

ALB.DOC

Title: **Are we in Agreement?**

Author: **Gabriela Alboiu**

Affiliation: Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics  
York University

Address: 4700 Keele Street  
South 555 Ross  
Toronto, ON, M3J 1P3  
Canada

e-mail: [galboiu@yorku.ca](mailto:galboiu@yorku.ca)

Telephone: 416-736-2100, extension 20302

Fax: 416-736-5483

## Are we in Agreement?\*

*Abstract:* This chapter argues for an analysis of Case checking as a property of phasal domains rather than of agreement. It shows that, cross-linguistically: (i) availability of Nominative subjects with phi-deficient T probes, (ii) failure of phi-complete T probes to check Case on their DP goals in the absence of temporal deixis, and (iii) recurrent phi-feature valuation by a single DP up to the first phase, receive a straightforward explanation under an approach where the crucial ingredient in Case valuation is a C-saturated T domain, rather than a phi-probe. Furthermore, by focusing on Romanian, it provides evidence against multiple Case checking and discusses the relationship between (un)availability of lexical subjects and featural properties of T in obligatory control and raising constructions.

*Keywords:* Case valuation, agreement, CP phases, control, raising

### 0. Introduction

This chapter discusses the relationship between structural Case valuation and phi-completeness (i.e. agreement) with a focus on Nominative Case. Starting with Chomsky (1981) and work by George and Kornfilt (1981), much of generative grammar has assumed Nominative Case to be incumbent on agreement properties within the functional domain, typically understood as phi-feature type properties, regardless of whether these phi-properties were taken to project independently as AGR phrases or to be couched parasitically on T, as suggested by

minimalist proposals. Most recently, Chomsky (2001a,b) assumes Nominative Case to be valued by an Agree operation with a phi-complete T probe, where, following insights in Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), phi-complete T is strictly correlated to a phi-complete C. Crucially, the presence of ‘agreement’, formalizable as an uninterpretable set of phi features ( $\mu\text{phi}$ ) features on T (and possibly C), is taken to be a necessary ingredient in Nominative Case-licensing mechanisms.

I suggest that generative grammar has placed too heavy a burden on agreement and argue that phi-specifications on T (i.e. agreement) are neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for Case checking. Instead, I propose an account of Case valuation based on phasal domains, which I show is better able to capture various cross-linguistic idiosyncrasies, including the following facts: (i) availability of Nominative subjects in the presence of phi-deficient T probes, (ii) failure of phi-complete T probes to value Case on their DP goals in the absence of temporal deixis, and (iii) recurrent phi-feature valuation by a single DP up to the first phase.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 1 introduces the reader to a broader picture of Nominative Case instantiation that goes beyond English and puts forth a unifying proposal. Section 2 focuses on featural properties of T and their role in Case assignment. A detailed discussion of each type of T follows in subsequent subsections. Section 3 discusses obligatory control phenomena in Romanian for which only a Case checking account with matrix probes can capture the data, despite the obligatory presence of an agreeing embedded T, thus further supporting an approach where Case features are independent of agreement. In Section 4, I argue against multiple Case valuation and provide further evidence that phi-probes are insufficient to license Case. Section 5 is a conclusion.

## 1. Instances of Nominative Case beyond English

While, it seems clear that for English overt Nominative subjects are intrinsically linked to a phi-complete T, thereby warranting Chomsky's claims, in certain Romance languages Nominative Case can also be valued by phi-deficient T probes, as shown by the availability of lexical subjects (in bold) in (1a) from Spanish and (1b) from Romanian infinitive constructions.<sup>i</sup>

- (1) a. *Lo supimos* [<sub>CP</sub> *después de* *llegar* ***él***].  
 we found out [<sub>CP</sub> after arrive.INF he.NOM]  
 'We found out after he had arrived.'  
 (adapted from Ledgeway 1998: 5)
- b. [<sub>CP</sub> *Înainte de a pleca ea*], *vreau să cumpăr*  
 [<sub>CP</sub> before of INF leave she.NOM], want.1SG SBJ buy  
*un tort.*  
 a cake.  
 'Before she leaves, I want to buy a cake.'

The above phenomenon has received recent attention in Ledgeway (1998) who discusses various types of infinitives available to Romance languages. However, it is also attested outside of Romance, for example in West Flemish (see Haegeman 1985), which suggests a noteworthy robustness. Note that these constructions are to be kept distinct from inflected infinitives discussed by Raposo (1987) for European Portuguese (henceforth, EP), as no agreement morphology is present on the infinitive. While the facts in (1) suggest Case valuation to be independent of phi-features, the availability of Nominative subjects with inflected infinitives, see (2) from Raposo, also divorces Nominative valuation from finiteness.

- (2) *Será difícil* [*eles aprovarem* *a proposta*].  
 'It will be difficult they to-approve-Agr the proposal.'  
 (Raposo 1987: 86)

On the other hand, caution is needed as even if these data show Case checking not to be incumbent on agreement or finiteness, they cannot be taken as an argument per se against phi-

probes valuing Case. So, were we to ignore the unwelcome theoretical implications faced by a system in which Case valuation were inconsistently available due to agreement, finiteness and possibly something else, we could, in principle, still entertain the idea that phi-complete probes can check and value Case. Fortunately, this account is refuted by the discussion below.

Under minimalism, inactive XPs do not enter further checking relationships. For DPs this translates into the impossibility of entering A-chains if already Case-marked. Specifically, once Case has been valued on a DP, the DP should become inactive and remain immovable (Chomsky 2001a,b). The familiar restrictions from English subject raising constructions in (3) support this claim:

- (3)
- a. Agreement<sub>i</sub> seems [ t<sub>i</sub> to be a popular topic these days].
  - b. It seems [that agreement is a popular topic these days].
  - c. \* Agreement<sub>i</sub> seems [that t<sub>i</sub> is a popular topic these days].

Subject DP raising is only permitted provided the DP is not Case-marked in the embedded clause; specifically, in (3a) but not in (3b) and (3c). Raposo (1987) provides similar evidence by showing that Nominative subjects cannot raise outside of inflected infinitives in EP, which further supports the view that DPs are ‘de-activated’ once their Case is valued.

Now if phi-probes could indeed value Case, DP raising for Nominative Case valuation from within a phi-complete TP would not to be expected. Nonetheless, there are languages that permit A-type agreement and raising of DP subjects from within phi-complete TPs. Subject raising constructions in Albanian, Greek, Persian and Romanian, among others, involve subjunctive complements in which the T probe is phi-complete. Consider (4) from Romanian, where both matrix and embedded T agree in person and number with the raised DP.

- (4)
- |                                |             |             |            |                      |                        |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Max<sub>i</sub></i>         | <i>pare</i> | [ <i>să</i> | <i>fie</i> | <i>t<sub>i</sub></i> | <i>de încredere</i> ]. |
| Max <sub>i</sub>               | seem.3SG    | [SBJ        | be.3SG     | t <sub>i</sub>       | of trust]              |
| ‘Max seems to be trustworthy.’ |             |             |            |                      |                        |

Had the DP ‘Max’ valued Case within the subjunctive clause in (4), any subsequent relationship with matrix T, as well as further raising should have been prohibited, contrary to fact.

These preliminary examples support an approach which divorces phi-probes from Case. A closer look at languages that cut their pie in a more refined way than English with respect to properties of T and licensing of Nominative Case suggests that *the sine qua non condition for Nominative Case valuation is the C-T (phase-level) relationship* rather than a phi-complete T. Following, Chomsky (2001b), Stowell 1982, and others, I take T to be ‘tensed’ only if saturated by C, which is equivalent to saying that *Nominative Case is available strictly in the presence of a tensed T.*<sup>ii</sup> This proposal has the benefit of providing a consistent account for Nominative Case valuation cross-linguistically, as well as shifting the burden from agreement to tense.<sup>iii</sup> In terms of implementation, I assume tensed T is formalizable as an interpretable deictic Tense feature (*i*T) on T with the potential of valuing Case. Paramount to our account is that *i*T will only be a property of T in the presence of CP. Following proposals in Haeberli (1999), Pesetsky and Torrego (2001, 2004), and Svenonius (2001), I take Case itself to be construed as an uninterpretable Tense feature (*u*T) on D.

The challenge then is twofold. On the one hand, we need to demonstrate that it is *i*T and not agreement that is responsible for Nominative Case checking, on the other hand we need to show that the *i*T specification on T is incumbent on the presence of the C domain. The next section addresses the various types of T (in terms of *i*T availability and phi-features) and their relationship with lexical subjects. Occurrence of the C head is also investigated. Much of the discussion focuses on Romanian which provides empirical evidence for all manners of T.

## 2. Featural properties of T

The prerequisite for demonstrating that T specified for *i*T can value abstract Case regardless of phi-features, warrants a discussion of all the potential T types emerging from the combination of these two parameters. Specifically, (i) a temporally deictic and phi-complete T, specified as [*i*T, *u*phi]; (ii) a temporally deictic but phi-deficient (or  $\phi$ -incomplete) T, specified as [*i*T] but no phi-probe; (iii) a phi-complete but anaphoric (i.e., ‘untensed’) T, specified solely as a phi-probe, [*u*phi]; and (iv) anaphoric T without any phi-features.<sup>iv, v</sup>

### 2.1. *T : [iT, uphi]*

I will set aside any detailed discussion of type (i) T. The reason for this is simple: given that both agreement and tense are available to T, these situations will not shed any light on which of the two features is responsible for Case-checking valuation, or whether it is the combination of them both.

