Traditional assumptions hold that the reference of complement control PRO is dependent on the reference of a higher argument and that the lexical properties of the embedding predicate are mostly responsible for controller determination. Against such views, this study argues for a possibility that the reference of certain instances of PRO (PC PRO) derives from its own internal structure.

The insight comes from Japanese control data in which certain modal particles (e.g. promissive, imperative and exhortative particles) appear in the complement (see Madigan 2008 for similar observations for Korean):

(1) Hanako-wa [PRO$_i$, roku-ji-ni atumar-u-to] it-ta.
    Hanako-Top [ six-o’clock-at gather-Prm-Cto] say-Past
    ‘Hanako said PRO$_i$ to gather at six.’ Prm=promissive

PRO= Hanako + others (excluding Hanako’s addressee)

(2) Hanako-wa [PRO$_j$, roku-ji-ni atumar-e-to] it-ta.
    Hanako-Top [ six-o’clock-at gather-Imp-Cto] say-Past
    ‘Hanako said PRO$_j$ to gather at six.’ Imp=imperative

PRO= Hanako’s addressee + others (excluding Hanako)

In (1) and (2), the matrix predicate is kept constant (iu ‘say’). Both give rise to partial control. However, the reference options for PRO vary by the embedded modality. The interpretation of PRO seems to arise from the same structural reasons that derive the interpretation of root promissive and imperative (and some other) subjects.

Indexical agreement as in (3) is proposed as the source of the relevant subject construals and modal morphology. The key is to look inside the structure of the subject/PRO, which is taken to be equivalent to the structure of first/second person pronouns (Harley & Ritter 2002, Déchaine & Wiltischko 2002). The gap in reference of the PARTICIPANT and the entire DP(PRO) accounts for partial control; not just any partial control, but more specific kind of partial control in which certain discourse participant must be included in or excluded from the reference of PRO. The proposal may be extended to English partial control phenomena and beyond.