

Icelandic Object Extraposition is still a problem for the MTC: A Reply to Drummond and Hornstein

Jim Wood

Abstract: In Wood 2012, I argued that object extraposition of infinitive clauses in Icelandic reveal a problem for the Movement Theory of Control (MTC). Object extraposition involves a pronoun which, when present, prevents any movement out of the extraposed clause, but allows the control dependency. Drummond and Hornstein (2014) claim that the facts discussed in Wood 2012 are compatible with the MTC. In this reply, I show that their response is based on a misunderstanding of how Icelandic object extraposition works, and that the problem observed in Wood 2012 remains. I also present a novel argument against the MTC by showing that Drummond and Hornstein's account of 'promise'-verbs cannot be extended to Icelandic.

Keywords: movement theory of control, Icelandic, extraposition, promise-verbs, quirky case, infinitives

1 Object Extraposition and the Movement Theory of Control

Thráinsson 1979 contained a detailed study of Icelandic clausal extraposition from the subject and object positions. In the course of this study, Thráinsson (1979) points out that control infinitives can extrapose from subject and object positions as well. In sentences like (1), an optional (case-marked) pronoun *það* ‘it’ may appear; the presence of the pronoun often—but not always, as we will see further below—indicates that extraposition has taken place.¹

- (1) a. Þeir_i ákváðu (það) að PRO_i heimsækja Ólaf.
they.NOM decided (it.ACC) to visit Olaf.ACC
‘They decided to visit Olaf.’ (Adapted from Thráinsson 1979:111,114)
- b. Þeir_i frestuðu (því) að PRO_i hálshöggva fangana.
they.NOM postponed (it.DAT) to execute the.prisoners.ACC
‘They postponed executing the prisoners.’
(Adapted from Thráinsson 1979:228–229)

I argued in Wood 2012 that the availability of this pronoun in Obligatory Control (OC) structures is problematic for the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) (Hornstein 1999; Boeckx and Hornstein 2006; Boeckx et al. 2010a,b). According to the MTC, the surface subject in (1), *þeir* ‘they’, moves from the embedded subject position into the matrix clause by A-movement. The landing site of the movement is the external argument position of the matrix clause, SpecvP. The control reading is derived because the A-chain contains one DP in two θ -positions: in this case, the embedded external argument position and the matrix external argument position.

However, Thráinsson (1979) showed that A'-extraction can occur out of a control clause only when that pronoun is not present, as illustrated with topicalization in (2a).

- (2) a. Ólaf_i ákváðu þeir (*það) að PRO heimsækja t_i.
Olaf.ACC_i decided they.NOM (*it.ACC) to visit t_i
‘Olaf, the decided to visit.’

- b. Fangana_i frestuðu þeir (*því) að PRO hálshöggva t_i.
 the.prisoners.ACC_i postponed they.NOM (*it.DAT) to execute t_i
 ‘The prisoners, they decided to postpone executing.’

Moreover, there are no known cases of A-movement past such pronouns. For example, (3) shows that aspectual verbs can have raising verb syntax, since they preserve the dative case assigned by the embedded verb *leiðast* ‘feel bored’. (4) shows that the extra pronoun is not possible with these verbs.

- (3) Mér { byrjaði / hætti } að leiðast.
 me.DAT { began / stopped } to bore
 ‘I began/stopped feeling bored.’ (Sigurðsson 1989:70)

- (4) Haraldur { byrjaði (*það) / hætti (*því) } að senda henni bréf.
 Harold.NOM { began (*it.ACC) / stopped (*it.DAT) } to send her letters
 ‘Harold began to send her letters.’

(5) shows that these verbs are capable of assigning case to DP objects: *byrja* ‘begin’ assigns accusative and *hætta* ‘stop’ assigns dative. Thus, the problem with the extra pronoun in (4) cannot be that the matrix verb has no way to assign case to it.²

- (5) Þjálfarinn { byrjaði leikinn / hætti leiknum }.
 coach.the.NOM { began game.the.ACC / stopped game.the.DAT }
 ‘The coach {began/stopped} the game.’

My claim in Wood 2012 is that since a control dependency is possible past this pronoun, but no movement dependencies are possible past it, the control dependency should not be modeled as movement as it is currently understood. Of course, the MTC position has repeatedly emphasized that differences between raising constructions and control constructions are not automatically problems for the MTC, since “raising A-movement” and “control A-movement” involve different landing sites; therefore, differences between control and raising constructions could stem from these differences in the landing sites. I considered and dismissed two possible analytical avenues for the MTC, one treating these constructions as non-obligatory control and the other claiming that the pronoun was not in a θ -position, and therefore not an intervener. Since these

points have been left intact by Drummond and Hornstein (2014) (henceforth D&H), I will not discuss them further here.