### 2.2. *T : [iT] but no [uphi]*

As the examples in (1) show, in some languages Nominative subjects are available with uninflected infinitives. These clauses are temporally deictic, in that they allow for a distinct temporal specification from that of the matrix clause. Given their adjunct CP status, this is expected. T is saturated by C, so it bears an *i*T feature. Such infinitives share the important property of requiring an obligatory preposition, typically taken to be responsible for the presence

of Nominative subjects. One approach is to assume that the presence of the preposition, suggested to be external to the CP, ‘activates’ Case-assigning properties of the Inflectional domain, properties intrinsically related to agreement (see, for example, discussion in Cowper 2002, Haegeman 1985, Ledgeway 1998, Motapanyane 1995, and Raposo 1989). But if agreement were at stake, why is there no overt manifestation of phi-feature valuation on the embedded T? This is a puzzle given that agreement morphology is typically available to these languages, while some also license inflected infinitives (e.g. EP).<sup>vi</sup> On the other hand, were we to assume that phi-features are absent in this type of T, as suggested above, no agreement morphology would be expected. I suggest that [*u*phi] is present on T only when agreement morphology is available to the respective paradigm. In the absence of overt agreement morphology, I take T to lack [*u*phi] features (see also Landau 2004). Note, however, that in the absence of phi-features, the only property of T capable of valuing Nominative would have to be *i*T. In their discussion of English gerunds and *for-to* infinitives, Pesetsky and Torrego (2001, 2004) suggest that the preposition in C is an overt manifestation of T to C movement, required to satisfy the T-related properties of C. Extending their analysis to the infinitives in (1), we can take the preposition to be the spell-out of T to C movement. Intuitively, its presence is an indication of *i*T on T, which I take to be responsible for Nominative licensing. Technically speaking, Nominative emerges whenever the *u*T feature on the DP subject is checked and valued against *i*T in T.

### 2.3. T: [*u*phi] but no [*i*T]

I take this type of T to be present in all clauses unsaturated by a CP level but which show agreement morphology on T. Potential candidates are inflected infinitives and TP (but not CP!) subjunctives.

It turns out that inflected infinitives in EP are not of this type. These infinitives may function as subject sentences and adjunct clauses (see Raposo 1987) both of which require CP status, thus guaranteeing *i*T on T. While Ledgeway (1998) considers them to be [-T], Raposo (1987) argues that they contain a tense operator. In addition, Landau (2004), also argues for their [+T] status based on the fact that complements to factive, declarative and epistemic predicates must all be tensed (recall that whether T bears dependent or independent tense is irrelevant for Nominative Case valuation). Consequently, the featural specification of T in inflected infinitives in EP includes both *i*T and *u*phi, so lexical Nominative subjects are expected to be licensed and, in addition, expected to be barred from further entering A-chain type dependencies. This is in accord with the empirical facts, as noted in section 1.

Another well-documented instance of inflected infinitives is available in Hungarian (see Jakab 2003, Landau 2004, Tóth 2000). According to Jakab (2003) inflected infinitives in Hungarian have to be untensed, see (5), her (20):

- (5) \**Tegnap Jánosnak nem volt szabad holnap elmen-ni-e.*  
 yesterday John-DAT not was allowed tomorrow VM-go-INF-3SG  
 ‘Yesterday, John was not allowed to go away tomorrow.’

(5) shows that tense mismatch is disallowed between matrix and embedded T, which suggests infinitive T lacks an *i*T feature. Jakab (2003) argues contra Landau (2004) that these infinitival complements lack not only C but also T and that the obligatory control phenomena prevalent in inflected infinitives is the result of raising the unique DP argument from the reduced complement clause into the matrix clause. <sup>vii</sup>

Let us next focus on TP subjunctive clauses. It is currently well-known that languages such as Albanian, Persian, Greek, Bulgarian and Romanian, among others, take subjunctive (rather than infinitive) complements in both raising and control constructions.<sup>viii</sup> The question is whether these subjunctive clauses have CP or TP status. Most of the authors in footnote 8 distinguish between ‘two types’ of subjunctives, roughly revolving around tense and control properties. While subjunctive complements do not manifest independent tense on a par with indicative clauses, their tense properties may or may not be anaphoric depending on the matrix verb selecting them (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 and Farkas 1992, for Romanian; Krapova 2001, for Bulgarian; Landau 2004, for Balkan languages more generally). Specifically, complements to obligatory control (henceforth OC) predicates (i.e., ‘exhaustive control’ in the sense of Landau 1999, 2003, ‘semantic control’ in the sense of Wurmbrand 1998), such as aspectual, implicative, and some modal matrix verbs, are untensed (i.e., bear anaphoric tense). This is illustrated in (6) below, with Romanian data, where (6a) involves an OC implicative and (6b) involves an OC aspectual predicate. In both instances, subjunctive T is anaphorically related to matrix T as indicated by the absence of distinct temporal deixis.

- (6) a. *Am reușit să plec (\*mîine).*<sup>ix</sup>  
 AUX.1SG managed SBJ leave.1SG tomorrow  
 ‘I managed to leave (\*tomorrow).’
- b. *Încep să citesc / \*fi citit.*  
 begin.1SG SBJ read.1SG / PAST read  
 ‘I’m beginning to (\*have) read.’

On the other hand, complements to desideratives and other non-obligatory control predicates, which may optionally (and, in some languages, partially) take an identical embedded argument, allow for a distinct tense from that of the matrix clause, albeit dependent on matrix clause T given the irrealis status of subjunctives in general. (7) illustrates both these phenomena.<sup>x</sup>

- (7) a. *Am vrut să plece Mihai*  
 AUX.1SG wanted SBJ leave.3SG Mihai.NOM  
 (*mîine*).  
 (tomorrow)  
 ‘I wanted for Mihai to leave (tomorrow).’
- b. *Am vrut să plec (mîine)*.  
 AUX.1SG wanted SBJ leave.1SG (tomorrow)  
 ‘I wanted to leave (tomorrow).’

In our system, this amounts to saying that T in OC subjunctives is not specified for *i*T, whereas T in non-OC subjunctives *is*. Contra Landau (1999, 2004) who assumes a unitary CP account, but following Alboiu (2004), I suggest that the presence versus absence of *i*T specification on subjunctive T is strictly dependent on the presence versus absence of the CP domain. Specifically, while non-OC subjunctives have CP status, OC subjunctives are non-phasal TPs. Consequently, they fall under the type of T being investigated in this section.<sup>xi</sup>

The next subsection provides further evidence that, in Romanian, subjunctives to OC predicates (as defined above) have non-phasal status on a par with raising complements.

### 2.3.1. Further evidence for the non-phasal status of certain Romanian subjunctives

Let us first note that in addition to the synthetic marking of person and number on the verb stem, as in Romance more generally, Romanian subjunctives also require the obligatory presence of a subjunctive particle *să* preceding the verb (i.e., the subjunctive is also analytically marked as in other Balkan languages).

The subjunctive particle *să* has generally been argued to be a mood/finite marker within T by a number of authors (e.g. Alboiu 2002, Cornilescu 1997, Isac 2002, Motapanyane 1995, Pîrvulescu 2001, Rivero 1994, Terzi 1992), though Dobrovie-Sorin (1994, 2001) suggests *să* is ambiguous between a C and a T element. Given the availability of a distinct subjunctive

complementizer in the language, specifically *ca*, an unambiguous C element which surfaces to the left of *să*, I take *să* to be a genuine T element.

As discussed in Alboiu and Motapanyane (2000), the subjunctive complementizer *ca* is obligatory with topicalised material, as in (8a), optional with fronted focus, as in (8b), and subject to idiolectal variation when nothing precedes *să*, as in (8c).

- (8) a. *Trebuie*      [\*(*ca*)      *Mioara<sub>i</sub>*      *să*      *ajungă*      *t<sub>i</sub> repede*].  
 must            that.SBJ      Mioara      SBJ      arrive.3SG *t<sub>i</sub>* soon.’  
 ‘Mioara must arrive soon.’
- b. *Vreau*           [(*ca*)            *AZI*      *să*      *pleci*      (*nu* *mîine*)].  
 want.1SG      that. SBJ      today      SBJ      leave.2SG (not tomorrow)  
 ‘It is today that I want you to leave (, not tomorrow).’
- c. *Vreau*           [(?*ca*)            *să*      *ningă*].  
 want.1SG      that. SBJ      SBJ      snow.3SG  
 ‘I want it to snow.’

