

A Comparative Inquiry of Obligatory Control and Clitic Climbing

Abstract

This paper investigates the similarities and differences between obligatory control, and clitic climbing and proposes a unified phase-based account for these phenomena, maintaining the idea that the movement, either of a DP or of a clitic, never crosses a phase v^* or C, at least in the Romance languages under discussion. Specifically, a locality condition prevents movement in control constructions across the boundaries of a tensed or a phi-fully specified clause, namely a CP phase as movement is blocked by a topicalized element. In the same vein, clitic climbing is prevented to operate across a v^* as it is blocked by focused elements. Hence, obligatory control, raising and clitic climbing in Romanian and Spanish show similarities regarding the apparent optional positions of subjects and clitics and not at least, regarding locality effects and defective intervention.

Keywords: Clitic Climbing, Control, Raising, Restructuring, Phase, Multiple Case-Marked Chains

1. Introduction

The phenomena of control represents a core topic of investigation both in the early generative theories and in modern minimalist approaches, which regard it either as a Move-based or an Agree-based operation. The major interest in this topic is related to the syntactic status of the unpronounced subject of control infinitives, subjunctives and indicatives. Obligatory control (OC) in the standard theory refers to the non-local referential relation between an unpronounced subject, regarded as PRO in deficient clauses, and its controller:

- (1) a. John_i learned [PRO_i to ride horses]
- b. John_i ordered Susan_j [PRO_j to do the dishes]

In the framework of Government and Binding, PRO and its distribution are analyzed on the basis of the binding theory. Accordingly, since PRO is simultaneously an anaphor and a pronoun, further stipulations are needed in order to avoid violations of the Binding Conditions. One necessary requirement for PRO is that it does not have binding domains and, hence, it is ungoverned and not Case-marked. This is known in the literature as the PRO Theorem, introduced by Chomsky (1981). As this theory has several crucial shortcomings, several adjustments have been proposed to deal with them; see e.g. Manzini (1983), Koster (1984) and Bouchard (1984). For instance, the PRO Theorem is not able to determine the reference of PRO, or the dual status of PRO, as a pronoun and anaphor at the same time, and cannot be captured satisfactorily by the binding theory.

A second stage in the investigation of control constructions began with the rise of the Minimalist Program; (see Chomsky (1995)). Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) propose that PRO is the only NP that can bear a Null Case due to its covert nature. Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) and Chomsky (2001) also argue that the Null Case is only assigned by non-finite T.

Motivated by several empirical and theoretical shortcomings of the previous approaches, Hornstein (1999, 2001, 2009) proposes a novel analysis of control that completely eliminates PRO. From this perspective, control, reflexivization and raising are the result of A-movement. Crucially, control and raising differ only in theta-theoretic terms: movement is to theta positions in control and to non-theta positions in raising. An argument in favor of the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) is the existence of the phenomena of Backward Subject Control (BSC) in several languages (schematically presented in (2a)), e.g. in Japanese (Kuroda 1978), Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2002), Mizo (Subbarao 2003), Greek, Romanian

and Spanish (Alexiadou et. Al. 2009, 2010, 2011) and Backward Object Control (BOC) in Brazilian (Br.) Portuguese (Farell 1995), Korean (Monahan 2003) and Malagasy (Potsdam 2006) .

- (2)a. PRO tried [to Bill cut the line] Backward Subject Control
 b. I persuaded PRO_i [Kim_i to smile] Backward Object Control

However, the MTC is not free of problems either. According to Landau (2003), the MTC faces serious problems with respect to Case Theory. Landau (2003, 2007) identifies a crucial contrast between raising and control constructions. This difference is observable in languages with case concord, like Icelandic. When the embedded predicate assigns a quirky case to its subject in Icelandic, this case shows up on the matrix subject in raising and not in control constructions. The matrix controller bears nominative, while PRO bears quirky case, as shown by agreeing elements like floating quantifiers or depictives. This contrast is illustrated schematically in (3) for Icelandic (from Landau 2007: 305):

- (3) a. DP_i DAT.....V.....[t_i.....V.....FQ DAT] Raising
 b. DP_i NOM.....V.....[PRO_i.....V.....FQ DAT] Control

In contrast to the MTC, Landau (2003,2004, 2007) proposes an Agree-based approach to PRO. According to this approach, obligatory control is accounted for in terms of the minimalist operation Agree between PRO and a controller mediated by the matrix functional head. A clear benefit of this theory is that it provides a unified Agree-based analysis of both partial and exhaustive control. However, Landau's approach still cannot account for a number of empirical data. First, like the previous PRO-based theory, his approach also assumes that obligatory control appears if T in deficient clauses is not specified for both tense and

agreement. This is contradicted by Br. Portuguese, where obligatory control can also appear in indicative clauses (Ferreira 2004, Rodrigues 2004):

- (4) *O João₁ disse que e_{1/*2} estava cansado.* (Br. Portuguese)
 the John said-3SG that was-3SG tired

Second, the ultimate challenge for the Agree-based approach to PRO is posed by languages with backward control, whereby the controllee is structurally superior to the controller. A PRO theory of control would have to explain why backward control patterns do not represent cases of Principle C violations, how the controller receives case from a non-finite verb, or how PRO receives case in the matrix clause. Summarizing, one of the main theoretical and empirical questions for the current theories of control is whether raising and control are both movement-derived constructions or whether they involve Move in raising and Agree in control.

I believe that an answer to this question can be provided by regarding control crosslinguistically and by comparing it to other similar “movement” phenomena such as “optional” clitic climbing.

In this paper I investigate the similarities and differences between clitic climbing, and obligatory control in order to propose a unified phase-based account for these phenomena, maintaining the idea that movement, either of a DP or of a clitic, never crosses a phase v* or C, at least in the languages at hand.

- (5)a. *Santa (les) puede ofrecer(les) a los niños muchos regalos.* (Spanish)

Santa CL-DAT can-SG offer-CL.DAT to the children many presents.

‘Santa Claus can offer the children many presents.’

- b. *(Juan) trata de leer (Juan) el libro (Juan)*

(John) try.3SG to read (John) the book (John)
'John tries to read the book.'

In (5), both the object-clitic and the subject can occur in different slots with respect to the distribution of their shared arguments (object-clitic DP or subject DP), locality constraints and theta-role assignment. In light of these similarities I propose that both clitic climbing (CC) and obligatory control (OC; cf. Hornstein 1999 and subsequent work) are the residues of movement.

I then present the implications of such a unified proposal, with focus on typological correlations. In order to do so, I draw a parallel between control verbs and restructuring verbs showing in line with Cinque (2001, 2003) that only the latter allow clitic climbing. Moreover, I argue that clitic climbing is licit only in monoclausal structures that do not allow an impersonal reflexive SE that checks nominative (cf. Schäfer 2014) and that lack both a v* and a C-phase. In order to do so, data from different Romance languages are considered.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2, I present a unified account for obligatory control in Romance languages, by presenting the differences among (Brazilian) Portuguese, Romanian and Spanish. In section 3 the same exercise is done with respect to clitic climbing, where a unified movement-based account is entertained for the Romance domain. In section 4 the similarities arising from the proposals for CC and OC are then presented.

2. A comparative analysis of Obligatory Control

[illegible]

2.1 A typology of OC in Romance languages

Regarding criterion (i), while Brazilian Portuguese allows obligatory control into either a noninflected infinitive clause or into an indicative clause, Romanian allows OC into r

6

into a subjunctive clause² and Spanish allows it into an infinitive clause only:

(7) Brazilian Portuguese

- a. *Eles₁ aprenderam a [e_{1/*2} falar(em) baixo à mesa].*
 they learned to talk.INF-(*3PL) softly at.the table
 ‘They learned to talk softly at the table.’
- b. *O João₁ disse que e_{1/*2} estava cansado.*
 the João said-3SG that was-3SG tired
 ‘João said that he was tired.’