D&H claim that the facts in Wood 2012 can be handled by the MTC under the assumption that extraposition involves right adjunction to vP. The idea is this. The problem with (4) is that the DP moves to SpecTP, but the extraposed infinitive is adjoined to vP. There are two ways of accomplishing this, and both lead to problems. First, one might adjoin the infinitive to vP, and from there, raise the subject out of the infinitive into the matrix subject position (SpecTP). But this is impossible because an extraposed infinitive is an island for extraction. Second, one might first raise the subject out of the infinitive into the matrix SpecTP, and then adjoin the infinitive to vP. This, however, violates the Extension Condition, which requires that Merge applies to the root of the tree (Chomsky 1995). Since vP is dominated by TP, the clause cannot adjoin to vP after TP has been built. Control clauses, however, are different in that the DP in the infinitive is moving to the matrix SpecvP, not SpecTP. So a subject can move to the matrix SpecvP, and the clause can then adjoin to vP. The problems associated with raising clauses vanish: movement occurs before the clause becomes an island, and adjunction respects the Extension Condition.

I will show that D&H's reply is misguided in its attempt to account for control past the pronoun in terms of the landing site of object extraposition. The presence of the pronoun does not force extraposition, and clauses occurring with the pronoun are islands for extraction whether extraposition takes place or not. Therefore, movement is impossible even before extraposition takes place, and the landing site is irrelevant. Moreover, extraposition does not always force the presence of the pronoun, and when the pronoun is not present, extraposed clauses are not necessarily islands for extraction. Thráinsson (1979) argued in detail that the pronoun underlyingly forms a constituent with the clause, and that this constituent is an island. I will show that facts motivating Thráinsson's analysis carry the same force today that they did in the theory of that time.

2 Constituency

D&H note that Thráinsson (1979) analyzes sentences such as (1), when the pronoun is present, as involving object extraposition, but they do not discuss what Thráinsson's analysis of object extraposition was. Thráinsson (1979) argues at length that the pronoun and the following clause form a constituent, and that when object extraposition takes place, the clause is extraposed out of this complex NP.³ Thráinsson (1979:219–220) cites numerous constituency tests in favor of this conclusion. They include topicalization (6a), left dislocation (6b), it-clefting (6c), passivization (6d), and right-node raising (6e).

- (6) a. [Það að María skuli hafa farið] harma ég ákaflega.
[it that Mary should have gone] regret I deeply
'That Mary went, I deeply regret.'
- b. [Það að María skuli hafa farið], það er hörmulegt.
[it that Mary should have gone], that is deplorable
'That Mary went, that is deplorable.'
- c. Það er [það að María skuli hafa farið] sem Jón harmar ákaflega.
it is [it that Mary should have gone] that John regrets deeply
'It is that Mary went that John deeply regrets.'
- d. [Það að María skuli hafa farið] er almennt harmað.
[it that Mary should have gone] is generally regretted
'That Mary went is generally regretted.'
- e. Jón harmar en Haraldur elskar [það að María skuli hafa farið].
John regrets but Harold loves [it that Mary should have gone]
'John regrets but Harold loves that Mary went.'

I will refer to clauses headed by this pronoun as pronoun-headed clauses (PHCs). Control PHCs also pass constituency tests:⁴ they may be topicalized (7), or undergo contrastive dislocation (8) (Thráinsson 1979, 2007; Zaenen 1980, 1997; Ott 2014a).⁵

- (7) a. [Það að PRO_i heimsækja Ólaf] ákváðu þeir_i, en...
 [it.ACC to visit Olaf] decided they, but...
 ‘They decided to visit Olaf, but...’
- b. [Því að PRO_i hitta Maríu] gleymdi ég_i...
 [it.DAT to meet Mary] forgot I...
 ‘I forgot to meet Mary...’
- (8) a. [Það að PRO_i heimsækja Ólaf], (einmitt) það ákváðu þeir_i.
 [it.ACC to visit Olaf] (exactly) it.ACC decided they
 ‘To visit Olaf, they decided to do just that.’
- b. [Því að PRO_i heimsækja Maríu],
 [it.DAT to visit Mary]
 (einmitt) því gleymdi ég_i alveg.
 (exactly) it.DAT forgot I.NOM completely
 ‘To visit Mary, I completely forgot to do just that.’

There is even further reason, beyond these constituency tests, to believe that the presence of the pronoun does not necessarily indicate that extraposition has applied. According to Thráinsson (1979:221), the sentence in (9b) involves extraposition, while the sentence in (9a) does not. The sentences in (10), then, show that the pronoun itself can only be topicalized when the clause has extraposed: (10a), in which the pronoun is topicalized from the non-extraposed order of (9a), is ungrammatical, while (10b), in which the pronoun is topicalized from the extraposed order of (9b), is grammatical.

