

Overt Nominative Subjects in Infinitival Complements in Hungarian¹

Anna Szabolcsi

New York University, 3-12-09

Abstract

We argue that the infinitival complements of subject-control and subject-to-subject raising verbs in Hungarian can have overt nominative subjects. The infinitival subject status of these DPs is diagnosed by constituent order, binding properties, and scope interpretation. Long-distance Agree(ment) and multiple agreement are crucial to their overtness.

1. Outline of the argument

This paper is concerned with data that I discovered exactly 20 years ago and have been grappling with ever since: overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements. Although I do not claim to have a definitive analysis yet, the good news is that syntactic theory seems to be in a better position to tackle them today than it was back then.

The following two examples will give a sense of the data. Note that ‘only DP’ is interpreted inside the complement.

- (1) Context: A group of friends boards a crowded bus that has only one vacant seat.

Senki nem akart csak ő leül-ni.

Nobody not wanted-3SG only he/she sit-INF

‘Nobody wanted it to be the case that only he/she takes a seat’

- (2) Context: In the past many actors got good roles, but recently directors have lost interest in all but one of them.

Idén el-kezdett csak Péter kap-ni

this.year PRT-began-3S only Peter get-INF

jó szerepek-et.

good roles-ACC

‘This year it has begun to be the case that only Peter is getting good roles’

¹ I would like to thank the participants of ICSH 8, the two reviewers, and the editors of this volume for helpful comments.

Example (1) is a case of obligatory subject control. The finite control predicate has its own subject, a quantifier phrase. The verb in the complement bears the infinitival suffix *-ni*. The infinitival complement contains the overt nominative 3SG pronoun *ő* (translated as 'he/she', because Hungarian has no grammatical gender; in what follows I will pick a gender to simplify the glosses). The pronoun acts as a variable bound by the matrix subject; moreover it has the same *de se* interpretation that controlled PRO classically receives (Chierchia 1989).

The verb *elkezd* 'begin' in (2) is a raising verb. Perlmutter (1970) showed that *begin* has both a control version and a raising version. The raising version is most easily detected when the complement predicate is not agentive. Crucial to us at this point is the fact that the infinitival complement has an overt nominative subject, *Péter*.

It will be shown that *ő* in (1) and *Péter* in (2) originate in and are located inside the infinitival complement and are moreover the subjects of those complements. If so, what enables them to be phonetically overt, when the subjects of control and raising complements are typically null? A reliable answer to this question is not likely to come from the consideration of just one language, because several different explanations may well be compatible with its data. On the other hand, even a single language may allow us to conclude that some particular property does not constitute a necessary condition. The discussion in this paper is largely confined to Hungarian and its goals are accordingly preliminary and modest. A cross-linguistic investigation is taken up in Szabolcsi (2007) and in work in progress.

Specifically, I propose that the overtness of the infinitival subjects in (1) and (2) is not due to rich infinitival inflection, nor to government of the subject from C, cf. Rizzi (1982) and Raposo (1987). Instead, the critical property seems to be that the infinitival subjects we are looking at agree with finite matrix verbs in person and number. (1) and (2) are, then, cases of *long-distance Agree* (Chomsky 1995). Moreover, at least (1) definitely requires *multiple agreement* (Ura 1996, Hiraiwa 2001, 2005, Chomsky 2008). Long-distance agreement and multiple agreement are crucial tools that Minimalism offers and the Government--Binding and Principles & Parameters frameworks did not.

If person-number agreement with a finite verb enables infinitival subjects to be overt, then the present proposal does not necessitate a major departure from the old idea that the overtness of DP is contingent on abstract Case, and Nominative is assigned by the tensed inflection. Abstract Case also figures prominently in Minimalism. There is however an alternative line of thinking that severs the relation between abstract Case and morphological case, and calls the usefulness of postulating abstract Case into question (Marantz 1991, McFadden 2004, and many others). In this paper nominative case is mentioned only as a morphological property (a significant one, given that Hungarian has over twenty morphological cases).

I remain agnostic regarding any deeper reasons why person-number agreement with a tensed verb allows the nominative DP to be overt.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 sets out to familiarize the English speaking reader with the meanings of the sentences this paper focuses on. Section 3 argues that our nominative DP is located in the infinitival complement, and Section 4, that it is none other than the subject of that complement. Section 5 discusses the agreement with the finite verb. Section 6 comments on the *de se* interpretation of the subjects of control complements. Section 7 concludes the discussion.

