
 Int.: ‘Zhangsan regrets that he went to Beijing last summer.’

2.3 Interim summary

In this section we have reviewed the distribution of overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese, and challenges D. Li's (2024) conclusion that only PC verbs allow overt controlees. We use other EC verbs like *bimian* 'avoid' and *beipo* 'be compelled' to show that some EC verbs also allow overt controlees embedded under their complements.

Our counterexamples show that EC/PC distinction cannot make a clear cut on the licensing of overt subjects. Therefore, we believe that an account based on different complement types (He 2020, 2024) should be a better way to demonstrate the distribution of overt controlees. In the next section we will further elaborate how ICH explains the licensing condition of overt subjects. Verbs belonging to *Proposition* class and *Situation* class allow overt controlees, while verbs in *Event* class only allow null PRO.

3 Different structures, different controlees

In the previous section we have argued against D. Li's (2024) conclusions that only PC verbs allow overt controlees, hence control types cannot be the licenser of overt controlees. In this section, we propose that the distinction between EC and PC lies in semantics, not syntax, but the occurrence of overt controlees is a syntactic property of certain types of control complements. We will first show the advantage of ICH in licensing overt controlees, and then argue against D. Li's (2024) analysis on PC in Mandarin Chinese.

3.1 Finite *Situation* complements select overt controlees

In previous parts we provide ample instances to challenge D. Li's (2024) conclusion that only PC verbs allow overt controlees. Nevertheless, we think that her conclusion is insightful, that overt controlees only occur when clauses are finite, but the finiteness of a clause complement is not determined by whether the verb is EC or PC, but by its position on ICH (Wurmbrand and Lohninger 2023; He 2024). As for the control construction, dependence is what needs to be taken into consideration. The dependence of an embedded clause on its matrix clause concerns the subject referential dependence (He 2024), which connects to the licensing of overt controlees. As He (2024) points out, in Mandarin the complement type maps to the finiteness of the complement. *Proposition* complements must be finite; *Situation* complements can be either finite or non-finite, while *Event* complements must be non-finite. A finite complement allows an overt subject and a temporal marking, but finite *Situation* complements differ from *Proposition* complements in that they are in temporal and/or subject referential dependency (He 2024). As in (47), the control predicate *houhui* 'regret' selects a *Situation* complement, in that its complement clause has an overt, referential bound subject, with an overt progressive marker *zai*. Therefore, the occurrence of overt controlees is determined by the type of the complement clause. In control constructions, *Situation* complements allow overt controlees, while *Event* complements only allow null PROs.

- (47) Zhangsan_i hen houhui [ziji_i/tamen_{i+} dangshi **zai**
 Zhangsan very regret self/they at-that-time PROG
 canguan bowuguan].
 visit museum
 ‘Zhangsan regretted that he/they went to the museum at that time.’
 (He 2024: 290)

D. Li (2024) mentions that PC verbs always take *Situations* as their complements, while EC verbs take *Events*. Additionally, the tolerance of PC is a key property of *Situation* complement rather than *Event* complement for Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2023). However, we have demonstrated that PC verbs and *Situation* verbs are not fully overlapped because some EC verbs show tolerance to overt controlees. In the next part we will revisit D. Li’s (2024) proposal on accounting for partial reading in Mandarin Chinese, and we argue that the EC/PC distinction is a semantic one, while the occurrence of overt controlee is a syntactic property of *Situation* complements. Theoretically and empirically, we should expect that overt controlees are not licensed by PC predicates.

3.2 Against an AM analysis

First, we will examine D. Li’s (2024) treatment of partial reading in Mandarin Chinese. D. Li (2024) argues that the partial reading in Mandarin is realized by an overt AM *men* or a covert AM, which maps a kind to a salient group in the context (Jiang 2017). The semantics of AM is stated as (48).

- (48) $[AM]^c = \lambda x$. The plural entity that includes x and those associated with x in the context c
 (D. Li 2024: 352)

D. Li (2024) argues that pronouns and reflexives can achieve partial reading by attaching an overt AM *men*, and the partial reading of PRO under PC verbs comes from a covert AM *men* attached to the PRO. This treatment is in line with proposals for partial reading in languages lacking lexicalized AM (Madigan 2008). Therefore, the embedded subjects *ta* ‘he’ denotes an exhaustive reading, and when it is attached with an AM *men*, *tamen* denotes a partial reading. For a null PRO, both exhaustive reading and partial reading are possible, as in (49). However, *ziji* is incapable of attaching *men*, as in (50), hence it only has exhaustive reading in control constructions.