Given that C is not always lexicalized as *ca*, the absence of *ca* cannot be taken as synonymous to the absence of C. The absence of C, on the other hand, will necessarily prevent insertion of the complementizer *ca*. Returning to OC subjunctives, there are further properties which point towards their non-phasal (i.e., TP) status aside from lack of *iT* specification, addressed in the previous section. First, subjunctives to OC predicates can never occur with the complementizer, see (9), or with wh-phrases, see (10).<sup>xii</sup>

- (9) a. *Victor va*                      *începe* [TP (\**ca* *pe Mihai*)                      *să-l*  
 Victor will.3SG                  begin [TP (that.SBJ PE Mihai)                      SBJ-3SG.M.ACC  
*ajute*].  
 help]  
 ‘Victor will begin to help Mihai.’
- b. *Victor va*                      *începe* [TP *să-l*                      *ajute* (*pe Mihai*).]  
 Victor will.3SG                  begin [TP SBJ-3SG.M.ACC                      help      (PE Mihai)]  
 ‘Victor will begin to help Mihai.’
- (10) a. *Mihai va*                      *începe* [TP (\**ce*)                      *să*      *cînte*?]  
 Mihai will.3SG                  begin [TP (what)                      SBJ      sing]

‘What will Mihai start singing?’

- b. *Ce va începe Mihai* [TP *să cînte*]?  
 what will.3SG begin Mihai [TP SBJ sing]  
 ‘What will Mihai start singing?’

Importantly, the absence of *ca* in these contexts mirrors constructions with raising predicates (e.g., *pare* ‘seem’) also discussed in Grosu and Horvath (1987); see (11).

- (11) *Copiii par [TP (\*ca în ultima vreme) să stea*  
 kids-the seem.3PL [TP (that. SBJ in last.the time) SBJ stay.3PL  
*t<sub>i</sub> mult timp la calculator].*  
*t<sub>i</sub> much time at computer]*  
 ‘The kids seem to be spending too much time in front of the computer (lately).’

Crucially, this is different from what is available to desiderative predicates, which can arguably select a CP given the non-anaphoric tense properties available to these subjunctives (see discussion in the previous section). In (12), the subjunctive complement supports both an overt C and topicalized material, as expected if the *iT* property of T is incumbent on the C-T relationship.

- (12) *Am vrut [CP (ca la bursă) să fi*  
 AUX.1SG wanted [CP (that.SBJ at scholarship) SBJ PAST  
*plecat Mihai].*  
 left Mihai]  
 ‘I wanted for Mihai to have left for the scholarship.’

Second, in the presence of the subjunctive complementizer *ca*, negative polarity items cannot extract to the main clause sentence-initial contrastive focus position. This behaviour, shown in (13), is unsurprising in the presence of a CP (phasal) boundary.

- (13) a. *Ion nu voia [CP ca Mihai să invite pe*  
 Ion NEG wanted [CP that. SBJ Mihai SBJ invite.3SG PE  
*nimeni].*  
 noone]  
 ‘Ion didn’t want Mihai to invite anyone.’
- b. *\*Ion pe NIMENI<sub>i</sub> nu voia [CP ca Mihai să*  
 Ion PE NOONE<sub>i</sub> NEG wanted [CP that. SBJ Mihai SBJ

*invite*  $t_i$ ].  
 invite.3SG  $t_i$ ]  
 ‘Ion didn’t want Mihai to invite [<sub>FOCUS</sub> anyone].’

In contrast to (13), negative polarity items can undergo A-bar movement to this focus position in the absence of *ca* with both OC subjunctives, as in (14a,b), and raising subjunctives, as in (14c), which suggest that these subjunctives have a non-phasal, TP, reduced status.

- (14) a. *Ion pe NIMENI<sub>i</sub> nu reușea* [<sub>TP</sub> *să invite*  $t_i$ ].  
 Ion PE NOONE<sub>i</sub> NEG managed [<sub>TP</sub> SBJ invite.3SG  $t_i$ ]  
 ‘Ion didn’t manage to invite [<sub>FOCUS</sub> anyone].’
- b. *Pe NIMENI<sub>i</sub> n-a încercat Ion* [<sub>TP</sub> *să invite*  $t_i$ ].  
 PE NOONE<sub>i</sub> NEG-AUX.3SG tried Ion [<sub>TP</sub> SBJ invite.3SG  $t_i$ ]  
 ‘Ion didn’t try to invite [<sub>FOCUS</sub> anyone].’
- c. *Pe NIMENI<sub>i</sub> nu pare* [<sub>TP</sub> *să invite* *Ion*  $t_i$ ].  
 PE NOONE<sub>i</sub> NEG seems [<sub>TP</sub> SBJ invite.3SG Ion  $t_i$ ]  
 ‘Ion doesn’t seem to be inviting [<sub>FOCUS</sub> anyone].’

Consequently, I conclude that there is sufficient evidence to support the claim that subjunctive complements to obligatory control verbs have TP rather than CP status in Romanian. This correlation strengthens the claim that *i*T is only available to T if saturated by C. Specifically, that tense domains are phasal properties.

The crux of this conclusion is that material from within obligatory control subjunctives remains available to matrix clause Agree operations as it has not yet been sent to the interfaces. In section 3, this discussion is followed up by an account of Romanian OC as raising, supported by the absence of partial control phenomena in the language, alongside ‘backward control’ effects (in the sense of Polinsky and Potsdam 2002). I show there that under an account which equates Nominative Case valuation with the availability of *i*T on T, rather than agreement, the raising properties of obligatory control constructions fall out naturally. Prior to this discussion, however, we need to briefly focus our attention on the last type of T, specifically phi-deficient, untensed T.

2.4. *T: no [uphi] and no [iT]*

This is the T of English ECM and subject raising constructions. Martin (1996) has argued that raising in English is dependent on the absence of tensed T, while Rizzi (1982, Pesetsky 1995) and many others have demonstrated that these infinitives are TP rather than CP domains.

Insofar as Romanian is concerned, earlier stages of the language had phi-deficient, untensed T infinitive complements which were gradually replaced with a subjunctive counterpart. Nonetheless, even in modern Romanian (see also discussion in Motapanyane 1995), some aspectual verbs involved in OC are still currently acceptable with infinitive (15a), as well as subjunctive complements (15b).<sup>xiii</sup>

- (15) a. *Au început [TP a strănuta*  
 AUX.3PL started [TP INF sneeze  
*copiii de frig], așa că am închis*  
 children-the.NOM of cold], so that AUX.1PL closed  
*geamurile.*  
 windows-the  
 ‘The children started sneezing because of the cold, so we shut the windows.’
- b. *Au început [TP să strănute*  
 AUX.3PL started [TP SBJ sneeze.3PL  
*copiii de frig], așa că am închis*  
 children-the.NOM of cold], so that AUX.1PL closed  
*geamurile.*  
 windows-the  
 ‘The children started sneezing because of the cold, so we shut the windows.’

These data show that a lexical Nominative is legitimate in the embedded clause regardless of whether phi-features are present, as in (15b), or not, as in (15a). Recall, however, that we just argued that aspectuals select TP rather than CP complements and that the tense of their

complements is anaphoric, rather than specified for *i*T. Consequently, we do not expect the embedded T to be capable of checking Case in either (15a) or (15b).<sup>xiv</sup> However, it is paramount to note that the mere presence of a Nominative DP in the embedded clause says nothing with respect to which T probe - embedded or main clause - is responsible for checking and valuing this Case. In keeping with the proposal put forth in this chapter, in the absence of a deictic T probe, the *u*T (Case) feature on D cannot be checked nor valued. So how does the DP subject get its Nominative specification? The answer is straightforward: the non-phasal status of these complements permits active goals to enter checking relationships with matrix probes as the embedded clause has not undergone Spell Out. Matrix T, being saturated by C and thus temporally deictic has an *i*T feature which checks and values Nominative Case on the embedded subject. In the process, matrix T will also value its own *u*phi, which results in agreement with the embedded subject. The backward control flavour of these constructions, as well as properties of shared arguments more generally in Romanian OC is tackled in the next section.<sup>xv</sup>

### 3. Obligatory control in Romanian

In this section, I provide evidence for an account of obligatory control in Romanian analogous to that of raising predicates. So far, we have seen that in both raising and OC subjunctives, T is specified as *u*phi but untensed. So, whatever account we adopt for raising should also be relevant for control (and vice versa). And, if this seems an oversimplification, various arguments will strengthen the claim as we proceed. Let us first address the behaviour of the controlled/shared argument in Romanian OC subjunctives.<sup>xvi</sup>

While in languages like English, the shared argument is constrained to a matrix clause position, in Romanian it may surface in a number of legitimate slots, including in the embedded clause, as already shown in (15) and more elaborately, below in (16). However, only one instantiation of the DP subject is permitted (see also Alboiu 2004, in preparation).<sup>xvii</sup>

- (16)      (**Victor**)      *încearcă*      (**Victor**)      [*să*    *cînte*      (**Victor**)  
           (Victor.NOM) try.3SG      (Victor.NOM) [SBJ    sing.3SG      (Victor. NOM)  
           *la trombon*    (**Victor**)].  
           at trombone    (Victor.NOM)]  
           ‘Victor is trying to play the trombone.’

Note also, that despite the fact that the complement clause in Romanian is a subjunctive (with agreement morphology) rather than an infinitive, obligatory control still holds, as shown in (17a), with the silent subject represented in (17b).

- (17)      a.      **Victor** *încearcă*      (\***Mihai**)      *să*    *cînte*      (\***Mihai**).  
           Victor try.3SG      (\*Mihai)      SBJ    sing.3SG      (\*Mihai)  
           ‘Victor is trying (\*Mihai) to sing.’
- b.      **Victor<sub>i</sub>**      *încearcă*      *pro<sub>i</sub>/PRO<sub>i</sub>*      *să*    *cînte*.  
           Victor<sub>i</sub>      try.3SG      pro<sub>i</sub>/PRO<sub>i</sub>      SBJ    sing.3SG  
           ‘Victor is trying to sing.’