(8) Romanian

- a. *Domnia-sa₁ i-ar putea [e_{1/*2} lumina sufletul].*
 lord-his him- would could light-INF soul-the
 ‘His highness can enlighten his mind.’
- b. *Maria₁ a învățat [e_{1/*2} să călărească].*
 Maria has learned SUBJ ride-3SG
 ‘Maria learned how to ride.’

(9) Spanish

- Maria₁ aprendió a [e_{1/*2} cabalgar].*
 Maria learned to ride.INF
 ‘Maria learned how to ride.’

With respect to criterion (ii), the realization of overt agreement in the embedded domain of

² Romanian also allows infinitive clauses in other contexts, but they are limited to some dialects and can be part of the periphery once they exhibit a more archaic flavor (see Montapanyane 1995). In the case of Brazilian Portuguese, indicative clauses are also possible in the complement of NOC verbs, as we will briefly discuss.

sentences (7b) and (8b) allow us to hypothesize the presence of an [iphi] feature in the respective embedded Tense heads. On the other hand, the embedded Tense head does not include an [iT] feature in cases of OC in noninflected infinitive clauses in Brazilian Portuguese, in Romanian subjunctives selected by OC verbs and in Spanish complement infinitives of OC verbs, as can be inferred from the impossibility of temporal adverbs with independent features vis-à-vis the matrix clause in the sentences (10a), (11a) and (12):

(10) Brazilian Portuguese

- a. *Eles aprenderam a [falar (*em) baixo à mesa (*amanhã)].* OC
 They learned to talk.INF(*-3PL) softly at.the table (*tomorrow)
- b. *Ele nos disse [para ir(mos) à praia amanhã].* NOC
 he us told to go(-1PL) to.the beach tomorrow
- c. *O João₁ disse agora [que e_{1/*2} estará ocupado amanhã].* FOC³
 the João said-3SG now that will.be-3SG busy tomorrow

(11) Romanian

- a. *Maria a învățat [(ca) să călărească (*mâine)].* OC
 Maria learned COMPL SUBJ ride-3SG tomorrow
- b. *Maria a vrut (ca) să călărim mâine.* NOC
 Maria wanted COMPL SUBJ ride-1PL tomorrow

(12) Spanish

- a. *María aprendió [a cabalgar (*mañana)].* OC
 Maria learned to ride.INF (*tomorrow)
- b. *María quiso [cabalgar (mañana)].* NOC
 Maria wants ride.INF tomorrow

³ Finite Obligatory Control

The interplay between the realization of phi-features and tense features in the embedded clauses in both OC and NOC sentences in the languages under discussion is illustrated in the table below:

Table 1. Complements of control verbs in Brazilian Portuguese, Romanian and Spanish

Context	[u ϕ i]	[iT]	Example
BP (inflected)infinitive clauses (OC)	-/+	-	(10a)
BP inflected infinitive clauses (NOC)	+	+	(10b)
BP indicative clauses (FOC)	+	+	(10c)
Romanian subjunctive clauses (OC)	+	-	(11a)
Romanian subjunctive clauses (NOC)	+	+	(11b)
Spanish infinitive clauses (OC)	-	-	(12a)
Spanish infinitive clauses (NOC)	-	+	(12b)

From the table it is possible to argue that there is a strong correlation between absence of [iT] features and Obligatory Control, the only exception being indicative clauses in Brazilian Portuguese, (see Pires 2006). I will analyze this example together with the proposal correlating OC with the absence of [iT] in the embedded Tense and therefore nonprojection of CP.

As follows, I want to provide a unified analysis of control in Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese showing that although control constructions are not homogeneous regarding restructuring, they lack a CP layer across Romance.

2.2. *Restructuring/Non-restructuring with control verbs*

In this section, I show that obligatory control does not occur only in restructuring contexts and, hence, in monoclausal structures where the obligatory control verb does not have a syntactic subject (contrary to Cinque 1999 and subsequent work). On the basis of *negation*

and *event modification*, it shows that obligatory control constructions in Romanian are bi-eventive and bi-clausal, and hence cannot be analyzed as instances of restructuring (see for discussion Polinsky & Potsdam 2008 and also Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, Iordachioaia & Marchis 2010, 2012).

I will show that in contrast to Romanian, Spanish control constructions are bi-eventive, but involve restructuring since they allow clitic climbing.

a. Double negation (test for bi-eventiveness constructions)⁴

The Romance examples in (13), (14) and (15) respectively, show that in obligatory control constructions *two separate negations* are possible: in the matrix clause (13a, 14a, 15a), in the embedded clause (13b, 14b, 15b), or in both clauses (13c, 14c, 15c):

Romanian

(13) a. *Ion nu a învățat să gătească.*

Not has-3SG learned SUBJ cook-3SG

‘John didn’t learn to cook.’

b. *Ion a învățat să nu gătească.*

John has-3SG learned SUBJ not cook-3SG

(‘John learned not to cook (i.e. ‘John got into the habit of not cooking’)

c. *Ion nu a învățat să nu gătească.*

John no has-3SG learned SUBJ not cook-3SG

‘John didn’t learn not to cook.’ (i.e. ‘John still has the habit of cooking’)

Spanish

⁴ Kayne (1989) assumed that Neg blocks Clitic Climbing and, hence, independent negation should not be possible in restructuring contexts. However, Cinque (2004) shows that this is also not the case in Italian, this could be explained by the different positions of Neg within a language (cf. Cinque 1999).

- (14) a. *Juan no aprendió a cocinar.*
 John not learned to cook.
 John didn't learn to cook.
- b. *Juan aprendió a no cocinar.*
 John learned to not cook.
 ('John learned not to cook (i.e. 'John got into the habit of not cooking')
- c. *Juan no aprendió a no cocinar.*
 John not learned to not cook.
 ('John learned not to cook (i.e. 'John got into the habit of not cooking')

Portuguese

- (15) a. *A Ana não aprendeu a cozinhar.*
 The Ana not learned to cook
 'Ana didn't learn to cook.'
- b. *A Ana aprendeu a não cozinhar.*
 The Ana learned to not cook
 'Ana learned not to cook.' (Ana got into the habit of no cooking.)
- c. *A Ana não aprendeu a não cozinhar.*
 The Ana not learned not to cook
 'Ana didn't learn not to cook.' (Ana cannot get into the habit of no cooking.)

b. Independent Event Modifiers

Besides negation, events modifiers can independently modify the event of each clause, as illustrated in (16), (17) and (18):

Romanian

- (16) a. *Anul acesta Ion a învățat **de patru ori** să împuște.*
 Year-the this John has-3SG learned four times SUBJ shoot-3SG

‘This year there were four times that John learned how to shoot’

- b. *Anul acesta Ion a învățat să împuște **de patru ori**.*

Year-the this John has-3SG learned SUBJ shoot-3SG four times John.

‘This year John learned how to shoot four times (in a row).’

Spanish

- (17) a. *Este año Juan aprendió **cuatro veces** a tirar.*

This year John learned-3SG four times to shoot.

‘This year there were four times that John learned how to shoot’

- b. *Este año Juan aprendió a tirar **cuatro veces**.*

This year John learned-3SG to shoot four times.

‘This year there were four times that John learned how to shoot’

Portuguese

- (18) a. *Este ano o João aprendeu **quatro vezes** a atirar.*

This year John learned-3SG four times to shoot.

‘This year there were four times that John learned how to shoot’

- b. *Este ano o João aprendeu a atirar **quatro vezes**.*

This year John learned-3SG to shoot four times.

‘This year there were four times that John learned how to shoot’

These tests clearly show that the control constructions in the discussed Romance languages involve a bi-eventive constructions, that they have at least a VP. However, as follows I show that no all of them involve a vP/VoiceP (a phase).

c. **No(t) always transparency effects**

Rizzi (1982) and Cinque (2004), among others, argue that a diagnostic for restructuring verbs is that they show transparency effects (clitic climbing/ object raising). Transparency effects can be obtained with restructuring modal verbs in all Romance languages, but control verbs are dichotomous across languages. Unlike Spanish (and for German scrambling see Wurmbrand 2001) which permits clitic climbing both with modal and control verbs, Romanian control sentences do not involve restructuring since the embedded domain is a phase blocking the clitic movement.