- (49) Lisi_i dasuan Ø_{ii+} /ta_i/ta-men(-ziji)_{i+}/ziji(-*men)_{i/*i+} yao qu lüyou.
 Lisi plan PRO he/he-PL-self/self-PL will go travel
 ‘Lisi plans to go travel.’
 (D. Li 2024: 351)
- (50) Wo kanjian ziji(-*men) le.
 I see self(-PL) ASP
 ‘I saw myself(/*ourselves).’
 (D. Li 2024: 351)

Then why can the pronoun *ta* ‘he’ not acquire a partial reading by adding a covert AM, just like how PRO acquires a partial reading? D. Li (2024) stipulates that it is because the overtness of the AM and its attached element must be the same. In this way, only null PRO can attach a covert AM, and pronouns without overt *men* have no partial readings. As shown in (51), a null PRO disallows an overt AM, as in (51a), an overt controlee *ziji* cannot denote a partial meaning without an overt AM, as in (51b), and only (51c) has a partial reading, where an overt AM *men* is attached to an overt controlee.

- (51) a. Wo kanjian (*men) le.
 I see PL ASP
 ‘I saw [object from context].’
 b. Wo kanjian wo-ziji le.
 I see I-self ASP
 ‘I saw myself’. Not: ‘I saw ourselves.’
 c. Wo kanjian wo-men-ziji le.
 I see I-PL-self ASP
 ‘I saw ourselves.’
 (D. Li 2024: 351)

This analysis is problematic in Mandarin Chinese. First and foremost, *men* cannot be treated as an associative morpheme. When *men* is attached to a proper name, the whole DP can never refer to a salient group that contains that proper name, but to a group in which the entities share the same properties as the referent attached. In (52), the plural DP *Leifeng-men* cannot refer to a group that contains Leifeng and others who are not helpful, but denotes a group of people who are helpful like Leifeng.

- (52) Leifeng-men dou leyu-zhuren.
 Leifeng-PL all helpful
 Int.: ‘People like Leifeng are helpful.’

Moreover, *men* does not always bring a partial reading. Given proper contexts, the overt subject *ta-men* ‘he-PL’ can refer to another group in the context. In (53), our background knowledge makes it more natural to interpret *tamen* as another group of people other than the judges. Therefore, *men* cannot directly link to the partial reading in PC constructions.

- (53) Zhangsan quan gewei faguan_i wulun-ruhe ta-men_j dou
 Zhangsan urge every judge no-matter-what he-PL all
 gai bei chufa.
 should BE punish
 Lit.: ‘Zhangsan urged every judge_i that no matter what they_j should be punished.’

To sum up, though we have no concrete evidence to support or oppose the existence of covert AM for null PROs, the partial reading of overt controlees is not attributed to *men*. For overt controlees, we propose that (i) *men* only contributes

plurality (Kurafuji 2004; Yang 2005; Bošković and Hsieh 2013; Jiang 2012, 2020; etc.). Therefore, a pronoun in the singular form, e.g., *ta*, cannot denote a partial reading because of the mismatch in number. Only a plural pronoun, e.g., *tamen*, can denote plurality, hence allowing a partial reading. (ii) The partial reading is licensed by the subject referential dependence of *Situation* complement. Recalling from ICH, we know that *Situation* complements are restricted in temporal dependence and subject referential dependence. A control verb *dasuan* selects *Situation* complements, and the embedded subject of the clause must relate to the matrix subject. If the embedded subject is plural but the matrix subject is singular, the embedded controlee must contain the matrix subject as one of its members, hence bringing out a partial reading, as in (54).

- (54) Lisi_i dasuan ta-men(-ziji)_{i+} yao qu lüyou.
 Lisi plan he-PL-self will go travel
 ‘Lisi plans to go travel.’