Given the availability of agreement morphology present on the subjunctive, the null subject in Romanian obligatory control structures in (17b) has often been claimed to be an instantiation of ‘pro’ (e.g., Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Farkas 1988, Motapanyane 1995), but given the semantics of control, some authors maintain it as ‘PRO’ (e.g. Kempchinski 1986, Terzi 1992, Landau 2004).

At least the following questions need to be addressed in connection to these data: (i) Where does the DP subject originate? (ii) Is movement involved? and if so, (iii) What factors determine pronunciation site? (iv) Is there any genuine evidence for PRO?

As in Alboiu (2004, in preparation), I adopt here an approach which views theta-roles as features that can be valued via Agree on a par with any other unvalued feature and propose a

raising account of control. As noted earlier, I take the absence of independent semantic tense in control subjunctives to be synonymous to the failure to value Case on the embedded subject D. Consequently, despite the fact that the embedded DP subject values  $u\phi$  on embedded T, it remains accessible to matrix clause Agree operations as it has not checked its own Case feature (i.e.,  $uT$ ) in the subjunctive clause.

### 3.1. *Why 'raising' is the best solution*

In this section, I first show how none of the recent minimalist analyses can do justice to the Romanian OC data and subsequently refine a Hornstein-type account to capture the facts.

There are two major directions pursued with respect to obligatory control in recent studies: a reductionist and a non-reductionist approach. Approaches eliminating PRO differ primarily as to whether they assume or do not assume movement, which is usually linked to whether theta roles are construed as features or not. Perhaps the least controversial reductionist minimalist approach is that put forth by Wurmbrand (1998), who essentially argues that obligatory control presupposes a monoclausal construction, with no PRO. Her analysis is reminiscent of various restructuring analyses that go back to Rizzi (1982) and Haegeman and van Riemsdijk (1986). In a nutshell, the matrix verb selects a VP complement as in (18).

(18) John tried [<sub>VP</sub> to read the new Chomsky].

Wurmbrand's analysis is easily dismissed for Romanian as (16) shows evidence for structure beyond VP (i.e.,  $\phi$ -complete T, embedded subject DP, etc.). Furthermore, clitic climbing - a crucial argument for restructuring - while present in certain contexts in Romanian, see (19a), is ruled out in obligatory control contexts, see (19b). Given that clitics target the T

domain in Romance (since Kayne 1991), the subjunctive in (19b) must project at least to a TP.

xviii

- (19) a. *L<sub>i</sub>-a*                      *putut*                      [<sub>VP</sub> (\* *il<sub>i</sub>*)  
 CL.3SG.M.ACC<sub>i</sub>-AUX.3SG      could.PART            [<sub>VP</sub> (\* CL.3SG.M.ACC<sub>i</sub>)  
*vedea*] ?  
 see]  
 ‘Could s/he see him ?’
- b. *Nu*      (\**l<sub>i</sub>*)-*a*                      *încercat*                      [*să-l<sub>i</sub>*  
 not      (\*CL.3SG.M.ACC<sub>i</sub>)-AUX.3SG      tried                      [<sub>SBJ</sub>-CL.3SG.M.ACC<sub>i</sub>  
*vadă* ].  
 see]  
 ‘S/he didn’t try to see him.’

The most influential syntactic movement analyses of obligatory control belong to Manzini and Roussou (2000) and Hornstein (1999, 2001), so I will briefly focus on those. Both of these analyses view theta roles as features which have to be checked (i.e., valued) and crucially, both enable a DP to be associated with more than one theta-role.<sup>xix</sup>

Manzini and Roussou propose that theta roles are aspectual features which merge in the verbal domain and which associate with a DP. In their system, DPs can only merge in their Case position and, consequently, can only occur in the inflectional domain. From there a DP will attract as many theta-roles as are in its domain, essentially, all of the theta-roles up to the next DP. Obligatory control is devoid of any PRO, being simply viewed as attraction of two theta-roles instead of one. This is schematically illustrated in (20).

- (20) a. [<sub>TP</sub> John T [<sub>VP</sub> tried [<sub>TP</sub> to [<sub>VP</sub> read]]]]  
 b. [ John<sub>D</sub> [ tried θ<sub>1</sub> [θ<sub>2</sub> read ]]]
- 

A Manzini and Roussou approach has actually been proposed for Romanian by Dobrovie-Sorin (2001). Essentially, it would work as in (21):

- (21) a. *Victor încearcă să cînte la trombon.*  
 Victor try.3SG SBJ sing.3SG at trombone  
 ‘Victor is trying to play the trombone.’
- b. [ Victor<sub>D</sub> [ tried θ<sub>1</sub> [θ<sub>2</sub> the trombone play θ<sub>3</sub>]]]
- 

Leaving aside theory-internal problems with the Manzini and Roussou approach, such as for example, the fact that it is stipulative to assume the DP would be interested in attracting more than one theta-feature to begin with, there are also empirical problems which are more difficult to ignore. Basically, this analysis only works if the unique DP argument appears in the main clause preverbal position but becomes problematic once we consider data where the shared argument is not pronounced in the matrix clause domain but lower, as for instance in (22).

- (22) a. *pro<sub>i</sub> încearcă să cînte Victor<sub>i</sub> la trombon.*  
 pro<sub>i</sub> try.3SG SBJ sing.3SG Victor<sub>i</sub> at trombone  
 ‘Victor is trying to play the trombone.’
- b. [ pro<sub>D</sub> [ tried θ<sub>1</sub> Victor<sub>D</sub> [θ<sub>2</sub> the trombone play θ<sub>3</sub>]]]
- 

Crucially, (22) is a Condition C violation. If anything, assuming the expletive is indeed available in the Numeration, we expect it to be incapable of bearing the same index with the subjunctive DP subject, contrary to fact. One possibility is to hypothesize that Romanian is insensitive to Condition C effects. However, example (23) shows that Condition C effects are, nonetheless, operative in this language, which amounts to disqualifying the Manzini and Roussou approach as a correct analysis for Romanian.

- (23) *pro<sub>i/\*j</sub> știe că pleacă Mihai<sub>j</sub> mîine.*  
 pro<sub>i/\*j</sub> know.3SG that.IND leave.3SG Mihai<sub>j</sub> tomorrow  
 ‘He<sub>i/\*j</sub> knows that Mihai<sub>j</sub> will be leaving tomorrow.’

Hornstein’s approach is more conservative in that it assumes DPs to be merged in theta-domains rather than in the inflectional domain. Nonetheless, it is novel in that it allows for DP-

movement into theta-positions on a par with movement into Case positions. In his system, theta-roles are features that check either by initial or by second Merge (i.e., via DP-insertion from the Numeration or via DP-movement from within the syntactic tree, respectively). In this approach PRO is simply a lower unpronounced copy of a moved DP, as in (24), where the pronounced copy is in bold.

(24)  $[_{TP} \text{ **John** } T [_{VP} \text{ John tried } [_{TP} \text{ to } [_{VP} \text{ John } v [_{VP} \text{ read the new Chomsky}]]]]]$

The major proponent of the non-reductionist approach to control in minimalism is Landau. I next discuss Landau and leave Hornstein last, given that I ultimately adopt a revised version of Hornstein as the optimal solution for Romanian. Landau (1999, 2003) argues that PRO is cross-linguistically present in obligatory control structures and that equating control with raising is a major mistake. His insights rely heavily on an earlier analysis proposed by Borer (1989) which he adapts to minimalism. Essentially, obligatory control is seen as an instantiation of the operation Agree holding between a matrix probe and an embedded anaphoric element. This anaphoric element is sensitive to the specific type of control at stake in the derivation. If involved in ‘exhaustive control’ (OC in this paper), the anaphoric element is PRO; if involved in ‘partial control’ (here, non-OC), the anaphoric element is Agr of the embedded clause. The split between exhaustive versus partial control depends on whether the selecting matrix predicate obligatorily requires an identical embedded argument, see data in (25), or does so optionally, as in (26b), or even partially, as in (26c).

- (25) Exhaustive Control (EC)
- a. Tom<sub>i</sub> tried [PRO<sub>i</sub> to understand calculus]
  - b. \* Tom<sub>i</sub> tried [for Mary to understand calculus]
  - c. \* Tom<sub>i</sub> tried [PRO<sub>i+</sub> to meet at 9]

- (26) Partial Control (PC)
- a. Gandalf<sub>i</sub> wanted [PRO<sub>i</sub> to succeed]

- b. Gandalf<sub>i</sub> wanted [for Frodo to succeed]  
 c. Gandalf<sub>i</sub> wanted [PRO<sub>i+</sub> to meet late at night] / [PRO<sub>i+</sub> to leave together].

Crucially, for Landau (1999), PRO is present throughout, being ‘active’ for Agree due to its anaphoric nature and ‘inactive’ for movement given that it is Case-marked with null Case. However, by definition, PRO is in complementary distribution with overt DPs, clearly not the case for Romanian OC structures as shown in (16).<sup>xx</sup> Consequently, a PRO analysis cannot do justice to the data, so it seems stipulative to adopt it. Note that Landau’s main argument against a raising analysis for obligatory control in English comes from the availability of partial control with certain matrix verbs in this language, as seen in (26c). This is a viable argument that cannot be ignored. However, it is an argument that does not apply to Romanian, which lacks the partial control effects seen with English desideratives. Consider (27).