(19) a. *Juan **la** pudo reparar.* (Spanish)

Juan it-ACC could repair.

‘Juan could repair it.’

b. *Juan **la** trató de reparar.*

Juan it.ACC forgot of repair.

‘Juan forgot to repair it.’

(20) a. *Ion l-a putut repara.* (Romanian)

Ion CL.has could repair.

‘Ion could repair it.’

b. **Ion l-a încercat să repara.*

Ion CL.has try SUBJ repair.

‘Ion forgot to repair it.’

Since Brazilian Portuguese partially lost the clitics in the spoken language, we can test the clitic climbing only with a very limited set of clitics such as first person and second person singular and plural.

- (21) a. *O João *me pôde me esquecer.* (Brazilian Portuguese)
 John me-CL.ACC.1PERS could me-CL.ACC.1Person forget.
 ‘John could forget me.’
- b. *O João *me ententou- me de esquecer.*
 John me-CL.ACC.1PERS tried-me.CL.Acc to forget.
 ‘John tried to forget me.’

The loss of clitic climbing in Brazilian Portuguese can be explained by the loss of clitics, the strict word order SVO and by the loss of verbal morphology. In these respects, Brazilian Portuguese became closer to English than to other Romance languages. Hence, we can assume that the embedded domain in control constructions in Brazilian Portuguese does not involve restructuring like in English.

2.3. Multiple Case Marked Chains

In this section I bring two different arguments in favor of the fact that unlike in Spanish, the embedded domain in Romanian contains an independent case chain in subjunctives. That is both the embedded and the matrix verb independently assign case to its subject copies. Within the framework of the movement approach to Control, this implies that the subject belongs to an A-chain that bears two distinct cases.

Different scholars (Massam 1985, Yoon 1996, Bejar & Massam 1999; Ura 1996: 96-97) have proven the existence of multiple case-marked A-chains. An example from Niuean is provided in (22) (from Bejar & Massam 1999: 67):

- (22) a. *Manako a ia ke momohe [e na tama]*
 want ABS he SBJV sleep ABS pair child

‘He wants the two children to sleep’

- b. *Manako a ia [ke he na tama]_i ke momohe t_i*
 want ABS he MIDDLE pair child SBJV sleep

‘He wants the two children to sleep’

In (22a), when the DP *na tama* is merged in the subject position of the embedded clause, it receives absolutive Case. If the subject subsequently raises to a higher position like in (22b), it receives the middle structural Case. The chain between *na tama* and its trace bears a single theta role, but two Structural Cases, a low absolutive and a high middle. It seems that in such Structural-Structural Case Chains, it is always the higher Case which is realised (see Bejar & Massam 1999 for discussion).

Alexiadou et al. 2009 and subsequent work show that Greek (23a) and Romanian (23b) provides independent evidence that the embedded verb can assign a different case than the matrix verb. In causative constructions, the embedded subject originates in the lower clause checking nominative Case (as shown by the licensing of the nominative modifier in (23)) and then undergoes raising to the matrix object position checking Accusative under ECM:

- (23) a. *I Maria ekane ton Jani_i na t_i klapsi orgismenos* (Greek)

The Mary made the Janis-ACCSBJV cries-3SG angry-NOM

‘Mary made John cry angry’

- b. *Maria l_i-a făcut pe Ion_i să t_i plângă enervat.* (Romanian)

Mary-NOM CL-ACC-has-3SG made PE John-ACC SBJV cry-3SG nerved-NOM

‘Mary made John cry angry’

Analogical to Landau’s data from Icelandic, which clearly shows that there is one case chain in raising and two case-marked chains in control (see 3), Romanian and Greek also show a difference between raising and control in the realization of agreement and probably, indirectly of case. In these languages, the aspectual verbs ‘begin’ and ‘stop’ are ambiguous between obligatory control and raising⁵. When a quirky subject construction is embedded under such verbs, control aspectuals agree in person and number with the embedded quirky dative subject in (24a), while raising aspectuals agree in person and number with the embedded nominative theme regardless of the surface position of the quirky subject (24b). See this difference for Romanian in (24) (cf. Alexiadou et al 2010):

Romanian:

- (24)a. *A început să-i placă Mariei telenovelele.* Control
 has-**3SG** started SBJV-CL.DAT like Mary-DAT soap operas
- b. *Au început să-i placă Mariei telenovelele.* Raising
 has-**3PL** started SBJV-CL.DAT like Mary-DAT soap operas
 ‘Mary started to like soap operas.’

The examples above apparently show that Romanian and Spanish also have multiple case-marked chains in control similar to Icelandic, but these are revealed in the agreement pattern. As follows, I present another test to investigate the case assignment within the embedded domain in the languages under discussion.

2.3.1. SE test for an embedded case-marked chain

⁵ Alexiadou et al. (2010) show that control aspectuals are compatible with agent oriented adverbs such as “on purpose” while raising aspectuals are not.

The following test will cast more light on the properties of the embedded domain to assign or not the nominative case. The impersonal *SE* test shows novel evidence that Romanian subjunctives can independently assign nominative case. We learn this from the impersonal raising construction with *SE*. Observe that the raising verb *pare* in Romanian can co-occur with the impersonal/expletive reflexive pronoun *SE* which absorbs the nominative case and checks the D feature of the matrix verb.

(25) *Se pare că a plecat Ion în străinătate.* (Romanian)

SE seems that has gone John abroad.

‘It seems that John has gone abroad.’

In the example above, the raising verb subcategorizes an indicative embedded clause whose verb is phi-feature, tense complete and hence, can assign the nominative case on its own. The entire embedded clause is a phase because it is introduced by the complementizer *ca* considered a phase marker in Romanian (Alboiu 2007). In this construction, the derivation is saved by the impersonal reflexive pronoun *SE* that checks the nominative case of the raising verb and, hence, no violations of Phase Impenetrability Condition or of Freezing effects arise. Interestingly, in Romanian the impersonal raising verb *se pare* can subcategorize not only indicatives but also subjunctives:

(26) *Se pare să fi învățat Ion lecția și să nu se mai joace cu focul.* (Romanian)

SE seems SBJV have learned John lesson-the and SBJV not SE-play with fire-the.

‘Johns seems to have learned the lesson and not play with fire anymore.’

Crucially, (26) contradicts the general view that subjunctives in Romanian cannot assign nominative case due to its defective nature. Since expletive *SE* checks the nominative case in

raising + indicative, there is no reason to assume that it cannot do the same in raising + subjunctive constructions. If this is the case, then the subjunctive can assign nominative in spite of its tense defectiveness (see table 1).

According to Dobrovie-Sorin (1998) and Schäfer (2008) *SE* realizes either the internal argument or the external argument being obligatorily case marked but not necessarily being theta-marked. So if *SE* must be case marked but not theta-marked, then the impersonal raising constructions in Romanian have an expletive *SE* that checks only the nominative case of the raising verb (since raising verbs do not have an agent theta role to assign). So the impersonal raising constructions with *SE* in Romanian are expletives as the Voice head where *SE* is realized is expletive and, hence, cannot introduce a thematic role. Expletive Voice only introduces a D-feature and a Case-feature to be checked by a DP in its specifier, but it does not assign a thematic role to this DP (see Schäfer 2008).

Crucially, control verbs in Romanian can also co-occur with the reflexive *SE* receiving an impersonal interpretation similar to the passive one where the external argument is suppressed. Evidence for the fact that the embedded verb also has case to check is the fact that *SE* co-occurs also in the embedded domain, checking its nominative case. Moreover, we note a distinction between subjunctives in (27a and 27c) and infinitives in (27b) in Romanian. Double impersonal *SE* is accepted only with subjunctives in Romanian, a fact that suggests that irrespectively of the nature of matrix verb, the subjunctive is always capable of assigning its own nominative case.

