April 2010

Alleged Broad Subjects in Hebrew: A Rejoinder to Doron & Heycock 2010

Abstract

In response to Doron & Heycock (2010), this rejoinder reaffirms the conclusion of Landau (2009) that Hebrew has no Broad Subject construction. Both in distribution and interpretation, the alleged "broad subject" patterns with left-dislocated phrases and not with standard subjects. Doron & Heycock's counterarguments are either inconclusive or confounded by independent factors.

1. Introduction

This rejoinder is part of an on-going debate about the status, in fact the existence, of so-called "broad subjects" (BS) in Hebrew. The claim that Hebrew (and Arabic) features a multiple subject construction, familiar from Japanese and Korean, has been put forward in a series of articles (Doron and Heycock 1999, Heycock and Doron 2003, Alexopoulou, Doron and Heycock 2004). In this construction, an initial DP which is not the thematic subject of the matrix predicate is coindexed with a clause-internal pronoun. An example is given in (1), where the coindexed elements are also boldfaced.

(1) [**ha-kesef šelxa**]$_i$ tišmor al**av**$_i$ tov.
the-money your will.keep.2Msg on.it well
'Your money, watch it closely.'

According to the authors of these three articles, the initial DP in such sentences is (or can be) a subject, occupying an A-position, specifically a second [Spec,TP] position in the clausal hierarchy. This analysis was challenged in Landau 2009, where I argued that Hebrew has no multiple subject construction: Sentences like (1) are uniquely analyzable as left-dislocation (LD). The initial DP is a left-dislocated phrase (LDP), occupying an Ā-position. Landau (2009) has presented a series of arguments to that effect. The arguments were of two types. First, the alleged BS is indistinguishable from an LDP under any grammatical criterion. Second, the alleged BS displays striking contrasts with standard ("narrow") subjects.

In response to Landau's arguments, Doron and Heycock (2010) (henceforth, DH) re-affirm their earlier BS analysis. They argue that the distinction with LD is real and that

the distinctions with standard subjects are due to interfering factors, which do not militate against the essential subjecthood of the alleged BS.

In this rejoinder I respond to DH's objections. I will show that closer inspection of their data and of data that they do not discuss indicates that Landau's (2009) critique was warranted and calls for no revision: The BS analysis is unmotivated for Hebrew. I will do so by following the order of the arguments in DH's reply, one by one.[1]

2. An exegetical disagreement

The present debate is almost entirely empirical. Before turning to the facts, however, we should address one murky point of textual interpretation.

Landau cited a passage in Heycock & Doron 2003 where it is stated that the relation between the BS and the pronoun it binds "suggests either A-movement or an anaphoric relation". In their reply, DH claim that the passage has been misquoted, adding to it the "omitted" prefix: "In all the cases discussed above, it appears that..." (see (2) in their reply). The charge of misquotation is unclear to me, as I fail to see how that prefix changes the content of the suggested locality constraint or DH's stance regarding it. On a reasonable reading of this passage, one can conclude that DH take BS constructions to be subject to *stricter* locality conditions than LD (i.e., A-movement or anaphoric binding).

DH point out that in the later study of Alexopoulou, Doron & Heycock 2004 they present island-violating examples of BS constructions, and that therefore it was "absurd" to attribute that position to them. However, nowhere in the cited works do they explicitly renounce the suggested locality constraint on BS constructions. Hence, an equally plausible conclusion could be that DH's analysis is simply inconsistent.

Ultimately, the verdict on this exegetical debate is not so important. As a matter of fact, on the current exposition of their theory, DH are committed to even *less* distinctions between BSs and LDPs, thus moving towards my own position – that the two are nondistinct. The following corollary seems to faithfully represent their current view.

(2) *A corollary of DH's theory*

Every Hebrew sentence that has an LD parse has a BS parse.

[1] Unless otherwise stated, "DH" refers to Doron & Heycock (2010) and "Landau" to Landau (2009) in what follows. The reader should bear in mind that this is already a second cycle in the debate. To keep the text concise and focus on novel argumentation, much of the data in the earlier works cited above is referenced but not repeated. This rejoinder should be read at least with Landau 2009 and Doron & Heycock 2010 at hand.

That is, LD-sentences are a subset of BS-sentences. A proper subset, since LD is subject to further constraints from which BS constructions are exempt (see (3) below). This gives rise to certain testability difficulties that are discussed below. Fortunately, we can still examine DH's current proposal from the perspective of subjecthood: Does the alleged BS share any significant properties with standard (narrow) subjects in Hebrew? I will argue that Landau's (2009) original negative answer to this question stands, the objections in DH's reply notwithstanding.

3. Alleged contrasts between BS and LDP in Hebrew

In support of the alleged distinction between BS and LDP, DH reiterate their earlier claim that BSs are free from the general constraints that apply to LDPs. Three constraints are discussed:

(3) a. A BS can occur in a non-root context, an LDP cannot.
b. A BS can occur in a non-peripheral position, an LDP must be peripheral.
c. A BS can be a downward-entailing quantifier, an LDP cannot.

DH present examples in which a BS indeed displays this freedom of distribution (their (4), (6)-(8)). Of course, to be convinced of the alleged contrasts in (3), one would like to inspect comparable LD examples where the distributional constraints are shown to be in effect. Such Hebrew examples, however, are not provided by DH, and the reason is clear: In virtue of corollary (2), they cannot be constructed. Every LD construction in Hebrew can be analyzed as a BS construction too. Thus, any imaginable constraint that applies to LDPs but not to BSs would never materialize in an ungrammatical outcome, since the sentence it rules out would always be ruled in under the BS analysis. Consequently, on DH's view, there can be no Hebrew-internal evidence for any difference in the sensitivity of BSs and LDPs to the constraints mentioned in (3). The empirical question is whether the alleged Hebrew BSs are indeed exempt from these constraints.

3.1 Non-root contexts

To establish (3a) DH cite two examples (their (6)-(7)) where a BS occurs in a conditional clause. I myself find the examples quite marginal. In fact, consideration of the wider picture reveals that nearly always, the alleged BS yields marginal to ungrammatical results in non-root contexts. In other words, something like the root restriction *does* apply

(with limited exceptions), suggesting that the construction at hand is LD after all (all the following examples become grammatical when the boldfaced DP is substituted for the boldfaced pronoun).

