Chapter 7

Inflected infinitives and restructuring in Brazilian Portuguese

Marcello Modesto[1]

7.1. Introduction

The central question discussed in this chapter revolves around the contrast of two different classes of predicates in Brazilian Portuguese (BP), shown in (1)–(2). The class represented in (1) includes propositional (epistemic and declarative), factive, and desiderative predicates and so can be equated to the partial control (PC) class of Landau (2000, 2004, 2015). The verbs in (2) are implicative, modal, and aspectual, comprising Landau's exhaustive control (EC) class.[2]

---

[1] This article is part of the State University of Campinas project "Portuguese in space and time: linguistic contact, grammars in competition and parametric change" (FAPESP 12/06078-9). I would like to thank the editors of this volume for promoting the "Romania Nova" meetings, where this work was firstly presented, and for organizing this book, as well as both anonymous reviewers for their comments. Remaining errors are mine.

[2] The subject of nonfinite clauses is usually dubbed PRO and has been analyzed as an anaphor lacking a binding domain, hence exempt from the binding theory (Manzini 1983; Sag and Pollard 1991), an anaphor of sorts (Lebeaux 1984; Borer 1985), a pronoun (Bouchard 1984; Koster 1984; Hornstein and Lightfoot 1987), and a pronominal anaphor (Chomsky 1981, 1986; see also Kayne 1991). More recently, it has been argued (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993) that PRO is assigned a special "nonlexical," or null, case by nonfinite inflection (and the only DP that can bear that case is PRO); or that PRO is in fact a trace of A-movement of the nonfinite subject (Hornstein 1999). My use of PRO here is noncommittal to any analysis. The notation PRO_{1+}

(1) a. A presidente$_1$ disse PRO$_{1+}$ estarem trabalhando em prol da igualdade social.[3]

the president said be-INF-3PL working in favor of.the equality social

'The president said that they are working for social justice.'

b. A presidente$_1$ acredita PRO$_{1+}$ terem contido a inflação.

the president believes have-INF-3PL held the inflation

'The president believes that they have held down inflation.'

c. A presidente$_1$ resolveu PRO$_{1+}$ trabalharem também nos feriados.

the president decided work-INF-3PL also in.the holidays

'The president decided (for them) to work during the holidays too.'

(2) a. ??A presidente$_1$ conseguiu PRO$_{1+}$ se elegerem.[4]

the president managed SELF elect-INF-3PL

'The president managed (for her cabinet) to get elected.'

b. ??A presidente$_1$ começou a PRO$_{1+}$ trabalharem.

the president started PREP work-INF-3PL

'The president started working.'

---

indicates that the controller is included in a group of individuals previously defined by linguistic or extralinguistic context.

[3] That the structures in (1) do in fact involve control of the nonfinite clause subject is extensively argued for in Modesto (2010, in press).

[4] The sentences in (2) are not usual in speech, so Modesto (2010) finds them ungrammatical. Since some instances of nonfinite inflection in the complement of EC predicates have been attested, we do not consider such structures to be ungrammatical here, just unusual, in consonance with Modesto (in press).

c. ??A presidente$_1$ precisa PRO$_{1+}$ acabarem com a fome no Brasil.
the president needs eradicate-INF-3PL with the hunger in.the Brazil
'The president needs to eradicate hunger in Brazil.'

The fact that some predicates may take inflected nonfinite complements and other predicates only uninflected ones, as shown previously, seems to indicate that we are dealing with two different "types" of complements. Most theories of control take for granted that all nonfinite complements are CPs (see Chomsky 1981; Chomsky and Lasnik 1993; Bošković 1997; Hornstein 1999; Martin 2001; Hornstein and Polinsky 2010, among many others; Landau 2013 shows some arguments that nonfinite complements should be CPs) or at least TPs (see Bowers 2008).[5] This is true even in Landau's (2000, 2004) analysis of control, where the possibility of PC and EC interpretations is tied to the presence of semantic tense in the nonfinite complement. The significance of the BP data is showing that PC interpretations are connected to a structural difference between the two types of nonfinite complements.[6] This seems to indicate that complements with no semantic tense may be truncated phrases (lacking TP), as argued by Wurmbrand (2001) and Grano (2012). Wurmbrand showed that, in German, the size of EC complements may vary. BP speakers seem more resistant to use a nonrestructuring complement with EC predicates, but they are not ungrammatical (as assumed in footnote 3).

I argue here that EC predicates are restructuring predicates taking a nonfinite vP[7] complement, whereas PC are lexical predicates that take clausal (TPs or CPs) complements. If

[5] In some approaches, nonfinite clauses are VPs (see Chierchia, 1984; Dowty 1985; Pollard and Sag 1994; Bresnan 2001) but also uniformly.

[6] This is, in fact, also the conclusion reached by Landau (2015).

[7] In fact, I mean any phasal projection below TP.