Romanian

(27) a. *Se încearcă să se elimine corupția în instituțiile de stat.*

SE try-3SG SUBJ SE eliminate corruption-the in institution public.

‘One tries to eliminate the corruption from the public institutions.’

b. **Se poate eliminarse corupția în instituțiile de stat.*

SE poate-3SG eliminate.INF-SE corruption-the in institution public.

‘One can eliminate the corruption from the public institutions.’

c. *Se poate să se elimine corupția în instituțiile de stat.*

SE poate-3SG SUBJ SE eliminate.INF-SE corruption-the in institution public.

‘One can eliminate the corruption from the public institutions.’

In Spanish, the impersonal SE is possible only in the matrix verb since the matrix domain is the only one that has a vP or VoiceP. Infinitives in Spanish are bare VP and involve restructuring despite the fact that control constructions are bi-eventive.

Spanish

(28) a. *Se trata de eliminar- *se la corrupción en las instituciones del estado.*

SE try of eliminate- SEthe corruption from the public institutions.

‘One tries to eliminate the corruption from public institutions.’

b. *Se puede eliminar- *se la corrupción en las instituciones del estado.*

SE can of eliminate-SE the corruption from the public institutions.

‘One can eliminate the corruption from public institutions.’

In (28), one realizes that SE can be realized only once independently of the nature of matrix verb, whether this is a modal or a control verb. Importantly, the example in (28b) casts light on the fact that the matrix verb and the infinitive involve a complex predicate since SE can be realized also after the infinitive.

Crucially, the test with impersonal *SE* goes hand in hand with the one from clitic climbing. Spanish allows clitic climbing in control and it disallows double instantiation of SE while Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese show the opposite pattern.

As expected, as Brazilian Portuguese has finite control, it is clear that it can assign nominative

case and also SE. Regarding infinitives, SE can also occur, but only in the inflected infinitive: Brazilian Portuguese in examples like *Se tenta se fazer o melhor para o outro* ‘One tries to make the best for the other.’ (example given by Carolina Petersen through personal communication)

All in all, this section has investigated the crosslinguistic variation in the case assignment properties of the embedded complements in obligatory control. The SE test has showed that Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese subjunctives and inflected infinitives have an independent case-marked chain. In addition to transparency effects, it has also proven that Spanish control verbs involve restructuring and clausal union with the embedded verb which is unable to assign case to its external argument.

2.4. *A unified phase-based account to OC*

As we have learned from the previous section, control verbs trigger a bi-eventive structure but they behave differently across languages with respect to restructuring. Romanian is the most straight-forward case: subjunctives do not permit restructuring irrespectively of the type of matrix verb while infinitives, which are hardly used in Romanian, involve restructuring. In Brazilian Portuguese, inflected infinitives are on a par with Romanian subjunctives of control verbs in that they can assign nominative case and allowing double SE. Spanish, on the other hand, involves always restructuring in cases of control. Moreover, infinitives in Spanish permit clitic climbing and disallows impersonal SE that checks the nominative case in impersonal constructions.

With these ingredients and a few more, I proceed with a uniform analysis of control that respects the Phase Impenetrability Condition (cf. Chomsky 1995).

To begin with, Spanish imposes the least problems for the Movement Theory of Control.

For Romanian, Alboiu (2007) has extensively presented that phi-features and Tense features are independent, one not implying the existence of the other. Moreover, she shows that Tense features cannot be realized in OC contexts. In other words, OC verbs always subcategorizes deficient TPs whereas NOC verbs select CPs in these languages. In this sense, Landau's (2004) intuition regarding Tense features can be included into the same picture. A stronger argument for the dichotomy between TPs and CPs is found in Romanian, where there is a second type of subjunctive complement, introduced by *ca* (the subjunctive complementiser) plus the subjunctive marker *să*:

- Importantly, *ca* is absent in both obligatory control and raising complements (cf. Grosu & Horvath 1987) and hence, Alboiu (2007) argues that *ca* in Romanian defines a CP layer, introducing topics in the discourse.

⁷ An interesting topic of future work would be an experimental inquiry of the information structure of such constructions. However, this goes beyond the scope of this paper.

(30) *O João₁ disse que e_{1/*2} estava cansado. (Brazilian Portuguese)*

The João₁ said-3SG that was-3SG tired

‘João said that he was tired.’

If we take into account the proposal by Nunes (2008), which draws on ideas from Ferreira (2009 and previous works) and Rodrigues (2004), this possibility of movement out of a finite domain is possible because finite Ts in BP may enter the numeration specified for number and person or for number only. In this last case, well-formedness conditions in the morphological component trigger the addition of the person feature. Once Brazilian Portuguese distinctively encodes person and number inflection only for first person singular, when T is only specified for number, then first person is added if N is valued as singular, otherwise default person is assumed, as shown in Table 2. Therefore, I can assume that the embedded Tense is phi-incomplete, a fact that allows A-movement of the embedded subject out of the indicative clause.

Table 2: Verbal agreement paradigm in (colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese (Nunes 2010: 82).

<i>cantar</i> ‘to sing’: indicative present		
<i>eu</i> (I)	<i>canto</i>	<u>P:1; N:SG</u>
<i>você</i> (you.SG) <i>ele</i> (he) <i>ela</i> (she) <i>a gente</i> (we)	<i>canta</i>	P:default; N:default (= 3SG)
<i>vocês</i> (you.PL) <i>eles</i> (they.MASC) <i>elas</i> (they.FEM)	<i>cantam</i>	P:default; <u>N:PL</u> (= 3PL)

In light of these facts, the generalization according to which movement cannot occur across a fully-specified TP is valid also in the languages under discussion. In this respect, Brazilian

Portuguese finite control behaves like Romanian control in subjunctive clauses, the only difference being the trigger of T-deficiency: while in the former it is an incomplete [$\text{u}\phi\text{i}$] due to the absence of a person feature, in Romanian it is the lack of [iT]. In addition, Reed (2013) offers a semantic solution to the distinction between non-control/non-ECM/non-small clause verbs (fully-specified embedded TPs) and simple control verbs (non-fully specified embedded TPs). She convincingly shows that non-control verbs semantically select for different types of complements such as those denoting a Possible Fact, an Eventuality or a Proposition. Their truth-indetermination entails an independent anchoring of their tense to speech time that is syntactically “translated” into a complete ϕ -features, Case and tense. In other words, Reed assumes that fully inflected I/Ts have a direct anchoring to speech time and this makes them ϕ -complete. In other words, at the semantic-syntactical interface it is not only the lack of Tense the cause of a deficient/incomplete embedded domain in control structures, but also the semantic nature of the complement and its truth-(in)determination. In addition, there is a hint from Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) and Nunes (2010) that a defective TP is correlated with the lack of a TopP. In Romanian the complementiser *ca* obligatorily selects for a TopP in Romanian and blocks the subject movement to the matrix sentence. Similarly, in Brazilian Portuguese A-movement and therefore Obligatory Control is blocked whenever a Spec,TopP is present, as Nunes (2010) has pointed out (the examples are from Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 and Nunes 2010):

(31)a.* *Ion începe ca pe Maria s-o ajute. (Romanian)*

Ion starts compl PE Maria subj-her help

‘Ion is beginning to help Maria.’

b.* *O João₁ disse que esses livros, e₁ leu na semana passada. (Br. Portuguese)*

the João said that these books, read in the last week.

‘João said that he read these books last week.’