2. What do these sentences mean?

It may be surprising that a paper on DP overtiness starts out with worrying about the precise meanings of the sentences involved. The reason why this is critical is that the nominative DPs under investigation are scope taking operators or are modified by scope taking particles like ‘too’ and ‘only’, and in the sentences where they are claimed to occur inside the infinitival clause they take scope within that clause, carrying what will be called the LO reading. Many of the LO readings are not expressible (without complicated circumscription) unless the language makes overt infinitival subjects available. Other LO readings may be expressible, but not unambiguously. Thus the *raison d’être* for the overtiness of such subjects is to satisfy an interface need and to minimize the mismatch between PF and LF. I propose to interpret this interface need as one that calls for a systematic way to express a particular kind of truth-conditional content, even though in some instances there is an alternative, ambiguous way available. Roughly the same interpretation is needed to explain why Hungarian generally offers a way to indicate scope relations in surface structure, even though some of those truth-conditional contents would be expressible in less transparent ways as well (as in English).

Szabolcsi (2007) argues that various languages, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Russian among them have, or probably have, overt infinitival subjects of the Hungarian sort. On the other hand, English, French, German, and Dutch quite clearly lack them. Over and beyond the theoretical issues that this cross-linguistic contrast raises there is the practical consequence that the reader of this paper may find it difficult to form an intuitive grasp of the examples. The goal of this section is to set the stage by giving an informal sense of their meanings. We use English sentences that do not have the same structures as the Hungarian ones but have similar meanings.

First consider raising. We use the aspectual raising verb *begin* instead of *seem*, for two reasons. One is that Hungarian *látszik* ‘seem’ primarily takes either indicative or small clause complements and does not easily combine with infinitives. Thus using *begin* lays better groundwork

for the rest of the paper. Another reason is that the truth conditional effect of an operator scoping either in the matrix or in the complement is much sharper with the aspectual predicate than with the purely intensional one; we can get two logically independent readings. Consider two scenarios and sentence (5).

- (3) *The HI scenario: Total numbers growing, number of first-timers declining*

In April, 4 actresses got their first good reviews and then continued to get ones.

In May, another 2 actresses got their first good reviews and then continued to get ones.

No other changes happened.

- (4) *The LO scenario: Total numbers declining, number of first-timers staying the same*

In April, 10 actresses got good reviews, 4 of them for the first time.

In May, 8 of the above 10 actresses didn't get good reviews. But another 4 actresses got their first good reviews.

No other changes happened.

- (5) *Fewer actresses began to get good reviews in May.*

(a) 'Fewer actresses got their first good reviews in May than earlier'

(b) 'It began to be the case in May that fewer actresses overall were getting good reviews than earlier'

(5) is ambiguous. Reading (a) is true in the HI scenario but false in the LO one. It will be labeled the HI reading. Reading (b) is false in the HI scenario and true in the LO one. It will be called the LO reading, and this is the one relevant to us. Crucially, on the LO reading we are not interested in who began to get good reviews but, rather, what kind of overall situation began to obtain.

Given that neither the predicate *get good reviews* nor the predicate *begin to get good reviews* have agentive subjects (i.e. instigators of an action), *begin* is definitely a raising verb on the (b), LO reading. (It is plausibly also a raising verb on the (a), HI reading of (9). This latter fact is irrelevant to us though.) In English (5) the LO reading appears to be a result of "scope reconstruction" in the presence of A-movement, similarly to the classical example below (May 1985 and many others):

- (6) *A unicorn seems to be approaching.*

HI 'There is a particular unicorn that seems to be approaching'

LO 'It seems as though a unicorn is approaching'

In English the availability of the LO reading with *begin* is greatly enhanced

by the presence of a pertinent temporal adjunct (Edward Garrett, p.c.). The following naturally occurring example bears this out:²

- (7) "There was [around the third century BCE], in spite of the growth of population, still much cultivable land available. Victorious feudal lords induced farmers to come to their territory and to cultivate the wasteland. This is a period of great migrations, internal and external. It seems that *from this period on not only merchants but also farmers began to migrate southwards* into the area of the present provinces of Kwangtung and Kwangsi and as far as Tonking." [224] (<http://tqe.quaker.org/wealth-and-poverty/24appendixes-ch11.htm>)

In Hungarian the two readings of (5) would be expressed using different constituent orders, and no temporal adjunct is necessary to obtain the LO reading in (9). Moreover, the LO reading is generally available with all operators, whereas in English the choice seems delicate.