(4) a. ?* carix le'hagia le-šam [lifney še-**Dani** yigamer **lo** ha-kesef].
necessary to.get to-there [before that-Dani will.run.out to.him the-money
'It is necessary to get there before Dani's money runs out.'

b. * hitkašarti eleyxa kedey [še-**Rina** ha-tafkid **šela** lo yišaxax].
I.called to-you in.order that-Rina the-role her not will.be.forgotten
'I called you so that Rina's role would not be forgotten.'

c. * [ha-sikuyim še-**ha-menahel** taclixi le'hitxamek mimen**o** la'ad]
the-chances that-the-manager you.will.manage to.avoid from.him forever
hem dalim meod.
they slim very
'The chances that you'll manage to avoid the manager forever are very slim.'

d. * zot ha-megera [še-**Yosi** macanu et ha- ša'on **šelo** be-toxa].[2]
this the-drawer that-Yosi we.found ACC the-watch his inside.it
'This is the drawer in which we found Yosi's watch.'

On the LD analysis, the ungrammaticality of the embedded clauses in (4) is just as expected. On the BS analysis it is not. Moreover, the fact that some LD examples are not absolutely impossible in non-root contexts is also not surprising, for it is well-known that the restriction is not absolute even in English (Green 1976, Sawada and Larson 2004, Heycock 2006).

3.2 Non-peripheral position

LDPs are expected to precede *wh*-phrases (Rizzi 1997), but nothing prohibits adjunction to their left (provided the adjunct is semantically capable of modifying the LD clause). Landau's examples (27) and (10) confirm these expectations, respectively. In contrast,

[2] Notice that the relativized position in this example is occupied by a resumptive pronoun and not a gap. Thus, the example cannot be ruled out by the ad-hoc constraint DH invoke to account for intervention effects (see section 5.4).

BSs should be able to follow *wh*-phrases, occupying as they do [Spec,TP]. The ungrammaticality of Landau's (27b), repeated below as (5a), is therefore problematic to the BS analysis. Responding to this problem, DH argue that (5a) is out for an independent reason – "a highly topical element (the definite description) is placed after a focal element (the *wh*-expression)".

(5) a. * Le'an **ha-baxur ha-ze**, amru **lo** lalexet?
where the-guy the-this, said.3pl to.him to.go
'This guy, where did they tell him to go?'

b. Le'an ha-baxur ha-ze halax?
where the-guy the-this went
'Where did this guy go?'

c. * eyzo mera'ayenet **ha-baxur ha-ze**, amru **lo** lagešet eleyha?
which interviewer.F the-guy the-this, said.3pl to.him to.go to.her
'This guy, which interviewer did they tell him to go to?'

This seems like an ad-hoc constraint that is not independently motivated. Why should a topical element "clash" with a preceding focal element? Certainly *wh*-questions are fully consistent with definite subjects. If all that was wrong with (5a) were this pragmatic tension, (5b) should have been no better, but in fact, it is perfect. Later on DH invoke another ad-hoc constraint against the "mixing" of gap and resumptive pronoun dependencies in the same clause (see section 5.4), which might be recruited to explain the deviance of (5a). Again, some cases are left out, like (5c), where both dependencies terminate in a resumptive pronoun, and the result is no better than (5a) (each dependency, in isolation, is grammatical).

3.3 Downward-entailing quantifier

Possibly the strongest argument against the LD analysis, on DH's view, is provided by examples like (6), where the initial DP is a downward-entailing quantifier, including *wh*-operators. A common view of LD holds that such elements cannot figure as LDPs.

(6) a. **af exad,** lo racuy le'hastir mimen**o** dvarim ka'ele.
no one not advisable to.hide from.him things such
'It is not advisable to hide such things from anyone.'

b. **mi** ra'ita et axot**o** lifney šavua?
who you.saw sister.his before week
'Whose sister did you see a week ago?'

Drawing on Prince's (1997) characterization of LD, Landau argued that there is, in fact, a grammatical derivation of (6a-b) as LD constructions. While two paths to LD are pragmatic, imposing some "referentiality" on the LDP, the third path is purely syntactic and serves to save an otherwise impossible movement out of islands. As Landau wrote, this function is "blind to information structure, applying in all island environments, whether the initial DP is a topic, focus, *wh*-phrase, relative pronoun and so on." (p. 93). Since Hebrew allows neither P-stranding nor extraction of possessors out of DPs, environments like (6a-b) furnish legitimate contexts for LD – *even* when the LDP is a downward-entailing quantifier.

DH (2010) reply by claiming that even the island-amnestying function of LD is restricted to phrases that introduce discourse entities – hence unavailable to downward-entailing quantifiers. Thus, these must be BSs in (6).

There is a straightforward way to tease apart the two accounts. On the view that LD in (6) is licensed by purely syntactic factors (i.e., island environments), analogous sentences *without* the islands should be ungrammatical. This is so because the only path to LD that is open to downward-entailing quantifiers is to amnesty an island violation. In contrast, on DH's view the pronoun-containing islands in (6) are accidental; surely BS dependencies do not *have* to cross islands. Thus, removing the island should leave the grammaticality of the sentences intact.

The facts bear out the former view: An initial downward-entailing quantifier cannot bind a pronoun in a position where a trace is possible. The resulting sentences are very marginal (7a-b), as is typical in Hebrew whenever a resumptive pronoun is used redundantly.[3] Crucially, definite LDPs may perfectly bind direct object pronouns (7c-d), since they may satisfy either one of the two alternative *pragmatic* functions of LD

[3] Relative clauses are the exception (among Ā-movement constructions) in freely allowing an alternation between a gap and a resumptive pronoun in direct object (and non-local subject) positions. Example (17a) in DH (2010) is analogous to (7a) and indeed, I find it very marginal.

(simplifying discourse processing or triggering a set-inference; see Prince 1997 for details).

(7) a. ?? **af exad,** lo racuy le'hastir **oto** be-makom kaze.
no one not advisable to.hide him in-place such
'It is not advisable to hide anyone in such a place.'

b. ?? **mi** ra'ita **oto** lifney šavua?
who you.saw him before week
'Who did you see a week ago?'

c. **ha-arnak šelxa,** lo racuy le'hastir **oto** be-makom kaze.
the-wallet yours not advisable to.hide it in-place such
'It is not advisable to hide your wallet in such a place.'

d. **ha-seret ha-ze,** ra'ita **oto** lifney šavua.
the-movie the-this you.saw it before week
'This movie, you saw it a week ago.'