Still, we leave a critical question aside: what leads to a partial reading? We follow Pearson’s (2016) proposal on the partial reading of PRO based on extension semantics, that PC verbs select an extension of the world-time-individual triple. An extension is defined as (55). (i) extends the doxastic alternative x to a set of individuals including x himself, hence explaining the PC reading.

Therefore, if a predicate allows extension, it would allow PC reading. As in Mandarin Chinese, Meng and Li (2019) propose that extension semantics is suitable to interpret some PC constructions in Mandarin. We propose that with the occurrence of overt controlees, extension still holds.

(55) *Extension*

For any pair of world-time-individual triples $\langle w, t, x \rangle$ and $\langle w', t', y \rangle$, $\langle w', t', y \rangle$ is an extension of $\langle w, t, x \rangle$ iff for every α, β such that α is a coordinate of $\langle w, t, x \rangle$ and β is a coordinate of $\langle w', t', y \rangle$ of the same type as α , *either*:

- (i) $\alpha \leq \beta$
 (ii) $\alpha \leq_{\text{precedes}} \beta$
 (iii) $\beta \leq_{\text{precedes}} \alpha$
 (Pearson 2016: 728)

Recent studies demonstrate that apart from temporal non-simultaneity (which separates *Event* from *Situation* complements), the attitudinal property is the other key requirement to license PC (Landau 2013; Pearson 2012, 2016; Meng and Li 2019). PC predicates must be attitude verbs, but verbs in the *Situation* class may not be attitude verbs. Therefore, PC verbs select *Situation* complements, but not vice versa. Now we will show that the counterexamples we present, i.e., *bimian* ‘avoid’ and *beipo* ‘be compelled’, are not attitude verbs. First, attitude verbs require their animate subjects (Pearson 2016). *Beipo* allows non-animate subjects, and hence it is not an attitude verb, as in (56).

- (56) Ta-de che beipo [PRO zai zhai lu shang kai.]
 her car be-compelled PRO at narrow road LOC drive
 ‘Her car is forced to be driven on the narrow road.’

Second, Quine (1956) points out that only attitude verbs can give rise to the “double vision” phenomenon. Given the following scenario in (57).

- (57) There is a certain man in a brown hat whom Ralph has glimpsed several times under questionable circumstances on which we need not enter here; suffice it to say that Ralph suspects he is a spy. Also there is a grey-haired man, vaguely known to Ralph as rather a pillar of the community, whom Ralph is not aware of having seen except once at the beach. Now Ralph does not know it but the men are one and the same [Bernard Ortcutt].
 (Pearson 2016: 706)

In such a scenario, the contradictory proposition in (58) can both be true. This is because the attitude holder can have different acquaintance relations to a single individual. Ralph has different attitudes towards the man in a brown hat and the grey-haired man, despite the fact that they are actually the same person, Ortcutt. Therefore, (58a) is true if Ralph believes the man in a brown hat is a spy, while (58b) is true if he believes that the grey-haired man is not a spy.

- (58) a. Ralph believes that Ortcutt is a spy. (True)
 b. Ralph believes that Ortcutt is not a spy. (True)
 (Pearson 2016: 706)

However, the double vision puzzle cannot hold for non-attitude verbs, because different acquaintance relations are irrelevant for non-attitude verbs. For example, given a non-attitude verb *deserve*, two propositions in (59) are contradictory under any circumstances.

- (59) # Ralph deserves to welcome Ortcutt at the party. Meanwhile, Ralph deserves to snub Ortcutt at the party.

Now we will test the double vision property for *bimian* ‘avoid’. The proposition from (60) is contradictory in the scenario in (59), hence these two verbs we present as counterexamples are both non-attitude verbs. Together with the animacy test for *beipo* in (56), we prove that all the verbs we present as counterexamples are non-attitude verbs, and hence are EC instead of PC verbs.

- (60) a. Zhangsan bimian le zai paidui shang huanying Lisi.
 Zhangsan avoid ASP at party LOC welcome Lisi
 ‘Zhangsan avoided to welcome Lisi at the party.’
 b. Zhangsan bimian le zai paidui shang lengluo Lisi.
 Zhangsan avoid ASP at party LOC snub Lisi
 ‘Zhangsan avoided to snub Lisi at the party.’