In the same vein, Bruening (2014) convincingly shows contrary to Hartman (2009, 2012) that not only DP experiencers but also other types of interveners (that do not compete with the raising subject for the same A-position) block the tough-movement and subject-to-subject raising in Italian and French:

- (32) a. *Sugar was very hard [in such conditions] to give up
 b. **Cette couleur est difficile [au crépuscule] à voir.* (French)
 this color is difficult at.the twilight to see
 ‘This color is difficult at twilight to see.’
 c. **Questi colori sono difficili [al crepuscolo] da vedere.* (Italian)
 these colors are difficult at.the twilight to see
 ‘These colors are difficult at twilight to see.’ (Bruening 2014:711/712)
- (33) a. **Jean a semblé [au cours de la réunion] avoir du talent.* (French)
 John has seemed during the meeting to have talent.
 ‘John seemed during the meeting to have talent.’
 b. ??*Gianni sembra in alcune occasione fare il suo dovere.* Italian
 Gianni seems on some occasions to.do the his duty.
 ‘Gianni seems on some occasions to do his duty.’ (Bruening 2014: 714)

What Bruening shows in these examples is that their ungrammaticality is not due to an intervention in A-movement of subjects in tough-movement or raising as adjuncts usually do not intervene in other cases of A-movement. It is actually more due to their linear position⁷. If

⁷ An interesting topic of future work would be an experimental inquiry of the information structure of such constructions. However, this goes beyond the scope of this paper.

this is so and our analysis is on the right track, then we could assume that an element in the Topic position intervenes in the subject movement, irrespectively of its nature.

3. A comparative analysis of Clitic Climbing

Now we turn to clitic climbing, another movement-based construction to be analyzed in this paper. This is the phenomenon where a clitic appears in a higher clause, irrespectively of its pre- or post-verbal placement. The derivation of clitic position in complex predicates formed from causative verbs is derived by movement, in a tradition dating back to Kayne (1975), a seminal work in the generative-transformational framework, in the same way as basic cliticization, which accounts for the final position clitics take in simple clauses. Kayne's tests showed that a clitic suffers locality restrictions, as any moved constituent does. Anagnostopoulou (2003) presents further evidence in this direction: in Greek, cliticization of indirect objects (IOs) systematically licenses A-movement of a subject theme (in a passive). A similar operation is blocked if a phrasal argument is realized instead of a clitic, due to the Minimal Link Condition (MLC):

(34) *[To vivlio]_i *(tis) charistike tis Marias t_i apo ton Petro.* (Greek)

The book CL-GEN awarded the Mary-GEN from the Peter.

'The book was awarded to Mary by Peter.'

I adopt here Anagnostopoulou's (1994, 2003, 2005) view that clitic movement in general consists in overt feature movement with a PF reflex. Besides, I follow, regarding clitic position in complex predicates, the proposal by Boeckx and Gallego (2008), according to which clitics enter into an Agree relation driven by phi-features (normally present on phase

heads).⁸ In this sense, a complete v head (v*) blocks clitic movement.

3.1 A typology of Clitic Climbing in Romance languages

As we know, a number of Romance languages have nowadays variation between clitic climbing and clitic non-climbing, such as Spanish, Catalan, Italian and Romanian

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| (35) | a. <i>La</i> voy a ver.

‘I will see her.’ | a’. Voy a ver <i>la</i> .

(Spanish) |
| | b. <i>El</i> torno a llegir.

‘I am reading it again.’ | b’. Torno a llegir- <i>lo</i>

(Catalan) |
| | c. <i>Lo</i> vorrei salutare.

‘I want to greet him.’ | c’. Vorrei salutar <i>lo</i> .

(Italian) |

Another group of languages is composed by French and European Portuguese which have extensive use of infinitives, block CC in this context (see (35a-b)), allowing it only with compound tenses (36a-b):⁹

⁸ This proposal is in general terms similar to Roberts’s (2010) theory of clitics, except from the fact that clitics also have an uninterpretable Case feature.

⁹ Causative complex predicates also allow CC in BP and French (see (i)). However, in BP only the causee is allowed to climb. We will not deal with CC with causative and perceptive verbs, which have different aspects involved. Therefore, we will stick to the restructuring construction.

- (i) a. *O chefe sempre manda(-os) procurar ajuda.*
the boss always have(they) to.search help
- b. *Le chef (les) fait toujours chercher de l’aide.*
The boss (them) have always search of the help

European Portuguese

- (36) a. (O) João deve publicar um livro este ano. Ele não (*o) podia terminá(-lo) antes.

(the) J. may publish a book this year. He not (*it) could finish (it) before.

French

- b. Jean doit publier un livre cette année. Il ne (*le) pouvait (le) finir avant ça.

(the) J. may publish a book this year. He not (*it) could finish (it) before this.

‘John may publish a book this year. He could not finish it before’

- (37) a. Ela (me) tinha (me) dito que queria viajar.

She (me) had (me) said that she.wanted to.travel

- b. Elle m’avait dit qu’elle voulait voyager.

she me had said that she wanted to.travel

‘She said to me she wanted to travel’

However, this picture is not uniform across Romance languages. In Romanian, clitic climbing is available only with modal verbs that subcategorize infinitives but not with control or raising verbs that subcategorize subjunctive clauses (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994):

- (38) a. *Îl pot mânca.* (Romanian)

CL-ACC can eat.

‘I can eat it.’

- b. **Îl încearcă/vrea să vadă.*

CL-ACC tries/ wants SUBJ see-3SG

‘He/she tries/ wants to see him.’

Moreover, Terzi (1992) shows that in Salentino, a Southern Italian dialect, clitic climbing can take place also when the embedded clause is a subjunctive clause with a missing subjunctive marker:

(39) *Lu we *ku kkatti.* (Salentino)

CL want SUBJ buy-2SG

‘You want to buy it.’

(40) **Maria o încearcă *(să) scrie.* (Romanian)

Maria CL-ACC try SUBJ write-3SG.

‘Mary tries to write it.’

Salentino and Romanian are similar in that they both have clitic climbing but only the former allows it in subjunctive clauses.

All in all, the above presented data clearly shows that Romance languages differ with respect to the syntactic structure/status of the embedded domain.

Let us consider without further ado, that the availability of CC in compound tenses indicate that there is a complete v (v^*)¹⁰. Following Boeckx & Gallego (2008), I would say that v may either be complete or defective in Spanish, Catalan and Italian. However, we will, for the time being, imagine that such a variation is not available and that the choice between higher or lower copy of the clitic is a matter of PF. This said, we become tempted to collapse the Brazilian Portuguese and French infinitival verb sequences with Romanian subjunctives. However, evidence from Salentino shows that the optional mood marker is the responsible for blocking CC (example from Terzi 1992):

¹⁰ v corresponds to the Voice Phrase. In section (2) the data with SE showed us that at least in Romanian, the embedded domain in control has a VoiceP that assigns nominative case.

- (41) *Lu we (*ku) kkatti.* (Salentino)
 cl want subj buy-2sg
 ‘You want to buy it.’

Let us then revise the findings we arrived at until now in Table 3.

Table 3. Availability of clitic climbing in Romance languages and related features

Context	CC	v*	Mood	Example
Spanish, Catalan, Italian infinitival clauses	+	-	-	(35)
Romanian subjunctives	-	+	+	(38)
BP/French infinitival clauses	-	+	-	(36)
BP/French compound tenses	+	-	-	(37)

3.2. *Towards an analysis*

On the basis of the above mentioned crosslinguistic data, clitic climbing seems to be triggered by two phenomena:

- i. restructuring/monoclausal structure (cf. Zagana 1982, Picallo 1990)
- ii. the lack of v* phase and a MoodP

On the basis of the tests with impersonal SE and transparency effects, we observed that Spanish controls always involve restructuring, while in Romanian the embedded domain can independently assign nominative case. Hence, if clitic climbing is possible with control and

raising construction in Spanish and if a clitic should not be able to move across a *v* phase, we can deduce that Spanish control constructions involve neither *C* nor a *v* phase. Unlike Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese involves a *v* phase and a MoodP since clitic climbing is illicit over infinitives, yet it cannot involve a CP since the embedded verb is deficient for person. Romanian shows a dual system: restructuring with infinitives of modal verbs and non-restructuring with all subjunctives. Therefore, control constructions (which almost exclusively select subjunctives) must involve a *v* phase that impedes clitic climbing yet lacks a CP layer due to the lack of deitic tense and the semantic truth-specification of the embedded complement.