These contrasts are inexplicable under DH's account. As BSs, downward-entailing quantifiers should be grammatical *both* in (6a-b) and in (7a-b). As LDPs, they should be *un*grammatical in all these examples, if LDPs must always satisfy the pragmatic condition (i.e., introducing discourse entities). The fact of the matter is that downward-entailing quantifiers can occur as LDPs as long as they bind into an island. This behavior makes sense on the LD analysis proposed here, which recognizes a purely syntactic path to LD. It does not make sense on the BS analysis, which is neither sensitive to the island-non-island distinction nor to the definite DP-downward-entailing quantifier distinction.[4]

In sum, DH offer the three empirical criteria in (3) as evidence that BSs are distinct entities from LDPs in the grammar of Hebrew. We have seen that the three

[4] An obvious question is why downward-entailing quantifiers make poor LDPs in English even when binding into islands (i). The problem, I think, is more general: *Any* quantificational antecedent cannot be resumed (ii). The general markedness of resumption in English has been standardly taken to indicate that the language lacks genuine resumptive pronouns and only makes use of "intrusive" pronouns (which resist a variable interpretation) in island environments (see Chao and Sells 1983, McCloskey 2006).

i. * Nobody$_i$, Mary offended his$_i$ feelings.
ii. * I'd like to meet every linguist$_i$ that Mary wondered if she should invite him$_i$ to the party.

criteria, in fact, do not distinguish the two types. In particular, the alleged BSs systematically behave as if they are standard LDPs; which is, I argue, what they are.

4. Alleged similarities between broad and narrow subjects

One would think that a theory proposing a new, hitherto unrecognized type of subject in Hebrew, would be primarily concerned with demonstrating that this new type exhibits many, if not most of the subject properties associated with standard (narrow) subjects in the languages. Curiously, DH acknowledge that the alleged BS fails most subject tests for various reasons (see the next section). The residual common ground of BSs and standard subjects in Hebrew is rather thin: It consists of two properties only. They too, I submit, point to the *differences*, rather than similarities, between BSs and standard subjects.

4.1 Coordination

Landau disputed DH's earlier claim that a shared DP can function as a narrow subject in one conjunct and a broad subject in another. The dispute was factual – the examples DH provided ((5) in Landau's article) are ungrammatical. DH admit they are "awkward" and provide a new example, (13), which I still find ungrammatical.

(8) **af mitmoded** eyn **lo** ba'ayot mula ve-lo mehases litkof ota.
no contestant NEG to.him problems facing.her and- not hesitates to.attack her
'No contestant has problems in facing her or hesitates to attack her.'

Hebrew speakers confronted with this example provide conflicting judgments. I suspect that the LDP can license topic-drop in the second conjunct for certain speakers, thus saving the example. That topic-drop is possible in present tense in Hebrew (although *pro* is not) is shown below.

(9) A: amarta še-Rina lo mistaderet im af xaver šela. ve-hem?
said.2sg that-Rina not get.along with no friend her. And they?
'You said that Rina doesn't get along with any friend of hers. And they?'

B: lo mehasesim litkof ota.
not hesitate.pl to.attack her
'Don't hesitate to attack her.'

The dubious status of DH's coordination examples makes it hard to draw firm conclusions from them. However, even if they are just "awkward", this awkwardness is unexplained on the BS analysis. If anything, conjunction reduction is to be favored over repetition of an identical subject in two conjuncts. Of course, on the LD analysis, the coordination structures are underivable, since the shared LDP binds a pronoun in one conjunct but not in the other.

4.2 Subject clefts

DH claimed that the BS can be clefted in a construction that only targets subjects for clefting. Unfortunately, their single example was taken from a highly literary translation of Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*. Landau responded that the example falls quite clearly outside the grammar of spoken Hebrew. By that I simply meant that parallel constructed sentences, if presented to Hebrew speakers, would certainly be judged ungrammatical.

DH (2010) do not seem to dispute this claim, however, fail to perceive its implications. These are quite clear: Whatever the status of the alleged BS is in the artificial language of the literary translation, it has no bearing on its status in the grammar which DH actually study – that of spoken Hebrew. To claim that spoken Hebrew has BSs on the basis of a single example from an unspoken literary text is no more justified than to claim that spoken Hebrew has an aspectual sense of *ve-* 'and' just because this sense is evidenced in Biblical Hebrew. In fact, the inference in the former case is even weaker, since we have reasons to believe that Biblical Hebrew (partially) represents a language that was once spoken, whereas there is no basis for this assumption regarding the translated subject cleft example.

5. Real contrasts between BSs and narrow subjects

The bulk of Landau 2009 is devoted to showing that under any applicable subject test in Hebrew – Landau discusses 11 of them – the alleged BS contrasts with standard subjects and, in fact, displays the typical behavior of an Ā-element. DH replied, essentially, that all these tests were applied sloppily, and interfering factors were not screened out. Once this is done, they argued, all the superficial differences between BSs and narrow subjects are explained away without compromising the validity of the claim that BSs are genuine subjects.

In what follows I respond to DH's critique case by case. In some cases, I show that DH's valid empirical objections do not detract from the force of Landau's points, once subtler and more controlled data are examined. In other cases, I show that DH's alternative accounts for Landau's data are not sufficiently general. And yet in other cases I submit DH's examples to further tests indicating that DH have misanalyzed some of their own data.

5.1 Binding

Landau showed that unlike standard subjects, the alleged BS cannot bind anaphors. This follows from the assumption that anaphor binding considers A-positions but not Ā-positions, and that the alleged BS is, in truth, an LDP occupying an Ā-position. DH replied that the relevant example ((16a) in their reply) is ruled out independently of the A/Ā distinction. Specifically, the Hebrew anaphor *acmo* is a SELF anaphor, which must be bound by a coargument (Reinhart and Reuland 1993). BSs not being arguments of the main predicate, they do not qualify as SELF-binders.

DH were correct to point out this confound. However, their conclusion – that the A/Ā distinction is irrelevant to the failure of binding by BS – is unwarranted; a confound cannot decide between competing explanations. What is needed is a way to resolve the confound; a test that would control for the difference in argumenthood of narrow and broad subjects.

Such a test is available with logophoric *picture*-reflexives, which exist in Hebrew (although their distribution is not as free as in English). As Reinhart & Reuland pointed out, logophors are exempt for the coargumenhood restriction. Crucially, they still need to pick an A-antecedent (with the appropriate "logocentric" properties), Ā-antecedents being excluded. The A-antecedent of a logophor need not c-command it, but cannot be too far away (the actual locality constraints being complex and defeasible).

