Portuguese, Russian and the theory of Control*

Michelle Sheehan

University of Cambridge

1. Introduction: inflected infinitives and obligatory control

European Portuguese is unusual in having both inflected and uninflected infinitives (I-infinitives and U-infinitives respectively) with partially overlapping but distinct distributions. Unlike U-infinitives, I-infinitives can surface with overt/null referential subjects in EP in certain complement clauses as well as in subject/adjunct clauses (see Raposo 1987, Madeira 1994, Ambar 1994, Sitaridou 2002, Scida 2004):

(1) Será difícil [(eles) aprovar**em** a proposta].
be.FUT.3SG difficult they approve.INF.3PL the proposal
'It will be difficult for them to approve the proposal.'
[EP, adapted from Raposo (1987: 86)]

(2) Eu lamento [ter**em** (os deputados) trabalhado pouco].
I regret.1SG have.INF.3PL the MPs worked little
'I believe/regret the MPs to have/having worked very little.'
[EP, adapted from Raposo (1987: 87)]

I-infinitives also surface in instances of non-obligatory control in EP (Pires 2006):[1]

(3) **Os professores$_i$** disseram **aos alunos$_j$** que era preciso [*pro*$_{i/j}$ trabalhar**em**]
the teachers said to.the students that was necessary work.INF.3PL
'The teachers told the students that it was necessary to work.'

The clear fact that I-infinitives are banned in exhaustive local subject control has often been taken as evidence that they are *not*, however, possible in instances of obligatory control (OC) (see Landau 2004: 850, Pires 2006: ch4):

*Versions of this paper have been presented at *NELS 43*, CUNY, *Going Romance*, Leuven, *Workshop on Portuguese Syntax*, Venice, and at the Universities of Edinburgh and Cambridge. Many thanks to the respective audiences for feedback and critique, especially Guglielmo Cinque, Richard Kayne, Ian Roberts and Theresa Biberauer. Thanks also to Ekaterina Chernova and Pavel Iosad for filling in some gaps in the Russian data as well as to the many native Portuguese speakers who took the time to fill in the six online questionnaires on which this paper is based. In relation to the EP data, I also benefitted greatly from discussions with Ana Madeira and José Cruz da Angela.

[1] Unless otherwise attributed, all EP examples were collected by the author.

(4) Preferias chegar(***es**) a tempo.
preferred.2SG arrive.INF.(2SG) at time
'You would prefer to arrive on time.'

As has been previously noted in the literature, however, I-infinitives *do* occur in a number of other OC contexts, apparently optionally (Maurer Júnior 1968, Raposo 1989, Madeira 1994, Sitaridou 2002 on European Portuguese; Modesto 2010, Rabelo 2010 on Brazilian Portuguese). Consider the following examples of object OC and non-local subject OC in EP:

(5) a. Eu obriguei/persuadi os meninos a ler(em) esse livro
I forced/persuaded the kids A read.INF(.3PL) that book
'I forced/persuaded the kids to read that book.'
[EP, adapted from Raposo (1989: 277)]

b. Prometemos à Maria comprar(mos)-lhe um presente.
promised.1PL to.the Maria buy.INF.1PL-her.DAT a present
'We promised Maria to buy her a present.'
[EP, adapted from Madeira (1994: 181)]

In relation to (one dialect of) Brazilian Portuguese (BP), moreover, Modesto (2010) notes that I-infinitives are possible even in instances of local subject control where a partial control reading is at stake (in the sense of Landau 2000):

(6) O presidente$_1$ preferiu PRO$_{1+}$ se reunirem às 6.
the chair preferred SE meet.INF.3PL at.the 6
'The chair preferred to gather at 6:00.' [BP, Modesto (2010: 85)]

Discussion with native speaker informants reveals, interestingly, that there is significant variation with respect to the acceptability of examples like (5)-(6). As such, this paper subjects the relevant patterns to systematic study in European Portuguese, reporting data from a number of online questionnaires with 19+ participants. The patterns which emerge are highly reminiscent of the patterns of case independence observed in Russian, as reported by Landau (2008). The aim of this paper is thus to present the novel EP facts and to provide an account of the EP data which might be extended to Russian (and other languages with case independence). The remaining differences between OC in EP/Russian, it will be argued, can be attributed to independently justified parameters of variation.

