1 Introduction

- A central question for control theory is how to characterize the relationship between the distribution of PRO and the (non)finiteness of the clause it appears in.

- A central empirical domain in which this debate has played out so far is in languages that are rich in finiteness-related morphology in ways that often complicate existing theories:
  - Balkan languages (Terzi 1992; Iatridou 1993; Landau 2004; Alexiadou et al. 2010)
  - South Asian languages (McFadden and Sundaresan 2014 and other papers in NLLT 32(1))

- A neglected area: What can languages that apparently lack finiteness-related morphology tell us about the distribution of control?

Control in Mandarin Chinese:

- First studied in a generative context by Jim Huang and Audrey Li in their dissertations in the 1980s (Huang 1982; Li 1985).

- These studies prompted debate that is still ongoing among Chinese linguists over whether Mandarin has a (covert) finite/nonfinite distinction.

- But it has not played a significant role in recent debate in control theory.

- The work presented in this talk is part of an effort to fill that gap.


  “In Chinese, there is a fairly systematic distinction between finite and nonfinite clauses which may be made on the basis of the *potential* occurrence of […] an aspect marker or a modal […]” (Huang 1989:189)

Previous view II: Mandarin does not have a finite/nonfinite distinction and does not have (syntactic) control. (Xu 1985–1986; Y. Huang 1994b; Hu, Pan, and Xu 2001; cf. also J.W. Lin 2010, 2012)
**My central thesis:** Mandarin has no finite/nonfinite distinction but it does have control. The distribution of control in Mandarin is regulated by a split in complement size: vP complements instantiate control and CP complements do not.

**Implications:**

1. Some of the burden of explaining the distribution of control can be shifted away from finiteness contrasts and onto principles that regulate complement size (cf. McFadden 2014).

2. The Case-based approach to the distribution of control (Bouchard 1984) provides a natural way of linking complement size to the distribution of control: vP lacks the functional structure to Case-license an ordinary DP.

**Roadmap:**

**Section 2: The Control-Aspect Correlation**

3. In Mandarin, an aspect marker in a controlled complement clause — when grammatical at all — instantiates *matrix* aspect, whereas an aspect marker in a *non*-controlled complement clause instantiates *embedded* aspect.

**Section 3: The Syntax of Control**

4. a. VP
   
   \[ V_{control} vP \]
   
   b. VP
   
   \[ V_{non-control} CP \]

**Section 4: The Syntax of Aspect Placement**

5. Biclausal structure w/non-controlled (CP) complement
   a. Asp[\{iA: \} \[ vP \ldots v+V\text{-}guo[uA:EXP] \ldots [CP \ldots v+V \ldots ] \} ← higher V values Asp
   b. *Asp[\{iA: \} \[ vP \ldots v+V \ldots [CP \ldots v+V\text{-}guo[uA:EXP] \ldots ] \} ← *lower V values Asp

6. Biclausal structure w/controlled (vP) complement
   a. Asp[\{iA: \} \[ vP \ldots v+V\text{-}guo[uA:EXP] \ldots [vP PRO v+V \ldots ] \} ← higher V values Asp
   b. Asp[\{iA: \} \[ vP \ldots v+V \ldots [vP PRO v+V\text{-}guo[uA:EXP] \ldots ] \} ← lower V values Asp

**Section 5: Some remaining puzzles**

**Section 6: Conclusions**
2 The Control-Aspect Correlation

**Question:** What is the right analysis of Mandarin ASPECT-UNDER-CONTROL structures like (7)?

(7) zhangsan quan lisi₁ [PRO₁ chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to eat an apple.’

**Competing answers** from previous literature:

(8) [ ASP [ . . . V_{matrix} . . . [ . . . V_{embedded} . . . ] ] ]

→ Mandarin has a covert FINITE/NONFINITE distinction. Mandarin controlled clauses are NONFINITE and disallow aspect marking; apparent counterexamples like (7) are actually non-local realizations of MATRIX aspect, variants on (9). (Huang 1989; Li 1990, cf. also Huang 1982; Li 1985; Cheng 1989; Lin 2011)

(9) zhangsan quan-guo lisi₁ [PRO₁ chi-yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan urge-EXP Lisi eat one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to eat an apple.’

(10) [ . . . V_{matrix} . . . [ ASP [ . . . V_{embedded} . . . ] ] ]

→ Mandarin has no FINITE/NONFINITE distinction; (7) instantiates EMBEDDED aspect. (Xu 1985–1986; Huang 1994b; Hu et al. 2001)

**Position I will argue for:** The matrix analysis of aspect-under-control is correct (but does not indicate a finite/nonfinite distinction).