3.3 Interim summary

In this section we have posed our analysis on licensing overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese. We argue against D. Li's (2024) proposal of PC, that PC reading is achieved through a covert AM in syntax. Following Pearson (2016) and other studies, we propose that PC reading is a semantic property of attitude verbs, but it is not guaranteed by some syntactic operators. Further, we argue that the distinction between EC and PC is a semantic issue, while the licensing of overt controlees is a syntactic property of complement clauses. Therefore, theoretically and empirically, we believe that ICH is a better way to explain the licensing of overt controlees.³

4 Remaining issues

4.1 Coercion and free subjects

Up until now we have proved that the distribution of overt controlees has nothing to do with EC/PC distinctions, rather, overt controlees only occur in *Situation* complements, and verbs which select *Situation* complements do not fully overlap with PC verbs. Only attitude verbs allow PC, thus some non-attitude verbs selecting *Situation* complements are EC verbs but still allow overt controlees. In this part we come to coercion, which allows a verb to change its meaning slightly to fit a more independent complement. We propose that typical control verbs are able to be coerced to take *Propositional* complements, and hence allow overt subjects. Take *dasuan* 'plan' as an example (repeated below). Here *dasuan* changes its meaning into 'consider the plan that', hence selecting a *Proposition* as its complement (He 2020). Therefore, the embedded subject allows long distance binding, and it can even refer to a salient member in the context. Coercion challenges Li's (2024) basic proposal that the control verb constructions with overt embedded subjects are OC constructions. Whether an overt subject is an overt controlee or not depends on temporal dependence and subject referential dependence of the embedded clause, and only *Situation* complements allow overt controlees.

- (61) Zhangsan_i zhidao dongshihui_j dasuan mingnian ta_{i/#ij/k}
 Zhangsan know board plan next-year he
 dang zongjingli. (=24a)
 be CEO
 'Zhangsan_i knows that the board_j considers a plan that he_{i/#ij/k} will be the CEO
 next year.'

³ One reviewer asked how to fit the distinction between EC and PC into the ICH framework. ICH classifies three types of complements, yet it fails to offer a syntactic criterion to examine whether a *Situation* complement allows PC reading or not. We will leave this question to further research.

4.2 The identity of overt controlees

Besides the licensing issue of overt controlees, whether they are lexicalized PROs (Madigan 2008; Landau 2013, 2015; Zhang 2016) or not (Lee 2009; D. Li 2024) is also a debated issue. Since the distribution of null PROs and overt controlees is not restricted by EC/PC verbs, we prefer a unified account for overt and covert control subjects. Meanwhile, as Zhang (2016) and D. Li (2024) pointed out, overt controlees, i.e. reflexives, CPros, and bound pronouns, retain their original semantic or syntactic properties when they are controlled. Further investigation is open for future research. In this paper, we propose that the four types of control subjects are **derived** from minimal pronouns (Kratzer 2009):

(62) *A minimal pronoun*

X is a minimal pronoun if and only if $X = [D, u\phi]$

In the derivation of Narrow Syntax, a minimal pronoun is merged as the subject of the embedded control complement. The defective ϕ feature requires an antecedent to be valued, hence controlees, whether overt or not, always require referential dependencies with matrix subjects. However, when the minimal pronoun is lexicalized, its phonological form and semantic interpretation would be constrained. Therefore, both overt and covert controlees are instances of the minimal pronoun. Different languages have specific choices of the realization of the minimal pronoun. As for Mandarin Chinese, only null PROs, reflexives *ziji*, CPros, and bound pronouns are allowed.