- (27) a. \* *Eu vreau* [să plec împreună].  
 I want.1SG [SBJ leave.1SG together]  
 b. *Eu vreau* [să plecăm împreună].  
 I want.1SG [SBJ leave.1PL together]  
 ‘I want to leave together.’

(27a) shows that a syntactically singular subject cannot license a semantically plural predicate (i.e., a collective predicate) as in the case of English. The subject has to be plural, as in (27b), in which case we are dealing with exhaustive control again and not partial control. In effect then, there is nothing to prevent a raising analysis for Romanian obligatory control structures.<sup>xxi</sup>

A Hornstein-type analysis would work as in (28), where the subject DP first merges in the Spec,vP of the embedded clause and subsequently moves to its second Merge position in Spec,vP of matrix clause, thus satisfying the external thematic roles of both predicates (i.e.,  $\theta_v^e$  and  $\theta_v^m$ , respectively).

- (28) [TP is trying [<sub>vP</sub> Victor  $\theta_v^m$  [TP SBJ play [<sub>vP</sub> Victor  $\theta_v^e$  [<sub>vP</sub> the trombone]]]]]
-

The problem with (28) is that it only partially accounts for (16), repeated as (29) with the copies relevant for the theta-chain in bold:

- (29) *Victor încearcă*      **Victor** *să*      *cînte*      **Victor**  
 Victor try.3SG      Victor SBJ      sing.3SG      Victor  
*la trombon*      *Victor*.  
 at trombone      *Victor*  
 ‘Victor is trying to play the trombone.’

Recall that in Romanian, subjects do not dislocate to Spec,TP for Case valuation. Crucially, in (29), ‘Victor’ in italics is not involved in movement of the English EPP-type when matrix initial but is interpreted as a topic. If anything, then, the Hornstein account predicts pronunciation of the postverbal copy for VSO language like Romanian, which we see not to be supported by the empirical facts. Consequently, while I take an approach which views theta-roles as features in need of valuation to be not only correct but the best solution for Romanian, dislocation cannot be a prerequisite - contra Hornstein.<sup>xxii</sup> In Alboiu (2004, in preparation) I argue that whether theta-feature and/or Case valuation is further accompanied by movement of the embedded DP subject to the matrix clause depends on the presence or absence of relevant semantico-pragmatic triggers for displacement (e.g., focus, de-rhematization, etc.). Given that our focus here is the relationship, or lack thereof, between Case valuation and agreement, I take the significance of each copy instantiation in Romanian OC to be beyond the scope of our discussion and I refer the interested reader to the aforementioned papers.

Let us next briefly consider desideratives which seem to provide some interesting evidence in support a raising analysis of control. Consider first (30).

- (30) *pro<sub>i/\*j</sub> vrea*      [<sub>CP</sub> *ca* *mîine*      *să*      *cînte*      *Mihai<sub>j</sub>*  
*pro* want.3SG      [<sub>CP</sub> that tomorrow      SBJ      sing.3SG      Mihai  
*la trombon*].  
 at trombone]  
 ‘S/he wants Mihai to play the trombone tomorrow.’

In the presence of a CP phasal complement, the null subject (i.e., a referential *pro*) of the matrix clause cannot be coreferential with the embedded subject as this would result in a Condition C violation. As expected, (30) can only be interpreted with disjoint DPs. However, in the absence of clear indication for the phasal domain (i.e., in the absence of the subjunctive complementizer *ca*), as in (31), the matrix subject may be interpreted coreferentially with the embedded subject.

- (31)  $pro_i / *pro_j$  *vrea* [ *să* *cînte* *Mihai\_j la trombon* ].  
 $pro_i / *pro_j$  want.3SG [ SBJ sing.3SG *Mihai\_j at trombone* ]  
 (i) ‘S/he wants Mihai to play the trombone.’ OR  
 (ii) ‘Mihai wants to play the trombone.’

Reading (i) is, in effect, a sub-type of (30); namely, the phasal CP domain is present but C is null given that nothing has been topicalized. As a result,  $pro_i$  and  $Mihai_j$  are Case-marked by distinct T probes, matrix and embedded, respectively. Reading (ii) is more interesting, as something akin to (30) can no longer be assumed. The reason is straightforward: a  $pro_j$  in the matrix clause would trigger a Condition C violation. The only possibility we are left with is to assume control-as-raising on a par with genuine OC constructions.<sup>xxiii</sup>

To conclude this discussion, I assume that obligatory control in Romanian is an instance of ‘raising’, loosely defined as an instance of a matrix probe valuing the Case features of an active embedded DP. We expect that whether dislocation ensues or not in such cases would depend on the status of A-chains in the respective language. Given that in Romanian, A-chain formation is not incumbent on movement, dislocation is not a prerequisite, as shown.

### 3.2. *When is control raising?*

If we are on the right track in assuming that embedded DP subjects are available to matrix clause probes whenever they are initially merged in unsaturated T domains, the issue of

whether a language permits control-as-raising or not resides solely with the status of the embedded clause. If the embedded clause is a non-phasal TP, as in Romanian OC and standard raising constructions, Greek complements to aspectual and classical raising verbs (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2002) and Hungarian inflected infinitives involved in control (Jakab 2003), then the  $uT$  feature on the highest embedded D will be checked by matrix T. However, prior to this checking operation, the respective nominal remains active and capable of satisfying the  $uD$  theta-feature on matrix clause  $v$ , should there be one. There happens to be one with aspectual and implicative verbs, but none with classical raising predicates.

Note, however that control-as-raising is not synonymous to an agreeing T. Polinsky and Potsdam (2002) propose a raising-type analysis for OC constructions in various languages that lack any agreement morphology on the embedded T but instantiate backward control, such as Japanese or Malagasy. The reverse side of the coin is also available. For example, Persian, a pro-drop SOV language, in which complements to control verbs are subjunctives with a phi-complete T, is difficult to capture under a raising-type analysis. First of all, despite the relative mobility of the subject DP, backward control is ruled out in Persian, as shown in (32).

- (32)      (Ali)   say    kar-d            (Ali)   [<sub>CP</sub> (ke)        (\*Ali) be-r-e].  
           (Ali)   try    did.3SG        (Ali)   [<sub>CP</sub> (that)      (\*Ali) SBJ-go-3SG]  
           ‘Ali tried to leave.’

In addition, the complementizer *ke* is optionally available to OC constructions, which suggests a robust CP domain. Consequently, we can assume that the subjunctive complement to OC verbs constitutes a phasal domain (contra Ghomeshi 2001 who argues for a restructuring analysis, but in accord with Darzi 2004). This is similar to English, with the exception that T is specified as  $u\phi$  in the Persian embedded subjunctive but as phi-deficient in the English infinitive. Nonetheless, I take it that in both cases, the presence of C licenses an  $iT$  feature on embedded T,

which guarantees Case-marking of the embedded DP subject in its own phasal domain, thus preventing it from entering subsequent Agree operations with any matrix probes. However, as we know for English and is observable in (32) for Persian, the embedded subject is never overt and is intrinsically anaphoric, so it has to be PRO. Note that a Case-marked PRO has ceased to be a contradiction since Chomsky and Lasnik (1993); moreover, I take Landau's point (2004) who argues against the concept of 'null Case' and suggests that PRO checks its Case feature and has it valued as any DP would in that domain - except that it will never be phonetically spelled out due to its anaphoric status. Unsurprisingly, its antecedent will be the one with the privilege of phonetic features. As indicated by the brackets around the subject DP in (32), for Persian, the antecedent need not be pronounced, which is expected given the pro-drop status of this language. This is different from English, of course, in which the antecedent has to be pronounced. To sum up, in languages like English and Persian, OC is best kept distinct from raising due to the CP status of the complements.

#### **4. Against multiple Case valuation**

Aside from construing Case as a tense feature, rather than a phi-feature, the proposal set forth in this chapter relies on Chomsky's crucial assumption that Case-checking inactivates a DP from further entertaining A-chain type dependencies. But suppose that these assumptions were wrong. A number of authors have in fact argued for the availability of multiple Case checking and against the uniqueness of Case (e.g. Bejar and Massam 1999, Ura 2000, among others). If multiple Case checking turned out to be available, we might have to reconsider some of our

claims. In addition, there is a weaker version of this approach which also needs to be dismissed. Specifically, Carstens (2003) has recently argued that Case-checked DPs remain active until the phase is shipped off to the interface levels. Consequently, while I have shown that in the absence of a C-T relationship at the complement level, the embedded subject DP is accessible to matrix probes, separate evidence against multiple Case-checking and/or Case-checking in the embedded domain is needed to strengthen the claim that Case is not a property of agreement. In the absence of such evidence, it is possible in principle to assume that the embedded phi-complete but untensed T does in fact check Case, but that the DP remains active until Spell Out. The following subsections provide a discussion focusing on Romanian that dismisses these concerns as unfounded.