Just like the Japanese element *zibun-zisin*, a *picture*-reflexive in Hebrew can be bound by a higher subject (10a), showing it is not a SELF anaphor (cf. DH's (16b)). Nevertheless, an alleged BS still cannot bind a *picture*-reflexive. The relevant example must be constructed with some care. First, note that non-c-commanding experiencers qualify as logophoric antecedents (thanks to their implicated mental perspective), but only when clausemate to the logophor (10b)[5]; an embedded object experiencer cannot

[5] See Landau 2010:71-73 for a summary of evidence that backward binding is not reducible to reconstruction.

antecede a logophor inside the matrix subject (10c), presumably a distance effect. Crucially, a matrix alleged BS coindexed with the embedded object experiencer still cannot antecede the logophor inside the matrix narrow subject (10d), even though presumably distance is not an issue anymore. The only remaining explanation for the ill-formedness of (10d) is that *Gil*, although semantically logocentric, cannot bind the logophor because it occupies an Ā-position, being an LDP and not a BS.

(10) a. Gil$_i$ xašav še-ha-tmuna šel acmo$_i$ yac'a haxi gru'a.
Gil thought that-the-picture of himself came.out most bad
'Gil thought that the picture of himself came out worst.'

b. ha-tmuna šel acmo$_i$ me'acbenet et Gil$_i$.
the-picture of himself annoys ACC Gil
'The picture of himself$_i$ annoys Gil$_i$.'

c. * ha-tmuna šel acmo hoxixa le-kulam še-omanut me'acbenet et Gil.
the-picture of himself proved to-everyoone that-art annoys ACC Gil
'The picture of himself$_i$ proves to everyone that art annoys Gil$_i$.'

d. * **Gil$_i$**, ha-tmuna šel acmo$_i$ hoxixa le-kulam še-omanut me'acbenet **oto$_i$**.
Gil the-picture of himself proved to-everyoone that-art annoys him
'Gil$_i$, the picture of himself$_i$ proves to everyone that art annoys him$_i$.'

5.2 Triggered inversion

Landau showed that in the context of triggered inversion (where some XP precedes the subject), an alleged broad subject cannot invert with the verb, unlike a narrow subject (NS) (Landau's example (31)). This is naturally explained if the former is an LDP; the latter never invert with verbs in Hebrew.

DH argue that here too independent principles interfere. In particular, an inverted structure [XP V NS ...] is subject to an adjacency constraint: Nothing may intervene between V and NS. A BS occurring between V and NS would disrupt the adjacency, hence the failure of inversion.

Notice first the this account begs the question of why the adjacency constraint must hold between V and the *narrow* subject and cannot be satisfied by V-BS adjacency

alone. After all, if BS is simply a subject, and all the inverted verb wants is to be adjacent to a subject, sequences like [XP-V-BS-NS...] should be licit.

Nevertheless, suppose, for the sake of the argument, that it is NS that needs to be adjacent to V. Such conditions are most naturally understood in prosodic terms: The sequence V-NS must form a prosodic unit, and any intervener breaks up this unit.

The question arises what happens when NS is null (e.g., *pro*). Presumably, whatever the licensing conditions on *pro* are, prosody is not part of them; it is hard to imagine why a null element would need to form a prosodic unit with anything at all. Given these plausible assumptions, DH predict one grammatical realization of the sequence [XP-V-BS-NS...]; namely, when NS=*pro*. In this situation, the intervention of BS between V and *pro* would have no prosodic consequences. In fact, if *pro* itself is redundant, its function taken over by interpretable verbal morphology (Alexiadou and Anagnostpoulou 1998), the adjacency constraint is not even statable in null subject contexts.

The facts, however, are different: V cannot invert with BS even across a (referential or impersonal) *pro* NS.

(11) a. **Rina**, harsu/harasti et ha-bayit **šela** etmol.
Rina demolioshed.3pl/1sg ACC the-house her yesterday
'Rina, they/I demolished her house yesterday.'

b. * etmol harsu/harasti **Rina** et ha-bayit **šela**.
yesterday demolished.3pl/isg Rina ACC the-house her
'Rina, yesterday they/I demolished her house.'

As far as I can see, the adjacency constraint invoked by DH to rule out Landau's original examples (32a-b) cannot be extended to (11b); perhaps an as-yet unstated constraint can do the job. The point is that such complications are unnecessary under the LD analysis, where all the relevant examples are uniformly ruled out: LDPs do not invert with verbs, regardless of the nature of the subject (lexical or null).

5.3 Raising

Landau has shown that the alleged BS in Hebrew cannot undergo Raising-to-Object (his examples (23b), (29b)), another traditional subject test. In response, DH argue that raising of a BS never materializes in Hebrew due to an independent coincidence of three factors:

(i) raising complements in Hebrew are nonfinite; (ii) sentential predicates must case-license a subject in them (i.e., the NS); (iii) nonfinite clauses do not case-license a subject.

However, as Landau discusses in connection with his example (20), arbitrary PRO is perfectly licit in nonfinite clauses.[6] Therefore, DH's account, as sketched above, only applies to lexical NSs. Whenever the NS is PRO_{atb}, no grammatical principle blocks it from appearing in a nonfinite sentential predicate (participial or infinitive – see (12a-b)). The NS being licensed in the complement clause, the BS should then be licensed via Raising-to-Object.

In fact, the resulting sentences are just as bad as they are with a lexical NS. (12a) illustrates the failure of raising out of an adjectival small complement to an epistemic verb (the raisee is accusative) and (12b) the failure of raising out of a causative infinitival complement (the raisee is dative).

(12) a. * ani maxšiv et **Gil$_i$** [t_i PRO_{arb} axra'im al**av**].
I consider ACC Gil responsible on.him
'I consider Gil, people/somebody responsible for him.'

b. * natati la-**lixlux$_i$** [t_i PRO_{arb} letate *oto* haxuca].
let.1sg to-the-dirt to.wipe it outside
'I let the dirt, people/somebody wipe it outside.'

Barring ad-hoc stipulations about the licensing of PRO_{arb}, the BS analysis cannot rule out Raising-to-Object of the BS in such contexts. In contrast, the LD analysis again faces no problem: LDPs never raise to object positions (perhaps a consequence of the ban on improper movement, or of a clash in case features).[7]

---

[6] Whether it is licensed by case or not is a different matter. For a non-case-based account of the distribution of PRO, see Landau 2006.

[7] In support of the claim that BSs are not licensed in nonfinite clauses, DH present example (i) (their (23b). In predicate nominal sentences with a pronominal copula ('pron'), the subject is claimed to be a BS. The ultimate reason for the ungrammaticality of (i), however, is the fact that perception verbs select small clauses; a finite complement – signaled by the presence of 'pron' – is excluded (unless the finite complementizer *še-* 'that' is used, in which case the sense is no longer perceptual but rather 'see that...'). That case-licensing of an alleged BS is not at issue here can be seen in (ii), where a tensed copula (*haya* 'was') is equally excluded. Presumably, DH would not argue that the subject of *haya* must always be a BS. Hence, the effect observed in (i) does not bear on the BS hypothesis.