- (8) *Kevesebb színésznő kezdett el jó kritikák-at*
fewer actress began-3SG PRT good reviews-ACC
kap-ni.
get-INF
HI 'Fewer actresses got their first good reviews'

- (9) *El-kezdett kevesebb színésznő kap-ni jó kritikák-at.*
PRT-began.3SG fewer actress get-INF good reviews-ACC
LO 'It began to be the case that fewer actresses overall were getting good reviews'

Next consider control. The particle *too* associates with different DPs in (10) and (11). The example most relevant to us is (11): here *too* associates with the PRO subject of *be tall*. Krifka (1998) argues that postposed stressed additive particles, like English *too*, may associate even with a phonetically null element if that is a contrastive topic in his sense. The well-known reading in (10) is the HI reading; the more novel one in (4) the LO reading.

²E. Garrett (p.c.): "The suggestion, it seems to me, is that merchants were migrating southwards as a matter of course, though perhaps to a lesser degree, even before the 3rd century BCE. what changed is that the feudal lords began to induce farmers to come as well. On this reading, it is LO: "from this period on... it began to happen... that not only merchants (as they had for some time) but also farmers as well migrated southwards...". On the other hand, I suppose it's possible that merchants only started migrating southwards at the same time as farmers, in which case the reading is HI: "from this period on... not only merchants but also farmers... they began to migrate southwards..." This second reading seems to me less likely, best perhaps if there is a sense of surprise: to wit, it is common knowledge among scholars that merchants began migrating southwards in the 3rd century BCE, but interestingly farmers also began migrating southwards then as well."

- (10) *Mary wants/hates to be tall. I want/hate to be tall too.*
 HI `I too want/hate it to be the case that I am tall`
- (11) *Mary is tall. I want/hate to be tall too.*
 LO `I want/hate it to be the case that I too am tall`

If *too* attaches to the matrix subject, the *want*-example is still ambiguous, see (12). But the variant with *hate* lacks the LO reading; the sequence in (13b) is incoherent.

- (12) a. *Mary wants to be tall. I too want to be tall.*
 HI `I too want it to be the case that I am tall`
 b. *Mary is tall. I too want to be tall.*
 LO `I want it to be the case that I too am tall`
- (13) a. *Mary hates to be tall. I too hate to be tall.*
 HI `I too hate it that I am tall`
 b. *Mary is tall. #I too hate to be tall.*
 intended: LO `I hate it that I too am tall`

In Hungarian the two readings are expressed by different constituent orders, in a manner parallel to (8) and (9).³

³ As one of the reviewers notes, sentences like (14) may be ambiguous, with the HI reading favored, because its LO reading is blocked by the competing specialized structure (15). The ambiguity is more robust when the analog of (15) does not sound good, as in (i). (For some reason, when the matrix subject is not an operator and the infinitival clause with the overt pronoun is subjacent to the matrix, the result is degraded; see also Szabolcsi (2005). When the matrix subject is an operator or the distance between the two subjects is greater, the result is typically fine. See (1) and (72)-(75).)

- (i) a. *Péter is szeret-ne magas len-ni.*
 Peter too would.like-3SG tall be-INF
 HI or LO `Peter would like to be tall too`
 b. *?*Péter szeret-ne ő is magas len-ni.*
 Peter would.like-INF he too tall be-INF

As the reviewer notes, this observation bears on whether the existence of overt infinitival subjects is motivated by an interface need: if (i)b. were not available, the LO reading would be still expressible. But we have seen that English *I too hate to be tall* only has a HI reading, cf. (13), so I am not sure that the Hungarian counterpart, *Én is utálok magas lenni* would be ambiguous if the form specialized for the LO reading did not exist, compare (14) and (15). I propose to interpret the interface need as one that calls for a systematic way to express a particular kind of truth-conditional content, whether or not in some instances there is an alternative (ambiguous) expression available. I thank the reviewer for raising this issue.

- (14) *Én is szeretnék/utálok magas lenni.*
 I too would.like-1SG/hate-1SG tall be-INF
 HI 'I too want/hate it to be the case that I am tall'
- (15) *Szeretnék/Utálok én is magas lenni.*
 would.like-1SG/hate-1SG I too tall be-INF
 LO 'I want/hate it to be the case that I too am tall'

To summarize, when a nominative DP is associated with a suitable scope-taking operator, English can express LO readings in both control and raising constructions. But these readings come about in specifically scope-related ways, by “scope reconstruction” or in view of the ability of postposed additive particles under stress to associate with PRO. The reader should bear these readings in mind when contemplating the Hungarian examples that carry LO readings, but this paper will not investigate English any further.