Section 2 introduces the EP patterns in comparison with the Russian facts. Section 3 briefly highlights the challenges which these facts raise for theories of Control. Section 4 provides a novel account of the patterns in question and also addresses two remaining differences between the two languages. Finally, section 5 concludes.

2. Patterns of inflection/case independence

Russian, like Icelandic and Ancient Greek, displays a phenomenon known as *case concord*, whereby secondary predicates, which are inflected for case, either *can* or in some cases *must* reflect the case of the DP which they modify. Where case concord is optional, a default instrumental (INST) case is also possible (Landau 2008, citing Comrie 1974 amongst many others):

(7) Ja našel **ego** **odnogo** / *odnim/ p'janym / ?**p'janogo**
I.NOM found him.ACC alone.ACC/*alone.INST/ drunk.INST/? drunk.ACC
'I found him alone/drunk.' [Russian, Landau (2008: 882)][2]

The interesting fact, in relation to OC, is that in (some) non-finite complements, it is possible for secondary predicates to surface with dative (DAT) case:

(8) Ona poprosila ego [PRO ne ezdit tuda **odnomu**].
she.NOM asked him.ACC PRO not to.go there alone.DAT
'She asked him not to go there alone.' [Russian, Landau (2008: 883)]

As (i) the default case for secondary predicates is INST and (ii) *odin* always displays case concord, DAT cannot be a default here, as Landau notes. The apparent implication, then, is that (what I will descriptively call) PRO is the source of case in such examples, meaning that PRO itself bears case/Case. Instances where secondary predicates surface as DAT are thus referred to as examples of 'case independence', whereas contexts where they share the case of the matrix controller are referred to as examples of 'case transmission', following Landau (2008).

Given the substantial body of evidence that EP I-infinitives assign nominative Case to their subjects (see Raposo 1987, Quicoli 1996), they can be considered similar to case independence in Russian. In both instances, the subject of a non-finite clause bears case/Case, the only difference being that in EP, the source of this Case is arguably the I-infinitive, whereas in Russian the origin of DAT is somewhat more opaque. U-infinitives, on the other hand, can be considered equivalent to case transmission, as in such contexts PRO shares all of the features of its controller in both languages. These parallels are particularly insightful because the distribution of case independence vs. case transmission in instances of OC parallels quite closely the distribution of I-infinitives vs. U-infinitives in EP, something which to my knowledge has not previously been noted. To aid comparison of the two languages, I refer to OC with an U-infinitive/case transmission as 'caseless OC', and OC with an I-infinitive/case independence as 'cased OC'.

Data from online surveys confirms that EP, like Russian, requires caseless OC with exhaustive local subject OC:[3]

(9) EP exhaustive local suject OC [**caseless 100%**; cased 0%, n=19]
Preferíamos receber(***mos**) um salário maior
prefer.1PL receive.INF.1PL a salary higher
'We would prefer to get a higher salary.'

(10) Russian exhaustive local subject OC [**caseless 100%**; cased 0%, n=30]
On želaet **PRO$_{NOM}$** ženit'sja na nej sam/ ***samomu** v cerkvi.
he.NOM wants to.marry her himself.NOM/*.DAT in church
'He wants to marry her himself in a church.' [Landau (2008: 887)]

[2] *Odin* 'alone' and *sam* 'onseself', unlike other predicates require obligatory case concord (Landau 2008: 882). According to native speakers I have consulted, the same is true also of *vse* 'all'.

[3] Unless otherwise stated, all generalisations about Russian in this section come from Landau (2008), as do the supporting examples.