The analysis I propose is a phase-based constraint.

3.2.1. A phase-based constraint: Don't climb across a phase!

In line with Boeckx & Gallego (2008) and Gallego (2011), I consider the restructuring domains in Salentino where CC takes place to be defective as clitic climbing can only occur if the clitic is “active” (cf. Chomsky 2000). This is so only if *v* cannot check its Case.

$$(42) \quad [v^* [V [C_{def} [T [EA Cl v^* [V t_{Cl}]]]]]] \quad (\text{Boeckx \& Gallego 2008})$$

By the virtue of the fact that cliticization is related to phi-feature movement and can only target phase heads: *C* and *v**/Voice (Boeckx & Gallego 2008), clitics should not be able to move out of inflected clauses. I explain the distinction between Romanian and Salentino/Spanish, by arguing that in Romanian subjunctive clauses are TP with a complete *v** and they are independently case-marked chains being able to deactivate the clitic for Case (freezing effects). In Salentino, Spanish, Italian and Catalan, on the other hand, the clitic remains active as in the absence of a *v** phase, it cannot check its Case.

I link the absence of the subjunctive marker in Salentino with the lack of v^* and of a MoodP. This hypothesis is observed also by different scholars such as Iatridou (1990) Sportiche (1996), Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1997) among others who argue that cliticization is subject to a clause mate locality condition.

On the basis of these observations, in the spirit of Boeckx & Gallego (2008) I add that the clause mate locality condition proposed in the literature is a v^* constraint.

ii. **Defective intervention: Don't climb across Focus!**

Moreover, I argue that like in the case of obligatory control where the presence of a C phase is linked to a Topic feature (cf. Alboiu (2007), the strong v^* in subjunctives is linked to the edge feature of Focus. One of the first ideas in this direction comes from Borgonovo & Valmala (2010). By working with the difference between the use of indicative and subjunctive moods in Spanish, they show that subjunctive mood indicates focus on the embedded clause. The following example (see Borgonovo & Valmala 2010) is a piece of evidence that negation takes as its focus the embedded clause in (43a), but the corrective constituent (introduced by *sino*) targets the matrix.

- (43) a. ???No vio [*que Pedro saliera*] *sino* *que lo oyó.* (Spanish)
 not see that P. exits.SUBJ. instead that it.ACC hear.IND.
- b. No vio [*que Pedro salía*] *sino que lo oyó.*
 not see that P. exits.IMP instead that it.ACC hear.IND.
 'I didn't see Peter leaving the room but I heard it.'

(44) a. #Îl pot numai marți vedea. (Romanian)
CL-ACC can only Tuesday see.
'I can see him only Tuesday'

b. #Lo puedo/trato solamente el martes ver. (Spanish)
CL-ACC can/try only Tuesday see.
'I can see him only today'

c. Pot/Încerc numai marți să-l văd. (Romanian)
Can/Try-1SG only Tuesday SUBJ-CL.ACC see
'I can/try to see him only Tuesday'

4. To sum up: Control vs. Clitic Climbing


32

4.1. *Theta-Role assignment*

One expected distinction between obligatory control, raising and clitic climbing regards the number of theta-roles the moved constituent checks: while in Obligatory Control contexts the subject may check several theta-roles - in CC, the object seems to always check one theta-role, i.e., the one received from the lexical verb (infinitive or subjunctive) depending on the language):

- (45) a. *Lo volevi comprare (lo).* (Italian)
 $\theta \longrightarrow$
- b. *Lu we kkatti (lu).* (Salentino)
 $\theta \longrightarrow$
 ‘You want to but it’

This could be understood as a counterexample to the expected parallelism between clitic climbing and control. Hence, this seems to conclude that clitic climbing should be analyzed on a par with raising, whereby only one theta role is assigned by the embedded verb but the subject DP moves in the matrix clause to check case. I argue, hence, that clitic climbing and raising in Romance are subject to the same movement-based analysis:

- Agree*
- 
- (46) a. $[_{TP} \text{ Copiiii} \text{ par } [_{TP} \text{ să citească } [_{DP} (\text{copiii})]]]$ (Romanian)
 seems-3PL SUBJ read-3PL children.the
 ‘The children seem reading’
- b. *Ta pedia stamatisan na diavazun ta pedia vivlia .* (Greek)

the children stopped-3PL SUBJ read-3PL the children books

‘The children stopped reading books.’

- c. *Los niños parecen leer (los niños).* (Spanish)

the children seems-3PL read-INF the children

‘John seems reading the book.’

- d. *Os meninos parecem que compraram um carro novo.* (Br. Portuguese)

The boys seem-3PL that bought-3PL a car new.

‘The boys seem to have bought a new car.’

Nevertheless, in Romanian and Greek, the object clitic in CC can move from and into different theta-role positions, just like in control constructions:

- (47) a. *O Janis tu epevale [na tu aresi tu Jani tu i opera]* (Greek)

The-John CL- imposed SUBJ CL like the Janis-GEN the opera

- b. *Ion le-a impus [să le placă copiilor lui opera]* (Romanian)

John Cl- has imposed SUBJ Cl please children-Dat his opera-the

‘John imposed it on his children to like the opera.’

Notice that the copy of the object clitic is overtly realized both in embedded clauses, where the clitic, together with its associate DP, represents a quirky subject that is assigned the experiencer theta role, and also in the matrix clause as the indirect object of the verb *impose*. Therefore, CC also behaves like subject control (and not only similar to subject raising) in terms of its theta-role assignment properties. Hence, the facts in (47) give additional support for proposed correlation¹¹.

¹¹ This example seems to be a counterexample to our v* as clitic is not allowed to be movement above a phase.

But these examples are cases of resumption where both copies must be overtly realized at PF. Once our approach

Hence, clitic climbing can be analyzed both in terms of control and raising depending on the number of theta roles assigned to the copy.

4.2. *The “apparent” optionality in the position of subjects and clitics*

Alexiadou et. al. (2009, 2010) show that languages with subjects in situ such as Greek, Romanian and Spanish¹² allow both forward and backward control and long distance agree/backward raising where the subjects can be realized in the embedded domain agreeing with the matrix verb.

(48) *A învățat/Pare* *să* *călărească* *Maria.* (Romanian)

learned /seems SBJV. ride-3SG Maria

(49) *Aprendió/Parece* *a cabalgar* *María.* (Spanish)

learned/seems to ride-INF Maria

Crucially, control and raising preserve the same word order like simple VSO sentences

combines two ingredients - a constraint in narrow syntax and another one in PF - we are able to account for apparent exceptions to the Boeckx / Gallego proposal. In some languages, it seems to be the case that both copies of the clitic are pronounced. This phenomenon is expected to happen in other cases of OC, provided that a morphological fusion between the relevant copy of the clitic and a functional category takes place, as Boeckx, Hornstein & Nunes (2008) propose for other languages.

¹² Ordóñez (2009) brings empirical evidence that backward control in Spanish is only apparent, being actually a case of scrambling. However, like in Romanian and Greek, the variable position of subjects is triggered by information structure (cf. Gabriel 2010).

where a subject can be in the preverbal position only if it is a topic or a contrastive focus¹³ or if it is part of an all-focus-sentence¹⁴.

(50) a. *Ce s-a întâmplat?* (Romanian)

What has happened?

b. *Pare să fi vărsat Maria laptele.*

Seems SBJV_{PTC} be spilt Mary milk-the

‘It seems that Maria has spilt the milk.’

c. *#MARIA pare să fi vărsat laptele.*

Mary seems SBJV_{PTC} has spilt milk-the

‘Maria seems to have spilt the milk.’