- (9) a. Ég veit [**það að María er farin**] alveg fyrir víst.
 I know [it that Mary is gone] quite for sure
- b. Ég veit **það** alveg fyrir víst [**að María er farin**].
 I know it quite for sure [that Mary is gone]
- (10) a. ?* Það veit ég [að María er farin] alveg fyrir víst.
 it know I [that Mary is gone] quite for sure
- b. Það veit ég alveg fyrir víst [að María er farin].
 it know I quite for sure [that Mary is gone]

These facts receive a straightforward explanation: if extraposition does not apply, topicalization moves the entire PHC, yielding sentences like (6a)/(7). If extraposition moves the CP out of the PHC, then topicalization of the DP remnant yields (10b).

Assuming this much, it is straightforward to test whether PHCs are islands when extraposition does not take place; the sentences in (11) verify that they are.

- (11) a. Ég veit [það að Jón elskar Maríu] alveg fyrir vís.
 I.NOM know [it that John.NOM loves Mary.ACC] quite for sure
 ‘I know that John loves Mary for sure.’
 b. *Maríu_i veit ég [það að Jón elskar t_i] alveg fyrir vís.
 Mary.ACC_i know I.NOM [it that John.NOM loves t_i] quite for sure
 INTENDED: ‘Mary I know that John loves for sure.’

Now, one could try to claim that in (11a), the clause in fact has undergone extraposition, and that the adverbial *alveg fyrir vís* ‘for sure’ is simply right adjoined to vP after the clause has adjoined there. This, however, requires a new explanation for (10b), which follows straightforwardly from the assumption that extraposition has not taken place.

To take another example, it has been noted that extraction is possible out of clauses which have undergone right-node raising (RNR).

- (12) [Which official]_i did they say that Bob suspected and Frank proved [that Sally bribed t_i]? (Postal 1998:146)

In Icelandic, too, it is possible to extract out of a RNR clause—as long as the clause is not a PHC (see 6e), as illustrated in (13) (examples due to E.F. Sigurðsson (p.c.)).

- (13) a. Hvern_i elskar Jón en aðrir hata
 who.ACC loves John but others hate
 [(*það) að deildin vill ráða t_i]?
 [(*it.ACC) that the.department wants hire]
 ‘Who does John love but others hate that the department wants to hire?’
 b. Hvern_i er Jón ánægður með en aðrir eru ósáttir við
 who.ACC is John happy with but others are unhappy with

[(*það) að deildin vill ráða t_i]?

[(*it.ACC) that the.department wants hire]

‘Who is John happy with but others unhappy with the department wanting to hire?’

The strength of this argument depends on whether extraposition has taken place in examples like (6e). If we assume that the only parse of (6e) is one in which extraposition has taken place, then (13) does not say anything beyond the general fact that extraction is impossible out of object extraposed clauses. I know of no good reason to suppose that extraposition has taken place in (6e); (6e) simply fits in with all the other constituency tests showing that the pronoun and the CP form a constituent. Why should it not be possible to RNR such a constituent? Moreover, even if extraposition is one possible parse of (6e), the argument goes through so long as it is not the only parse. Suppose there is one parse of (6e) where the pronoun and the CP form a surface constituent, and another where the CP has extraposed out of that constituent. If the islandhood of PHCs derives from extraposition, then extraction should be possible under the parse where extraposition has not taken place. But extraction is not possible at all, which follows from the claim that PHCs are islands whether extraposition takes place or not.⁶

So far, then, we have good reason to believe that for PHCs, the pronoun and the clause form a constituent, and that extraction out of the CP contained in this constituent is not possible, regardless of whether extraposition has taken place. In the next section, this point will be strengthened by an examination of subject extraposition.

3 Subject Extraposition

To appreciate the point about constituency discussed in the previous section, it is important to turn to subject extraposition. In short, subject extraposition shows that it is not extraposition that creates an extraction island *per se*, it is the PHC that is an island for extraction. That is, subject extraposition is sometimes movement of a CP out of a PHC, but sometimes it is just movement of a CP. Only in the former case is the extraposed clause an island. Importantly, Thráinsson (1979) argued that

unlike subject extraposition, CP object extraposition with an overt pronoun is always movement out of a PHC. Thus, object extraposition is an extraction island not because of landing site of extraposition—not even because of extraposition at all—but because object extraposition involves a PHC, and PHCs are extraction islands.

Thráinsson (1979) was investigating a well-known proposal by Rosenbaum (1967), according to which sentential arguments were NPs headed by a sometimes silent pronoun ‘it’. According to this view, extraposition involved movement of the CP (to update the terminology) out of this NP constituent. Thráinsson’s conclusion was that the Rosenbaum structures do exist—but that another option also exists, namely extraposition of the CP leaving behind a dummy pronoun. That is, it cannot be maintained that all CP extraposition involves movement out of an NP.