Where a partial control reading is at stake, however, EP permits cased OC for some speakers and Russian basically requires it:

(11) EP partial local subject OC [caseless 81%; cased 40%, n=21][4]
O João$_i$ preferia [PRO$_{i+}$ reunir**(%em)**=se mais tarde].
the João preferred.3SG meet.INF.3PL=SE.3 more late
'John would prefer to meet later on.'

(12) Russian partial local subject OC [caseless 3%; **cased 100%**, n=27]
Predsedatel' predpočel **PRO$_{DAT}$** sobrat'sja **vsem**/ ***vse** v šest'.
chair.NOM preferred to.gather all.DAT/ *.NOM at six
'The chair preferred to all gather at six.' [Landau (2008: 908)]

A notable difference between the two languages, in this respect, is that EP also permits partial OC readings with caseless OC here. I return to this difference between the two languages in section 4.

The data pattern differently where exhaustive non-local subject control is concerned. With verbs like promise/vow/threaten, which permit subject control across a matrix object, both languages permit either caseless or cased OC, but the former is more widely acceptable. The results are strikingly similar in the two languages here:

(13) EP exhaustive non-local subject OC [caseless 95%; cased 37%. n=19]
Prometemos à professora chegar**(%mos)** a tempo.
promised to.the teacher arrive.INF.1PL at time
'We promised the teacher to arrive on time.'

(14) Russian exhaustive non-local subject OC [caseless 73%; cased 45%, n=30]
Ivan pokljalsja druzjam [**PRO$_{NOM/DAT}$** sdelat' eto sam/%samomu].
Ivan.NOM vowed friends to.do it himself.NOM/.DAT
'Ivan vowed to his friends to do it alone tomorrow.' [Landau 2008: 890]

With partial non-local subject OC, cased OC is much more widely accepted in EP and (apparently) required in Russian (though this pattern is not tested experimentally by Landau and these data come from consultation with just two native speakers):

(15) EP partial non-local subject OC [caseless 76%; cased 90%, n=19]
O Pedro prometeu à Ana reunir(em)=se em Braga
the Pedro promised to.the Ana meet.3PL=SE in Braga
'Pedro promised Ana to meet in Braga.'

(16) Russian partial non-local subject OC [caseless 0%; **cased 100%**, n=2]
Ivan pokljalsja druzjam [**PRO$_{DAT}$** sobrat'sja vsem/ *vse v šest'
Ivan.NOM vowed friends to.gather all.DAT/.NOM at six
'Ivan vowed to his friends to all gather at six.'

[4] The reason that the percentages do not add up to 100 is that many speakers accept both forms in the same contexts (in both EP and Russian). Participants were presented with the two options separately and asked to judge their acceptability in the context of a larger survey complete with fillers.

Finally, consider object OC, which patterns similarly. In instances of exhaustive OC, both caseless and cased OC are widely accepted by many speakers, though some display a preference for one or the other:

(17) EP exhaustive object OC [caseless 70%; cased 70%, n=44]
O professor persuadiu os alunos a fazer(em) o trabalho.
the teacher persuaded the pupils A do.INF.3PL the work
'The teacher persuaded the pupils to do the work.'

(18) Russian exhaustive object OC [caseless 60%; cased 90%, n=30]
Ona poprosila ego [$PRO_{DAT/NOM}$ ne ezdit' tuda odnogo/ odnomu].
she.NOM asked him.ACC not to.go there alone.ACC/.DAT
'She asked him not to go there alone tomorrow.' [Landau (2008: 888)]

With a partial control reading, however, again cased OC is basically required in Russian and more widely accepted in EP too:

(19) EP partial object OC [caseless 58%; cased 95%, n=19]
Os professores persuadiram o diretor a reunir(em)=se mais tarde
the teachers persuaded the headteacher A meet.INF.3PL=SE more late
'The teachers persuaded the headteacher to meet later on.'