EC predicates are functional items, as defended by Grano (2012),[8] the matrix subject (the controller) is actually moved from the nonfinite vP in EC structures and only PC complements would have a PRO subject. As noted by Grano (2012, p. 17), "a primary virtue of this core proposal is that the exhaustive control behavior of predicates in this class becomes a trivial consequence of the fact that the controller and controlled positions are members of the same A-chain; by the same token, the availability of partial control becomes a fully general property of PRO." (See also Cinque 2006, where a similar point is made about EC/PC and restructuring.)

To put the following discussion in a nutshell: Landau (2000, 2004) delimited the PC and the EC class in English[9] (and supposed that they should be constant cross-linguistically). He identified them with f-subjunctives and c-subjunctives, respectively, in Balkan languages, which are two classes that have been discussed extensively (see Terzi 1992; Iatridou 1993; Varlokosta 1993; Varlokosta and Hornstein 1993; Krapova 2001; Spyropoulos 2008; Kapetangianni and Seely 2008). Others have explored another division in two large classes that reoccur in many languages: restructuring and nonrestructuring predicates (see Rizzi 1978; Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004; Cinque 2006; Wurmbrand 2001; Hinterhölzl 2006). In this case, Landau thinks they are different classes. Grano (2012) argues against Landau's objections and proposes that all EC predicates are restructuring. BP data is shown here to corroborate Grano's proposal in at least two respects: EC predicates do give rise to restructuring symptoms, and only PC complements are usually inflected.

---

[8] Grano (2012) assumes the theory in Cinque (2006), where restructuring predicates realize functional heads in a universal hierarchy. Rosen (1991) had already proposed a similar idea.

[9] The partial control phenomenon had been noticed before (see Wilkinson 1971; Williams 1980; Martin 1996; Wurmbrand 1998).

Grano's (2012) analysis covers a considerable empirical terrain. It accounts for reconstruction phenomena; it explains why EC predicates exhibit restructuring symptoms; it accounts for the existence of two types of "subjunctives" in Balkan languages and in fact two classes of control verbs in every language. It accounts both for the BP facts (see Modesto 2010, in press), which seem to demonstrate the existence of a nonfinite subject different from the controller (call it PRO) in PC complements, and for the evidence of backward control in Balkan languages, since this is observed only with EC verbs (see Alexiadou et al. 2010).

In Section 7.2, I review Granos's analysis. Section 7.3 discusses inflected infinitives in BP and EP and shows that, despite differences in licensing overt subjects, the two classes of predicates behave similarly in the two varieties: PC complements are possibly inflected; EC complements cannot usually inflect. Section 7.4 examines EC complements in BP and shows that their behavior is consistent with a restructuring analysis. Section 7.5 offers a conclusion.

7.2. Control, restructuring, and the PC/EP split

7.2.1. Grano's correlations

Grano (2012) starts by observing that the class of predicates that can take a finite complement in English is largely coincidental with the class of PC predicates as defined by Landau (2000, 2004), as seen in (3)–(6):[10]

(3) a. John claimed [to get an A].

b. John expected [to get an A].

[10] A few apparent exceptions to this generalization, like the verbs *remember* and *forget*, are shown by Grano not to be real exceptions, because the variants that admit finite complements are not implicative but rather factive.

c. John planned [to get an A].

(4) a. John tried [to get an A].

b. John had [to get an A].

c. John started [to get an A].

(5) a. John claimed [that he got an A].

b. John expected [that he got an A].

c. John planned [that he got an A].

(6) a. *John tried [that he got an A].

b. *John had [that he got an A].

c. *John started [that he got an A].

Second, he contends that PC predicates admit overt embedded subjects, whereas EC predicates do not. Half of this generalization follows trivially from the finite complementation patterns discussed earlier, but the other half (that EC predicates are never ECM) does not automatically follow from the lack of finite complementation. This generalization is also at work in Balkan languages, and it does give the correct results, as also noted by Landau (2004): the PC class in Balkan languages take f-subjunctive complements, which may contain a free referring overt subject; the EC class, on the other hand, take c-subjunctives, which do not admit lexical subjects:

(7) a. O Yanis tolmise na figi (*o Kostas).
the Yanis dared PRT leave the Kostas
'Yanis dared (*for Kostas) to leave.'

b. O Yanis elpizi na figi (o Kostas).
the Yanis hopes PRT leave the Kostas
'Yanis hopes that he/Kostas will leave.'

Next, Grano argues that EC predicates restructure and PC predicates do not. This generalization in fact was observed by Wurmbrand (1998) and is subsequently discussed by Landau (2000), Wurmbrand (2001), Barrie (2004), and Cinque (2006), who accept the claim in varying degrees. Wurmbrand (2001) and Landau (2004), for instance, do not believe that all restructuring predicates belong to the EC class, given that verbs like *want* (and *intend*) seem to restructure in most languages and yet allow PC interpretations. Grano devotes a chapter to explaining the particularities of *want* (which is not of concern here) and shows that, explaining away a few exceptions and cross-linguistic variation, the picture that emerges is a double implication between EC and restructuring. Grano's conclusion is in accordance with the findings in Wurmbrand (2015), an extensive study about reconstruction.

