

# The (dis)association of Tense, *phi*-features EPP and nominative Case

## Case studies from Romance and Greek

Ioanna Sitaridou

University of Cambridge

The aim of the paper is to shed light to the licensing mechanism of nominative Case-marked subjects and to assess current developments within the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995) pertaining to subject licensing, *phi*-features, Case and the EPP. Data are drawn from Portuguese inflected infinitives, Spanish personal infinitives and Greek subjunctive clauses. The comparative study of these constructions enables us to observe that T-defectiveness should not be exclusively associated with *phi*-incompleteness. Instead, a dissociation is necessary. It is then proposed that Tense, rather than agreement correlates with nominative Case despite the fact that agreement is morphologically visible and tense morphologically invisible.

### 1. Introduction

Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001a, 2001b) argues that T is defective when selected by V, and therefore has an incomplete set of *phi*-features. In such a way, he connects T-defectiveness with *phi*-incompleteness. This accurately captures the data for raising constructions in English, for instance. This claim makes also the prediction that a defective T by virtue of being *phi*-incomplete cannot check the nominative Case of an attracted DP, instead it can only license PRO. However, this approach might be too simplistic. In languages such as Greek, in raising constructions, a *phi*-complete T fails to license a nominative Case subject suggesting that it can be T-defective without being *phi*-incomplete. On the other hand, Portuguese, in raising predicates with an inflected infinitive manages to license a nominative Case subject. So far, a dissociation of *phi*-features and T-completeness seems to be compelling. To reinforce this claim, further evi-

dence from Spanish is put forward, and which shows a double dissociation: personal infinitive constructions with a *phi*-incomplete T are not T-defective and therefore still able to license a nominative Case subject.

In this paper comparative data from European Portuguese (EP) inflected infinitives and Modern Greek (MG) subjunctives are presented, which show that Tense, rather than agreement correlates with nominative Case despite the fact that the agreement is morphologically visible and tense morphologically invisible. Additionally, data from Spanish personal infinitives are discussed which show that a T which is *phi*-incomplete can still license a nominative subject. This last set of data is meant to disprove more traditional approaches to nominative Case licensing, namely association only with (morphological or abstract) verbal agreement.

Let us now spell out why comparing MG *na*-clauses and EP inflected infinitives constitutes an interesting comparison: (i) MG uses *na*-clauses where Romance languages use infinitives; however, *na*-clauses have agreement on the verb and mood encoded on *na*.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it has also been claimed that some subjunctive constructions license PRO instead of *pro* (Terzi 1997) thus suggesting that *na*-clauses function as infinitives. It follows that inflected infinitives on the basis of the inflection they bear are a step closer to MG *na*-clauses than simple infinitives.<sup>2</sup> They are therefore an ideal syntactic minimal pair to test for Case and agreement phenomena; (ii) neither inflected infinitives nor *na*-clauses permit any morphological realisation of Tense; (iii) *na*-clauses and inflected infinitives in MG and EP respectively seem to involve both T and C heads. The comparison between Portuguese inflected infinitives and Spanish personal infinitives is particularly enlightening because: (i) they have the subject position of a non-finite clause filled by a phonetically realised lexical noun (or pronoun), which has nominative Case; (ii) these two languages are close cognates and it is therefore easier to highlight the differences in these two constructions, which in effect form a syntactic minimal pair. Lastly, comparing all three highlights the problems of making finiteness a central notion in syntax, namely a property that determines the licensing of nominative Case to the subject.

For the purpose of this paper however, I will not offer a complete treatment of either inflected infinitives, *na*-clauses or personal infinitives since the focus lies on the relation of agreement with Tense and nominative Case. For detailed accounts of the above phenomena, the reader is referred to the pivotal work of Raposo (1987) and Ambar (1994) for Portuguese inflected infinitives; Rigau (1995) and Torrego (1998) for Spanish personal infinitives; Iatridou (1993) and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002) for raising in Greek. Fi-

**Table 1.** The distribution of the EP inflected infinitive

Subject		✓
Complement	declaratives	✓
	factives	✓
	perception	✓
	volitionals	X
	causatives	✓
	modals	X
	obligatory control	X
	optional control	✓
Adjuncts		✓
Agreement morphology		✓
Word Order	declaratives	VS
	factives	SV

nally, for a unified treatment compatible with the analysis presented here cf. Sitaridou (2002).