(i) matay nizke lir'ot et Dani (*hu) roš-memšala?
When will.achieve.1pl to.see ACC Dani (he) prime-minister
'When will we get to see Dani prime minister?'

Moving on to Raising-to-Subject, Landau's example (24b) has shown that BSs cannot raise to the matrix subject position – even from infinitival complements that do license a local lexical subject (by long-distance Agree with the matrix T). DH (fn. 7) respond that Landau's example is actually grammatical, and cite another good example of this sort. Indeed, the examples are possible, but only on the LD reading, which requires a heavy pause following the initial DP. Is there a way to decide which analysis is correct?

Genuine Raising-to-Subject creates familiar scope ambiguities between the raisee and the raising predicate (13a). If BSs can actually raise from the periphery of the complement clause over the matrix verb, they should be scopally ambiguous with it. In fact, however, they always take wider scope (13b-c).

(13) a. mišehu ba-kahal$_i$ carix [t$_i$ lada'at et ha-tšuva].
somebody in.the-audience should.3sgM to.know ACC the-answer
'Somebody in the audience should know the answer.'

(i) There is somebody in the audience (say, John) who should know the answer.
(ii) It must be the case that there is somebody in the audience who knows the answer.

b. **mišehu ba-kahal** crixim [le'hagid **lo** et ha-tšuva].
somebody in.the-audience should.3pl to.tell to.him ACC the-answer
'Somebody in the audience, they should tell him the answer.'

Only (i): There is somebody in the audience (say, John) who they should tell the answer.

c. **mišehu ba-kahal** crixa [le'hitkabel ha-tšuva **šelo**].
somebody in.the-audience should.3sgF to.be.received the-answer his
'Somebody in the audience, his answer should be received.'

(ii) matay ra'item et Dani (*haya) roš-memšala?
When saw.2pl to.see ACC Dani (was) prime-minister
'When did you see Dani (*was) prime minister?'

Only (i): There is somebody in the audience (say, John) whose answer should be received.

If *mišehu ba-kahal* 'somebody in the audience' in (13b-c) could have been generated as the BS of the complement clause – recall that BSs are *not* restricted to root contexts – and then raise to become the matrix subject, it would have left a trace structurally lower than the predicate 'should'. This trace (or copy) would have produced the second, low-scope reading for the QP, just like it does in (13a). The sharp contrast between these cases strongly argues against a raising derivation of (13b-c); but the BS analysis cannot explain *why* this derivation is impossible. On the LD analysis, in contrast, the facts are expected. The initial QP in (13b-c) could not have raised as LDPs (occupying Ā-positions) do not undergo raising. Nor could it be an embedded LDP that has undergone topicalization to the matrix clause. As Landau has argued (his (28)), LD is unavailable in infinitives (possibly due to their reduced left periphery). Thus, there is no derivation of (13b-c) in which the initial QP has started off in the embedded clause, explaining its unambiguous wide scope.

5.4 Intervention effects

Following ADH, Landau pointed out that BS-clauses are islands for *wh*-movement (his example (25c)). This is readily understood if the alleged BS is an LDP. Since LDPs occupy Ā-positions, they create barriers for Ā-movement. Since subjects do not block Ā-movement, the BS analysis does not predict this effect.

Once again, this straightforward account, which requires no auxiliary assumptions, is challenged in DH's reply. The islandhood of BS-clauses, they argue, has nothing to do with the type of position occupied by the BS. Instead, it is attributed to the presence of the pronoun it binds, a resumptive pronoun in DH's view. The relevant intervention effect, according to DH, "surfaces in Hebrew whenever an Ā-dependency terminating in a gap has to cross a dependency terminating in a resumptive pronoun." This restriction is not explained, but claimed to be needed independently (see DH's (27)).

The first problem with this account is whether the independent restriction that is invoked is needed in the grammar of Hebrew. Note that standard resumptive pronouns are Ā-bound. Hence, any movement across the binder of the resumptive pronoun will, ipso facto, also violate locality conditions (relativized minimality). Indeed, DH's example (27b), repeated below with my judgment as (14a), does not reveal a clear contrast: The

example is very marginal even with a gap, and the resumptive pronoun does not make it substantially worse.[8]

Furthermore, the sentence does not improve even if we make the two dependencies uniform, both terminating in a resumptive pronoun (14b). These observations suggest that DH's restriction is spurious, capturing an arbitrary subset of a natural class which is better characterized in terms of the standard theory of relativized minimality.

(14) a. ?* le-eyze anašim eyn lax tšuva še-efšar latet (ota)?
to-which people NEG to.you answer that-possible to.give (it)?
'To which people don't you have an answer that you can give?'

b. ?* le-eyze anašim$_i$ eyn lax tšuva$_j$ še-efšar latet la'hem$_i$ ota$_j$?
to-which people NEG to.you answer that-possible to.give to.them it?
'To which people don't you have an answer that you can give?'

The second, and perhaps deeper problem with DH's account, is their presupposition that A-bound pronouns could qualify as *resumptive* pronouns. This view is quite unorthodox and requires justification on its own, which DH do not provide. The only other candidate for A-bound resumptive pronoun that I am aware of is the copy pronoun in the "copy raising" construction (Rogers 1971, Heycock 1994, Potsdam and Runner 2001, Asudeh and Toivonen, to appear), which is also attested in Hebrew (Lappin 1984, Landau, to appear). However, this pronoun has no detrimental effect whatsoever on *wh*-extraction across its dependency.

---

[8] An independent confound in (14a) is the possibility of construing the *wh*-phrase as a matrix adjunct of the negative existential *eyn*, cf. (i). This is particularly natural given that the embedded predicate *latet tšuva* 'give an answer' does not necessitate a goal argument, and the two parses (matrix or embedded question) produce very similar meanings. Once the matrix construal is blocked (ii), the islandhood of the relative clause becomes clear, and a gap is not tolerated (iii), contra DH's description.

(i) le-eyze anašim eyn lax tšuva/koax/savlanut?
to-which people NEG to.you answer/energy/patience
'Which people don't you have any answer/energy/patience for?'

(ii) * me-eyze anašim eyn lax šitot?
from-which people NEG to.you methods
'From which people don't you have methods?'