2.1 A syntactic argument for the matrix analysis

The bolded items in (11) all result in unacceptability when they appear together with experiential -guo (12).

(11) a. zhangsan bu quan lisi [chi yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan NEG urge Lisi eat one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan doesn’t/won’t urge Lisi to eat an apple.’

b. zhangsan zai quan lisi [chi yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan PROG urge Lisi eat one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan is urging Lisi to eat an apple.’

c. zhangsan mei-tian quan [lisi chi yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan every-day urge Lisi eat one-CL apple
‘Every day, Zhangsan urges Lisi to eat an apple.’

---

1Abbreviations used in glosses: CL = classifier, EXP = experiential aspect, NEG = negation, PNP = perfective nonpast, PP = perfective past, PRF = perfective aspect, PROG = progressive aspect, PRT = unanalyzed particle, 3SG = third-person singular.
(12)  a. *zhangsan bu quan-guo lisi [chi yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan NEG urge-EXP Lisi eat one-CL apple
b. *zhangsan zai quan-guo lisi [chi yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan PROG urge-EXP Lisi eat one-CL apple
c. *zhangsan mei-tian quan-guo [lisi chi yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan every-day urge-EXP Lisi eat one-CL apple

(13) shows that this incompatibility is clause-bound:

(13)  a. zhangsan bu renwei [lisi chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan NEG believe Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
    ‘Zhangsan doesn’t believe that Lisi ate an apple.’
b. zhangsan zai zhenglun [lisi chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan PROG argue Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
    ‘Zhangsan is arguing that Lisi ate an apple.’
c. zhangsan mei-tian shuo [lisi chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan every-day say Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
    ‘Every day, Zhangsan says that Lisi ate an apple.’

Punchline: the clause-boundedness of this incompatibility is apparently suspended in aspect-under-control sentences:

(14)  a. *zhangsan bu quan lisi [chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan NEG urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
b. *zhangsan zai quan lisi [chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan PROG urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
c. *zhangsan mei-tian quan lisi [chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
    Zhangsan every-day urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple

→ (14) is immediately explained on the matrix analysis but not on the embedded analysis.

2.2 Could the embedded analysis handle the facts in (14)?

Starting observation: -guo is past-oriented relative to some anchor $t_0$ (Lin 2003, 2006; Rubinstein and Hashimoto 2010):

(15)  lisi he-guo jiu.
    Lisi drink-EXP wine
    ‘Lisi drank wine [before the speech time].’ (Lin 2006:10)

(16)  yuehan shuo [mali sheng-guo qi].
    John say Mary get-EXP angry
    ‘John said that Mary was angry [before the saying time].’ (Lin 2006:26)

(17)  $[\text{guo}] = \lambda P(t) \lambda t_{Top} \lambda t_0 \exists t[P(t) \land \text{IStage}(t, P) \subseteq t_{Top} \land t_{Top} < t_0]$ (Lin 2006:12)

What does -guo anchor to in aspect-under-control structures like (18)?
(18) zhangsan quan lisi [chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to eat an apple.’

Matrix analysis: -guo anchors to speech time.

Embedded analysis:

(19) a. Hypothesis a: $t_0 = \text{matrix time}$
b. Hypothesis b: $t_0 = \text{contextually determined time internal to the complement clause}$
c. Hypothesis c: $t_0 = \text{speech time}$

Hypothesis a is wrong:

(20) $(18) \neq \text{‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to have eaten an apple.’}$

Hypothesis b is wrong:

(21) shi-dian qian zhangsan hui tui-guo fang.
ten-o’clock before Zhangsan will quit-EXP room
‘Before ten o’clock, Zhangsan will have checked out of the room.’

(22) *zhangsan zai quan lisi [shi-dian qian tui-guo fang].
Zhangsan PROG urge Lisi ten-o’clock before quit-EXP room
Intended: ‘Zhangsan is urging Lisi to have checked out of the room before ten o’clock.’

Hypothesis c is not obviously wrong and even appears to account for the crucial facts repeated in (23).

(23) a. *zhangsan bu quan lisi [chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan NEG urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
Intended: ‘Zhangsan didn’t urge Lisi to eat an apple.’
b. *zhangsan zai quan lisi [chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan PROG urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
Intended: ‘Zhangsan is urging Lisi to eat an apple.’
c. *zhangsan mei-tian quan lisi [chi-guo yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan every-day urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
Intended: ‘Every day, Zhangsan urges Lisi to eat an apple.’