This paper focuses on Hungarian examples that unambiguously carry the LO reading, such as (9) and (15). Here the whole nominative DP occurs in a special position. It will be argued that this is the position of the infinitival subject.

3. “Our nominative DP” is located inside the infinitival clause

Some of the sentences we are looking at, for example (1), contain more than one DP in the nominative. One of them is clearly sitting in the matrix subject position and there is nothing mysterious about it. The other one is what we are interested in. The present section argues that it is located inside the infinitival clause, and the next section argues that it is the infinitival subject. Until such time as the arguments are completed, the DP under investigation will be neutrally referred to as “our nominative DP”.

Recall that in (9) and (15), the Hungarian sentences carrying LO readings, our nominative DPs occur in postverbal position. Hungarian is known to map scope relations to linear order and intonation (see Kiss 2002, Brody and Szabolcsi 2003, among many others), so this may seem like a simple instance of the same correspondence.⁴ The placement of *csak DP* ‘only DP’ and *nem DP* ‘not DP’ offers clear evidence that on the LO reading our nominative DP is not simply placed within the scope of the control/raising verb.

Due to the association of *csak* ‘only’ and *nem* ‘not, constituent negation’ with focus, *csak DP* and *nem DP* have a very restricted

⁴ Indeed, *DP is* ‘DP too’ may occur either preverbally or postverbally in mono-clausal examples and so (9) and (15) by themselves are not diagnostic. The main reason why the particle *is* ‘too’ was used above is that it was useful in conjuring up English counterparts.

distribution in mono-clausal examples: they must occur in the immediately preverbal position. The reason is that focus in Hungarian is immediately preverbal.

(16) * *Olvast-am* *csak én* *egy* *könyv-et*.
read-1SG only I a book-ACC

(17) *Csak én* *olvastam* *egy* *könyv-et*.
only I read-1SG a book-ACC
'Only I read a book'

(18) * *Olvast-am* *nem én* *egy* *könyv-et*.
read-1SG not I a book-ACC

(19) *Nem én* *olvastam* *egy* *könyv-et*.
not I read-1SG a book-ACC
'It is not me who read a book'

The position of *csak DP* and *nem DP* completely disambiguates the infinitival examples:

(20) *Csak én* *szeretnék* *magas lenni*.
only I would.like-1SG tall be-INF
HI 'I am the only one who wants to be tall'

(21) *Szeretnék* *csak én* *lenni magas*.
would.like-1SG only I be-INF tall
LO 'I want it to be the case that I am the only one who is tall'

(22) *Nem én* *szeretné-k* *magas len-ni*.
not I would.like-1SG tall be-INF
HI: 'I am not the one who wants to be tall'

(23) *Szeretné-k* *nem én* *len-ni magas*.
would.like-1SG not I be-INF tall
LO: 'I want it to be the case that I am not the one who is tall'

The puzzle is how *csak én* and *nem én* can occur in postverbal position in the LO readings when we have just seen that (16) and (18) are sharply ungrammatical. The fact that (21) and (23) are perfect can only be explained if *csak én* and *nem én*, despite being the sole overt nominative DPs in the sentence, are not located in matrix clause but, instead, belong to the complement. If so, then they are not "postverbal" but in fact "preverbal", i.e. their relevant property is that they immediately precede the infinitival

verb.

It is well-established that Hungarian finite clauses have a rigid sequence of operator positions in the preverbal field. Koopman & Szabolcsi (2000: Chapter 6) argue that exactly the same sequence occurs in infinitival clauses that exhibit what they call “the English order”, i.e. no superficially noticeable restructuring. This descriptive claim has never been contested. Compare, for example, finite (24) and infinitival (25). The linear and scopal order of operator phrases in the preverbal field is topic (RefP), quantifier (DistP), and focus (with or without *csak* ‘only’) in both cases.

- (24) *Holnap minden-ről (csak) én*
 tomorrow everything-ALLAT only I
beszél-ek.
 talk-1SG
 ‘Tomorrow everything will be such that it is me who talks
 about it/ only I talk about it’
- (25) *Szerettem volna holnap mindenről*
 would.have.liked-1SG tomorrow everything-ALLAT
csak én beszél-ni.
 only I talk-INF
 ‘I would have liked it to be the case that tomorrow
 everything is such that it is me who talks about it/ only I talk
 about it’

These orders make it plain that *csak én* occupies the same focus position in the infinitival clause of (25) as in the finite (24). There is simply no other way for it to occur where it does.⁵

Crucial to us is the fact that constituent order shows our nominative DPs to be located inside the infinitival clause. Thus the bracketing of (15), (21), and (25) is as follows:

- (15)’ Szeretnék [én is magas lenni].
 (21)’ Szeretnék [nem én lenni magas].
 (25)’ Szerettem volna [holnap mindenről (csak) én beszélni].