5 Conclusion

To conclude, this article revisits arguments provided by D. Li (2024), that (i) constructions with overt embedded subjects are OC constructions. (ii) Overt controlees only appear under PC verbs. (iii) PC and EC constructions differ syntactically. (iv) In Mandarin the partial reading comes from AM *men*. We argue that her conclusions are based on limited observations and misleading explanations, and further propose that (i) constructions with overt embedded subjects are not always OC constructions. Sometimes a control verb allows a free embedded subject. (ii) Overt controlees do not only appear under PC verbs. Some EC verbs also allow overt controlees. (iii) In Mandarin the partial reading does not come from AM *men*. *Men* is not an AM in Mandarin and the partial reading comes from the semantic property of attitude verbs. Therefore, we propose that the distribution of overt controlees in Mandarin Chinese has nothing to do with PC. It is the complement types stipulated by ICH that describe the licensing condition of overt controlees. *Proposition* complements allow free subjects, *Situation* complements allow overt controlees, and *Event* complements only allow null PROs. The occurrence of overt controlees should be restricted by syntax, not semantics. Eventually, we leave some flexibilities on the selection of complements for a verb by coercion. A verb can slightly change its meaning to accept different clause types.

Acknowledgments

This research is supported by Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program (Project number: 2025THZWJC33). We wish to extend our sincere thanks to the two anonymous reviewers and editors of *Studies in Chinese Linguistics* for their insightful comments and constructive suggestions, which have greatly enhanced this paper both in substance and presentation. Any errors or shortcomings that remain are our sole responsibility.

References

- Bošković, Željko & I-Ta Chris Hsieh. 2013. On word order, binding relations, and plurality in Chinese noun phrases. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8(4). 173–204.
- Givón, Talmy. 1980. The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. *Studies in Language* 4(3). 333–377. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.4.3.03giv>.
- Grano, Thomas. 2015. *Control and restructuring*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198703921>.
- He, Yuyin. 2020. *Time in Mandarin: The fingerprints of tense and finiteness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University dissertation.
- He, Yuyin. 2024. Finiteness in Mandarin clausal complements: The role of ICH and future modals. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 33(2). 259–297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10831-024-09278-w>.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic inquiry* 30(1). 69–96. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002438999553968>.
- Hu, Jianhua, Haihua Pan & Liejiong Xu. 2001. Is there a finite vs. nonfinite distinction in Chinese? *Linguistics* 39. 1117–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2001.043>.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1989. Pro-drop in Chinese: A generalized control theory. In Osvaldo Jaeggli & Kenneth J. Safir (eds.), *The null subject parameter*, 185–214. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-2540-3_6.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 2017. On finiteness and the architecture of complement clauses. Handout for the talk at National Tsinghua University, 27 October.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 2022. Finiteness, opacity, and Chinese clausal architecture. In Andrew Simpson (ed.), *New explorations in Chinese theoretical syntax: Studies in honor of Yen-hui Audrey Li*, 17–76. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.272.02hua>.
- Huang, Nick. 2018. Control complements in Mandarin Chinese: Implications for restructuring and the Chinese finiteness debate. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 27(4). 347–376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-018-9185-1>.
- Huang, Nick. 2024. Finiteness in a language without finite morphology: An experimental study of Mandarin Chinese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 42(2). 533–556. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-023-09591-4>.
- Jiang, Li Julie. 2012. *Nominal arguments and language variation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University dissertation.

- Jiang, Li Julie. 2017. Mandarin associative plural *-men* and NPs with *-men*. *International Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 4(2). 191–256. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijchl.16015.jia>.
- Jiang, Li Julie. 2020. *Nominal arguments and language variation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2). 187–237. <https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2009.40.2.187>.
- Kurafuji, Takeo. 2004. Plural morphemes, definiteness, and the notion of semantic parameter. *Language and Linguistics* 5(1). 211–242.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-3943-4>.
- Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Landau, Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262028851>.
- Lee, Kum Young. 2009. *Finite control in Korean*. Iowa City, IA: The University of Iowa dissertation.
- Li, Daoxin. 2024. Controlling overt subjects in Mandarin. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 33(3). 333–366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-024-09280-2>.
- Li, Yen-Hui Audrey. 1985. *Abstract case in Chinese*. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California dissertation.
- Li, Yen-Hui Audrey. 1990. *Order and constituency in Mandarin Chinese*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-1898-6>.
- Lin, Jo-Wang. 2006. Time in a language without tense: The case of Chinese. *Journal of Semantics* 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffh033>.
- Lin, Jo-Wang. 2010. A tenseless analysis of Mandarin Chinese revisited: A response to Sybesma 2007. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41(2). 305–329. <https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2010.41.2.305>.
- Lin, T.-H. Jonah. 2011. Finiteness of clauses and raising of arguments in Mandarin Chinese. *Syntax* 14(1). 48–73. [10.1111/j.1467-9612.2010.00145.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2010.00145.x).
- Lin, T-H Jonah. 2012. Multiple-modal constructions in Mandarin Chinese and their finiteness properties. *Journal of Linguistics* 48(1). 151–186. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226711000272>.
- Madigan, Sean William. 2008. *Control constructions in Korean*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware dissertation.
- Meng, Fanjun & Jinglian Li. 2019. Hanyu bufen kongzhi de shixian xingshi ji qi jiedu [The instantiations of partial control in Chinese and their interpretations]. *Waiyu Jiaoxue yu Yanjiu* [Foreign language teaching and research] 51(5). 653–664, 799.
- Park, Yangsook. 2018. Overt subjects in obligatory control constructions in Korean. In Wm. G. Bennett, Lindsay Hracs & Dennis Ryan Storoshenko (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th West coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)*, 305–312. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Pearson, Hazel. 2012. *The sense of self: Topics in the semantics of de se expressions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University dissertation.