(iii) * [me-eyze anašim]$_j$ eyn lax šitot$_i$ še-efšar lilmod t$_i$/otan$_i$ t$_j$?
from-which people NEG to.you methods that-possible to.learn t$_i$/t$_i$
'From which people don't you have methods?'

(15) a. Gil_i nir'e ke'ilu hu_i omed le'harbic le-Yosi.
Gil looks as.if he stands to.hit to-Yosi
'Gil looks like he's about to hit Yosi.'

b. le-mi_j Gil_i nir'e ke'ilu hu_i omed le'harbic t_j?
to-whom Gil looks as.if he stands to.hit
'Who does Gil look like he's about to hit?'

To sum up: It is far from clear that the pronoun in a BS-clause, insofar as it is A-bound, should qualify as a resumptive pronoun. If it does, then it is subject to an unexplained restriction (no movement across a resumptive dependency), which does not apply to the only other potential instance of A-bound resumptive pronoun. When Ā-bound resumptive pronouns are considered, DH's restriction seems spurious, better subsumed under relativized minimality. A relativized minimality account, in turn, supports the conclusion that the alleged BS is in fact an LDP, and precisely for that reason, creates Ā-barriers.

5.5 Constituent negation

Landau claimed that unlike subjects but like LDPs, the alleged BS cannot be negated by constituent negation (his (35)). DH point out (in their (28b)) that the relevant examples improve when contrastive stress falls on the DP and not on the negative particle. I agree with their observation and therefore retract this objection. It should be noted that this test (unlike all the other ones) did not follow from any theoretical distinction between subjects and LDPs, hence its original significance was rather limited to begin with.

5.6 Control

Control constructions provide two useful tests to distinguish the BS analysis from the LD analysis. First, since controllers must occupy A-positions, a BS should be able to control but an LDP should not. Second, since the controllee (PRO) is necessarily a subject, a BS should be controllable but an LDP should not. Indeed, as Landau showed (his (18), (20)), the alleged BS fails to participate in control in both directions, confirming its LDP status. By contrast, genuine BSs in Japanese can control and be controlled (Landau's (21)).

DH dispute some of these facts, providing an example (their (29)) where an alleged BS controls into an adjunct. I find the example completely ungrammatical, no

better that DH's (30), where the intended controller is a DP-internal possessor that does not c-command the adjunct. DH's (29) was presented to 44 native speakers of Hebrew; only two found it acceptable, and the majority rejected it.[9] To venture a speculation on the reasons for this disagreement, it is possible that DH allow the adjunct in their (29) (headed by *without*) to be *logophorically* controlled (this requires a prosodic pause between the main clause and the adjunct). Logophoric control, unlike obligatory control, is not a structural relation (see Williams 1992, Lyngfelt 1999, Landau 2000, 2003). Importantly, high topicality plays a role in determining the reference of a logophoric PRO (Kawasaki 1993), which might explain why LD may facilitate its identification. In any event, under neutral intonation and pragmatic circumstances, DH's (29) is far worse than any comparable example with a narrow subject controller, as native speakers confirm, an asymmetry DH do not explain.

DH further cite their (38a-b) as examples where a matrix BH controls an embedded subject (broad or narrow) in the complement of *keday*/*racuy* 'advisable'/'preferable'. What they fail to mention is that the dependency between the alleged matrix BS and the alleged controlled subject is unbounded; it can be expanded by iterative insertion of material as the parenthesized string in (16), modeled on DH's (38b).

(16) **kol bayit$_i$** keday/racuy še- (ha-iriya tidroš še-)
every house advisable/preferable that (the-municipalty will.require that)
tihye **lo$_i$** mirpeset.
will.be to.it balcony
'Every house, it is advisable/preferable that (the municipality will require that)
it will have a balcony.'

Needless to say, no known obligatory control configuration is similarly unbounded. This clearly points to an Ā-dependency: topicalization in DH's (38a), terminating in a trace, and LD in their (38b), terminating in a resumptive pronoun.

Consider next the failure of the alleged BS to be controlled. Landau was careful to construct examples (his (20a-b)) in which the NS was an arbitrary PRO – an element that is licensed in infinitives. Nonetheless, in their reply DH again invoke the restriction that they appealed to in connection with the raising test (see (12) above): Hebrew infinitives cannot host lexical subjects. Landau's examples (20a-b), they argue, are ruled out because "impersonal *pro* in Hebrew, unlike PRO, is only licensed in a tensed clause, and

[9] I thank Irena Botwinik for collecting these judgments.

PRO itself does not have an impersonal interpretation." The last statement, as mentioned, is false: Impersonal PRO is nothing but PRO_{arb}, and Hebrew infinitives freely license it. Hence, DH have not provided a satisfactory explanation for why a BS cannot function as PRO in a controlled infinitive.

Nevertheless, DH claim that the alleged BS can and must be controlled in Hebrew subjunctives, which I have shown in previous work to display obligatory control with 3rd person null subjects (Landau 2004). Their examples (32)-(33), (36) are intended to illustrate this possibility. In fact, these data are confounded by independent semantic factors that obscure the question of control.

DH use *cipa* 'expect of' and *daraš* 'demand' as (object) control verbs.[10] These verbs select Action complements in the sense of Jackendoff and Culicover 2003. However, the complements with which they appear, in DH's examples, do not normally denote actions; cf. (17a), which is DH's (32). The way speakers overcome this discrepancy is by semantic coercion – the complement state is supplemented with implicit material that makes it an Action (Sag and Pollard 1991). In the case of (17a), the sentence is interpreted as "I expected of Gil to *display* courage", or perhaps 'I expected of Gil *to bring himself* to have courage".

(17) a. cipiti me-Gil$_i$ še-yihye lo$_{i/*j}$ omec.
expected.1sg from-Gil that-will.be.3Msg to.him courage
'I expected of Gil to have courage.'

b. cipiti me-Gil$_i$ še-yihye maspik oxel le-kulam.
expected.1sg from-Gil that-will.be.3Msg enough food to-everybody
'I expected of Gil that there would be enough food for everybody.'

It is this process of semantic coercion, I submit, that is responsible for the deceptive appearance of control in (17a) (and the rest of DH's subjunctive examples), and *not* a syntactic control relation with a PRO BS, as DH propose. Notice first that this semantic property is independent of control: the referent of the object of *cipa* 'expect' must be the implicit causer (or 'initiator' in Farkas's 1988 sense) of the embedded event/state even in non-control environments: Thus, (17b) must be interpreted along the lines of "I expected of Gil *to make sure* that there would be enough food for everybody." Now, since having

[10] Note that Hebrew *cipa* is an object control verb and not an ECM verb. Thus, it is more properly translated as 'expect of'. Importantly, its complement is semantically an Action, unlike ECM complements.

courage is a quality (or behavior) that one can only guarantee in oneself, the matrix object *Gil*, which is semantically identified as the implicit causer in the complement of (17a) (but *not* via control), comes to be understood as the one having courage. This inferential chain mimics syntactic control, but is fundamentally different from it.[11]

This alternative account makes a very specific prediction: Controlled subjunctives that are not semantically selected to be Actions will not display this "pseudo-control" of an alleged BS, the reason being that no matrix participant will be necessarily implicated in them via semantic coercion. The prediction is indeed correct.