## 2. The distribution of inflected infinitives, *na*-clauses and personal infinitives

In Portuguese there is the possibility of using inflectional morphology on the infinitive. Moreover, the inflected infinitive can surface with a separate nominative subject, which is distinct from that of the governing verb:

- (1) Eu lamento os deputados perderem os  
 I regret-1SG the deputies lose-INFIN3PL the  
 documentos. (Portuguese)  
 documents  
 'I regret that the deputies lost the documents.' (Madeira 1994: 180)

It can appear in L-related as well as non-L-related positions, a summary of which is shown in Table 1.

In Modern Greek the function of infinitival structures is assumed by *na*-clauses. *Na*-clauses are headed by the subjunctive particle *na*, are obligatorily inflected for person agreement and can also be used as obviative subjunctives:

- (2) I Maria prospathise na figi. (Modern Greek)  
 the Maria try-PAST3SG na leave-3SG  
 'Mary tried to leave.'

In Table 2 a summary of the basic distribution of *na*-clauses is presented.

Table 2. The distribution of *na*-clauses in MG

Subject		✓
Complement	declaratives	X
	factives	✓
	perception	✓
	volitionals	✓
	causatives	✓
	modals	✓
Adjuncts		✓
Agreement morphology		✓
Word Order		VS
Relation between matrix and embedded subject		co-reference+ disjoint reference
Complementiser		low rank: <i>na</i>

Table 3. The distribution of the Spanish personal infinitive

Subject		✓
Complement	Declaratives	X
	Factives	X
	perception	X
	Volitionals	X
	Causatives	X
	Modals	X
	Obligatory control	X
	optional control	X
Adjuncts		✓
Agreement morphology		X
Word Order		VS

Finally, in some varieties of Spanish, infinitive clauses take lexical subjects Case marked as nominative. So far, the similarity with the Portuguese inflected infinitive is quite striking: they are both Romance languages and permit the subject of an infinitive to surface with nominative Case. However, the personal infinitive is not inflected for agreement and can only occur in non-L-related positions like the one exemplified in (3):

- (3) Antes de actuar Caballé, el público estaba  
before of perform-INFIN Caballé the audience be-PAST3SG  
expectante. (Spanish)  
expectant  
'Before Caballé performed, the audience was expectant.' (Rigau 1995: 280)

In Table 3 a summary of the distribution of personal infinitives is presented.

### 3. The proposal

I try to demonstrate, first, that *phi*-features are not related to the licensing of nominative Case. As a matter of fact, the latter can still be licensed without agreement or even invoking to abstract agreement. Second, I suggest to disentangle T-defectiveness from *phi*-incompleteness. A TP is defective not when it is *phi*-incomplete but when it is not selected by C. Third, I argue that semantic tense is capable of licensing nominative Case. In this sense, infinitival tense is similar to the matrix Tense. Having said that, I do not equate matrix Tense with embedded Tense since they are different *vis-à-vis* their ability for independent sentencehood: only T which is unselected (or selected by an operator at C) can it be matrix. To be unselected, in most languages, it requires morphological realisation of Tense.

#### 3.1 Evidence from subject raising out of aspectual subjunctives and inflected infinitives

In MG, subjunctive constructions do not involve obviation effects, hence they can participate in obligatory control (OC) structures (which in Romance languages they are reserved for infinitives) (cf. Philippaki-Warbuton 1992; Terzi 1997; Tsoulas 1995 among others), as shown in (4a) and (5a):

- (4) a. O Yanis theli na figi. (Modern Greek)  
         the John want-3SG na leave-3SG  
         ‘John wants to leave.’  
       b. O Yanis theli na figo.  
         the John want-3SG na leave-1SG  
         ‘John wants me to leave.’
- (5) a. Yanis arxise na trexi.  
         the John start-PAST3SG na run-3SG  
         ‘John started to run.’  
       b. \*O Yanis arxise na trexo.  
         the John start-PAST3SG na run-1SG  
         \*‘John started for me to run.’