- Pearson, Hazel. 2016. The semantics of partial control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34. 691–738. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-015-9313-9>.
- Quine, Willard Van Orman. 1956. Quantifiers and propositional attitudes. *Journal of Philosophy* 53. 177–187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2022451>.
- Ramchand, Gillian & Peter Svenonius. 2014. Deriving the functional hierarchy. *Language Sciences* 46. 152–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2014.06.013>.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2009. Overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements cross-linguistically: Data, diagnostics, and preliminary analyses. In Patricia Irwin & Violeta Vázquez Rojas Maldonado (eds.), *NYU working papers in linguistics*, vol 2. New York: New York University.
- Ussery, Cherlon, Lydia Ding & Yining Rebecca Liu. 2016. The typology of Mandarin infinitives. In Patrick Farrell (ed.), *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, vol. 1, Article 28, 1–15.
- Wurmbrand, Susi & Magdalena Lohninger. 2023. An implicational universal in complementation: Theoretical insights and empirical progress. In Jutta Hartmann and Angelika Wöllstein (eds.), *Propositional arguments in cross-linguistic research: Theoretical and empirical issues*, 183–232. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yang, Henrietta Shu-fen. 2005. *Plurality and modification in Mandarin nominal phrases*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin dissertation.
- Zhang, Niina Ning. 2016. Identifying Chinese dependent clauses in the forms of subjects. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 25(3). 275–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-016-9146-5>.

Hao Pan

Mailing address: Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Tsinghua University,
Haidian District, Beijing
Email: ph24@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Ruiyang Chen

Mailing address: Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Tsinghua University,
Haidian District, Beijing
Email: cry23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Xiaoshi Hu

Mailing address: Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Tsinghua University,
Haidian District, Beijing
Email: xvictorhu@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn
Received: June 29, 2025
Accepted: February 25, 2026

控制類型還是補語類型？

——論漢語普通話中顯性受控語的允准

潘 浩、陳睿揚、胡笑適
清華大學

提要

與其他語言一致，漢語普通話的控制結構中允許顯性控制主語的出現。近年來，學界圍繞顯性受控語的句法地位與允準機制展開了爭論。李道昕（2024）提出，顯性受控語的出現與窮盡控制 / 部分控制兩種結構的對立相關，只有部分控制動詞能允準顯性受控語。與之相對，何雨殷（2024）在蘊含性補語層級（*Implicational Complementation Hierarchy*，簡稱 ICH）的框架下提出，只有事態類補足語允準顯性受控語。本研究反駁了李道昕（2024）的核心結論，並針對其研究發現提出了反例。研究表明，某些窮盡控制動詞同樣可以允準顯性受控語；在漢語普通話中，包含控制動詞的語句並非必然屬於強制控制結構。據此，本文挖掘的新語言事實支持了何雨殷（2024）的觀點；我們進一步論證，蘊含性補語層級（ICH）是刻畫漢語普通話中顯性受控語分、佈規律的更優框架，並且強制機制使得包含控制動詞的句子能夠轉換為非控制結構。

關鍵詞

控制結構，部分控制，顯性受控語，ICH，漢語普通話