The last generalization has to do with subject orientation of PC predicates: EC predicates do not always entail something about their subject but PC predicates always do. This discussion is built on an observation that goes back at least to Perlmutter (1970) that aspectual and modal verbs are ambiguous between raising and control structures. Grano's argumentation goes in two directions: on the one hand, it subscribes to recent claims that those predicates only have a raising syntax (see Bhatt 1998; Wurmbrand 1999; Rochete 1999; Fukuda 2012); on the other, it claims to be possible to include *try* and implicative predicates in general in the class of raising predicates by assuming that those predicates introduce a pronoun that is bound by the raised subject.

Throughout, Grano (2012) assumes another generalization, due to Landau (2000, 2004): PC complements are tensed and EC complements are untensed, which follows from the fact that EC predicates are functional (restructuring) items. The developments in Wurmbrand (2014) and

Landau (2015), however, seem to show that the correct distinction is not between Tensed and un-Tensed complements but between attitudinal and nonattitudinal complements.

7.2.2. Explaining the correlations

In order to explain the correlations listed in (8), Grano (2012) assumes Cinque's (2006) suggestion that EC verbs are uniformly functional heads in the inflectional layer of the clause. Realizing either a Mood or an Aspect head, EC predicates are merged to a vP (possibly topped by functional structure below the EC predicate in Cinque's hierarchy). The crucial point is that EC structures are monoclausal and PC structures are biclausal. This explains the five generalizations discussed previously:

(8) a. Finite complementation: PC predicates admit finite complements; EC predicates do not.

b. Overt embedded subjects: PC predicates admit overt embedded subjects; EC predicates do not.

c. Restructuring: EC predicates restructure; PC predicates do not.

d. Subject orientation: EC predicates do not always entail something about their subject; PC predicates always do.

e. Tense: PC complements are tensed; EC are not (with caveats).

Generalizations (8b-e) follow with no problems. Since EC complements have no T projection, they are untensed (tense is always "anaphoric" in the sense of Landau [2004]); overt subjects are not licensed, and restructuring effects obtain. Since the subject is raised from the EC complement to the "matrix" subject position, some EC predicates do not entail anything about their subjects. The ones that do are analyzed by Grano as introducing a pronoun that is bound by the subject after movement to Spec T.

The generalization (8a) is meant as a generalization about the distribution of finite complements in English. However, unlike the other four generalizations, the first one is difficult to maintain cross-linguistically. Verbs like *want*, *try,* and *manage* do take finite complements in many languages. In Greek, for example, in which some desiderative and implicative verbs take complements with "dependent" tense (which may license overt subjects; see Spyropoulos 2008), Grano (2012) assumes that those verbs may optionally embed a silent main verb $Ø_{have}$ (and that does, in fact, vary across languages). In Portuguese, a verb like *conseguir* 'to manage' may take finite subjunctive complements:

(9) O Pedro conseguiu que a Maria ficasse em casa.
the Pedro managed that the Maria stayed.SUBJ in home
'Pedro succeeded in keeping Maria home.'

It would be possible to assume, with Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2004) that (at least some) restructuring predicates have both lexical and functional uses, which would explain why some EC predicates take finite complements in some languages. However, Grano's analysis is more restrictive, and, therefore, it should be preferred if tenable. In fact, the BP data in (1) and (2) provide an argument that EC predicates do not usually have lexical incarnations. If they did, the explanation as to why EC complements do not generally inflect would be lost, or it would have to be assumed that EC predicates are always functional when the complement is nonfinite. Otherwise, assuming that some EC predicates may embed $Ø_{have}$ gives the correct results under the more plausible assumption that this silent verb subcategorizes for subjunctive clauses in BP. Still, it is a fact that, in German (Wurmbrand 2001), restructuring of EC complements is optional, which argues against Grano's obligatory reconstruction. Since restructuring can be tracked in BP by the presence of nonfinite inflection, accepting the sentences in (2) as

grammatical would mean that restructuring is also optional in BP, though non-restructuring EC complements are much more unusual in BP than in German.