(20) Russian partial object OC [caseless 11%; **cased 100%**, n=18]
Ona poprosila predsedatelja [**PRO_{DAT}** sobrat'sja vsem/*vsex v šest']
she.NOM asked chair.ACC to.gather all.DAT/*ACC at six
'She asked the chair to all gather at six.' [Landau (2008: 909)]

The patterns can be summarised as follows, where parentheses indicate dispreferred forms:

Table 1: distribution of case in non-finite clauses

Control context	**Russian**	**EP**
Exhaustive **local subject** Control	caseless	caseless
Partial **local subject** Control	cased	(cased)/caseless
Exhaustive **non-local subject** Control	(cased)/caseless	(cased)/caseless
Partial **non-local subject** Control	cased	cased/(caseless)
Exhaustive **object** Control	cased/caseless	cased/caseless
Partial **object** Control	cased	cased/(caseless)

Exhaustive control behaves the same in the two languages. In both languages we see an asymmetry between exhaustive local subject control which requires a caseless complement clause and the other kinds of OC, which allow either cased/caseless complements. A striking difference between the two languages is the fact that, in EP, caseless complements are also possible in instances of partial control, unlike in Russian. In section 3, I outline the challenges raised by these patterns for existing theories of Control before providing an analysis of them in section 4.

3. Challenges for theories of Obligatory Control

Approaches to OC in both Government and Binding and Minimalism have by and large attempted to derive the distribution of PRO from Case.[5] Thus the PRO Theorem proposed that PRO must be ungoverned, to avoid the inherent contradiction in its specification as both [+anaphoric, +pronominal] (see Chomsky 1981). The Movement Theory of Control (MTC) similarly, proposes that OC PRO be assimilated to A-trace, with the OC relation resulting from movement (see Hornstein 1999, Boeckx and Hornstein 2004, 2006, Boeckx, Hornstein and Nunes 2010). In both approaches, the strong prediction is that OC PRO (descriptively speaking) will lack Case.

The facts discussed above in Russian and EP are apparently problematic for such approaches as they appear to provide evidence precisely that OC subjects sometimes bear case (and presumably Case). While the challenge posed by Russian (and case independence more generally) is well established (see Andrews 1971, 1976 and Sigurðsson 2008, Bobaljik & Landau 2009 for recent discussion), the challenge from controlled I-infinitives in Portuguese has not been much discussed (though see Modesto 2010 on Brazilian Portuguese). In this section, I show that the EP patterns pose potential challenges for both the MTC and Landau's Agree-based alternative. In section 4, I propose an alternative account which avoids these problems.

The main challenge for the MTC is that controlled I-infinitives in EP display all the diagnostic properties of OC and yet cannot be derived via movement under standard assumptions (see Sheehan 2013a). Thus controlled I-infinitives cannot get an arbitrary interpretation, require a local c-commanding antecedent, trigger a sloppy reading under ellipsis and get a bound/de se reading. For space reasons, I illustrate only the requirement for a local (21) c-commanding (22) antecedent here:

(21) *O Pedro acha que eu preferia reunirem=se mais cedo.
the Pedro believes that I preferred meet.INF.3PL=SE more early

(22) a. %[A chefe do João$_i$]$_j$ preferia reunirem=se sem ele$_i$.
the boss of.the João preferred.3SG meet.INF.3PL=SE without him
'João's (female) boss would prefer to meet without him.'

b. *[A chefe do João$_i$]$_j$ preferia reunirem-se sem ela$_j$.
the boss of.the João preferred.3SG meet.INF.3PL=SE without her
'João's (female) boss would prefer to meet without her tomorrow.'

OC of an I-infinitive, however, fails to behave like movement in several crucial respects. Firstly, PRO does not look like a copy/trace of its controller as the two can differ in syntactic phi-features:

(23) a. %O João preferia reunirmo=nos mais tarde.
the João preferred.3SG meet.INF.1PL=SE.1PL more late
'João$_i$ would prefer PRO$_{i+speaker}$ to meet later on.'

b. %Preferias reunirmo=nos mais tarde?
preferred.2SG meet.INF.1PL=SE.1PL more late
'Would you$_i$ prefer PRO$_{i+speaker}$ to meet later on.'