However, on the basis of the contrast between (4b) and (5b) whereby only *theli* ‘he wants’, an non-obligatory control (NOC) verb, allows for disjoint reference, it has been claimed (cf. Varlokosta 1994) that there are two types of control predicates in Greek: optional control verbs (e.g. volitionals as in (4)) and obligatory control verbs (e.g. *psych* and aspectuals ones as in (5)). Alexiadou and

Table 4. Summary of the possibilities for raising out of *na*-clauses in MG

Greek			Subject raising	Word-order	Complete <i>phi</i> -set	Semantic Tense
<i>na</i> -clauses	Control	Optional	X	VS	✓	✓
		Obligatory	✓	SV	✓	X
		<i>fenete</i> 'it seems'	✓	VS/SV	✓	X

Anagnostopoulou (2002) argue that raising of the subject holds only for the latter class of control predicates, that is the obligatory ones. In Table 4 there is a summary of the control properties of subjunctives in MG.

MG *na*-clauses have morphological agreement and are therefore not dependent on the agreement of the matrix verb. However, they lack morphological tense and are therefore dependent on the tense of the matrix verb. With verbs of OC the subject agrees obligatorily with the matrix (OC as in (6)):

- (6) O Yanis arxise na klei/\*kleo (Modern Greek)  
the Yanis-NOM start-PAST3SG *na* cry-3SG/1SG  
'John started to cry/\*that I cry.'

In contrast, a verb of optional control can subcategorise for a predicate that could be tensed and, importantly, allow for a distinct subject from the matrix verb (NOC as in (7)):

- (7) Ithela na efevge o Yanis  
want-IMPERF1SG *na* leave-IMPERF3SG the Yanis  
noris. (Modern Greek)  
early  
'I wanted John to leave early.'

What is striking is that although agreement is present in both subjunctive examples ((6) and (7)), crucially it does not always suffice to license the nominative Case of the subject. Therefore the subject in (6), after checking the EPP in spec-TP, is forced to raise further in order to check its nominative Case. Bear in mind that if the structural Case had already been checked, the phrase would have been 'frozen in place'. This is not true since the subject raises further to check the EPP of the matrix T as well as its own Case, thus yielding the observed word order SV (6). Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002) adopt the claim that aspectual subjunctives lack tense<sup>3</sup> and, on the basis of this claim, they argue that the licensing of the nominative Case in the embedded clause becomes impossible. They also argue that subject agreement in Greek reflects EPP-checking rather than Case-checking.



### 3.2 Evidence from subject raising out of passivised perception complements

Let us now consider another set of data<sup>5</sup> initially discussed by Quicoli (1996). He observed that while (9b) is grammatical, (10b) is not.

- (9) a. Eu ja vi os soldados a cair. (Portuguese)  
 I already see-PAST1SG the soldiers-ACC a fall-INFIN  
 b. Vi os soldados cairem.  
 see-PAST1SG the soldiers-NOM fall-INFIN3PL  
 'I see the soldiers falling.'
- (10) a. Os soldados foram vistos a cair.  
 the soldiers be-PAST3PL see-PART a fall-INFIN  
 b. \*Os soldados foram vistos cairem.  
 the soldiers be-PAST3PL see-PART fall-INFIN3PL  
 'The soldiers were seen falling.' (Quicoli 1996:69)

Quicoli (1996) claimed that once (9b) is passivised it becomes ungrammatical as in (10b). Why is it that the inflected infinitive cannot license its subject in (10b)? According to him, the structure in (10b) is excluded by means of Binding Theory since the anaphoric trace is free within the local domain created by the infinitival AGR. Given that Binding Theory is dispensed with (or at least Principles B and C), I will attempt to capture the ungrammaticality of (10b) in the light of the discussion in the previous section. However, before proceeding with the analysis, it should be noted that (10a) is not the passive of (9a) but rather the one of (11):

- (11) Vi cair os soldados. (Portuguese)  
 see-PAST1SG fall-INFIN the soldiers-NOM  
 'I see the soldiers falling.'