Consider (14), which can be derived by extraposing the CP out of the PHC in (15a), or by extraposing the clause in (15b) and inserting a dummy expletive.

- (14) Það er merkilegt [að jörðin skuli vera hnöttótt].
 it is interesting [that the.earth should be round]
 ‘It is interesting that the earth is round.’ (Thráinsson 1979:191)

- (15) a. [Það að jörðin skuli vera hnöttótt] er merkilegt.
 [it that the.earth should be round] is interesting
 ‘That the earth is round is interesting.’ (Thráinsson 1979:190)
- b. [Að jörðin skuli vera hnöttótt] er merkilegt.
 [that the.earth should be round] is interesting
 ‘That the earth is round is interesting.’ (Thráinsson 1979:193)

The difference between the two derivations can be seen by forming a yes-no question from the sentence in (14). The dummy pronoun is not retained in such contexts. (16a) is unambiguously derived from a structure such as (15a), while (16b) is unambiguously derived from a structure such as (15b).

- (16) a. Er það (ekki) merkilegt [að jörðin skuli vera hnöttótt]?
 is it (not) interesting [that the.earth should be round]
 ‘Is(n’t) it interesting that the earth is round?’ (Thráinsson 1979:192)

- b. Er (ekki) merkilegt [að jörðin skuli vera hnöttótt]?
 is (not) interesting [that the.earth should be round]
 ‘Is(n’t) it interesting that the earth is round?’ (Thráinsson 1979:194)

At least three further pieces of evidence corroborate this view. First, for many predicates, PHCs require a special discourse context. Thráinsson (1979) notes that with non-factive and semi-factive predicates such as *satt* ‘true’, *líklegt* ‘likely’ and *augljóst* ‘obvious’, the pronoun is often unacceptable without a special discourse context.

- (17) # [Það að Jón hefur étið hákarlinn] er augljóst.
 [it that John has eaten the.shark] is obvious (Thráinsson 1979:181)

If the proposition is mentioned in the discourse first (providing an antecedent for the pronoun), then such sentences are possible, as illustrated with the dialogue in (18).

- (18) A: Það er augljóst að María heldur við Harald og elskar Jón ekki neitt.
 it is obvious that Mary holds with Harold and loves John not at.all
 ‘It’s obvious that Mary’s having an affair with Harold and doesn’t love John at all.’
 B: [Það að María heldur við Harald] er augljóst,
 [it that Mary holds with Harold] is obvious
 (en ég gæti nú samt trúað að hún elskaði Jón).
 but I could now still believe that she loved John
 ‘That Mary’s having an affair with Harold is obvious
 but I could still believe that she loves John.’ (Thráinsson 1979:202)

When the pronoun is retained in non-initial contexts, and the CP extraposes, the same requirement for a special discourse context shows up (Thráinsson 1979:203).

- (19) # Nú er það augljóst að María heldur við Harald.
 now is it obvious that Mary holds with Harold
 ‘Now it’s obvious that Mary’s having an affair with Harold.’

Thus, the same kind of discourse context is required for (a) extraposition sentences where non-initial *það* is retained, and (b) non-extraposed sentences containing a PHC

in the subject position. This correlation supports the view that when the pronoun is retained, it is due to extraposition taking place out of the PHC.

Second, we saw above in example (1b) that *fresta* ‘postpone’ assigns dative to its DP object when there is one. As shown in (20), this pronoun may occupy the subject position when the verb is passivized, even in non-initial contexts.

- (20) Í gær var því frestað að hálshöggva fangana.
yesterday was it.DAT postponed to execute the.prisoners

‘Yesterday, executing the prisoners was postponed.’ (Thráinsson 1979:229)

However, (1b) showed that the pronoun is optional with *fresta* ‘postpone’. Thus, it is also possible to have an extraposition sentence that does not have a dative pronoun in the subject position, as shown in (21a). However, since this pronoun is a dummy, it cannot be retained in non-initial contexts, as illustrated in (21b).

- (21) a. Það var frestað að hálshöggva fangana.
it.NOM was postponed to execute the.prisoners
‘Executing the prisoners was postponed.’ (Thráinsson 1979:228)

- b. Í gær var (*það) frestað að hálshöggva fangana.
yesterday was (*it.NOM) postponed to execute the.prisoners
‘Yesterday, executing the prisoners was postponed.’ (Thráinsson 1979:229)

The source of the contrast between (21b) and (16a) is clear: the pronoun in (16a) is the same one that forms a constituent with the clause in (15a). When a non-initial pronoun is retained in extraposition contexts, it is the pronoun from the PHC. For *fresta* ‘postpone’, that pronoun is dative, so the nominative *það* in (21b) is not possible.