Moreover, raising is not possible from I-infinitives (Raposo 1989: 297, Quicoli 1996: 59) (24), and the phenomenon of partial A-movement does not exist elsewhere (25):

[5] With Landau (2000, 2004, 2008) a notable exception, to which we return shortly.

(24) a. *pro*$_i$ parecem [t_i ter razão]
seem.3PL have.INF reason

b. EXPL parece [*pro* terem razão]
seem.3SG have.INF.3PL reason
'They seem to be right.'

c. **pro* parecem [t_i terem razão]
seem.3PL have.INF.3PL reason

(25) a. *O Pedro parece terem=se reunido
The Pedro seems.3SG have.INF.3PL=SE met

b. *O Pedro foi reunido ontem.
The Pedro was reunited yesterday
Lit. 'Pedro was reunited yesterday.'

See Sheehan (2013a) for a critique of other MTC–compatible analyses, including Rodrigues' (2007) subextraction approach.

The EP data also raise certain challenges for Landau's Agree-based approach to Control, though they provide new empirical support for his contention that there are two flavours of OC. Simplifying somewhat, Landau (2000, 2004, 2008) claims that partial control is possible because where C mediates the OC relation, PRO can differ from its controller in its mereological (+/-MER) specification, which is distinct, crucially, from its syntactic number specification. Predicates like 'meet', in EP, as in English, require only a *semantically* plural +MER subject:

(26) O comitê /*o Manel reúne=se todos os dias
the committee /the Manel meets.3SG=SE all the days
Lit. 'The committee/*Manel meets every day.'

As C is not specified for +/-MER, this fact allows for mismatches like that in (27):

(27) Controller$_{-MER}$…[C PRO$_{+MER}$ …]

This analysis cannot extend straightforwardly to partial OC in EP, as, in such contexts, PRO can differ from its controller in its syntactic feature specification (see (23a-b) above). The only condition appears to be a semantic one: the controller must be a potential subset of the reference of *pro,* hence a 1SG pronominal cannot control an ambiguous 2PL/3PL verb form:

(28) *Eu preferia reunirem=se mais cedo.
I preferred.1SG meet.INF.3PL/2PL=SE more early

The subject in such contexts can also be shown to be syntactically plural:

(29) %Preferia ser*(**mos)** amigos do que sócios
preferred.1SG be.INF.1PL friends of.the than partners
'I'd prefer to be friends than partners.'

So Landau's account, although it works well for Russian (and many other languages), cannot easily be extended to EP, because in EP PRO can differ from its controller in both person and number features.

4. A novel approach to Obligatory Control

Thus far it has been shown that there are two distinct kinds of OC in Russian and EP: 'caseless OC' and 'cased OC'. Caseless OC generally gives rise to unambiguous exhaustive control in Russian (and less obviously so also in EP),[6] whereas cased OC gives rise to ambiguous partial/exhaustive control in both languages. Both kinds of OC, moreover, share certain structural properties indicative of the fact that OC is a narrow syntactic dependency. In this section, I propose that caseless OC is derived via movement, more or less in the manner proposed by Hornstein and co-authors, whereas cased OC is the result of failed movement, whereby a thematic head establishes an Agree dependency with a case-marked pronominal which cannot, however, move to absorb a second theta-role (see Cinque 2006, van Urk 2010 and Grano 2012 for variants of the claim that some but not all OC involves movement).