Example (25) argues for two further points. First, it shows that our

⁵ An important question that I am not able to answer is whether overt nominative infinitival subjects must be scope-bearing operators or can be, say, plain unfocussed proper names. It is difficult if not impossible to find syntactic or semantic tests that tell apart a name that is postverbal in the matrix clause and one that is in the initial neutral topic position in the infinitival complement. If one believes that spelling out the infinitival subject may only happen if this is necessary to express a particular truth-conditional content, then probably such subjects must be operators. But answering such big questions goes beyond the scope of this paper.

nominative DP does not have to immediately follow either the matrix or the infinitival verb and thus to be governed by it, to use older terminology. An arbitrarily long sequence of operators may separate it from the matrix verb, and the infinitival verb never precedes it. Therefore its overtness cannot be due to “Exceptional Case Marking” or to “Infl-to-Comp” movement.

A second important point has to do with the absence of clause union (restructuring). The suspicion might have arisen that the phenomenon we are investigating somehow requires clause union. The long operator sequence in (25) already indicates that its infinitival clause is not a reduced complement; Koopman and Szabolcsi (2000: Chapter 6) argue that it is a full CP. Further evidence that clause union is not involved comes from the inventory of matrix verbs. Consider *utál* ‘hate’, cross-linguistically not a restructuring verb, and *el-felejt* ‘forget’. *El-felejt* has a prefix, and prefixal verbs never restructure in Hungarian. Both verbs take infinitival complements that contain overt nominatives; in fact, all subject control verbs do.

(26) *Utál-ok csak én dolgoz-ni.*
 hate-1SG only I work-INF
 LO ‘I hate it that only I work’

(27) *Nem felejtett-em el én is aláírni a level-et.*
 not forgot-1SG PRT I too sign-inf the
 letter-ACC
 LO ‘I didn’t forget to bring it about that I too sign the letter’
 (cf. I remembered to sign it too)

Szabolcsi (2005) discussed the control data above and tentatively concluded that Hungarian has overt subjects in infinitival complements.

As we saw in the preceding section, not only control but also raising complements exhibit the phenomenon at hand. Szabolcsi (2005) mentioned examples with *elkezd* ‘begin’ and the futurate verb *fog*, but glossed over the fact that they involve raising, not control. Bartos (2006a) and Márta Abrusán (p.c.) drew attention to their raising character. The arguments from constituent order apply to raising complements exactly as they do to control complements, so I add the brackets around the infinitival clause right away.

(28) *Nem én kezdtem el [éjszaka dolgoz-ni].*
 not I began-1SG PRT at.night work-INF
 HI ‘It is not me who began to work at night’

(29) *El-kezdtem [nem én dolgozni éjszaka].*
 PRT-began-1SG not I work-INF at.night
 LO ‘It began to be the case that it is not me who works at

night'

- (30) *Csak én nem fog-ok [dolgoz-ni éjszaka].*
 only I not will-1SG work-INF at.night
 HI 'I am the only one who will not work at night'
- (31) *Nem fog-ok [csak én dolgoz-ni éjszaka].*
 not will-1SG only I work-INF at.night
 LO 'It is not going to be the case that only I work at night'
- (32) *Holnap fogok [mindenki-vel*
 tomorrow will-1SG everyone-COMIT
csak én beszélni].
 only I talk-INF
 LO 'Tomorrow is the day when for everyone x, only I will talk with x'

We conclude that infinitival complements of both subject control verbs and subject-to-subject raising verbs in Hungarian can contain an overt nominative DP.

4. "Our nominative DP" is the subject of the infinitival clause

4.1 An argument from Binding Theory

We have seen that our nominative DP is located inside the infinitival clause, but does it originate there? One important argument comes from the Binding Theory.

The crucial observation is that the nominative DP inside a control complement can only be a personal pronoun whereas, as (2) showed, the one inside a raising complement can be a referential DP. This is exactly as expected if the DP originates in the complement clause. In the case of control, our nominative DP is bound by the matrix subject (an overt one or dropped *pro*). If the two are not in the same local domain, a pronoun can be so bound (Principle B), but a referential expression cannot (Principle C). Thus we do not expect to find lexical DPs in the subject position of the control complement. Indeed, (34) is sharply degraded as compared to (33):⁶

⁶ One of the reviewers finds several examples similar to (34) to be acceptable. For (i) he/she provides the context below. (The reviewer's example contains *nem akart* 'didn't want' which, as he/she notes, has an irrelevant alternative reading, so I have replaced it with *utált volna* 'would have hated'.)