7.3. Inflected complements in EP and BP

In the Government and Binding (GB) era, there was a consensus that inflected infinitives always appear with subjects that are either pronominal (null or overt) or lexical (full DPs), whereas uninflected infinitives can only have PRO subjects, in all nonfinite contexts. This is (tacitly or explicitly) assumed in Rouveret (1980), Negrão (1986), Raposo (1987), Lightfoot (1991), Ambar (1994, 1998), Quicoli (1996), Safir (1996), Pires (2001), Miller (2002), and Landau (2004), which shows that relating PRO with lack of inflection remains a common theoretical stance to this day. Such a consensus arose both from theory internal reasons (PRO was barred from appearing in governed or Case-marked positions, and nonfinite inflection was taken to be a governor/Case-assigner) and due to EP data, mainly from Raposo (1987). Raposo's (see also Ambar 1994; Madeira 1994; Galves 2001) main concern was to explain why nonfinite inflection licenses an overt subject in propositional and factive complements but not in desiderative ones, as seen in (10a–b) versus (10c).

(10) EP

a. Eu penso terem os deputados trabalhado pouco.
I think have.INF.3PL the deputies worked little
'I think that the deputies did not work much.'

b. Eu lamento os deputados terem trabalhado pouco.
I regret the deputies have.INF.3PL worked little
'I regret that the deputies did not work much.'

c. *Eu desejava terem os deputados trabalhado mais.

I wished have.INF.3PL the deputies worked more

'I wish the deputies have worked harder.'

In Raposo's analysis, nonfinite AGR itself has to be licensed by Case, and that is not possible in (10c). With (10c) explained away, it was then possible to maintain that nonfinite agreement always licenses a subject with independent reference, whereas noninflected infinitives are used in control structures. However, the GB consensus left unexplained the fact that object control structures are normally inflected (which is mentioned in Raposo 1989) and that the complement of desiderative predicates is also possibly inflected, as noted by Madeira (1994):

(11) *EP*

a. Eu persuadi os rapazes a virem mais cedo.

I persuaded the boys to come.INF.3PL more early

'I persuaded the boys to come earlier.'

b. Prometemos comprarmos-lhe um presente. (adapted from Madeira 1994)

(we) promised buy.INF.1PL-CL one present

'We promised to buy her a present.'

The data discussed in Modesto (2010, 2011, in press) indicates that the GB consensus was in fact mistaken; nonfinite inflection normally appears in control structures in BP (and possibly also EP). The facts, then, are not very different in the two varieties; in EP, like in BP, the two classes of complements behave differently: PC complements can be inflected and EC complements cannot (see (12)).

(12) *EP*

a. *Tentamos comprarmos-lhe um presente.

(we) tried buy.INF.1PL-CL one present

'We tried to buy her a present.'

b. *Os miúdos começaram a correrem.

the kids started to run.INF.3PL

'The kids started to run.'

Despite that similarity, there are some differences between EP and BP (with respect to inflected nonfinite clauses). BP accepts overt subjects in the complement of desiderative predicates and does not allow referential null subjects (in nonfinite and finite clauses alike). In EP, example (13) contains a null *pro* subject licensed by nonfinite inflection which is capable of referring to the Clintons inside the DP. In BP, however, since inflection is not capable of licensing null referential subject even in finite contexts (cf. Modesto 2000, 2008; Rodrigues 2004), example (13) is ungrammatical.

(13) EP/*BP

[A filha dos Clinton$_1$]$_2$ lamentou *ec*$_1$ terem perdido as eleições.

the daughter of.the Clinton regretted have-INF-3PL lost the elections

'The daughter of the Clintons regretted that they lost the elections.'

The assumption that nonfinite inflection licenses *pro* in EP has not been contested and is not discussed here for lack of space. For BP, as shown in Modesto (in press), all null subjects of nonfinite clauses are controlled, irrespective of inflection, though overt subjects are also licensed

in the same contexts (see Sundaresan and McFadden 2009; Sundaresan 2014; McFadden and Sundaresan 2014; Modesto (in press) for a fuller discussion).[11]

7.4. EC complements in BP

As mentioned in the introduction, the classes of PC and EC predicates in BP can be differentiated by one crucial property: PC complements may be inflected and EC complements cannot, as seen in (1) and (2), repeated here.

(1) a. A presidente$_1$ disse PRO$_{1+}$ estarem trabalhando em prol da igualdade social.
the president said be-INF-3PL working in favor of.the equality social
'The president said that they are working for social justice.'

b. A presidente$_1$ acredita PRO$_{1+}$ terem contido a inflação.
the president believes have-INF-3PL held the inflation
'The president believes that they have held down inflation.'

c. A presidente$_1$ resolveu PRO$_{1+}$ trabalharem também nos feriados.
the president decided work-INF-3PL also in.the holidays
'The president decided (for them) to work during the holidays too.'

(2) a. ??A presidente$_1$ conseguiu PRO$_{1+}$ se elegerem.
the president managed SELF elect-INF-3PL
'The president managed (for her cabinet) to get elected.'