Consider the verb *kiva* 'hope', which takes a controlled subjunctive according to Landau 2004. Unlike the complement of *cipa*/*daraš* 'expect of'/'demand', the complement of this verb is semantically unrestricted (e.g., *John hoped to be taller*). Nevertheless, when its subject is a null 3rd person pronoun, it is obligatorily controlled by the matrix subject (18a). Note now that Hebrew lacks (non-impersonal) 3rd person *pro*, hence a null 3Sg subject must be PRO. Correspondingly, when the matrix subject is in 1st person, a 3rd person PRO is obviously impossible (control entails feature matching), and the embedded subject must be overt (18b).

(18) a. Gil_i kiva [še-$PRO_{i/*j}$ yihye bari]
Gil hoped that will.be.3sg healthy
'Gil hoped to be healthy'

b. pro_i kiviti [še-hu_j/*pro_j yihye bari]
hoped.1sg that-he will.be.3sg healthy
'I hoped that he would be healthy.'

c. pro_i kiviti [še- (?? hu_j) yihye lo_j omec]
hoped.1sg that (?? he) will.be.3sg to.him courage
'I hoped that he would have courage.'

d $Rina_i$ kivta [še- (?? hu_j) yihye lo_j omec]
hoped.3Fsg that (?? he) will.be.3sg to.him courage
'Rina hoped that he would have courage.'

[11] Indeed, such semantic links are less rigid than syntactic control. Let us imagine that Gil has such motivational powers over his son, that he can talk him into courageous behavior in certain circumstances. In this context, *lo* 'to.him' in (17a) might refer to the son and not to Gil, proving that this is not a case of obligatory control. The relevant reading is easier to obtain in the absence of ambiguity, e.g., when the pronoun is in a different gender (*la* 'to.her'), speaking of Gil's daughter.

The crucial examples are (18c-d), where the same complement occurs that DH use in their example (32). On DH's analysis, this complement has a BS PRO which is obligatorily controlled in subjunctive contexts. Since this BS is necessarily co-indexed with the possessive pronoun *lo* 'to.him' (BSs must bind a pronoun in Hebrew), one would expect the latter to be obligatorily coreferential with the matrix subject. Therefore, (18c), where the matrix subject is 1st person and the alleged embedded BS is 3rd person, is predicted to be ungrammatical, just like (18b) is with an embedded null subject; and similarly to the latter, (18c) should demand an overt pronoun instead of the embedded null subject. In fact, (18c) is perfectly grammatical with no referential dependency between the matrix and the embedded clauses, and an overt preverbal pronoun in the complement is highly degraded (presumably, because of the strong dispreference to embedded LD). (18d) makes the same point, this time with a gender mismatch between the matrix subject and the embedded possessor.

The striking contrast between genuine control contexts like (18a) and examples like (18c-d) seriously undermines the claim that the latter involve any controlled subject; thus, once care is taken to factor out irrelevant semantic constraints on certain subjunctive complements, there is no evidence for a BS, let alone a controllable one, from control constructions in Hebrew.

At this point one may wonder why DH assume that complements like [*yihye lo omec*] 'will be to him courage' *must* be generated with a BS PRO, which would produce obligatory control in the contexts of (17)-(18). After all, the BS variant is supposed to be an option, not a necessity. Would DH predict obligatory control also in (19)? (*hivtiax* 'promise' is a verb that can select controlled subjunctives).

(19) Rina$_i$ hivtixa [še- *pro*$_{arb}$ ya'azru lo$_j$].
Rina promised.3fsg that will.help.3pl to.him
'Rina promised that people/somebody would help him.'

Presumably, nothing forces merging a PRO BS coindexed with *lo* 'to.him' above the *pro*$_{arb}$ NS in the complement; hence the lack of control. Why, then, are the possessive constructions used in DH's examples (32)-(33), (36) ('have courage/patience') obliged to project a BS PRO? Evidently, DH *suppose* that these sentences display obligatory control and want to derive this effect. But if I am correct, the control effect in DH's examples is illusory, a combined result of the semantics of action complements and the semantics of "mental possession" complements. Once either of these factors is neutralized, the

"control" effect goes away. Granted that, the subjunctive facts do not argue either way: On the BS analysis, the lack of obligatory control could follow from the optionality of a BS structure (a BS PRO need not be projected). On the LD analysis, the lack of control would follow from the fact that LDPs are not subjects, hence not controllable.[12]

Rather than situations where the alleged BS *must* be controlled (apparently, no such cases exist), it is situations where it *cannot* be controlled that seriously challenge the BS analysis. The former situations can always be explained away (no BS is projected); the latter cannot be so (why is a PRO BS not projected?). Thus, Landau's original examples (18), (20) stand as unanswerable as they were prior to DH's reply.

5.7 Obligatory pronoun

As Landau pointed out, a salient difference between BS constructions in Japanese and their alleged counterparts in Hebrew is the status of the pronoun that is bound by the BS. In Japanese, such a pronoun (whether overt or null) is not necessary, whereas in Hebrew it is (see Landau's (36)-(37)). DH acknowledge this contrast in passing (their fn. 8) without explaining what it follows from. In fact, Landau proposed a very simple account of this asymmetry, in analogy to the following pair.

(20) a. As for John, something terrible happened (to him).
b. John, something terrible happened *(to him).

Hanging topic constructions (20a) articulate an *aboutness* relation between an individual and a proposition. Left dislocation (20b) articulates a predication relation between an individual and a property. The complement clause in the latter case is formed with a null operator, which in turn demands a pronominal variable to bind. A propositional clause, on the other hand, contains no such operator, hence no pronoun is required (see Landau, to appear for discussion of this distinction in a broader context). Apparently, BS constructions (in Japanese) are analogous to hanging topic constructions – both expressing an aboutness relation. The reason that the alleged BS construction in Hebrew

[12] DH argue that complements with a controlled BS PRO are transparent to NPI-licensing, a characteristic of controlled subjunctives (their (36)). The facts, however, are far from clear. Many alleged BS clauses are *not* transparent to NPI-licensing. The ungrammatical (i) depicts a BS analysis of the complement clause; note that the alleged BS would be a controlled PRO, coindexed with the possessive pronoun.