(24) A ‘Hypothesis c’ account of the data in (24):
   a. bu, zai and mei-tian fix the matrix time to speech time: $t_{\text{matrix}} = t_{\text{speech}}$
   b. -guo orders the embedded event before speech time: $t_{\text{embedded}} < t_{\text{speech}}$
   c. quan ‘urge’ orders the embedded event after matrix time: $t_{\text{matrix}} < t_{\text{embedded}}$
   d. Contradiction: $[t_{\text{embedded}} < t_{\text{speech}}] \land [t_{\text{speech}} < t_{\text{embedded}}]$

But the following contrast shows that Hypothesis c ultimately fails as well:

(25) a. zuotian xiawu zhangsan zai quan lisi chi yi-ge pingguo.
yesterday afternoon Zhangsan PROG urge Lisi eat one-CL apple
Yesterday afternoon Zhangsan was urging Lisi to eat an apple.

(26) Hypothesis c incorrectly predicts (25b) to be grammatical:

a. ‘yesterday’: \( t_{\text{matrix}} < t_{\text{speech}} \)
b. ‘urge’: \( t_{\text{matrix}} < t_{\text{embedded}} \)
c. -guo: \( t_{\text{embedded}} < t_{\text{speech}} \)
d. No contradiction: \( t_{\text{matrix}} < t_{\text{embedded}} < t_{\text{speech}} \)

Interim conclusion: Sentences of the form in (27) have an analysis like (28).

(27) zhangsan quan lisi \([\text{PRO}_1 \text{chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to eat an apple.’

(28) \([\text{GUO} \ldots V_{\text{matrix}} \ldots \ldots V_{\text{embedded}} \ldots ]\]

MATRIX ANALYSIS

2.3 Generalizing across embedding predicates

(29) CONTROL PREDICATES \(\rightarrow\) embedded -guo realizes MATRIX aspect

a. zhangsan (*bu) quan lisi \([\text{chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan NEG urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan negated Lisi to eat an apple.’

b. zhangsan (*bu) bi lisi \([\text{chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan NEG force Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan forced Lisi to eat an apple.’

c. zhangsan (*bu) qing lisi \([\text{chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan NEG invite Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan invited Lisi to eat an apple.’

(30) NON-CONTROL PREDICATES \(\rightarrow\) embedded -guo realizes EMBEDDED aspect

a. zhangsan bu renwei \([\text{lisi chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan believe Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan doesn’t believe that Lisi ate an apple.’

b. zhangsan bu xiwang \([\text{lisi chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan hope Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan hopes that Lisi ate an apple.’

c. zhangsan bu jide \([\text{lisi chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan remember Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan doesn’t remember that Lisi ate an apple.’

d. zhangsan bu zhidao \([\text{lisi chi-guo yi-ge pingguo}].\)

Zhangsan know Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan doesn’t know that Lisi ate an apple.’

2.4 Generalizing across aspect markers

Verb-final perfective -le behaves in a way similar to -guo:
Progressive marker *zai is ungrammatical in controlled complements:

(32) *zhangsan quan lisi [zai chi yi-ge pingguo].
Zhangsan urge Lisi PROG eat one-CL apple

The control-aspect correlation: In Mandarin, an aspect marker in a controlled complement clause — when grammatical at all — instantiates matrix aspect, whereas an aspect marker in a non-controlled complement clause instantiates embedded aspect.

3 The Syntax of Control

The control-aspect correlation leaves us with two questions:

(34) a. Why can’t an aspect marker in a controlled complement instantiate embedded (local) aspect?
   b. Why can -guo and -le in a controlled complement instantiate matrix aspect?

Answering the first question:

Proposal: Controlled complements in Mandarin do not have enough structure to project Asp:

(35) a.VP
    \[ V_{\text{control}} \quad vP \]
    \[ V_{\text{non-control}} \quad CP \]
Since [Spec,vP] is not a Case position, we correctly account for the distribution of PRO à la Bouchard 1984:

(36)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{VP} \\
V & v'P \\
\text{b.} & \text{VP} \\
V & \text{CP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{PRO/*DP[Case:nom]} & v' \\
v & \text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

**Independent support:** Distribution of Inner Topics

(37) **Descriptive generalization:** Non-controlled complements support inner topicalization; controlled complements do not (Ernst and Wang 1995; Paul 2005, building on Fu 1994; Lu 1994).

(38) *ta shuo {CP lisi nei-jian shi1 diaocha-le t1}.
He say Lisi that-CL matter investigate-PRF
‘He said that Lisi investigated that matter.’

(39) *ta pai lisi {vP PRO nei-jian shi1 diaocha-le t1}.
He send lisi that-CL matter investigate-PRF
‘He sent Lisi to investigate that matter.’