(51) a. *Q: Cine a vărsat laptele?* (Romanian)

Who has spilt the milk?

b. *MARIA pare să-l fi vărsat.*

Mary seems SBJV_{PTC}-CL-ACC be spilt.

¹³ Nava and Zubizarreta (2010) show that there are different patterns of focus among dialects of Spanish. Preverbal subject might have narrow focus, cf. Nava and Zubizarreta (2010) a. o. for more on the prosody of dislocated elements in Spanish. For more information about Romanian informational structure, see Cornilescu (1997), Alboiu (2007) and references therein.

¹⁴ In the literature there are two competing analyses concerning the preverbal position of subjects in null subject languages that actually make contradictory predictions regarding the status of preverbal subjects. Some approaches predict that all preverbal subjects in null subject languages are base-generated in an A-bar position in a manner similar to Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) (cf. Barbosa 1994 Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998) while other theories assume that at least some preverbal subjects are in an A position (cf. Holmberg 2005 Sheehan 2006). Nevertheless, none of these theories are free of problems and a more detailed analysis of this phenomenon goes beyond the scope of this paper.

‘Maria seems to have spilt it.’

- c. *Pare să-l fi vărsat #Maria/ MARIA*

Seem-3SG SBJV_{PTC}- CL-ACC be spilt Mary/MARY

‘It seems that Mary has spilt it.’

- (52) a. Q: *¿Qué pasó?* (Spanish)

‘What happened?’

- b. *Parece haber botado la leche María.*

Seems-3SG have-INF spilt the milk Mary.

‘It seems that Maria has spilt the milk.’

- c. *#MARIA parece haber botado la leche.*

Mary seems-#SG have-INF spilt the milk

‘Maria seems to have spilt the milk.’

- (53) a. Q: *¿Quién botó la leche?* (Spanish)

‘Who has spilt the milk?’

- b. *MARÍA parece haberla botado.*

Mary seems-3SG have-CL-ACC spilt.

‘Mary seems to have spilt it.’

- c. *Parece haberla botado # María/ MARÍA.*

Seem-3SG have-INF- CL-ACC spilt Mary/MARY

‘It seems that Mary has spilt the milk.’

The above examples show that postverbal subjects can be used both in control and raising in all focused-sentences while (preverbal) left dislocated subjects and right dislocated subjects

are usually preferred when they are focal or bear contrastive focus.

Table 4: Word Order and Information Structure in Spanish (Gabriel 2010)

Information Structure:	All-Focus-Sentence	Focal Subject/Contrastive Focus	Other (e.g. Focal Object)
	a. <i>¿Qué pasó?</i> ‘What happened?’	b. <i>¿Quién botó el diario?</i> ‘Who spilt the milk?’	c. <i>¿Qué botó María?</i> ‘What did Mary spill?’
<i>María botó la leche.</i>	OK	*	OK
<i>MARÍA botó la leche.¹</i>	*	OK	*
<i>Botó María la leche.</i>	OK	*	?
<i>Botó MARÍA la leche.</i>	*	?	*
<i>Botó la LECHE, María.</i>	*	*	OK
<i>Botó la leche MARÍA.</i>	*	OK	*

(S) *María* = Mary, (V) *botó* = spilt-3sg, (O) *la leche* = the milk
1 = the capitals indicate that the element is prosodically marked

In the literature there are two competing analyses concerning the preverbal position of subjects in null subject languages that actually make contradictory predictions regarding the status of preverbal subjects. Some approaches predict that all preverbal subjects in null subject languages are base-generated in an A-bar position in a manner similar to Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) (cf. Barbosa 1994 Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998) while other theories assume that at least some preverbal subjects are in an A position (cf. Holmberg 2005 Sheehan 2006). A compromise to this debate comes from Rizzi’s (2001) proposal

according to which there is agreement in Comp domain, in other words, A positions can be found also in the CP layer. (for a thorough analysis of A, A-bar positions and minimality effects see Rizzi 2001).

Analogically, according to Cardinaletti & Slonsky (2004) there are different positions of clitics too: The first is a high position, licensed independently of the choice of verb, and forming part of the functional projection of IP. The second type of clitic position is lower in the structure since it is contributed by a lexical or by a quasi-functional verb. The phenomenon known as *clitic climbing* triggers the appearance of the clitic pronoun in the clausal (higher) clitic position (cf. Cardinaletti & Slonsky 2004). Crucially, only lexical verbs have a clitic position available and are able to license them¹⁵. In Cardinaletti & Slonsky's view, the optionality of clitic climbing is only apparent in that one and the same verb can be either functional enabling clitic climbing or lexical licensing a lower clitic position. If their analysis is on the right track and it can be extended to Spanish and Romanian, then we can assume that like in the cases of subjects in control, the optional realization of clitics is only apparent: it is triggered by the syntactic architecture of the clause. Both postverbal subjects and enclitic clitics are basis-generated in situ/postverbally and they are licensed by the lexical verbs while preverbal subjects and clitics move in a non-thematic position either due to information structure reasons or to other syntactic reasons such as the skeleton of the IP. However, in this paper I have provided additional evidence that such syntactic reasons that enable or block movement are linked to locality constraints such as the Phase Impenetrability Condition.

¹⁵ The dual nature of restructured verbs as functional, semi-functional or lexical proposed by Cardinaletti & Slonsky (2004) corresponds to the distinction between raising and control verbs. Importantly, Alexiadou et al. (2010) show that aspectual verbs in Greek and Romanian are also ambiguous between raising and control.

4.3 *Locality Effects and Defective Intervention*

This paper provided a movement analysis for control, raising and clitic climbing according to which these three phenomena show similar properties with respect to defective intervention and locality constraints.

So far we have regarded:

Properties of Control/Raising

1. A locality condition prevents it from operating across the boundaries of a tensed clause: CP phase
2. Defective intervention: a topicalized DP

Properties of Clitic Climbing

1. Locality condition: across a v^*
2. Defective intervention: a focused DP

All in all, raising and control are subject to the same locality condition. That is: A movement across a CP in control constructions can be explained in Romanian, Spanish, Greek and Brazilian Portuguese, if C selects a phi or tense-incomplete T and hence, it should not define a strong phase. Hence, I conclude that a locality condition prevents movement from operating across the boundaries of a tensed or a phi-fully specified clause, namely a CP phase as movement is blocked by a topicalized element. In the same vein, since clitic climbing is also a movement based phenomenon like raising and control, it is sensitive to similar conditions: Movement is prevented across a v^* and it is blocked by focused elements.