Note that both word orders in (9a) and (11) are possible with perception verbs in Portuguese (as indeed is the case in French and Italian). However, the structure in (9a) is a biclausal structure and as such it allows an inflected infinitive, as in (9b). Crucially though, neither (9a) nor (9b) can be passivised. The structure in (10b) is the passive of (11) since the latter is monoclausal hence allowing passivisation. Interestingly, the same pattern is observed in Old Neapolitan, namely that an inflected infinitive is banned as a complement of a perception verb, unless the subject of the infinitive intervenes between the perception verb and the infinitive, as in (12):

- (12) E tu, regina Ecuba, in che costillatione fuste nata,  
 and you queen Hecabe in which constellation be-past3sg born  
 che dige [=devi] vedere tutti li parti tuy essereno dati  
 that must-2SG see-INFIN all the parts yours be-INFIN3PL given  
 a morte? (Old Neapolitan)  
 to death  
 'And you, Queen Hecabe, under which constellation were you born  
 that you must see all of your children being given to death?' (Vincent  
 1996:401)

Moving to the analysis, I would like to suggest that the derivation in (10b) crashes because the inflected infinitive actually licenses the Case of its subject thus leaving the upstairs EPP unchecked. Let me explain what might sound paradoxical: in (9b) *os soldados* 'soldiers' moves to Spec-TP of the embedded T and checks the EPP; it also licenses its Case hence it 'freezes in place'. No further movement takes place, since the matrix verb checks its EPP by the null subject. Crucially, the derivation converges. Now consider (10b): *os soldados* 'soldiers' moves to Spec-TP where it checks the EPP as well as its Case and cannot move any farther once its Case is licensed. However, once the embedded subject is 'frozen', the matrix verb by virtue of being a passive cannot check its EPP (actually both the Specs of *visto* and *foram* need to check their EPP but this is not important for the analysis assumed here). Hence, the derivation crashes. So to wrap it up, it is not the inflected infinitive not being able to license Case when in a passivised context, but rather the fact that it does; thus prohibiting it from sharing the subject with the matrix verb as it is necessary for the derivation to converge.

Let us now see if the second leg of prediction made in the previous section can also be ratified by the Greek data. In brief, the prediction is that whereas agreement equals<sup>6</sup> Case in EP, it does not do so in MG. So far, I have shown that the prediction is confirmed by the Portuguese data in (9) to (11). Consider the MG data in (13):

- (13) a. Akuo tus stratiotes na fevgun. (Modern Greek)  
 hear-1SG the soldiers-ACC na leave-3PL  
 'I hear the soldiers leaving.'  
 b. I stratiotes akugonde na fevgun.  
 the soldiers hear-PASS3PL na leave-3PL  
 'The soldiers are heard to be leaving.'

As predicted, (13b) is grammatical because the embedded subjunctive verb *na fevgun* 'leave' does not license the Case of its subject *i stratiotes* 'the soldiers'.



Therefore, the subject is accessible to further raising, as is the case since the matrix verb has an EPP feature to check. Crucially, it is only the matrix verb that can successfully license the Case on the subject.

### 3.3 Evidence from subject raising out of causative complements

Let us now consider another set of data which investigates the possibility of subject raising out of causative complements in EP and MG. Before doing so, let us consider French first, because the three languages exploit three different patterns. In French, the subject of the infinitive must be postverbal; nothing can intervene between the matrix verb and the embedded verb:

- (14) a. Jean a fait danser Marie. (French)  
           Jean have-3SG make-PART dance-INFIN Marie  
           ‘Jean made Marie dance.’  
       b. \*Jean a fait Marie danser.  
           Jean have-3SG make-PART Marie dance-INFIN  
           ‘Jean made Marie dance.’

(14a) is grammatical whereas (14b) is not. Interestingly, in Portuguese both word orders are possible (15):

- (15) a. Eu fiz dançar a Maria. (Portuguese)  
           I make-PAST1SG dance-INFIN the Maria  
           ‘I made Marie dance.’  
       b. Eu fiz a Maria dançar.  
           I make-PAST1SG the Maria dance-INFIN  
           ‘I made Marie dance.’

The difference between French and Portuguese is that French only has the monoclausal causatives (like modern Italian). Portuguese, on the other hand, like Old Italian, has both the monoclausal pattern (15a) and the biclausal one (15b) just as it does with perception verbs. Importantly, it is only the latter that tolerates an inflected infinitive (16b):

- (16) a. \*Eu fiz escreverem os alunos a carta. (Portuguese)  
           I made write-INFIN3PL the pupils-NOM the card  
       b. Eu fiz os alunos escreverem a carta.  
           I made the pupils-NOM write-INFIN3PL the card  
           ‘I made the pupils write the card.’