The third point is in fact a variant of the second point. For some verbs, the pronoun is not optional, it is obligatory. For example, *fagna* ‘rejoice’ requires a dative pronoun in order to take a clausal complement, as illustrated in (22a). When verbs with this property are passivized and their clauses extraposed, the pronoun in the subject position must be dative, not nominative, as shown by the contrast between (22b) and (22c).

- (22) a. Ég fagna *(því) að þú skulir vera kominn.
 I rejoice *(it.DAT) that you should be arrived
 ‘I rejoice in your arrival.’
- b. { Því / *Það } er fagnað að þú skulir vera kominn.
 { it.DAT / *it.NOM } is rejoiced that you should be arrived
 (Thráinsson 1979:230)

These facts reinforce the claim above that subject extraposition may take place out of a PHC, stranding the pronoun, or not, leading to a dummy pronoun. When the PHC pronoun is obligatory in the active, the dummy pronoun is impossible in the passive.

We have seen solid evidence that (i) pronouns may form a constituent with a CP clause, and (ii) extraposition only sometimes moves a CP out of this clause; other times, the CP moves in its entirety and leaves a first-position dummy pronoun behind. Given this much, it is straightforward to show that extraction out of an extraposed CP is only banned when a PHC is involved.

- (23) a. *Maríu_i* er hörmulegt [að Jón skuli hafa barið *t_i*]
 Mary.ACC is deplorable [that John should have hit]
 ‘Mary, it’s deplorable that John hit.’ (Thráinsson 1979:195)
- b. **Maríu_i* er það hörmulegt [að Jón skuli hafa barið *t_i*]
 Mary.ACC is it.NOM deplorable [that John should have hit]
 (Thráinsson 1979:196)

In (23a), the object *Maríu* ‘Mary.ACC’ has been extracted out of the embedded clause and topicalized to the matrix CP. The extraction is successful, since the CP is not at any point contained within a PHC. The absence of a PHC is verified by the fact that there is no dummy pronoun; the dummy pronoun only appears in the first position, and since the DP *Maríu* ‘Mary.ACC’ has moved to SpecCP, it is that DP that is in the first position, making the dummy pronoun impossible. In (23b) the pronoun is retained and the sentence is ungrammatical: the retention of the non-initial pronoun indicates extraposition out of a PHC, and PHCs are islands.

By adding one more clause layer, it can even be shown that the overt presence of

það is not the problem. In (24), the intermediate *það* is the dummy pronoun, since it is in the first position (in its clause) and extraction is possible past it.

- (24) Maríu_i segir Ólafur að það sé hörmulegt
 Mary.ACC says Olaf.NOM that it is deplorable

[að Jón skuli hafa barið t_i]

[that John should have hit]

‘Mary, Olaf says it’s deplorable that John hit.’ (Thráinsson 1979:197)

Thráinsson (1979:197) sums up his conclusion as follows: “Thus, it is only the *það* which is unmistakably a remnant of a base generated [_{NP} *það* S] configuration which ‘blocks’ extraction and not just any *það* nor a particular semantic class of predicates.”

What the facts discussed in this and the previous section show is that for the argument against the MTC, it does not matter when extraposition happens, or what projection it targets: the PHC is an extraction island whether extraposition takes a place or not. Moving the controller out of the clause before extraposition takes place does not help anything, because the clause is already an island, before extraposition takes place. The fact that control is possible across this boundary shows that the dependency between PRO and its controller cannot be reduced to A-movement as we currently understand it; my objection in Wood 2012 therefore stands.

4 ‘Promise’ verbs and other issues

The preceding sections have outlined why the response in D&H does not suffice to handle the facts I discussed in Wood 2012. In short, their response is based on a misunderstanding of the analysis of Icelandic object extraposition. However, D&H’s reply raises a number of further issues, a subset of which I will turn to briefly in this section. First, I present a novel argument against the MTC from Icelandic ‘promise’-verbs,⁷ and then discuss a further problem stemming from raising-to-object constructions.

4.1 ‘Promise’ verbs

D&H discuss ‘promise’-type verbs, which seem to be problematic for the MTC.

(25) John_i promised Mary_j [PRO_{i/*j} to leave].

In (25), *John* controls PRO despite the fact that *Mary* seems to intervene, in violation of the Minimal Distance Principle of Rosenbaum (1967). In response to Ndayiragije (2012), D&H cite the solution to this problem proposed in Hornstein 2001 and Boeckx and Hornstein 2003:274, which is to suppose that *Mary* is contained in a PP headed by a null preposition. The ability of *John* to move past *Mary* in ‘promise’-type verbs is thus collapsed with the ability of *John* to move past the PP *to Mary* in raising verbs.