Context: A small group of students, who believe they are to be punished, lobby for the whole class to be punished, because they believe it would diminish the negative value of the punishment in the eyes of their parents.

- (33) *Utál-na mindig csak ő kap-ni*
 would.hate-3SG always only he get-INF
büntetés-t.
 punishment-ACC
 'He would hate it if always only he got punished'
- (34) **Utál-na mindig csak Péter kap-ni*
 would.hate-3SG always only Peter get-INF
büntetés-t.
 punishment-ACC
 intended: 'Peter would hate it if always only he got punished'

On the other hand, the infinitival complement of a raising verb is not bound by another DP with an independent thematic role; it is free to be a pronoun or a lexical DP. This is what we find.

- (35) *Elkezdett mindig csak Péter kap-ni büntetés-t.*
 began-3SG always only Peter get-INF punishment-ACC
 'It began to be the case that always only Peter got punished'

Principle C definitely rules out (34) if the subject of 'hate' and 'only Peter' are independent arguments and the former binds the latter, but the status of the overt pronoun in (33) deserves further comment. When no operator is attached to it, *ő* alternates with some null element; what is it, PRO or *pro*?

- (36) *(Péter/pro) Utálna [PRO/pro minden nap*
 Peter/pro would.hate-3SG every day
büntetés-t kap-ni.
 punishment-ACC get-INF
 'Peter/he would hate to get punished every day'

One of the reviewers notes that this question is crucial if specifically

-
- (i) *Utált volna csak kevés diák büntetést kapni.*
 would.have.hated-3SG only few student punishment-ACC get-INF
 'A small number of students did not want that only they get a punishment'

I have tested this with three speakers, and although they said they understood the context, they did not accept (i) as an appropriate description of it. They also noted that if the *büntetést kapni* order used by the reviewer is changed to *kapni büntetést*, which is normally available when the infinitival complement has a focus, (i) becomes even worse. For the time being I continue to assume that the contrast between pronominal and lexical DPs is genuine.

Binding Theory disallows normal pronominals and PRO to occur in the same position. I find it conceivable that (36) is structurally ambiguous, its infinitival complement containing PRO on one analysis and *pro* on another. Relevant to us is the Binding Theoretically safe pronominal option. See further discussion of pronouns and PRO in section 6.⁷

If the contrast in (34)-(35) are real, it is multiply important. First, it clinches the Hungarian analysis. Second, it serves as an important diagnostic tool for work on other languages. And third, this contrast hints at the proper analysis. It makes it less likely for example that we are dealing with a case of backward control (with or without control-as-raising). The default prediction of the backward control analysis would be that the lower subject can be pronounced as is, without being somehow reduced to a pronoun. This is indeed what the backward control literature finds (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002, Alexiadou et al. 2008; though see Boeckx et al. 2007). Thus the theoretical challenge is not just to account for when a lower link in a chain can be spelled out in a pronominal form – we are facing the general question of when a DP can be pronounced.

4.2 A potential confound in cross-linguistic counterparts

But the fact that our nominative DP in control complements must be a pronoun opens the way for a potential confound. Perhaps that nominative DP is not the subject, just a “pronominal double” of the real PRO or *pro* subject? This question arises especially because languages like Italian, Spanish, and Modern Hebrew have such pronominal doubles in monoclausal examples:

⁷ The reviewer writes that an unstressed but overt pronoun seems worse in this construction than one would expect it in view of the standards of Hungarian pro-drop (unfortunately, an under-researched topic). I am not sure that it is indeed worse. First, it is not clear if these infinitival complements allow non-operator overt subjects at all. It seems impossible to find syntactic or semantic tests to tell apart a plain name or non-contrastive pronoun that is postverbal in the matrix clause and one that is in the initial neutral topic position in the infinitival complement (whether it be a raising or a control construction). If one believes that spelling out the infinitival subject may only happen if this is necessary to express a particular truth-conditional content, then probably such subjects must be operators. Beyond that, comparisons should involve discursively similar examples. To my ears, the overt pronouns are infelicitous or unacceptable in both examples below.