[11] I have eschewed from the discussion the fact that nonfinite inflection does license overt subjects in BP and EP in subject clauses, nonfinite complements of prepositions, perception verbs, and causatives. These matters cannot be discussed here for lack of space.

b. ??A presidente$_1$ começou a PRO$_{1+}$ trabalharem.

the president started PREP work-INF-3PL

'The president started working.'

c. ??A presidente$_1$ precisa PRO$_{1+}$ acabarem com a fome no Brasil.

the president needs eradicate-INF-3PL with the hunger in.the Brazil

'The president needs to eradicate hunger in Brazil.'

As seen in (1), nonfinite inflection may be used in BP to give rise to a PC control interpretation, which shows that Landau's (2000, 2004) description of PC phenomena was in fact correct (contra Hornstein 2003; Boeckx and Hornstein 2004; Bowers 2008). However, nonfinite inflection can also be used in BP in control structures with EC interpretation (as long as the matrix predicate belongs to the PC class). This is seen in (14).

(14) a. Cientistas afirmam terem descoberto a cura do câncer.

scientists claim have.INF.3PL found the cure of.the cancer

'Scientists claim to have found the cure for cancer.'

b. Os amantes lamentaram estarem tão distantes um do outro.

the lovers lamented be.INF.3PL so distant one of.the other

'The lovers regretted being so distant from each other.'

c. Os estudantes decidiram não chegarem todos ao mesmo tempo.

the students decided not arrive.INF.3PL all at.the same time

'The students decided not to arrive all at the same time.'

d. Os meninos tentaram/começaram a/precisam trabalhar(*em).

the boys tried / started to / need work.INF(*.3PL)

'The boys tried / started / need to work.'

The fact that EC complements are not usually inflected is explained by Grano's (2012) analysis. If modal, aspectual and implicative predicates are functional elements; there is no T (or Agr) projection in the embedded clause and, therefore, the complement of such predicates cannot be inflected. If that is the correct analysis, EC complements should show restructuring effects in BP. In what follows, I argue that EC complements in fact do show transparency effects. The argument involves NPIs, licensing of auxiliaries, the possibility of low adverbs, and quantifier scope. However, as mentioned before, it may be the case that reconstruction with EC complements is in fact optional in BP.

The core restructuring effect in Romance is clitic climbing (see Rizzi 1978; Luján 1980; Zubizarreta 1982; Burzio 1986; Kayne 1989; Uriagereka 1995; Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004; Cinque 2006). However, clitic climbing is not a general property of Romance languages, since it is absent in French and BP, and, even in the languages where it is common, it is not obligatory. Since clitic climbing is optional in those languages that allow it, we can conclude that, although clitic climbing implies restructuring, restructuring does not force clitic climbing. The fact, then, that BP never shows clitic climbing does not tell us whether restructuring occurs. See Wurmbrand (2015) for the same claim.

The first indication that EC predicates are restructuring is the licensing of NPIs like *nunca* 'never'. In (15), it is shown that *nunca* is licensed by a clause-mate negation in finite contexts. The same is true when the NPI is in a nonfinite complement to a desiderative verb like *decidir* 'to decide':

(15) a. *A Lina disse que ela vai sair nunca.
the Lina said that she will leave.INF never
'Lina said that she would never leave.'

b. *A Lina não disse que ela vai sair nunca.

the Lina not said that she will leave.INF never

'Lina didn't say that she would never leave.'

c. A Lina disse que ela não vai sair nunca.

the Lina said that she not will leave.INF never

'Lina said that she would never leave.'

(16) a. *A Lina decidiu sair nunca (mais).

the Lina decided leave.INF never (more)

'Lina decided never to leave.'

b. *A Lina não decidiu sair nunca (mais).

the Lina not decided leave.INF never (more)

'Lina didn't decided never to leave.'

c. A Lina decidiu não sair nunca (mais).

the Lina decided not leave.INF never (more)

'Lina decided never to leave.'

In the complement of EC verbs, on the other hand, matrix negation is enough to license the NPI:

(17) a. A Lina não tenta ajudar nunca à sua mãe.

the Lina not tries help.INF never to her mother

'Lina never tries to help her mother.'

b. A Lina não começa a estudar nunca.

the Lina not start PREP study.INF never

'Lina never starts to study.'

c. Os meninos não precisam trabalhar nunca.

the boys not need work.INF nothing

'The boys never have to work.'

Sentence (18) shows that negation may appear in the complement of an EC predicate. However, in those contexts, negation does not license NPIs, which seems to show that negation in (18) is best analyzed as constituent negation.

(18) Eu tentei não atrapalhar.

I tried not get.in.the.way

'I tried not to get in the way.'

(19) a. Os meninos tentam não atrapalhar (*nunca).

the boys try not be-in-the-way.INF never

'The boys try not to be in the way.'

b. Os meninos começaram a não estudar (*nunca).

the boys started PREP not study.INF never

'The boys started not to study.'

c. Os meninos podem não trabalhar (??nunca).

the boys may not work.INF never

'The boys may not work.'