In Portuguese, (16b) is grammatical, while (16a) is not. This follows naturally from our account so far: in (16b) the subject raises to spec-TP where it checks

the EPP and licenses the nominative Case and therefore 'freezes in place'. Now compare the equivalent Greek data in (17):

- (17) a. Vazo ton Kosta na tiganizi psaria. (Modern Greek)  
           put-SG the Kostas-ACC na fry-1SG fishes  
       b. Evala na tiganizi psaria o Kostas.  
           put-PAST1SG na fry-1SG fishes the Kostas-NOM  
       c. \*Evala o Kostas na tiganizi psaria.  
           put-PAST1SG the Kostas-NOM na fry-1SG fishes  
           'I made Kostas fry fish.' (Iatridou 1993: 176)

In Greek, (17b) is grammatical if and only if the nominative subject is postverbal. The preverbal position is possible for the subject but then nominative Case cannot be sanctioned. The ungrammaticality of (17c) shows that the preverbal subject can only be licensed with accusative Case (17a).

### 3.4 A control case: Evidence from object raising out of complex adjectival constructions

Let us now consider a fourth set of data initially discussed by Raposo (1987). He observed that while (18a) and (18c) are grammatical, (18b) is not.

- (18) a. Esses relógios são difíceis de arranjar. (Portuguese)  
           those watches be-3PL difficult de repair-INFIN  
           'Those watches are difficult to repair.'  
       b. \*Esses relógios são difíceis de arranjarmos.  
           those watches be-3PL difficult de repair-INFIN1PL  
           'Those watches are difficult for us to repair.'  
       c. Esses relógios são difíceis de serem arranjados.  
           those watches be-3PL difficult de be-INFIN3PL repair-PART  
           'Those watches are difficult to be repaired.' (Raposo 1987: 104)

Raposo (1987) attributes the ungrammaticality of (18b) to the doubly filled Comp Filter. According to him, there is a null operator in the embedded Comp, which blocks Agr raising. I would like to argue that (18b) is ungrammatical not because the inflected infinitive fails to license its subject but because long movement of the object is not possible. To put it differently, the ungrammaticality of (18b) is not due to the inflected infinitive being incapable of licensing Case but due to the object not being able to reach so far. If this claim is on the right track, then it is predicted that MG will behave on a par with Portuguese since the two languages behave asymmetrically only towards subject raising but not

towards object raising. Moreover, it will be shown that (18c), despite the fact that the inflected infinitive does not license the Case of the subject, does not constitute counter-evidence to (18) and to my claim that in EP, in the presence of agreement, Case must be checked.

In (18b), *esses relógios* 'those watches' originates as the sister to the infinitive *arranjar* 'repair'. Next, *arranjar* 'repair' raises to T<sup>0</sup> in order to check the EPP (and pick the *-mos* ending). Then, *esses relógios* 'those watches' must raise to check the EPP of the matrix T<sup>0</sup> since *são difíceis* 'are difficult' is merged with *phi*-features such that can only be checked by *esses relógios* 'those watches'. However, this movement will drive the computation to crash. Movement in general needs to proceed step-by-step; crucially though this movement jumps over one spec, namely the spec-TP of the embedded clause. An additional piece of evidence that demonstrates that the problem with the derivation in (18b) is not the licensing of the null subject by the infinitive comes from (19):

- (19) Será            difícil    arranjar-mos    esses relógios.    (Portuguese)  
       be-FUT3PL difficult repair-INFIN1PL those watches  
       'It is difficult for us to repair those watches.'

Example (19) is grammatical and proves that the inflected infinitive successfully licenses the Case of its subject, provided that the object *esses relógios* 'those watches' stays in its original position.

Turning now to the derivation in (18c), the only difference from the failed derivation in (18b) is that in the former the inflected infinitive is passivised. It is argued that the passive explains the felicity of the derivation. In (18c), *esses relógios* 'those watches' originates as the sister to the infinitive *serem arranjado* 'they are repaired'. Next, *serem arranjado* 'they are repaired' raises to v<sup>0</sup> and *esses relógios* 'those watches' raises to spec-vP where it checks the EPP feature but not its Case because the passivised inflected infinitive has absorbed both the *theta* role and the structural Case. *Esses relógios* 'those watches' is therefore, still accessible to the computation. Lastly, it is attracted to spec-TP of the matrix verb *são difíceis* 'are difficult' where it checks the EPP of the matrix TP as well as its own Case.