- (i) #*Péter utálná, ha ő minden nap büntetés-t kap-na.*
 Peter would.hate-3SG if he every day punishment-ACC get-cond.3SG
 ‘Peter would hate it if he got punished every day (finite conditional complement)’
- (ii) #*Péter utálna ő minden nap büntetés-t kap-ni.*
 Peter would.hate-3SG he every day punishment-ACC get-INF
 ‘Peter would hate it if he got punished every day (infinitival complement)’

In sum, I do not believe there is anything obviously wrong with a *pro* analysis of (36), whether or not it also has a PRO analysis.

- (37) Gianni è andato solo lui a Milano.
 `As for Gianni, only he went to Milan`

It turns out that in Hungarian, just like in English, such examples are simply ungrammatical. Let us consider two potential cases. First, emphatic pronouns. In Hungarian emphatics are reflexives (*maga*) and not personal pronouns (*ő*), as pointed out in Szabolcsi (2005).

- (38) a. *Péter maga is dolgozott.* b. *Péter nem maga dolgozott.*
 Peter himself too worked Peter not himself worked
 `Peter himself worked too` `Peter didn't work himself`
- (39) a. * *Péter ő is dolgozott.* b. * *Péter nem ő dolgozott.*
 Peter he too worked Peter not he worked
- (40) a. (*Ő*) *maga is dolgozott.* b. (*Ő*) *nem maga dolgozott.*
 he himself too worked he not himself worked
 `He himself worked too` `He didn't work himself`
- (41) a. * *Ő ő is dolgozott.* b. * *Ő nem ő dolgozott.*
 he he too worked he not he worked

Second, consider pronominal placeholders for 3rd person left dislocated expressions. In my dialect (which may or may not coincide with the Budapest, or urban, variety) these placeholders are distal demonstratives, never personal pronouns. (The construction belongs to the spoken language and would not be found in the writing of educated speakers. In this respect it contrasts sharply with our nominative DPs, which do not violate the norm of the literary language.)

- (42) a. *Péter az dolgozott.* b. *A fiúk azok dolgoztak.*
 Peter that worked the boys those worked
 `Peter worked` `The boys worked`

To identify such placeholders, it is to be noted that they practically cliticize to the topic and cannot be separated or focused:

- (43) a. * *Péter tegnap az dolgozott.*
 Peter yesterday that worked
 b. * *Péter csak az dolgozott.*
 Peter only that worked

Pronominal subjects do not participate in this construction:

- (44) a. **Én az dolgozott/dolgozt-am.*
 I that worked.3SG/worked-1SG
 b. **Ő az dolgozott.*
 he that worked.3SG

I am aware that there are speakers who use the personal pronoun *ő* in the place of demonstrative *az*:

- (45) a. *Péter ő dolgozott.* b. *A fiúk ők dolgoztak.*
 Peter he worked the boys they worked
 `Peter worked' `The boys worked'

This fact could be a confound if only such speakers, but not speakers like myself, accepted nominative personal pronouns in infinitival complements and if the infinitival construction were similarly restricted to 3rd person. This is not the case. All the infinitival data reported in this paper are perfect for speakers like myself, who do not use (45).

These facts show that the Hungarian control construction under discussion has no possible source in emphatic or placeholder pronouns.

4.3 Complemented pronouns

But we can do even better. Postal 1966 observed that personal pronouns in English may take a noun complement. This observation is one of the cornerstones of the hypothesis that such pronouns are determiners.

- (46) We linguists and you philosophers should talk more to each other.
 (47) You troops go South and you troops go North.

Such complemented pronouns do not induce a Principle C violation:

- (48) We know that only we linguists can do this.

If Principle C is the only reason why our nominative DP in a control complement must be pronominal, then we predict that the pronouns we analyze as overt subjects can take a noun complement. This is indeed the case. The grammaticality of (49) was observed by Anikó Lipták (Huba Bartos, p.c.). The same possibility exists with raising verbs, as in (50):

- (49) *Szeretné-nk csak mi nyelvészek kap-ni magasabb
 would.like-1PL only we linguists get-INF higher
 fizetés-t.
 salary-ACC
 `We would like it to be the case that only we linguists get a*

higher salary'

- (50) *Elkezdt-ünk nem mi nyelvészek ülni az első sor-ban.*
 began-1PL not we linguists sit-INF the first row-IN
 'It began to be the case that it is not we linguists who sit in
 the first row'

And similarly with numerals:

- (51) *Szeretné-nk csak mi hám-an kapni magasabb*
 would.like-1PL only we three-SFX get-INF higher
fizetés-t.
 salary-ACC
 'We would like it to be the case that only we three get a
 higher salary'
- (52) *Elkezdtü-nk nem mi hárm-an ül-ni az első sor-ban.*
 began-1pl not we three-SFX sit-INF the first row-IN
 'It began to be the case that not we three sit in the first row'