#### 4.1. *The absence of blocking effects with Datives*

Let us assume for the sake of argument, that the phi-complete but untensed T in the subjunctive clauses in (33) is sufficient for Case valuation. The DP *Max*, would then check Nominative Case against both the embedded and the matrix clause Ts.

- (33) a. *Max pare* [TP *să fie de încredere*].  
 Max seem.3SG [TP SBJ be.3SG of trust]  
 ‘Max seems trustworthy.’
- b. *Max va încerca* [TP *să termine lucrarea mâine*].  
 Max will.3SG try [TP SBJ finish.3SG paper-the tomorrow]  
 ‘Max will try finishing the paper tomorrow.’

In order to rule out multiple Case checking of the DP *Max* in (31), we need independent evidence that Case valuation does, in fact, render the goal inactive. I take the blocking effect of Dative DPs to provide such evidence.

Consider first (34) from Romanian, where the control predicate takes a Dative argument:

- (34) a. *Mama a promis copiilor*  
 mother-the AUX.3SG promised children-the.DAT  
 [TP *să vină acasă repede*].  
 [TP SBJ come.3SG home quickly]  
 ‘Mother promised the children [to come home fast].’

Sentences of the type in (34) have always been problematic given that *copiilor* ‘to the children’ does not control as this violates all sorts of locality requirements (Rosenbaum 1967, Hornstein 1999, Culicover & Jackendoff 2001 and so on). However, once we assume that Case-marked goals are inactive, the account is straightforward. Specifically, matrix *v* needs to discharge/value its external theta-role but given that *copiilor* is inherently Case-marked Dative, hence inactive, its goal can only be the embedded DP *mama* ‘mother’. Consequently, we need to assume that the subject DP is active in a way that the Dative argument is not. What makes a DP a legitimate goal for A-chain dependencies then *has* to be its unchecked Case.<sup>xxiv</sup>

A similar argument can be made by looking at standard raising verbs with Dative experiencers in Romanian. In (35), for example, we notice that Case-marked experiencers do not block raising regardless of phi-type properties of the embedded complement.<sup>xxv</sup>

- (35) a. *Culorile astea îi par*  
 Colour.3PL.F-the these CL.DAT seem.3PL  
*mamei* [TP *a fi foarte potrivite*].  
 mother.DAT [TP INF be very suitable.3PL.F]  
 ‘These colours seem to mother [to be quite suitable].’
- b. *Culorile astea îi par*  
 Colour.3PL.F-the these CL.DAT seem.3PL  
*mamei* [TP *să fie foarte potrivite*].  
 mother.DAT [TP SBJ be.3 very suitable.3PL.F]  
 ‘These colours seem to mother [to be quite suitable].’

If multiple Case checking were possible, we would lack an explanation as to why the Dative experiencer cannot itself satisfy the phi-features of matrix T.

4.2. *Emphatics and Case-checking*

While the discussion above argues against the availability of multiple Case checking for inactive goals, it has nothing to say with respect to whether the embedded subject is perhaps Case-marked by the subjunctive T but still active up to the first phasal level. Technically speaking, if it were to remain active up to the first phase, it should become unavailable once the matrix  $vP$  is spelled out. Specifically, the Case-marked but still active embedded DP would be capable of acting as a goal for theta-role valuation of matrix  $v$  but would subsequently become inactive once matrix  $vP$  were sent to the interface levels. So, phi-features in matrix T would never find the embedded subject and never establish an Agree operation with it, even under Carstens's (2003) approach. The simple fact that the embedded subject enters an Agree operation with matrix T refutes the possibility of it having been Case-marked by the embedded T probe. However, for the sake of the argument, let us also look at empirical evidence.

The discussion focuses on Romanian emphatics exemplified in (36):

- (36) a. *Mihai*            *însuși*            *a*            *făcut*    [<sub>vP</sub> *t<sub>SU</sub>* *acest desen*].  
 Mihai.NOM    himself            AUX.3SG    done    [<sub>vP</sub> *t<sub>SU</sub>* this drawing]  
 'Mihai himself made this drawing.'
- b. *Mihai*            *a*            *făcut*    [<sub>vP</sub> \*(*el*) *însuși*            *acest desen*].  
 Mihai.NOM    AUX.3SG            done    [<sub>vP</sub> he.NOM himself            this drawing]  
 'Mihai made this drawing himself.'

We can see that subject emphatics cannot be stranded but need to either dislocate with the subject, as in (36a), or if they remain in-situ, as in (36b), they need to rely on a pronominal subject copy for a host. Given that T only probes once, the pronominal copy in (36b) cannot be argued to value Nominative Case independently of (or in addition to) the subject DP *Mihai*.

Consequently, I suggest that the pronominal host for the in-situ emphatic is simply a spelled out lower copy of the subject.

Consider next the behaviour of subject emphatics in embedded OC subjunctives. The data in (37) show the emphatic either together with the DP subject *Victor* (37a) or, together with a pronominal copy of the DP subject (37b).

- (37) a. *Victor*      *însuși*      *încearcă*      [TP *să facă*      *t<sub>su</sub>*  
 Victor.NOM      himself      try.3SG      [TP SBJ make.3SG      *t<sub>su</sub>*  
*pizza*].  
*pizza*]  
 ‘Victor himself is trying to make pizza.’
- b. *Victor<sub>i</sub>*      *începe*      [TP *să facă*      *el<sub>i</sub>*  
 Victor.NOM<sub>i</sub>      begin.3SG      [TP SBJ make.3SG      he.NOM<sub>i</sub>  
*însuși*      *pizza*].  
 himself<sub>i</sub>      *pizza*]  
 ‘Victor is trying to make pizza himself.’

It is not unreasonable to assume that in (37b) there is a single valuation of Nominative Case, specifically by matrix T, which creates an A-chain with a lower emphatic copy instantiated at PF, on a par with what we argued for (36b). However, this need not be so a priori and pending further evidence, the claim that we are dealing with Nominative valued twice cannot be immediately ruled out.

Fortunately, a look at emphatics more generally seems to provide clear evidence that T cannot value Nominative Case in OC contexts. Compare (38a) with (38b):

- (38) a. *Mihai<sub>i</sub>*      *regretă*      [CP *că*      *el<sub>i</sub>*      *nu*      *poate*  
 Mihai.NOM<sub>i</sub>      regret.3SG      [CP that.IND      he.NOM<sub>i</sub>      NEG      can  
*veni*      (*el<sub>i</sub>*      *însuși* )].  
 come.3SG      (he.NOM<sub>i</sub>      himself<sub>i</sub>)]  
 ‘Mihai regrets that he himself can’t come.’
- b. *Victor<sub>i</sub>*      *începe*      [TP *să facă*      (\**el<sub>i</sub>*)      *pizza*  
 Victor.NOM<sub>i</sub>      begin.3SG      [TP SBJ make.3SG      (\* he.NOM<sub>i</sub>)      *pizza*  
 (*el<sub>i</sub>*      *însuși* )].  
 (he.NOM<sub>i</sub>      himself<sub>i</sub>)]  
 ‘Victor is beginning to make pizza himself.’

In non-obligatory control contexts, as in (38a) for example, where the complement to the factive main clause verb has CP status, a syntactically independent (though in this case semantically equivalent) subject DP is licensed *in addition* to the emphatic copy should there be one. This contrasts with the situation in OC subjunctives, as illustrated by (38b). The difference lies in the fact that in (38a) but not (38b), the embedded T can value Nominative Case. This is a welcome empirical result as it supports the theoretical claims in this paper.

## 5. Conclusions

In this chapter, I have argued for an analysis of Case valuation as a property of phasal domains, rather than of phi-probes. Nominative Case checking was shown to be reliant on a tensed T, obtainable exclusively when T is saturated by C. The discussion concentrated mainly on Romanian, which allows for all potential feature combinations in T, but a variety of other well-known constructions were also investigated. Much of the analysis focused on phi-complete anaphoric T contexts which have typically been assumed to check Nominative given the availability of lexical subjects in this domain and/or overt agreement morphology on the T-related heads. However, our conclusions systematically pointed to the absence of Nominative Case checking in the absence of a CP phasal domain, regardless of phi-type specifications in T.

Crucially, the fact that D values phi-features for a certain probe is not synonymous to Case checking, so a D will remain active as long (and only as long) as it maintains an unchecked  $uT$  feature and in this interval it will be capable of acting as a goal to as many probes as can legitimately entertain an Agree operation with it. Valuation of uninterpretable features on

multiple probes will result in multiple agreement chains and/or multiple theta-roles but whether this is accompanied by dislocation or not seems to be an independent property.

Equally important is the fact that such an approach to Case valuation provides important insights into the relationship between standard raising and obligatory control and why some languages seem to treat them alike while others seem more adamant about keeping them distinct.

Having negotiated our way to the conclusion that agreeing Ts (i.e., phi-complete probes) are incapable of valuing Case in the absence of C, in Table 1, I summarize the relevant featural properties of T in conjunction with Case-checking, and consequently raising availability, and exemplify with the various cross-linguistic constructions discussed in this chapter.