Let us now consider the Greek data but before doing so let me assess the power of the prediction. According to what I have claimed so far, Greek is expected to be on a par with Portuguese given that the nature of the movement involved in these constructions is object raising. The prediction is borne out. Consider (20b):

- (20) a. Afto to roloi ine diskolo na to diorthosome. (Modern Greek)  
 this watch be-3SG difficult *na* it repair-1PL  
 'This watch is difficult for us to repair.'
- b. \*Afto to roloi ine diskolo na diorthosome.  
 this watch be-3SG difficult *na* repair-1PL  
 'This watch is difficult for us to repair.'
- c. Afto to roloi ine diskolo na diorthothi.  
 this watches be-3SG difficult *de* repair-PASS3SG  
 'This watch is difficult to be repaired.'

Example (20b), which is the equivalent of (18b), is ungrammatical for the same reasons that the Portuguese example is out. However, Greek has the alternative strategy of clitic doubling which rescues the derivation in (20a) because the clitic offers an intermediate landing site for the object (being its agreement (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003)).

### 3.5 Evidence from personal infinitives

Let us now consider the case of Spanish personal infinitives. Personal infinitives can only surface as adjuncts. In minimalist terms, the matrix clause and the adjunct clause represent two different *phases* (cf. Chomsky 2001a). The matrix is built first and then is sent out to PF. At the point at which matrix TP1 is built, adjunct TP2 starts out as a separate derivation.<sup>7</sup> Personal infinitives make a good illustration of the fact that the derivation actually proceeds in terms of *phases* because the nominative subject would not have been possible unless the infinitival phrase to which it belongs constitutes a separate *phase* from the matrix one.

Turning now to the mechanics of the solution, the preposition *antes* 'before' in example (21) selects a CP headed by *de*:

- (21) Antes de actuar Caballé, el público estaba  
 before *de* perform-INFIN Caballé the audience be-IMPERF3SG  
 expectante. (Spanish)  
 expectant  
 'Before Caballé performed, the audience was expectant.'

In the derivation in (21), infinitival T is *phi*-incomplete but not T-defective because it is selected by an overt C; when the infinitive is attracted to T<sup>0</sup>, there is no strong EPP to attract the subject to spec-TP.<sup>8</sup> However, this fact does not preclude the subject from getting nominative Case. The subject remains

VP-internally, *Agree* applies locally and the nominative Case of the subject is erased under matching.

Next, consider the impossibility of personal infinitives as complements. An obvious question is that if Tense licenses nominative Case in adjuncts why can it not license nominative subjects in infinitive complements? Consider the ungrammatical (22):

- (22) \**Lamento* (ellos) perder (ellos) los  
 regret (they-NOM) lose-INFIN (they-NOM) the  
 documentos. (Spanish)  
 documents  
 'I regret that they lost the documents.' (Sitaridou 2002: 189)

Example (22) is ungrammatical irrespective of whether the subject *ellos* 'they' precedes or follows the infinitive *perder* 'lose'. At this stage one could argue either: (i) infinitive T is not selected by C; or (ii) it is selected by C but this C by virtue of being empty permits infinitive T to be 'penetrated' by the upper phase. I would like to suggest that (ii) is right. (22) is ungrammatical not because T is defective but because of *Agree* (in the technical sense of Landau (2000)) applying and relating mismatched *phi*-features between the upper and the lower clause.

Let us consider the derivation step by step within the spirit of Landau's (2002) analysis of Control (for a detailed discussion cf. Sitaridou (2002)). The complement (*ellos* *perder* (*ellos*) *los documentos*) is a (semantically) tensed complement since the matrix verb is a factive one. Let us assume that *Agree*<sub>1</sub> takes place between the subject *ellos* 'they' and the infinitive *perder* 'lose' without the subject moving out of the VP. So far the derivation proceeds as expected. As we have seen in the previous cases, the subject can remain VP-in-situ but still license its nominative Case by virtue of *Agree*. As a second step, *Agree*<sub>2</sub> applies and the matrix head, in this case *lamento* 'I regret', inherits the semantic number of DP *yo* 'I'. This second step is also legitimate. However, by virtue of the fact that embedded T is infinitival it is also *phi*-incomplete; it follows that *ellos* 'they' *cannot* raise to spec-TP because of the lack of EPP. Not having agreement and not having an overt C drives the derivation to crash. More explicitly, since spec-TP is not occupied by the lexical subject *ellos* 'they', in terms of computation, when *Agree*<sub>3</sub> applies it will establish a relation between the matrix subject and the null element in the embedded spec-TP. When *Agree*<sub>3</sub> applies, spec-TP position is related to mismatched *phi*-features, these of *yo* 'I' instead those of *ellos* 'they', since the former c-commands now the embedded *pro*. Hence the derivation cannot converge.