(i) * lo darašti me-Gil$_i$ [še-PRO$_i$ ha-maxlif šelo$_i$ yedaber im af exad].
NEG demanded.1sg that- the-substitute his will.talk with no one
'I didn't demand from Gil that his substitute would talk to anyone.'

must contain a bound pronoun is, quite simply, that it *is* an LD construction, just like (20b). DH have not provided any alternative explanation for this striking crosslinguistic contrast, neither in their earlier work nor in their reply to Landau 2009.

6. Conclusion

Let us take stock. First, it would be useful to factor out of the debate whatever factual disagreements and irrelevant tests have emerged. Such is the case with the coordination, subject clefts, and the (in)ability of a BS to control into adjuncts. Similarly, the test of constituent negation appears to be uninformative.

The remaining issues are the following. First, there are the properties that DH claimed distinguish BSs from LDs. Of these, we have seen that none remains. The alleged BS is generally disallowed in non-root and non-peripheral positions, just like an LDP. Contrary to DH's claim, downward-entailing quantifiers *are* possible LDPs in Hebrew, provided the pronoun they bind occurs inside an island. Thus, neither locality diagnostics (which are discarded on DH's current view) nor any other distributional criteria that can distinguish BSs from LDPs have survived.

Some of the empirical objections raised in DH's reply have indeed shown Landau's arguments to be insufficient (though not invalid). Unfortunately, DH have not proceeded to seek decisive evidence. One goal of this rejoinder has been to show that such evidence exists, and it clearly points to the ultimate correctness of Landau's position. Thus, new data have been presented that target more accurately the interaction of alleged BSs with downward-entailing quantifiers, anaphor binding, triggered inversion, raising to subject and subjunctive control. All the evidence indicates that the alleged BS does not behave like standard (narrow) subjects in Hebrew.

DH's reply has invoked three ad-hoc constraints to explain some of these asymmetries: A clash between highly topical and focal elements, a ban on impersonal subjects in infinitives and a restriction on the interleaving of gap-chains and resumptive chains. I have argued that none of these ad hoc constraints is independently motivated, and, in fact, they fail to capture natural classes of phenomena.

Finally, there is a straightforward argument for the LD analysis and against the BS analysis, which remains unanswered in DH's reply: The obligatory presence of a bound pronoun in the construction.

Considering this overall state of affairs, my earlier conclusion remains unchanged, perhaps it is even firmer now: Hebrew has no analogue to the Japanese BS construction.

Hebrew clauses contain at most a single subject; whatever appears to be a "broad" subject is consistently a left-dislocated phrase.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostpoulou. 1998. Parameterizing AGR: Word Order, V-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 491-539.

Alexopoulou, Theodora, Edit Doron, and Caroline Heycock. 2004. Broad Subjects and Clitic Left Dislocation. In *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and Their Effects*, ed. by David Adger, Cecile de Cat and George Tsoulas, 329-358. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Asudeh, Ash, and Ida Toivonen. Copy Raising and Perception. To appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Chao, Wynn, and Peter Sells. 1983. On the Interpretation of Resumptive Pronouns. In *Proceedings of NELS 13*, ed. by Peter Sells and Charles Jones, 47-61. Amherst: GLSA Publications.

Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock. 1999. Filling and Licensing Multiple Specifiers. In *Specifiers: Minimalist Approaches*, ed. by David Adger, Susan Pintzuk, Bernadette Plunkett and George Tsoulas, 69-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock. 2010. In Support of Broad Subjects in Hebrew. *Lingua*, in press.

Farkas, Donca F. 1988. On Obligatory Control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11, 27–58.

Green, Georgia. 1976. Main Clause Phenomena in Subordinate Clauses. *Language* 52, 382-397.

Heycock, Caroline. 1994. *Layers of Predication*. New York: Garland Publishing Co.

Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded Root Phenomena. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Vol. II*, ed. by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 174-209: Blackwell Publishing.

Heycock, Caroline, and Edit Doron. 2003. Categorial Subjects. *Gengo Kenkyu* 123, 95-135.

Jackendoff, Ray, and Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The Semantic Basis of Control in English. *Language* 79, 517-556.

Kawasaki, Noriko. 1993. *Control and Arbitrary Interpretation in English*. PhD dissertation, UMASS.

Landau, Idan. Predication vs. Aboutness in Copy Raising. To appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. .

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

Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement Out of Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 471–498.

Landau, Idan. 2004. The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22, 811-877.

Landau, Idan. 2006. Severing the Distribution of PRO from Case. *Syntax* 9, 153-170.

Landau, Idan. 2009. Against Broad Subjects in Hebrew. *Lingua* 119, 89-101.

Landau, Idan. 2010. *The Locative Syntax of Experiencers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lappin, Shalom. 1984. Predication and Raising. In *Proceedings of NELS 14*, ed. by Charles Jones and Peter Sells, 236-252. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Lyngfelt, Benjamin. 1999. Optimal Control: An OT Perspective on the Interpretation of PRO in Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 63, 75-104.

McCloskey, James. 2006. Resumption. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Vol. IV*, ed. by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 94-117: Blackwell Publishing.

Potsdam, Eric, and Jeffrey Runner. 2001. Richard Returns: Copy-Raising and its Implications. In *Proceedings of CLS 37*, ed. by Mary Andronis, Christopher Ball, Heidi Elston and Sylvain Neuvel, 453-468. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Prince, Ellen F. 1997. On the Functions of Left-Dislocation in English Discourse. In *Directions in Functional Linguistics*, ed. by Akaio Kamio, 117-143. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 657–720.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Rogers, Andy. 1971. Three Kinds of Physical Peception Verbs. In *Proceedings of CLS 7*, ed. by Douglas Adams et al., 206-222. Chicago: Univesrity of Chicago.

Sag, Ivan, and Carl Pollard. 1991. An Integrated Theory of Complement Control. *Language* 67, 63–113.

Sawada, Miyuki, and Richard K. Larson. 2004. Presupposition and Root Transforms in Adjunct Clauses. In *Proceedings of NELS 34*, ed. by Matthew Wolf and Keir Moulton, 517-528. UMASS, Amherst: GLSA.

Williams, Edwin. 1992. Adjunct Control. In *Control and Grammar*, ed. by Richard Larson, Sabine Iatridou, Utpal Lahiri and James Higginbotham, 297–322. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.