This follows from (35) in conjunction with (40):

(40) CP > TopP > FocP > IP > InnerTopP > InnerFocP > AspP > vP (Paul 2005)

### 4 The Syntax of Aspect Placement

(41) a. Why can’t an aspect marker in a controlled complement instantiate embedded (local) aspect?
   b. Why can -guo and -le in a controlled complement instantiate matrix aspect?

A more general question: What is the syntax of aspect placement in Mandarin?

(42) a. zhangsan zai chi yi-ge pingguo.
Zhansan PROG eat one-CL apple
‘Zhansan is eating an apple,’

b. zhangsan chi-guo yi-ge pingguo.
Zhansan eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhansan has eaten an apple.’

c. zhangsan chi-le yi-ge pingguo.
Zhansan eat-PRF one-CL apple
‘Zhansan ate an apple.’
I assume progressive *zai* is base-generated in Asp and remains there throughout the derivation.

What about the affixal aspect markers -*guo* and -*le*?
— We know that Mandarin does not have V-to-Asp movement (Gu 1993).
— So the analytical task is similar to that of relating T and V morphology in English.

A formalization in the spirit of Pesetsky & Torrego’s (2007) approach to English T/V syntax:

**Lexical entries:**

(43) Aspectual heads

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Asp[iA:] ∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Asp[iA:PROG] <em>zai</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(44) Verbs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>V-<em>guo</em>[uA:EXP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>V-<em>le</em>[uA:PRF]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monoclausal configurations:**

(45) Asp[iA:] … *v*+V-*guo*[uA:EXP]

EXPERIENTIAL ASPECT

(46) Asp[iA:] … *v*+V-*le*[uA:PRF]

PERFECTIVE ASPECT

(47) Asp[iA:PROG] *zai* … *v*+V

PROGRESSIVE ASPECT

(48) Asp[iA:] … *v*+V → Asp[iA:NEUT] … *v*+V

NEUTRAL ASPECT (Smith 1991)

**Biclausal configurations:**

**Generalization to be explained:**

Non-control → Matrix aspect can be realized only on matrix verb:

(49) *zhangsan* *zhenglun*{-*guo*} [lisi₁ chi{*-*guo*} yi-ge pingguo].

Zhangsan argue-EXP Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple

‘Zhangsan argued that Lisi eats an apple.’

Control → Matrix aspect can be realized on matrix verb or on embedded verb:

(50) *zhangsan* *quan*{-*guo*} lisi₁ [PRO₁ chi{*-*guo*} yi-ge pingguo].

Zhangsan urge-EXP Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple

‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to eat an apple.’

(51) Phase Theory (Chomsky 2001):

a. C and v are phase heads.

b. Phase Impenetrability Condition: The complement to a phase head becomes inaccessible to further syntactic operations when the next highest phase head is merged in.

(52) Non-controlled (CP) complements

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
b. *Asp[iA: ] [vP ... v+V ... [CP ... v+V-guo[uA:EXP] ... ] ] ← PIC violation!

\[(52b) = \]
\[
\text{boxed portion} = \text{Spellout domain}
\]

\[(53) \quad \text{Controlled (vP) complements}
\]

\[a. \quad \text{Asp[iA: ] [vP ... v+V-guo[uA:EXP] ... [vP PRO v+V ... ] ]}
\]

\[b. \quad \text{Asp[iA: ] [vP ... v+V ... [vP PRO v+V-guo[uA:EXP] ... ] ] ← aspect-under-control}
\]

\[(53b) = \]

In order for the Agree relation in (53b) to not be a PIC violation, it is crucial to assume that Mandarin has V-to-v movement (so that V ‘escapes’ the spelled out VP and matrix Asp has access to it): see Huang 1994a; Tang 1998; Li 2002 for evidence.

The upshot: The control-aspect correlation falls out as an inevitable consequence of how the syntax of (non-)control (vP vs. CP complementation) interacts with the syntax of aspect placement and universal properties of phases, and no appeal to a finite/nonfinite distinction is needed.
5 Some remaining puzzles

5.1 Outstanding puzzle #1: Subject-control predicates

Some subject-control predicates disallow -guo regardless of whether it is placed on the matrix verb or on the embedded verb.

(54) a. Zhăngsan găn{*-guo} chî{*-guo} yi-ge pîngguô.
Zhangsan dare-EXP eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan dared to eat an apple.’

b. Zhăngsan kâishi{*-guo} chî{*-guo} yi-ge pîngguô.
Zhangsan begin-EXP eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan began to eat an apple.’

These facts fit the overall pattern: on the matrix analysis of aspect-under-control, whatever principle rules out matrix aspect placement also rules out embedded aspect placement.