Table 1: *Clause status with feature checking relevant for Case valuation*

(i)	$[_{CP} C \quad T \quad DP \quad \dots]$ $\left( \begin{array}{c} iT \\ \#\phi \end{array} \right) \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} \#\bar{E}: NOM \\ i\phi \end{array} \right)$	$\Rightarrow$ <i>embedded subject is <b>inactive</b> for raising</i>  (e.g., canonical indicatives; EP inflected infinitives; CP subjunctives in Romance, Balkan languages; control subjunctives in Persian)
(ii)	$[_{CP} C \quad T \quad DP \quad \dots]$ $\left( \begin{array}{c} iT \\ \#\phi \end{array} \right) \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} \#\bar{E}: NOM \\ i\phi \end{array} \right)$	$\Rightarrow$ <i>embedded subject is <b>inactive</b> for raising</i>  (e.g., uninflected infinitives in some Romance, West Flemish; control in English)
(iii)	$[_{TP} \quad T \quad DP \quad \dots]$ $\left( \begin{array}{c} \#\phi \\ \#\bar{E} \end{array} \right) \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} uT \\ i\phi \end{array} \right)$	$\Rightarrow$ <i>embedded subject is <b>active</b> for raising</i>  (e.g., TP subjunctives in Balkan languages, both standard raising and obligatory control; inflected infinitives in Hungarian)
(iv)	$[_{TP} \quad T \quad DP \quad \dots]$ $\left( \begin{array}{c} uT \\ i\phi \end{array} \right)$	$\Rightarrow$ <i>embedded subject is <b>active</b> for raising</i>  (e.g., subject raising and ECM in English; standard raising and OC from Romanian infinitives; uninflected backward control languages)

In conclusion, I would like to hope that we are in agreement, despite the fact that Case-checking properties seem not to be.

---

\* Many thanks to Alexandra Cornilescu, Elizabeth Cowper, Daniela Isac, Arsalan Kahnemuyipour, Idan Landau, Diane Massam, Virginia Motapanyane-Hill, David Pesetsky and Daniel Seely for comments and discussion, as well as to audiences at the North American Syntax Conference in Montreal, the 2003 Annual Linguistics Conference at the University of Bucharest, and the Lisbon Workshop on Agreement, where some of this work was previously presented. Part of this work was supported by SSHRC Fellowship # 756-2002-0126. All errors are mine.

<sup>i</sup> I use the following abbreviations in the example sentences: SE: impersonal clitic, AUX: auxiliary, SBJ: subjunctive, INF: infinitive, IND: indicative, NEG: negative, PART: participle, CL: pronominal clitic, SG: singular, PL: plural, NOM: Nominative case, ACC: Accusative case, DAT: Dative case, M: masculine, F: feminine. ‘PE’ is a preposition associated with Romanian direct objects that have an <e> type denotation (see Cornilescu 2000b). In addition, *u*F is used to represent uninterpretable/unvalued formal features and *i*F stands for interpretable/valued formal features.

<sup>ii</sup> Semantically, a ‘tensed’ T is non-anaphoric, though it may be dependent, if irrealis, as in inflected infinitives in European Portuguese, CP infinitives in English and CP subjunctives where these are available. In a nutshell, ‘tensed’ T can be both realis and irrealis (dependent) tense, while ‘untensed’ T is always anaphoric. Syntactically, ‘tensed’ T is always selected by C, while ‘untensed’ T is never selected by C. Refinements to follow in subsequent sections.

<sup>iii</sup> This seems a desirable move on theoretical grounds. If Case is the reflex of syntactic licensing for a DP, specifically a validation mechanism acquired by virtue of establishing a syntactic relationship in the derivation, then it should correlate with features outside of the DP per se. T itself has no interpretable phi-features and any agreement morphology is acquired by virtue of connecting with a DP. Surely, it cannot be these unvalued phi-features on T that are responsible for licensing the DP in the derivation as this has a very circular flavour to it.

<sup>iv</sup> Note that it is beyond the scope of our discussion to investigate the tense properties of anaphoric T. Specifically, whether this T type implements its anaphoric status as a *u*T feature subsequently checked from within the matrix clause domain. What is crucial for us is the absence of *i*T and thus, as I argue, of Case.

<sup>v</sup> This division is somewhat reminiscent of the +/- T and +/- AGR specifications on INFL which date back to Pollock (1989) and have been used to distinguish between classes of infinitives in Haegeman (1985) and Ledgeway (1998).

<sup>vi</sup> Under this proposal, it also is not clear what the relationship between the presence of the preposition and phi-feature specification in T would be. Ledgeway’s suggestion that this relationship is possible due to the null-subject flavour of these languages is not sustainable, as West Flemish is not, technically speaking, a pro-drop language (Haegeman p.c.).

<sup>vii</sup> This approach is reminiscent of control-as-raising approaches argued for in Hornstein (1999, 2001) and subsequently in Alboiu (2004), Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002), Barrie and Pittman (2004), Boeckx and Hornstein (2003), among others. I will return to this issue shortly.

<sup>viii</sup> Important references include, among others, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002), Roussou (2001), Kapetangianni and Seely (2003) and Varlokosta (1994) for Greek, Krapova (2001) for Bulgarian and Greek, Ghomeshi (2001) for Persian, Terzi (1992) for Greek and Albanian, and, for Romanian, Alboiu (2004), Dobrovie-Sorin (1994, 2001), Farkas (1988), Grosu and Horvath (1987), Motapanyane (1995) and Pîrvulescu (2001).

<sup>ix</sup> Note that Romanian is a subject pro-drop language.

<sup>x</sup> I will refrain from using Landau’s ‘partial’ control denomination for these predicates given that in some languages, such as for example, Romanian, partial control effects are excluded (see Alboiu 2004) and this paper, section 3.1.

<sup>xi</sup> The fact that CP subjunctives license Nominative subjects (see 7) is expected given that T is specified as both *i*T and *u*phi. In the account proposed here, *i*T on T checks the *u*T feature on the subject DP and values it as Nominative. However, proponents of the Case-as-agreement approach could also argue their case, as mentioned in section 2.1., so it is irrelevant to focus on this type of subjunctive.

<sup>xii</sup> Dobrovie-Sorin (2001) also shows *ca* to be absent with obligatory control verbs. However, the author assumes *să* is ambiguous between C and T, so these complements would still presumably count as phasal in her account.

<sup>xiii</sup> Unsurprisingly, the same holds of raising predicates. For most speakers, the version with infinitive complements has a slightly more archaic flavour in both cases.

<sup>xiv</sup> Again, under the classical account that Case is assigned/valued via agreement, T in (15b) would be capable of assigning Nominative, whereas T in (15a) would not. So, the agreement account is even more at a loss than the account proposed here, which is at least capable of capturing the parallel behaviour of the two types of embedded T.

<sup>xv</sup> At this point, it is necessary to mention that all current studies on Romanian (see Alboiu 2002, Cornilescu 2000a, Dobrovie-Sorin 1987, 1994, Hill 2002) have argued that the language is VSO in the sense that the lexical verb undergoes obligatory displacement into the T domain, while Case is valued in-situ (i.e., via Agree without dislocation for EPP).

<sup>xvi</sup> I only discuss subject control here. Object control is irrelevant to our analysis as the matrix verb selects a non-anaphoric CP subjunctive, rather than an untensed TP as argued for subject control. This is shown in (ia) where, furthermore, we can also notice the availability of Nominative Case (bolded pronoun), as expected in view of the phasal status of these subjunctives. Given the pro-drop nature of Romanian, (ib) is equally unsurprising.

- (i) a. *L<sub>i</sub>-am rugat pe Ion<sub>i</sub> [CP ca mîine*  
 CL.3SG.M.ACC<sub>i</sub>-AUX.1SG asked PE Ion<sub>i</sub> [CP that.SBJ tomorrow  
*să plimbe el<sub>i</sub> cîinele].*  
 SBJ walk.3SG 3SG.M.NOM<sub>i</sub> dog-the]  
 ‘I asked John to walk the dog tomorrow.’
- b. *L<sub>i</sub>-am rugat pe Ion<sub>i</sub> [CP să plimbe*  
 CL.3SG.M.ACC<sub>i</sub>-AUX.1SG asked PE Ion<sub>i</sub> [CP SBJ walk.3SG  
*pro<sub>i</sub> cîinele].*  
*pro<sub>i</sub> dog-the]*  
 ‘I asked John to walk the dog.’

<sup>xvii</sup> Note that the positions occupied by the shared DP in (16) are A-related positions given the fact that bare quantifiers (in bold) can also occupy the same syntactic slots, as shown in (i).

- (i) *Încearcă (cineva) [să cînte (cineva)*  
 try.3SG (someone.NOM) [SBJ sing.3SG (someone.NOM)  
*la trombon (cineva)].*  
 at trombone (someone.NOM)]  
 ‘Someone is trying to play the trombone.’

<sup>xviii</sup> Significantly, implicatives, for which a restructuring analysis is more difficult to maintain on conceptual grounds, also allow backward control, as shown in (i).

- (i) *(Mihai) A reușit (Mihai) [să rezolve (Mihai)*  
 (Mihai) AUX.3SG managed (Mihai) [SBJ solve.3SG (Mihai)  
*toate exercițiile]?*  
 all exercises-the]?  
 ‘Did Mihai manage to solve all the exercises?’

While Wurmbrand (1998) argues that verbs like ‘try’ and ‘want’ are modals and, as such, restructuring/raising predicates, this claim is not sustainable for implicatives.

<sup>xix</sup> This is a legitimate move given that in minimalism D-structure and S-structure are no longer construed as separate levels of representation.