- (26) a. John promised [PP P(=Ø) Mary] [John to leave].
 ↑
 b. John seemed [PP P(=to) Mary] [John to be the best].
 ↑

This explanation cannot extend to Icelandic ‘promise’-type verbs.⁸ In Icelandic, both the DP object of *lofa* ‘promise’ and the experiencer of *virðast* ‘seem’ are dative DPs. Unlike in English, however, the experiencer cannot be skipped by A-movement—it is the experiencer that A-moves to the subject position (Sigurðsson 1996; Boeckx 2000; Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2004; Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008).

- (27) a. Mér_i hefur alltaf virst t_i [Jón vera klár].
 me.DAT has always seemed [John.NOM be clever]
 ‘John has always seemed to me to be clever.’
 b. * Jón_i hefur alltaf virst mér [t_i vera klár].
 John.NOM has always seemed me.DAT [be clever]

The ‘promisee’ of *lofa* ‘promise’ is demonstrably unskippable as well. When it takes two DP objects, both objects are marked dative, as shown in (28a). In the passive, it is the higher object, which expresses the person receiving the promise, that A-moves to the subject position. This object may not be skipped by the lower object.⁹

- (28) a. Þeir hafa lofað bændunum peningunum.
 they have promised the.farmers.DAT the.money.DAT
 ‘They have promised the farmers the money.’
 b. Bændunum_i hefur verið lofað t_i peningunum.
 the.farmers.DAT have been promised the.money.DAT

‘The farmers have been promised the money.’ (Thráinsson 2007:240)

- c. *Peningunum_i hefur verið lofað bændunum t_i.

the.money.DAT has been promised the.farmers.DAT

INTENDED: ‘The money has been promised to the farmers.’

Based on the fact that argumental dative DPs in general, and the object of *lofa* ‘promise’ in particular, cannot be skipped by A-movement, the MTC would lead us to expect that ‘promise’-type control is not possible in Icelandic. This expectation is not borne out; Icelandic behaves exactly like English. Either the subject can be the controller, as in (29a), or the object can be the controller, as in (29b); this is exactly like English, as indicated in the translations. Note also that a PHC is possible in both cases.

- (29) a. Jón_i lofaði mér_j [(því) [að PRO_i berja mig ekki aftur]].
 John.NOM promised me.DAT [(it.DAT) [to beat me not again]]
 ‘John promised me to not beat me again.’
 b. Jón_i lofaði mér_j [(því) [að PRO_j fá að fara bráðum]].
 John.NOM promised me.DAT [(it.DAT) [to get to leave soon]]
 ‘John promised me to be allowed to leave soon.’

To derive (29a), the MTC would require A-movement of *Jón* past *mér* ‘me’ (as well as the pronoun when it is present), and there is no reason to believe that this is possible.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that exactly like English, passives in Icelandic disambiguate the object and subject control readings. The implicit agent cannot control PRO when the object moves to the subject position.¹⁰

- (30) a. *Mér_i var lofað [(því) [að PRO_j berja mig ekki aftur]].
 me.DAT was promised [(it.DAT) [to beat me not again]]
 Like English: ‘*I was promised not to beat me again.’
 b. Mér_i var lofað [(því) [að PRO_i fá að fara bráðum]].
 me.DAT was promised [(it.DAT) [to get to leave soon]]
 ‘I was promised to be allowed to leave soon.’

That is, there is no relevant difference between Icelandic and English ‘promise’-type verbs except that (a) dative case is retained (a general difference between passives

of indirect objects in Icelandic and English), (b) a PHC is possible (a general difference between Icelandic and English control infinitives) and (c) the explanation for ‘promise’-type verbs given by Hornstein (2001), Boeckx and Hornstein (2003) and D&H does not work for Icelandic.

4.2 Raising-to-Object and Extraposition

D&H’s reply raises a number of further issues. D&H (461) note that their account is not easily reconcilable with the view that A’-extraction proceeds through vP edges, as required by the theory of phases in Chomsky 2001.¹¹ It would also seem to be incompatible with Chomsky’s (2008) analysis of ECM as raising-to-object. In brief, Chomsky (2008) proposes that in ECM constructions, V inherits ϕ -features from v* and Agrees with the embedded subject, which then remerges in the matrix SpecVP. In fact, there is long-standing empirical evidence in favor of the claim that ECM constructions involve raising-to-object, going back at least to Postal (1974), and Thráinsson (1979) argued that this is correct for Icelandic as well. If the reason that raising infinitives cannot be extraposed is that they involve A-movement higher than vP, as proposed by D&H, then we might expect that extraposition is possible in raising-to-object constructions. After all, when the embedded subject moves to SpecVP, the landing site is even lower than in the MTC derivation of control clauses. So there should be no problem with extraposing the embedded clause after that. As shown in (31), this is not possible (even though object control into a PHC is possible, as shown earlier in (29b)).