I take thematic roles to be configurationally determined so that in order to absorb a theta-role, a DP must merge with a thematic head via either external or internal merge. As the narrow syntax operates blind to these requirements, a thematic head Appl (in the case of object OC) bears the feature [D:]^{EPP} which probes Appl's visible complement domain for a potential argument and is valued with the goal's referential index. In instances where the goal DP lacks case, the DP in question moves to Appl's specifier, meaning that it will receive the associated thematic role configurationally:

(30) Exhaustive object OC (caseless OC) = movement
   a. $[_{ApplP}\ DP_i\ Appl_{[D:\ i]\ EPP}\ V\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ DP_{i\ [-Case]}\ T...]]]$
   b. Matrix Appl probes for a DP to value its [D:] feature.
   c. Appl forms a dependency with DP_i, which values its feature [D: i].
   d. DP_i is then attracted to spec ApplP to satisfy Appl's EPP feature.
   e. The derivation converges as long as DP_i can get Case.
   f. As DP_i occupies two theta-positions, it receives two distinct theta-roles.

Now consider a different scenario where a thematic head probes for a potential argument and comes across a DP with Case. Assuming that Case domains constitute phases, the only way for this to be possible is for the DP in question to occupy the lower phase edge, due to the Phase Impenetrability Condition.[7] I assume that while Appl is free to establish this dependency, the DP in question cannot then raise to Appl's specifier as this would constitute improper movement. As such, a distinct DP must be externally merged with Appl to satisfy its EPP feature:

[6] I return to the this complication in EP shortly.

[7] I further assume that it is phases which serve to make case-marked DPs invisible to higher probes not Chomsky's (2000, 2001) Activity (or lack thereof). The phenomenon of defective intervention, whereby Case-marked DPs in a local domain serve to block Agree relations, appears to lend support to such a move move. What is relevant for Case-checking, then, is whether a DP in the same domain as the probe is closest to it. A full discussion of these ideas would take us too far afield here, unfortunately.

(31) Partial/exhaustive object OC (cased OC) = failed movement
[$_{ApplP}$ DP_j Appl $_{[D: i], EPP}$ [$_{CP}$ DP_i $_{[+Case]}$ C ~~[$_{TP}$ t_i T …]~~]]

a. Matrix Appl probes for a DP to value its [D:] feature.

b. Appl forms a dependency with DP_i, which values its feature [D: i].

c. DP_i cannot move to spec ApplP due to the ban on improper movement.

d. DP_j is externally merged with Appl, receiving Appl's theta-role.

e. As Appl bears a valued thematic feature [D: i], it follows that the external argument's referential index j must be non-distinct from i.

f. The derivation converges as long as DP_j gets Case.

As sketched in (31), the partial/exhaustive control ambiguity arises from the non-distinctness requirement: either j = i (yielding exhaustive OC); or j⊂i (yielding partial OC). What is the nature of this non-distinctness requirement? I argue that it is part of a more general trend in grammar for the first dependency a head enters into to partially determine the nature of entities with which it can enter subsequent dependencies. The Person Case Constraint is a case in point: the phi-features of the second DP which a given case assigner agrees with must be non-distinct from the first DP which it has agreed with (Anagnostopoulou 2005 amongst many others). Defective intervention, more generally, follows a similar pattern (see Sheehan 2013a).

Independent support for such an approach to EP comes from the fact that overt subjects in non-finite subject clauses occupy a very high position, plausibly spec CP, hence they can precede the verb even in instances of enclisis (Madeira 1994: 197):

(32) Será difícil [$_{CP}$ eles reunirem=se [$_{TP}$ amanhã]].
will.be difficult them meet.INF.3PL=SE tomorrow
'It will be difficult for them to meet tomorrow.'

Moreover, the presence of some other phrase in spec CP blocks cased OC, plausibly because the wh-phrase blocks movement of the embedded subject to the phase edge:

(33) *O Pedro não sabe quando se reunirem.
the Pedro not knows when SE meet.INF.3PL

The approach also accounts for the fact that partial control in EP appears to be semantically rather than syntactically constrained: the referent of the controlled subject must contain the reference of the controller, but this cannot be stated in terms of mereology- or phi-features, as discussed above.