The fact that EC complements are structurally reduced can also be seen by the fact that no auxiliary is licensed, which is in contrast with PC complements.

(20) a. O João acredita estar perdendo.

the João believes be.INF loosing

'João believes to be loosing.'

b. O João odiou ter ido.

the João hated have.INF gone

'João hated to have gone.'

(21) a. *O João começou a estar perdendo.

the João started PREP be.INF loosing

'João started loosing.'

b. *O João tentou ter ido.

the João tried have.INF gone

'João tried to have gone.'

Another difference between EC and PC complements is related to licensing of low adverbs (adverbs that appear low in Cinque's hierarchy). EC complements do not license a low adverb like *já* 'already', whereas PC complements do:

(22) a. A Lina reconheceu já falar alemão.

the Lina acknowledged already speak.INF German

'Lina acknowledged to speak German already.'

b. A Lina queria já estar lá.

the Lina wanted already be.INF there

'Lina wanted to be there already.'

c. *A Lina conseguiu já falar alemão.

the Lina managed already speak.INF German

'Lina managed to already speak German.'

d. *A Lina precisa já estar lá.
the Lina needs already be.INF there
'Lina needs to be there already.'

The interpretation of universal quantifiers in PC and EC complements is also different. While universal quantifiers can take wide scope outside the nonfinite complement of EC complements, these readings are impossible when the quantifier appears in a PC complement. Example (23a) is ambiguous: it may mean that for every girl *x* in his class, Pedro tried to go out with *x*, or it may mean that Pedro tried to go out with the group of girls in his class. Sentence (23b), on the other hand, lacks the first reading: it may not mean that for every *x*, Pedro decided to go out with *x*.

(23) a. O Pedro tentou sair com todas as meninas da classe.
the Pedro tried go.out.INF with all the girls in.the class
'Pedro tried to go out with all/each girl in the class.'

b. O Pedro decidiu sair com todas as meninas da classe.
The Pedro decided go.out.INF with all the girls in.the class
'Pedro decided to go out with all/*each girl in the class.'

Consider now the equivalent to Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD) in BP. With EC predicates (24a–b), the complement of both matrix and embedded verbs may be deleted; with PC predicates, however, deletion of the matrix complement leads to ungrammaticality (see (24c)).

(24) a. O Pedro conseguiu resolver todo problema que a Maria conseguiu.
the Pedro managed solve.INF every problem that the Maria managed
'Pedro managed to solve every problem that Maria did.'

b. O Pedro conseguiu resolver todo problema que a Maria resolveu.
the Pedro managed solve.INF every problem that the Maria solved
'Pedro wanted to solve every problem that Maria did.'

c. *O Pedro disse ter resolvido todo problema que a Maria disse.
the Pedro said have.INF solved every problem that the Maria said
'Pedro said to have solved every problem that Maria did.'

d. O Pedro disse ter resolvido todo problema que a Maria resolveu.
the Pedro said have.INF solved every problem that the Maria solved
'Pedro said to have solved every problem that Maria did.'

Although an analysis of ACD in BP is beyond the scope of the present chapter, the facts in (24) corroborate the claim that there is a crucial difference between the complement of implicative verbs like *conseguir* 'to manage' and propositional verbs like *dizer* 'to say', as argued by many.

The data reviewed here provides considerable evidence that EC complements are structurally smaller than PC complements (as argued by Wurmbrand 2001 and Grano 2012, though see Wurmbrand 2015). Assuming that EC complements are bare vPs, we would explain the impossibility of nonfinite inflection in EC complements. Construing TPs as the complement of EC predicates may not be ungrammatical, however, as mentioned before.

The gist of Grano's (2012) analysis is that EC creates an identity effect (between the controller and the controllee) and therefore is consistent with a movement relation between the two positions. PC, on the other hand, creates a nonidentity effect (which is clearly seen in BP) and hence lends support for an agreement relation between controller and controllee. Since the nonidentity effect of control is seen in BP by the fact that verbal agreement is different in the complement and the matrix predicates of (partial) control structures in BP, it becomes important

to make sure that such an effect does not take place in raising structures. The examples in (25) show that there is no "partial raising," as expected.

(25) a. *O Pedro parece estarem contentes.
the Pedro seems be.INF.3PL happy
'Pedro seems that they are happy.'

b. *O Pedro custou pra saírem.
the Pedro cost to leave.INF.3PL
'Pedro took a long time (for them) to leave.'

However, the fact that control structures may be inflected in BP may lead to the expectation that the same should be the case with raising. The ungrammaticality of (26) shows that this is not the case, which seems to indicate that raising nonfinite complements are also truncated complements (as argued by Wurmbrand 2013).

(26) a. Os meninos parecem estar(*em) contentes.
the boys seems be.INF.3PL happy
'The boys seem to be happy.'

b. Os meninos custaram pra saír(*em).
the boys cost to leave.INF.3PL
'The boys took a long time to leave.'