References

- Alboiu, G. 2007. "Moving forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising". *Ne horizons in the analysis of control and raising* ed. by. W. Davies & S. Dubinsky .187-211. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. 1997. "Toward a Uniform Account of Scrambling and Clitic Doubling". *German: Syntactic Problems – Problematic Syntax* ed. by: Werner Abraham and Elly van Gelderen, 142-161. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag
- Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou. 1998. "Parametrizing Agr: word order, verb movement and EPP-checking." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, pp. 491-539.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. 2001. "The subject in situ generalization and the role of Case in driving computations". *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 193-231.
- Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E., Iordachioaia, G. & M. Marchis. 2009. Backward Control revisited. Invited talk at *Ling-Lunch*, MIT.
- Alexiadou, A, E. Anagnostopoulou, G. Iordachioaia & M. Marchis. 2010. No objection to Backward Control. *Movement theory of Control*. N. Hornstein & M. Polinsky (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia John Benjamins: 89-118.
- Alexiadou, A, E. Anagnostopoulou, G. Iordachioaia & M. Marchis. 2011. A stronger argument for Backward Control. *Proceedings of NELS* 39. Amherst, GLSA: 1-14.
- Alexiadou, A, E Anagnostopoulou, G. Iordăchioaia and M. Marchis. 2012. In Support of Long Distance Agree. In A. Alexiadou, T. Kiss and G. Müller (eds.), *Local Modelling of Nonlocal Dependencies in Syntax*. Linguistische Arbeiten, pp. 55-81.
- Anagnostopoulou. E. 1994. *Clitic Dependencies in Modern Greek*. Ph.D. dissertation, Salzburg University.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. 2003. *The syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Anagnostopoulou, E. 2005. "Cross-linguistic and Cross-Categorial Variation of Datives".
Advances in Greek Generative Syntax: In Honor of Dimitra Theophanopoulou
 Kontou.ed. by. Stavrou, M., Terzi, A, 61-126. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John
 Benjamins.
- Barbosa, P. 1994. "A new Look at the Null Subject Parameter." Paper presented at
CONSOLE III, Venice.
- Bejar, S & D. Massam, D. 1999. "Multiple Case Checking." *Syntax*, 2: 65–79
- Boeckx, C. & A.J. Gallego . 2008. "Clitic Climbing by (LongDistance) Agree". Paper
 presented at *Meeting clitics*. Workshop on explanatory proposals of clitics. Universitat
 Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, 18-29 August 2008.
- Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein, and J. Nunes. 2008. "Copy-reflexive and Copy-control
 Constructions: A Movement Analysis." *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 8:61-99.
- Borgonovo, C & V. Valmala. 2010. "The syntax of Spanish comparative correlatives."
 In: Bok-Bennema, Reineke, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe and Bart Hollebrands
 (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2008: Selected papers from 'Going
 Romance' Groningen 2008*. 2010. x, 251, 17–36.
- Bruening, B. 2014. "Defects of Defective Intervention." *Linguistic Inquiry*, Volume 45, 707-
 719.
- Cardinaletti A. & U. Shlonsky. 2004. "Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian."
Linguistic Inquiry, vol. 35.4, pp. 519-557
- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads. A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York:
 Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, G. 2001. "'Restructuring' and the order of aspectual and root modal heads." In
Current studies in Italian syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi, ed. by Guglielmo
 Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi, 137-155. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Cinque, G. 2003. "The interaction of passive, causative and 'restructuring' in Romance." In

- The syntax of Italian dialects, ed. by Christina Tortora, 50-66. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, G. 2004. “‘Restructuring’ and Functional Structure.” In *Structures and Beyond*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 132-191. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT-Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. “Derivation by Phase.” In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1-52.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. “Minimalist inquiries.” In *Step by step*, ed. R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 89-155
- Chomsky, N & H Lasnik. 1993. “The theory of principles and parameters.” Jacobs, J. & von Stechow, Armin & Sternefeld, Wolfgang & Vennemann, Theo (eds.), *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 506-569.
- Cornilescu, A. 1997. “Some notes on the syntax of the subject”. *Revue roumaine de linguistique XLII*: 101-147
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. “Clitic Doubling, Wh-Movement, and Quantification in Romanian”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 351-397.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1998. Impersonal SE Constructions in Romance and the Passivization of Unergatives. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29, 399-437.
- Farrell, P. 1995. “Backward control in Brazilian Portuguese.” In J. Fuller, H. Han and D. Parkinson (eds.), *Proceedings of ESCOL 11*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University: 116- 127
- Ferreira, M. 2004. “Hyperraising and null subjects in Brazilian Portuguese”. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 47: Collected Papers on Romance Syntax, 57–85.

- Ferreira, M. 2009. "Null subjects and finite control in Brazilian Portuguese". *Minimalist Essays on Brazilian Portuguese Syntax* ed by J. Nunes, 93–120. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Gabriel, C. 2010. "On Focus, Prosody, and Word Order in Argentinean Spanish. A Minimalist OT Account." In: *Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem*, Special issue 4 Optimality-theoretic Syntax, 183-222.
- Gallego, Á. 2011. Clitic movement and feature inheritance. Paper presented at Colloquium on Generative Grammar 21, Sevilla.
- Grosu, A. & J. Horvath. 1987. On non-finiteness in extraction constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 181-196.
- Hartman, J. 2009. "Intervention in tough constructions." In NELS 39, ed. By Suzi Lima, Kevin Mullin, and Brian Smith. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
- Hartman, J. 2012. "(Non-)intervention in A-movement. Some cross-constructional and cross linguistic considerations." *Linguistic Variation* 11:121-148.
- Holmberg, A. 2005. Is There a Little *Pro*? Evidence from Finnish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 533-564.
- Hornstein, N. 1999. "Movement and Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96.
- Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hornstein, N. 2009. *A Theory of Syntax: Minimal Operations and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Iatridou, S. 1990. "About Agr (P)". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 21:551–577.
- Kayne, R. 1975. *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 1989. "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing." In: O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.). *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht, Kluwer, 239-261.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1978. "Case marking, canonical sentence patterns and Counter Equi in Japanese". *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, 30-51. Tokyo: Kaitakusha

- Landau, I. 2003. "Movement out of control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 471-498.
- Landau, I. 2004. "The scale of finiteness and the calculus of Control." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811-877.
- Landau, I. 2007. "Movement resistant aspects of Control." W. Davies & S. Dubinsk (eds.), *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*. Dordrecht: Springer:290-325.
- Manzini, R. 1983. "On Control and Control Theory." *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 421-446.
- Massam, D. 1985. *Case theory and the projection principle*. Ph.D, MIT.
- McGinnis, M. 1998. *Locality in A-Movement*. Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Monahan, P. 2003. Backward object control in Korean. G. Garding and M. Tsujimura (eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 22*, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press: 356-369.
- Motapanyane, V. 1995. *Theoretical implications of complementation in Romanian*. Padova: Unipress.
- Nunes, J. 2008. Inherent Case as a Licensing Condition for A-movement: The Case of Hyper-raising Constructions in Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 7, pp. 83-108.
- Nunes, J. 2010. A Note on Wh-islands and Finite Control in Brazilian Portuguese. *Estudos da Língua(gem)* 8.2: 79-103.
- Ordóñez, F. 2009. "Backwards or in situ? Infinitival overt subjects in Romance." (Handout)
Paper presented at *19th Colloquium on Generative Grammar*. UPV-EHU
- Polinsky, M. & E. Potsdam. 2002. Backward Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 245-282.
- Picallo, C. 1990. "Modal verbs in Catalan." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8, 285-312.
- Pires, A. 2006. *The Minimalist Syntax of Defective Domains: Gerunds and Infinitives*.

- Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Polinsky, M. & E. Potsdam. 2007. Expanding the scope of control and raising. In W. Davies & S. Dubinsky (eds.) *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*. Springer.
- Potsdam, E. 2006. "Malagasy Backward object control and principles of chain reduction." Ms., Univ. of Florida.
- Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, L. 2001. "Relativized Minimality Effects". In: *The Handbook of Syntactic Theory*. Ed. by Mark R. Baltin and Chris Collins. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Roberts, I. 2010. *Agreement and Head Movement*. Linguistic Inquiries Monographs. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rodrigues, C. 2004. *Impoverished morphology and A-movement out of Case domains*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Schäfer, F. 2014. "Integrating Reflexively Marked Medio-Passives into a Formal Typology of Voice." Paper presented at Going Romance, Lisbon.
- Schäfer, F. 2008. *The Syntax of (Anti-)Causatives. External arguments in change-of state contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2006. *The EPP and Null Subjects in Romance*. PhD, Newcastle University.
- Sportiche, D. 1996. "Clitic constructions". In *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, ed. by Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, 213–287. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Subbarao, K. 2003. *Backward control: evidence from Mizo*. Ms. University of Delhi.
- Terzi, A. 1992. *PRO in Finite Clauses: a Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages*. Doctoral dissertation, CUNY.
- Ura, H. 1996. *Multiple Feature-Checking: A Theory of Grammatical Function Splitting*. MIT Ph.D dissertation.

- Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zagona, K. 1982. *Government and Proper Government of Verbal Projections*, PhD. University of Washington.
- Yoon, J H. 1996. "Ambiguity of government and the Chain Condition." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 105–162.