This approach to OC has the advantage of accounting both for the similarities between cased/caseless OC, attributing them to the properties of Agree (see also Landau 2004), as well as for their basic interpretational differences and the connection to Case/phases. The approach also leaves certain questions unanswered, however. Firstly, why must the controlled subject in cased OC be null, why aren't overt pronominals also possible? Secondly, what is special about local subject control? Why is cased OC unambiguous only in such contexts, disallowing an exhaustive reading? Finally, why is a partial control reading apparently possible in EP with caseless OC, contrary to expectations? While space limits preclude an in-depth response to these questions here, I nonetheless sketch an outline of how they might be addressed below (see Sheehan 2013a, b, for more extensive discussion).

The fact that the controlled subject in EP must be null I attribute to the fact that EP is a null subject language in which co-referent embedded subjects are more generally required to be null. In all other respects this null pronominal behaves like *pro*, but its presence in the lower phase edge means that it gets obligatorily controlled when the phase in question occupies a complement position.[8] The fact that local subject control is special, I attribute to *obviation*. In subjunctive complements too, exhaustive co-reference between a matrix subject and embedded *pro* is banned, whereas exhaustive co-reference with objects is possible, as is partial co-reference with any matrix argument (see Kempchinsky 2009 on Romance and Avrutin and Babyonyshev 1997 on Russian). Whatever explains this obviation pattern more generally, then, should also explain why cased-OC disallows exhaustive readings in instances of local subject control. Finally, the availability of a partial control reading with U-infinitives in EP, I attribute to the availability of a null comitative in EP (see Boeckx, Hornstein & Nunes 2010). The evidence for this comes from the fact that partial control with an U-infinitive is limited to predicates which can take a comitative argument elsewhere in EP, whereas the same is not true with partial control of an I-infinitive:

(34) a. %Adoro a Maria mas preferia não nos beijarmos em público.
love the Maria but preferred not SE.1PL kiss.INF.1PL in public

b. *Adoro a Maria mas preferia não me beijar em público (com ela).
love the Maria but preferred not SE.1SG kiss.INF in public with her

In comitative contexts, partial control of a U-infinitive is fully acceptable (note that PRO/A-trace and the controller obligatorily share all phi-features here):

(35) Eu preferia reconciliar/reunir=me/*nos/*se mais tarde.
I preferred.1SG make.up/meet.INF=SE.1SG/SE.1PL/SE more late
'I preferred/would prefer to meet/make up later.'

See Sheehan (2013b) for a discussion of null comitatives across Romance.

A final difference between Russian and EP also deserves mention here. While EP bans cased OC into wh-complements (as noted above), Russian does not (Landau 2008: 893). This raises a potential challenge for the extension of the EP analysis to Russian. An independent explanation for this fact is available however, as Russian is a multiple wh-movement language (Stepanov 1997) and so plausibly wh-movement will not serve to block movement of an embedded pronominal to spec CP. I leave a full investigation of this possibility to future research.

5. Conclusions

It has been argued that OC of I-infinitives in EP behaves similarly to case independence in languages like Russian. In both instances, a controlled pronominal can be shown to bear case/Case, generally yielding an ambiguous exhaustive/partial control reading. An analysis of EP has been put forth whereby the case-marked pronominal subject of an embedded clause moves to the phase edge and so is visible for theta-probing by a higher thematic head, giving rise to ambiguous

[8] Note that this provides a potential explanation as to why referential subjects of I-infinitives in complement domains are only possible in a lower position, inside TP, in the famous Aux-to-Comp construction (see Raposo 1987).

partial/exhaustive OC. Essentially, then, there are two kinds of OC. If the non-finite complement of a control predicate is non-phasal, OC is derived via movement, as an embedded argument is attracted to a second thematic position by a matrix thematic probe. If, however, the non-finite complement of a control predicate is phasal, an embedded pronominal will be visible for theta-probing only if it raises to the phase edge (spec CP). From this position, the pronominal in question can Agree with the matrix thematic probe but cannot move to a thematic position. As such, a distinct DP must be merged with the thematic probe to satisfy its EPP feature and absorb its theta-role. A non-distinctness requirement on specifier and head then gives rise to exhaustive/partial control. Additional complications arise because of obviation and the availability of null comitatives in EP and of multiple wh-movement in Russian.