This analysis is compatible – albeit in a different framework – with what Roussou (2001) claims for control complements, namely that the lack of EPP creates clause union. Based on the idea that the EPP is a clausal requirement (Roberts & Roussou 2002) Roussou (2001) further argues that lack of embedded Fin and AgrS force association with the matrix Fin and AgrS respectively. In my account either the presence of EPP in the infinitival T (as in the case of inflected infinitives) or of an overt complementiser (as in the case of personal infinitives) ensures that NOC properties.

#### 4. Conclusion

The ideas put forward in this paper are, first, that *phi*-incompleteness should be dissociated from T-defectiveness because of comparative evidence from raising constructions involving *na*-clauses in Greek and inflected infinitives in Portuguese. Also, it was shown, by means of novel data, that Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou's (1998) idea that agreement is a reflex of Case in EP but of EPP in MG holds. Second, semantic Tense can license nominative subjects as shown by Spanish personal infinitives. Third, infinitival Tense is equated to matrix Tense with regards to the ability to license nominative Case but not vis-à-vis independent sentencehood. Matrix Tense differs in that it is either: (i) unselected (as in the case of root clauses) or (ii) selected by (an operator in) C (as in the case of imperatives).

The present paper has also serious implications for the notion of finiteness. The latter cannot be used as a primitive to define grammatical constructions or syntactic operations (for this reason it was avoided throughout the paper) since in the way it has been used in the literature it includes two contradictory assumptions: (a) possibility of nominative subjects; and (b) independent sentencehood. The present study however, highlights that finiteness should be either (a) or (b), and strongly suggests that is essentially the lack of (b) that captures nonfiniteness, which is then defined as the need for two heads to be in synergy. This by definition means a lack of independence for the lower clause. Under such a view nothing precludes the licensing of nominative Case; it rather affects the way nominative Case is licensed.



**Table 6.** The correlates of Tense, Case, phi-features and EPP in (some cases of) *na*-clauses in Greek, in inflected infinitives in Portuguese and in personal infinitives in Spanish

Languages	Morphological Tense	<i>phi</i> -features	Case	EPP	Semantic Tense	selected by C
Portuguese inflected infinitive	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Greek aspectual subjunctives	X	✓	✓	✓	X	X
Spanish personal infinitives	X	X	✓	X	✓	✓

## Notes

1. The status of *na* is a highly controversial issue. It has been claimed in the literature that *na* is: (a) a complementiser (Aggouraki 1991); (b) a mood element (Philippaki-Warbuton 1992); and (c) a FinP element (Roussou 2000). Its status is not of immediate concern to us.

2. By 'a step closer' I hint on the possibility that (non-)finiteness can be a gradual notion (in the sense of Vincent 1998).

3. This claim is originally made in Iatridou (1993).

4. One might wonder why not comparing raising predicates of the *fenete* 'it seems' type in MG. This is for expositional reasons in order not to misrepresent Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou's original analysis. However, as far as I am concerned the verb *fenete* 'it seems' – albeit less straightforward – exemplifies the same pattern:

- (i) a. Ta pedja fenode na ine xarumena. (Modern Greek)  
       the children seem-PASS3PL *na* be-3PL happy  
       b. Fenode na ine xarumena ta pedia.  
       seem-PASS3PL *na* be-3PL happy the children  
       c. \*Fenode ta pedia na ine xarumena.  
       seem-PASS3PL the children *na* be-3PL happy  
       'The kids seem to be happy.'
- (ii) a. Ta pedja fenode oti ine xarumena.  
       the children seem-PASS3PL *that* be-3PL happy  
       b. Fenode oti ine xarumena ta pedja.  
       seem-PASS3PL *that* be-3PL happy the children  
       c. Fenete oti ta pedja ine xarumena.  
       seem-PASS3SG the children *that* be-3PL happy  
       'It seems that the kids are happy.'