- (31) Hann_i hefur alltaf talið mig í barnaskap sínum_i (*það) vera prest.
 he has always believed me in foolishness REFL (*it.ACC) be priest
 ‘He has always believed me in his foolishness to be a priest.’

Of course, it is always possible (perhaps even likely) that extraposition of raising infinitives is ungrammatical for independent reasons. Perhaps raising infinitives are TPs and control infinitives are CPs, and TPs, for some reason, cannot extrapose. However, this is not what D&H say. They explicitly rule out extraposition of raising infinitives on the grounds that raising targets a particular region of the clause—SpecTP—that

is higher than the vP target of extraposition. That explanation does not extend to raising-to-object constructions.¹²

5 Conclusion

This article has shown that object extraposition remains a problem for the MTC. As argued by Thráinsson (1979), object extraposition is derived from a ‘pronoun-headed clause’ (PHC), a structure where a pronoun forms a constituent with a clause. Movement out of a PHC is impossible regardless of whether or not extraposition takes place. D&H’s attempt to account for the Icelandic facts on the basis of the landing site of extraposition cannot succeed, because the PHC is an island before extraposition takes place, and even if it does not take place. Despite the fact that movement dependencies cannot reach inside PHCs, control dependencies can. The conclusion is that the locality for control is not the same as the locality for movement.

I have furthermore shown that D&H’s reply to Ndayiragije (2012) cannot be extended to Icelandic ‘promise’-type verbs. If we take the locality of A-movement seriously—something that is well-understood for Icelandic—then there is no explanation for why subject control is possible past an object with ‘promise’-type verbs. The object in question is an ordinary dative DP that undergoes ordinary A-movement, and blocks A-movement of DPs past it. If we truly want to understand the various dependencies encoded in natural language, we cannot conclude that control and A-movement dependencies are collapsed. Their locality properties are just not the same.

References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics*. Mouton: Walter de Gruyter.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2000. Quirky agreement. *Studia Linguistica* 54:354–380.
- Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2003. Reply to “Control is not movement”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:269–280.
- Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2006. Control in Icelandic and Theories of Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:591–606.
- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010a. *Control as Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010b. Icelandic Control Really Is A-Movement: Reply to Bobaljik and Landau. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:111–130.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Malden, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, ed. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Drummond, Alex, and Norbert Hornstein. 2014. Some purported problems for the Movement Theory of Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:449–462.
- Fischer, Silke. 2013. Object Extraposition in Germanic – A Challenge for Control Theory? Paper presented at the 28th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop, University of Leipzig.

- Holmberg, Anders, and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2004. Agreement and movement in Icelandic raising constructions. *Lingua* 114:651–673.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69–96.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Koopman, Hilda. 2006. Agreement configurations: In defense of “Spec head”. In *Agreement Systems*, ed. Cedric Boeckx, 159–199. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ndayiragije, Juvénal. 2012. On raising out of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:275–299.
- Ott, Dennis. 2014a. An Ellipsis Approach to Contrastive Left-Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:269–303.
- Ott, Dennis. 2014b. Controlling for Movement: Reply to Wood 2012. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 92:58–65.
- Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and its Theoretical Implications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1998. *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rosenbaum, Peter. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schütze, Carson T. 2003. Syncrretism and double agreement with Icelandic nominative objects. In *Grammatik i fokus/Grammar in focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack 18 November 2003*, ed. Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson, and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson, volume II, 295–303. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages.

- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1989. Verbal Syntax and Case in Icelandic. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Lund.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1996. Icelandic finite verb agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57:1–46.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, and Anders Holmberg. 2008. Icelandic dative intervention: Person and number are separate probes. In *Agreement Restrictions*, ed. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susan Fischer, and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 251–280. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1979. On Complementation in Icelandic. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The Syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Urk, Coppe. 2013. Visser's Generalization: The syntax of control and the passive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44:168–178.
- van Urk, Coppe, and Norvin Richards. 2015. Two components of long-distance extraction: Successive cyclicity in Dinka. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46:113–155.
- Wood, Jim. 2012. Against the 'Movement Theory of Control': Another Argument from Icelandic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:322–330.
- Wood, Jim, and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson. 2014. *Let*-causatives and (a)symmetric DAT-NOM constructions. *Syntax* 17:269–298.
- Zaenen, Annie. 1980. Extraction Rules in Icelandic. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Zaenen, Annie. 1997. Contrastive Dislocation in Dutch and Icelandic. In *Materials*

on Left Dislocation, ed. Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk van Riemsdijk, and Frans Zwarts, 119–148. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and grammatical functions: The Icelandic passive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3:441–483.