But for other subject-control predicates there is speaker variation in acceptability of -guo in the matrix clause, while -guo in the embedded clause remains consistently unacceptable across speakers.

(55) a. Zhăngsan dâsuân{%-guo} chî{*-guo} yi-ge pîngguô.
Zhangsan plan-EXP eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan planned to eat an apple.’

b. Zhăngsan zhûnbèi{%-guo} chî{*-guo} yi-ge pîngguô.
Zhangsan prepare-EXP eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan got ready to eat an apple.’

c. Zhăngsan juêdìng{%-guo} chî{*-guo} yi-ge pîngguô.
Zhangsan decide-EXP eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan decided to eat an apple.’

d. Zhăngsan qîtû{%-guo} chî{*-guo} yi-ge pîngguô.
Zhangsan try-EXP eat-EXP one-CL apple
‘Zhangsan tried to eat an apple.’

These facts don’t threaten the control-aspect correlation, but they do pose an over-generation problem for the proposed analysis: what bars matrix aspect from being realized on the embedded verb?

One possibility is a split between subject-control verbs and object-control verbs in whether they are born featureless (56a) or with an unvalued feature (56b) so that the offending examples are ruled out via intervention as in (57).

(56) a. object-control verb: V

b. subject-control verb: V[uA:__]

(57) *Asp[iA:__] [vP . . . v+V[uA:__] . . . [vP PRO . . . v+V-guo[uA:EXP] . . . ] ]

Actually we probably want to have something like (57) to account for the following English facts:

(58) a. John saw Bill leave.

b. *Jonn see Bill left.

But what’s lacking is independent evidence for (56).
5.2 Outstanding puzzle #2: An interpretive contrast

For some but not all speakers of Mandarin, matrix vs. embedded placement of -guo gives rise to an interpretive contrast brought out by the following minimal pair:

(59) a. Zhāngsān quàn-guo Lǐsì chí yi-ge píngguǒ (%kěshì Lǐsì bu kěn chí).  
   Zhangsan urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple but Lisi NEG willing eat  
   ‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to eat an apple, but Lisi was unwilling to eat it.’

b. Zhāngsān quàn Lǐsì chí-guo yi-ge píngguǒ (%kěshì Lǐsì bu kěn chí).  
   Zhangsan urge Lisi eat-EXP one-CL apple but Lisi NEG willing eat  
   ‘Zhangsan urged Lisi to eat an apple, but Lisi was unwilling to eat it.’

(59b) shows signs of an actuality entailment. What do we say about this group of speakers?

The embedded analysis appears to have the advantage here, since the interpretive contrast could be tied to matrix vs. embedded aspect. But there would still be a puzzle because it is not a general property of embedded -guo that it gives rise to actuality entailments:

(60) zhāngsān ting-shuo [lìsì chī-guo liulian], kēshì shìshìsāng lìsì conglái miéyǒu chī-guo  
    Zhangsan hear-say Lisi eat-EXP durian but in.fact Lisi always NEG eat-EXP  
    liulian.  
    ‘Zhangsan heard that Lisi has eaten durian, but in fact Lisi has never eaten durian.

(61) Gianni ha voluto parlare a Maria, (%ma non lo ha fatto).  
    Gianni has wanted talk to Maria but NEG it has done  
    ‘Gianni wanted to talk to Maria, #but he didn’t do it.’ (Hacquard 2008:19)

But what would still be left unexplained is why (59a) does not give rise to an actuality entailment.

Hypothesis A: A Hacquard 2006-style approach to actuality entailments whereby the two crucial ingredients that give rise to an actuality entailment are monoclausality and perfectivity:

Hypothesis B: A Giannakidou and Staraki 2013-style approach to actuality entailments that proposes a paratactic syntax:

(62) O John prospathise ke pire to epidoma.  
    the John tried.PRF.PST.3SG and take.PRF.PST.3SG the bonus  
    ‘John tried and got the bonus.’ (Giannakidou and Staraki 2013:261)

On this view, (59b) is not a control structure at all but rather two coordinated clauses. But as for now, there is no independent evidence for a paratactic analysis of (59b).
6 Conclusions

Bracketing off the two outstanding puzzles, the central conclusions are as follows:

(63) Aspect marking in Mandarin controlled complements — when grammatical — is non-local realization of matrix aspect.

(64) This odd state of affairs falls out from three properties of the grammar:
   a. The vP status of controlled complements in Mandarin
   b. The syntax of aspect placement in Mandarin
   c. Phase Theory

(65) Mandarin has no finite/nonfinite distinction though it does have control.

(66) Some of the burden of explaining the distribution of control can be shifted away from finiteness contrasts and onto principles that regulate complement size.
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