7.5. Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that the distribution of nonfinite inflection in control structures in BP may corroborate the analysis in Grano (2012), in which EC predicates are inserted as functional heads in a cinquean hierarchy, taking a vP as complement. Not having a T projection, EC complements in BP cannot be inflected and show restructuring effects: NPIs may be licensed

by “matrix” negation; some adverbs are not licensed; EC and PC predicates behave differently in ACD contexts; and EC complements allow high readings of quantifiers that are not allowed out of PC complements. If this analysis is on the right track, it implies that the division in two classes of predicates is universal, each language expressing it in a particular way. As mentioned by Grano, a desirable consequence of the analysis is to equate EC with raising, making PC readings a diagnostic for the presence of PRO. If, however, T and inflection are grammatical in EC complements in BP, BP data seems to support a less radical view than Grano’s. EC complements are always restructuring (as in Landau 2015), but the size of the complement may vary (as in Wurmbrand 2001, 2015), sometimes including a TP and sometimes not. The most relevant empirical contribution of this work is to show that there is restructuring also in BP, a language without clitic climbing (also in consonance with Wurmbrand 2015).

References

Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordăchioaia, and Mihaela Marchis. (2010). No objections to backward control. In N. Hornstein and M. Polinsky (eds.), *Movement Theory of Control*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 89–117.

Ambar, Manuela. (1994). “Aux-to-comp” and lexical restrictions on verb movement. In G. Cinque, J. Koster, J. Y. Pollock, L. Rizzi and R. Zanuttini (eds.), *Paths towards Universal Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–24.

Ambar, Manuela. (1998). Inflected infinitives revisited: Genericity and single event. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 43: 5–36.

Barrie, Michael. (2004). Moving toward partial control. In K. Moulton and M. Wolf (eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th Meeting of the North East Linguistics Society*, Vol. 1. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Graduate Linguistic Student Association, 133–146.

Bhatt, Rajesh. (1998). Obligation and possession. In H. Harley (ed.), *UPenn/MIT Roundtable on Argument Structure and Aspect*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 32. Cambridge, MA: Department of Linguistics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 21–40.

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. (2004). Movement under control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 431–452.

Borer, Hagit. (1985). Anaphoric AGR. In O. Jaeggli and K. J. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 69–109.

Bošković, Željko. (1997). *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation*: *An Economy Approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bouchard, Denis. (1984). *On the Content of Empty Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Bowers, John. (2008). On reducing control to movement. *Syntax* 11: 125–143.

Bresnan, Joan. (2001). *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Burzio, Luigi. (1986). *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Cardinaletti, Anna, and Ur Shlonsky. (2004). Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 519–557.

Chierchia, Gennaro. (1984). Topics in the syntax and semantics of infinitives and gerunds. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Chomsky, Noam. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origins and Use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. (1993). The theory of principles and parameters. In J. Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld and Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax:*

An International Handbook of Contemporary Research, Vol. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 506–569.

Cinque, Guglielmo. (2006). *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dowty, David R. (1985). On recent analyses of the semantics of control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 8: 291–331.

Fukuda, Shinichiro. (2012). Aspectual verbs as functional heads: Evidence from Japanese aspectual verbs. *Natural Languages & Linguistic Theory* 30: 965–1026.

Galves, Charlotte. (2001). *Ensaios sobre as gramáticas do português*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.

Grano, Thomas A. (2012). Control and restructuring at the syntax-semantics interface. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Hinterhölzl, Roland. (2006). *Scrambling, Remnant Movement, and Restructuring in West Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hornstein, Norbert. (1999). Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69–96.

Hornstein, Norbert. (2003). On control. In R. Hendrick (ed.), *Minimalist Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell, 6–81.

Hornstein, Norbert, and David Lightfoot. (1987). Predication and PRO. *Language* 63: 23–52.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Maria Polinsky. (Eds.). (2010). *Movement Theory of Control*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Iatridou, Sabine. (1993). On nominative case assignment and a few related things. In Colin Phillips (ed.), *Papers on Case and Agreement II.* MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 19,.

Cambridge, MA: Department of Linguistics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 175–196.

Kapetangianni, Konstantia, and Daniel Seely. (2008). Control in Modern Greek: It's another good move. In William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky (eds.), *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*. Dordrecht: Springer, 133–157.

Kayne, Richard. (1989). Null subjects and clitic climbing. In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 239–261.

Kayne, Richard. (1991). Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–686.

Koster, Jan. (1984). On binding and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 417–459.

Krapova, Iliyana. (2001). Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek. In María Luisa Rivero and Angela Ralli (eds.), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 105–126.

Landau, Idan. (2000). *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Landau, Idan. (2004). The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811–877.