References

Ambar, M. 1994. 'Aux-to-Comp' and lexical restrictions on verb movement. In *Paths towards Universal Grammar*, eds. G. Cinque, J. Koster, J.-Y. Pollock, L. Rizzi and R. Zanuttini, 1-24. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Anagnostopoulou, E. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions: a feature checking analysis. In *Clitic and Affix Combinations*, eds. L. Heggie and F. Ordóñez, 199-235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Andrews, A. D. 1971. Case agreement of predicate modifiers in Ancient Greek. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 127–151.

Andrews, A. D. 1976. The VP-complement analysis in Modern Icelandic. In *NELS 6: proceedings of the 6th meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society,* eds. J. Maling, and A. Zaenen, 1– 21. Amherst: GLSA.

Avrutin, S. and M. Babyonyshev. 1997. Obviation in subjunctive clauses and AGR: evidence from Russian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15: 229-262.

Bobaljik, J. and I. Landau. 2009. Icelandic Control is not A-movement: the case from Case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:113-132.

Boeckx, C. and N. Hornstein. 2004. Movement under Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 431–452.

Boeckx, C. and N. Hornstein. 2006. The virtues of Control as movement. *Syntax* 9:118–130.

Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein, and J. Nunes. 2010. *Control as movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Foris.

Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, eds. R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 28-53. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Cinque, G. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Comrie, B. 1974. The second dative: a transformational approach. In *Slavic Transformational Syntax, Michigan Slavic Materials, No. 10,* eds. R. Brecht, and C. Chvany, 123–150. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.

Grano, T. 2012. *Control and Restructuring at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. University of Chicago, Illinois: PhD thesis.

Hornstein, N. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96.
Kempchinsky, P. 2009. What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive. *Lingua* 119: 1788-1810.
Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Landau, I. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811-877.
Landau, I. 2008. Two routes of control: evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 877–924.
Madeira, A. 1994. On the Portuguese inflected infinitive. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 6: 179-203.
Maurer Júnior, T. H. 1968. *O infinito flexionado português*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional.
Modesto, Marcelo. 2010. What Brazilian Portuguese says about Control: remarks on Boeckx & Hornstein. *Syntax* 13: 78-96.
Pires, A. 2006. *The Minimalist Syntax of Defective Domains: Gerunds and Infinitives*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Quicoli, A. C. 1996. Inflection and parametric variation: Portuguese vs. Spanish. In *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*, ed. Robert Freidin, 46-80. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Rabelo, P. C. 2010. *Argumentos (EPP) nulos no português do Brasil em contextos oracionais finitos e infinitivos*. Universidade de Brasília: PhD Thesis.
Raposo, E. 1987. Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: the inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18: 85-109.
Raposo, E. 1989. Prepositional infinitival constructions in European Portuguese. In *The Null Subject Parameter*, eds. O. Jaeggli and K. Safir. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Rodrigues, C. 2007. Agreement and flotation in partial and inverse partial Control configurations. In *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*, eds. William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 213-229. Amsterdam: Springer.
Scida, E. 2004. *The Inflected Infinitive in Romance Languages*. New York & London: Routledge
Sheehan, M. 2013a. Control of (un)inflected infinitives in European Portuguese. Ms.
Sheehan, M. 2013b. Partial Control in Romance Languages: the covert comitative analysis. Ms.
Sigurðsson, H. 2008. The case of PRO. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26: 403-450.
Sitaridou, I. 2002. The synchrony and diachrony of Romance infinitives with nominative subjects. PhD thesis: University of Manchester.
Stepanov, A. 1997. On Wh-Fronting in Russian. *Proceedings of NELS* 28.
van Urk, C. 2010. On obligatory control: a movement and PRO approach. Ms. Available online at http://web.mit.edu/cvanurk/www/papers.html.

Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics
Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages
University of Cambridge
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge, CB3 9DA

mls54@cam.ac.uk