Department of Linguistics

Yale University

370 Temple Street

New Haven, CT 06520

Notes

I would like to thank the anonymous *LI* reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions on this paper, as well as Anton Karl Ingason, Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson, Neil Myler, Dennis Ott, and Einar Freyr Sigurðsson (along with anyone I might have forgotten) for numerous helpful discussions. Thanks to Anton Karl Ingason, Einar Freyr Sigurðsson, and Höskuldur Thráinsson for native speaker judgments of Icelandic sentences. I am responsible for any remaining errors.

¹The pronoun has the following forms: *það* ‘nominative/accusative’ (syncretic), *því* ‘dative’, *þess* ‘genitive’. The following abbreviations are used glosses: ACC–accusative, DAT–dative, EXPL–expletive, FEM–feminine, GEN–genitive, INF–infinitive, MASC–masculine, NOM–nominative, SBJV–subjunctive, SG–singular.

²Note, moreover, that according to Thráinsson (1979:279), a pronoun referring to an infinitive clause is in fact possible, *pace* Ott (2014b:61).

- (i) A: Hætti Jón að reykja? B: Já, hann hætti því.
stopped John to smoke yes, he stopped it.DAT
‘Did John stop smoking?’ ‘Yes, he stopped.’

³Thráinsson (1979) uses the notation [_{NP} það S] for his claim; I will assume that the constituent is [_{DP} það CP] (see also Fischer 2013), but nothing hinges on this.

⁴Thanks to Höskuldur Thráinsson and Anton Karl Ingason for judgments of these examples. Anton Karl Ingason finds the contrastive dislocation examples better with a focus particle like *einmitt* ‘exactly’, and Höskuldur Thráinsson emphasizes that the pronoun must be contrastively focused in this construction. In some cases, the Icelandic sentences do not translate naturally into English sentences with similar fronting operations, so I opt for a translation without such fronting. The point, of course, is what Icelandic fronting shows about constituency.

⁵Some constituency tests, such as passivization, do not apply well to control PHCs due to the anaphoric nature of PRO. See Thráinsson 1979:117–118 for discussion. I will take it that the examples in (7) and (8) are enough to show that control clauses headed

by a pronoun do form a constituent with that pronoun, just like the finite clauses do, and that extraposition is movement of the CP out of that constituent.

⁶Ott (2014b) claims that extraposed infinitives are not a problem for the MTC under an analysis which treats extraposition as right dislocation, and a biclausal analysis of right dislocation at that. First of all, Thráinsson (1979) carefully distinguishes between these constructions and right dislocation constructions, and they have distinct prosodic and syntactic properties. So Ott's claim is almost certainly not correct in the general case. Second, (9a) would seem to be a counterexample to any proposal linking the pronoun to its clause by right dislocation only, assuming that the adverbial *alveg fyrir vís* 'quite for sure' is attached to the matrix clause. (Attaching the adverbial to the mostly-deleted clause of the right dislocate might necessitate non-constituent deletion, or unmotivated movement operations, for example.) Finally, Ott (2014b:60) is incorrect when he states that his argument "holds as long as the Right-dislocation parse is available," given a situation where the sentences are "derivationally ambiguous." It is the other way around: if there is a parse which cannot be analyzed as right dislocation—or even as object extraposition at all—and extraction is not possible while control is, then the argument against the MTC goes through.

⁷The relevance of 'promise'-verbs to the MTC has in general been widely discussed, as the references below show, but Icelandic 'promise'-verbs have not, to my knowledge, figured in this discussion.

⁸Thanks to E.F. Sigurðsson for discussion of the facts in this section.

⁹See Zaenen et al. (1985) and Wood and Sigurðsson (2014), *inter alia*.

¹⁰At first glance, it would seem as though these facts are counter-examples to van Urk's (2013) claim (based on Landau's (2000) system) that effects like this are limited to cases where T agrees with an overt DP. In (30), the subject is dative, so T has default agreement. However, there are actually reasons to think that T does abstractly agree with non-nominative subjects in Icelandic (in at least some features), and this has been proposed numerous times, for example by Boeckx (2000), Anagnostopoulou (2003),

Schütze (2003), Koopman (2006) and Sigurðsson and Holmberg (2008). Under this hypothesis, the Icelandic facts are exactly as van Urk (2013) would expect them to be.

¹¹See van Urk and Richards (2015) for recent evidence that DPs undergoing A'-movement do move through vP edges.

¹²The point of invoking raising infinitives in the first place was simply that there are no contexts where we see positive evidence of A-movement out of a PHC; raising infinitives are closer than any other structures to having the properties where we might expect such movement to be possible. A review, for example, suggests that if raising clauses are TPs and control clauses CPs, perhaps the PHC pronoun can only combine with CPs. This is entirely possible; but the point here is that we find no cases where anything can A-move or A'-move out of a PHC, and a control dependency into the PHC is nevertheless systematically allowed.