It is particularly interesting that whereas (ic) is ungrammatical, (iic) is not. However it should be noted that for (iic) to be grammatical the matrix *fenete* 'it seems' needs to be in 3SG rather than 3PL.

5. To the data *a* has been added to improve grammaticality. The original data do not have it. Thanks to Ana Castro and Fernanda Pratas for pointing this out, as well as for other comments.
6. Note that I do not say 'licenses' since this is NOT my claim. I rather want to show the special relation of agreement with Case in EP.
7. According to Pires and Rodrigues (2001), the adjunct is built first in the derivation and its subject moves to the matrix clause (by sideways movement) before the adjunct clause adjoins to the main clause. This way they explain left adjuncts. However, more than accounting for left adjuncts, which can be explained otherwise, they need this because they work within a control theory viewed as DP-movement (Hornstein 1999).
8. According to Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), spec-TP is not available in languages such as Greek and Spanish.

## References

- Agouraki, Y. (1991). A modern Greek complementiser and its significance for Universal Grammar. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 16.
- Alexiadou, A. & Anagnostopoulou, E. (1998). Parametrizing Agr. Word order, verb-movement and EPP-Checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 16(3), 491–539.
- Alexiadou, A. & Anagnostopoulou, E. (2002). Raising without infinitives and the role of agreement. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, S. Barbiers, & H.-M. Gärtner (Eds.), *Dimensions of Movement: From features to remnants*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ambar, M. (1994). Aux-to-COMP and lexical restrictions on verb movement. In G. Cinque et al. (Eds.), *Paths Towards Universal Grammar. Studies in honour of Richard S. Kayne*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). *Syntax of Ditransitives. Evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, & J. Uriagereka, *Step by Step. Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001a). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale. A life in language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001b). Beyond explanatory adequacy. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 20. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- Hornstein, N. (1999). Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 69–96.
- Iatridou, S. (1993). On nominative case assignment and a few related things. In J. Bobaljik & C. Phillips (Eds.), *Papers on Case and Agreement I*. [MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 19].
- Landau, I. (2000). *Elements of Control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Madeira, A. M. (1994). On the Portuguese inflected infinitive. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 6.

- Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1992). On mood and complementisers in Modern Greek. Ms., University of Reading.
- Pires, A. & Rodrigues, C. (2001). Non-finite adjuncts in romance: Deriving null subjects through remnant movement. Paper presented at the 31th *Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, University of Illinois at Chicago, April 19–22, 2001.
- Quicoli, A. C. (1996). Inflection and parametric variation: Portuguese vs. Spanish. In R. Freidin (Ed.), *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Raposo, E. (1987). Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18.
- Rigau, G. (1995). The properties of the temporal infinitive constructions in Catalan and Spanish. *Probus*, 7.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar. A handbook in generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Roberts, I. & Roussou, A. (2002). The EPP as a condition on tense dependencies. In P. Svenonius (Ed.), *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*. Oxford: OUP.
- Roussou, A. (2000). On the left periphery: Modal particles and complementisers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 1, 65–94.
- Roussou, A. (2001). Control and raising in and out of subjunctive complements. In M. L. Rivero & A. Ralli (Eds.), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. Oxford: OUP.
- Sitaridou, I. (2002). The Synchrony and Diachrony of Romance Infinitives with Nominative Subjects. PhD Dissertation, University of Manchester.
- Terzi, A. (1997). PRO and null case in finite clauses. *The Linguistic Review*, 14.
- Torrego, E. (1998). Nominative subjects and pro-drop INFL. *Syntax*, 1(2), 206–219.
- Tsoulas, G. (1995). The nature of the subjunctive and the formal grammar of obviation. In K. Zagana, *Grammatical Theory and Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Varlokosta, S. (1994). Issues on Modern Greek Sentential Complementation. PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Vincent, N. (1996). Appunti sulla sintassi dell'infinito coniugato in un testo napoletano del '300. In G. Lepschy, P. Benincà et al., *Italiano e Dialetti nel tempo: Saggi di Grammatica*. Roma: Bulzoni.