<sup>xx</sup> Note that Landau (2004) continues to assume that lexical Nominative subjects are ruled out in OC (his ‘exhaustive control’) subjunctives in the Balkan languages. At least for Romanian, this is incorrect, as shown.

<sup>xxi</sup> The Romanian equivalent for *Gandalf<sub>i</sub> wanted [PRO<sub>i+</sub> to meet late at night]* would require the use of impersonal SE. Consequently, this example (or any other example with SE) would be irrelevant given that in Romanian, on a par with Italian, this morpheme is unspecified for number and can be interpreted as both singular and plural. In other words, under the plural interpretation, we would have no indication whether we are dealing with partial control or with a SE bound by a plural *pro*. Given (27a), we can only assume the latter and conclude that partial control is excluded in Romanian. Recall that subjunctive complements to desideratives are distinct tense domains and, consequently expected to license *pro*.

<sup>xxii</sup> Interestingly, neither is dislocation a prerequisite in standard raising constructions in this language, which is expected under a unitary raising account of both OC and classical raising predicates:

- (i) *(Mihai) pare [să fie (Mihai) băiat deștept (Mihai)]*

---

(Mihai) seem.3SG [SBJ be.3SG (Mihai) boy smart (Mihai)]  
 ‘Mihai seems to be a smart guy.’

<sup>xxiii</sup> While complements to desiderative verbs have been shown to constitute distinct tense domains, which we have taken to be directly correlated to their CP status, if we are to maintain a uniform raising account of control whenever desideratives are involved in OC, we would expect an untensed T in the subjunctive complement given the obligatory TP status of raising complements. Interestingly, this is borne out, as illustrated by the data in (i) for which only the (a) reading is available.

- (i) *Ieri a vrut [să vină Victor mîine].*  
 yesterday AUX.3SG wanted [SBJ come.3SG Victor tomorrow]  
 (a) ‘Yesterday s/he wanted Victor to come tomorrow.’  
 (b) ‘\* Yesterday Victor wanted to come tomorrow.’

<sup>xxiv</sup> Note that Dative DPs do not passivize in Romanian.

<sup>xxv</sup> Not all languages behave in this manner. Cuervo (2002) shows that Dative experiencers block raising in Spanish and argues for a raising-as-control analysis for these constructions. Incidentally, the complement clauses in these cases are taken to be CPs rather than TPs.

## References

- Alboiu, G. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: University of Bucharest Press.
- Alboiu, G. 2004. Shared Arguments in Control. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 22: 53-74. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Alboiu, G. in preparation. Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising. In *Expanding vistas in the analysis of Control and Raising*, S. Dubinsky and W. Davies (eds). Springer.
- Alboiu, G and Motapanyane, V. 2000. The generative approach to Romanian grammar: an overview. In *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, V. Motapanyane (ed.), 1-48. New York: Elsevier.
- Alexiadou, A. and Anagnostopoulou, E. 2002. Raising without infinitives and the role of agreement. In *Dimensions of Movement*, A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, S. Barbiers and H.-M. Gärtner (eds), 17-30. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barrie, M. and Pittman, C. 2004. Partial Control and the Movement Towards Movement. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 22: 75-92. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bejar, S. and Massam, D. 1999. Multiple Case Checking. *Syntax* 2:2: 65-79.
- Boeckx, C. and Hornstein, N. 2003. Reply to ‘Control is Not Movement’. *Linguistics Inquiry* 34: 269-280.
- Borer, H. 1989. Anaphoric AGR. In *The Null Subject Parameter*, O. Jaeggli and K. J. Safir (eds), 69-109. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Carstens, V. 2003. Rethinking Complementizer Agreement: Agree with a Case-Checked Goal. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 393-413.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds), 89-147. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001a. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, M. Kenstowicz (ed.), 1- 52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001b. Beyond Explanatory Adequacy. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 20.

- 
- Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, N. and Lasnik, H. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. In *The Minimalist Program*, N. Chomsky, 13-128, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cornilescu, A. 1997. Some Notes on the Syntax of the Subject. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* XLII: 101-147.
- Cornilescu, A. 2000a. The double subject construction in Romanian. In *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, V. Motapanyane (ed.), 83-135. New York : Elsevier.
- Cornilescu, A. 2000b. Notes on the Interpretation of the Prepositional Accusative in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* II(1): 91-107. Bucharest : University of Bucharest Press.
- Cowper, E. 2002. Finiteness. Ms., University of Toronto.
- Cuervo, C. Maria. 2003. A Control-versus-Raising Theory of Dative Experiencers. In *Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquisition*, A. T. Pérez-Leroux and Y. Roberge (eds), 111-131. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Culicover, P. and Jackendoff, R. 2001. Control is Not Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 493-512.
- Darzi, A. 2004. Persian Subject Control. Paper presented at *Syntax Project Group*, University of Toronto.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1987. Syntaxe du roumain. PhD Dissertation, Université de Paris 7.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 2001. Head-to-Head Merge in Balkan Subjunctives and Locality. In *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*, M. L. Rivero and A. Ralli (eds), 44-74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farkas, D. 1988. On Obligatory Control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11: 27-58.
- Farkas, D. 1992. On the Semantics of Subjunctive Complements. In *Papers from the 20th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, P. Hirschbuhler (ed.), 69-105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- George, N. and Kornfilt, J. 1981. Finiteness and Boundedness in Turkish. In *Binding and Filtering*, F. Henry (ed), 105-127. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Ghomeshi, J. 2001. Control and Thematic Agreement. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 46: 9-40.
- Grosu, A. and Horvath, J. 1987. On Non-finiteness in Extraction Constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 181-196.
- Haeberli, E. 1999. Features, Categories and the Syntax of A-Positions: Synchronic and Diachronic variation in the Germanic Languages. PhD Dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Haegeman, L. 1985. INFL, COMP and Nominative Case assignment in Flemish infinitivals. In *Features and Projections*, P. Muysken and H. van Riemsdijk (eds), 123-137. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Haegeman, L. and van Riemsdijk, H. 1986. Verb Projection Raising, Scope, and the Typology of Rules Affecting Verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 417-466.
- Hill, V. 2002. Adhering Focus. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 164-172.
- Hornstein, N. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96.
- Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Isac, D. 2002. The Force of Negative Mood. Paper presented at the LSA Annual Meeting in San Francisco.
- Jakab, E. 2003. Restructuring in Relation to Tense and Agreement: Hungarian Infinitives. Paper presented at the *Approaching Asymmetry at the Interfaces* Conference, UQAM, Montreal.
- Kapetangianni, K. and Seely, D. 2003. Greek 'na' Clauses: A case study in Minimalist Methodology. Ms., University of Michigan, Anne Arbor.
- Kayne, R. S. 1991. Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 647-686.
- Kempchinsky, P. M. 1986. Romance Subjunctive Clauses and Logical Form. PhD Dissertation, UCLA.
- Krapova, Y. 2001. Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek. In *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*, M. L. Rivero and A. Ralli (eds), 105-127. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landau, I. 1999. Elements of Control. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Landau, I. 2003. Movement out of Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 471-499.

- 
- Landau, I. 2004. The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811-877.
- Ledgeway, A. 1998. Variation in the Romance infinitive: the case of the Southern Calabrian inflected infinitive. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96: 1-61.
- Manzini, R. and Roussou, A. 2000. A Minimalist Theory of A-Movement and Control. *Lingua* 110: 409-447.
- Martin, R. 1996. A minimalist theory of PRO and control. PhD Dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Motapanyane, V. 1995. *Theoretical Implications of Complementation in Romanian*, Padova: Unipress.
- Pestevy, D. 1995. *Zero Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, D. and Torrego, E. 2001. T-to-C Movement : causes and consequences. In *Ken Hale : A life in language*, M. Kenstowicz (ed.), 355-426. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, D. and Torrego, e. 2004. Tense, Case, and the Nature of Syntactic Categories, in *The Syntax of Time*, J. Gueron and J. Lacarme (eds), 495-539. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pîrvulescu, M. 2001. Le Concept de paradigme et la morphologie verbale. PhD Dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Polinsky, M. and Potsdam, E. 2002. Backward Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 245-283.
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1989. Verb Movement, UG and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365-424.
- Raposo, E. 1987. Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: the Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 85-109.
- Raposo, E. 1989. Prepositional infinitival constructions in European Portuguese. In *The Null Subject Parameter*, O. Jaeggli and K. J. Safir (eds), 277-305. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rivero, M. L. 1994. The structure of the Clause and V-movement in the Languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 63-120.
- Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rosenbaum, P. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Roussou, A. 2001. Control and Raising in and out of Subjunctive Complements. In *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*, M. L. Rivero and Angela Ralli (eds), 74-105. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Svenonius, P. 2001. Case and Event Structure. Ms., University of Tromsø.
- Stowell, T. 1982. The Tense of infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 561-570.
- Terzi, A. 1992. PRO in Finite Clauses. A Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages. PhD Dissertation, CUNY.
- Tóth, I. 2000. Inflected Infinitives in Hungarian. PhD Dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Ura, H. 2000. *Checking Theory and Grammatical Functions in Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, E. 1994. *Thematic Structure in Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wurmbrand, S. 1998. Infinitives. PhD Dissertation, MIT [published in 2001 by Mouton].