Landau, Idan. (2013). *Control in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Landau, Idan. (2015). *A Two-Tiered Theory of Control*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lebeaux, David. (1984). Locality and anaphoric binding. *The Linguistic Review* 4: 343–363.

Lightfoot, David. (1991). *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Luján, Marta. (1980). Clitic promotion and mood in Spanish verbal complements. *Linguistics* 18: 381–484.

Madeira, Ana Maria. (1994). On the Portuguese inflected infinitive. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 6: 179–203.

Manzini, Rita. (1983). On control and control theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 421–446.

Martin, Roger. (1996). A minimalist theory of PRO and control. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Martin, Roger. (2001). Null case and the distribution of PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 141–166.

McFadden, Thomas and Sandhya Sundaresan. (2014). Finiteness in South Asian languages: an introduction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 32, 1–28.

Miller, D. Gary. (2002). *Nonfinite Structures in Theory and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Modesto, Marcello. (2000). On the identification of null arguments. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Modesto, Marcello. (2008). Topic prominence and null subjects. In T. Biberauer (ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 375–409.

Modesto, Marcello. (2010). What Brazilian Portuguese says about control: Remarks on Boeckx & Hornstein. *Syntax* 13: 78–96.

Modesto, Marcello. (2011). Infinitivos flexionados em português brasileiro e sua relevância para a teoria do controle. In Dermeval Da Hora and Esmeralda Negrão (eds.), *Estudos da Linguagem: Casamento entre temas e perspectivas*. João Pessoa: Ideia, 63–87.

Modesto, Marcello. (in press). Inflected infinitives in Brazilian Portuguese and the theory of control. In Ana Lúcia Santos and Anabela Gonçalves (eds.), *Complement Clauses in Portuguese: Syntax and Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Negrão, Esmeralda V. (1986). Anaphora in Brazilian Portuguese complement structures. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Perlmutter, David. (1970). The two verbs begin. In P. Rosenbaum and R. Jacobs (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, MA: Ginn-Blaisdell, 107–119.

Pires, Acrisio. (2001). The syntax of gerunds and infinitives: subjects, case and control. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan A. Sag. (1994). *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Quicoli, A. Carlos. (1996). Inflection and parametric variation: Portuguese vs. Spanish. In R. Freidin (ed.), *Current issues in Comparative Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 46–80.

Raposo, Eduardo. (1987). Case theory and Infl-to-comp: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 85–109.

Raposo, Eduardo. (1989). Prepositional infinitival constructions in European Portuguese. In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 277–305.

Rizzi, Luigi. (1978). A restructuring rule in Italian syntax. In Samuel J. Keyser (ed.), *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 113–158.

Rochete, Anne. (1999). The selection properties of aspectual verbs. In Kyle Johnson and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Beyond Principles and Parameters*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 145–165.

Rodrigues, C. (2004). Impoverished morphology and A-movement out of case domains. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Rosen, Sara. (1991). Restructuring verbs are light verbs. In A. Halpern (ed.), *Proceedings of the 9th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 477–491.

Rouveret, Alain. (1980). Sur la notion de proposition finie: Gouvernement et inversion. *Languages* 60: 61–88.

Safir, Ken. (1996). PRO and pro: Comments on Quicoli. In Robert Freidin (ed.), *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 81–90.

Sag, Ivan, and Carl Pollard. (1991). An integrated theory of complement control. *Language* 67: 63–113.

Spyropoulos, Vassilios. (2008). Finiteness and control in Greek. In William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky (eds.), *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*. Dordrecht: Springer, 159–183.

Sundaresan, Sandhya and Thomas McFadden. (2009). Subject distribution in Tamil and other languages: selection vs. case. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics*, 2, 5–34.

Sundaresan, Sandhya. (2014). Making sense of silence: finiteness and the (OC) pro vs. pro distinction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 32, 59–85.

Terzi, Arhonto. (1992). PRO in finite clauses: A study of the inflectional heads of the Balkan languages. Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York.

Uriagereka, Juan. (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79–123.

Varlokosta, Spyridoula. (1993). Control complements in Modern Greek. *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 144–163.

Varlokosta, Spyridoula, and N. Hornstein. (1993). Control in Modern Greek. *Proceedings of North East Linguistics Society 23, University of Ottawa*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Graduate Linguistic Student Association, 507–521.

Wilkinson, Robert. (1971). Complement subject deletion and subset relations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 575–584.

Williams, Edwin. (1980). Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203–238.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. (1998). Infinitives. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. (1999). Modal verbs must be raising verbs. In S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. Haugen and P. Norquest (eds.), *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 599–612.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. (2001). *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. (2013). Move, agree, and phasehood in raising constructions—A typology. Unpublished manuscript.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. (2014). Tense and aspect in English infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45: 403–447.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. (2015). Restructuring across the world. Unpublished manuscript, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa. (1982). On the relationship of the lexicon to syntax. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.