The cross-linguistic significance of complemented pronouns is that in Italian they do not function as emphatic or placeholder pronouns in mono-clausal examples:⁸

- (53) Context: The philosophers say, 'Only we philosophers work'. The linguists reply,
 (i) *Guarda che noi abbiamo lavorato sodo anche noi!*
 look that we have.1PL worked a.lot also we
 'Look. We too worked a lot'
 (ii) **Guarda che noi abbiamo lavorato sodo anche noi linguisti!*
 look that we have.1PL worked a.lot also we linguists
 intended: 'Look. We linguists too worked a lot'

Hence, if *noi linguisti* occurs inside control complements with the characteristic interpretation described above, it cannot be the pronominal double of a PRO subject. It must be the infinitival subject itself:

- (54) Ø Vorremmo [andare solo noi linguisti a Milano].
 'We_i would like it to be the case that only we linguists_i go to
 Milan'

Therefore, if a language differs from Hungarian in that it has pronominal

⁸ All the Italian data in this paper are based on discussion with Ivano Caponigro and Andrea Cattaneo.

doubles in mono-clausal examples, this potential confound can be controlled for using complemented personal pronouns.⁹

To conclude, we have argued that our nominative DP is not simply located inside the infinitival complement but it originates there and is the subject of that complement. The critical argument came from the Binding Theory, which predicts the pronoun vs. lexical (referential) DP contrast between control and raising complements. We also noted that the existence of pronominal doubles could be a potential confound for control examples if Hungarian had them in the shape of personal pronouns; but Hungarian does not have personal pronoun doubles. No potential confounding factor is ever present in the raising examples.

5. Long-distance agreement with a finite verb and multiple agreement

5.1 Subject agreement with a finite verb

All Hungarian infinitival subjects exhibit person-number agreement with the finite verb. To recap, for example:

(55) *Utálok [csak én dolgozni].*
 hate-1SG only I work-INF
 LO: 'I hate it that only I work'

(56) *Nem fogok [csak én dolgozni éjszaka].*
 not will-1SG only I work-INF at.night
 LO: 'It is not going to be the case that only I work at night'

(57) *Elkezdte-ek [csak a fiúk dolgozni éjszaka].*
 began-3PL only the boys work-INF at.night
 LO: 'It began to be the case that only the boys work at night'

The fact that the pronoun in (55) agrees with the finite control verb is not very surprising; after all, it is controlled by the subject of that verb. Agreement with the matrix verb is more remarkable in the raising examples (56)-(57), since we have no evidence of *én* and *a fiúk* ever occurring in the

⁹ Caveat: Not all similar constructions constitute “complemented pronouns” in Postal’s sense. Spanish requires a definite article inside the construction:

(i) *nosotros *(los) linguistas*
 we the linguists

Clearly, this construction could not be used to argue that *nosotros* is a determiner. Relevant to us is the fact that *nosotros los linguistas* does not have the same distribution as *mi nyelvészek* and *noi linguisti*, and unfortunately it cannot be used to eliminate the pronominal double confound the way *noi linguisti* can.

matrix clause.

If the matrix agreement morpheme is removed, effectively turning the inflection into 3SG, which in most verb classes is morphologically unmarked, all these become word salads:

- (58) ****Utál* [csak én dolgozni].
 hate-3SG only I work-INF
- (59) ****Nem fog* [csak én dolgozni éjszaka].
 not will-3SG only I work-INF at.night
- (60) ****Elkezdett* [csak a fiúk dolgoz-ni éjszaka].
 began.3SG only the boys work-INF at.night

When agreement is not possible, there is no nominative infinitival subject. This predicts, correctly, that infinitival complements of object control verbs have no nominative subjects, since the matrix verb is committed to agree with a different argument. Compare object control *kényszerít* ‘force’ with the agreeing unaccusative version, *kényszerül* ‘be forced’:

- (61) * *Kényszerítettek (téged)* [te _____ is dolgoz-ni].
 forced.3PL you.ACC you.NOM too work-INF
 intended: ‘They forced you to work in addition to someone else working’
- (62) *Kényszerült-él* [te _____ is dolgoz-ni].
 was.forced.2SG you.NOM too work-INF
 LO ‘You (SG) were forced to work too (in addition to someone else working)’

As is the case with nominatives in general, the pertinent agreement must be subject- and not object-agreement. So (63), where the verb, exceptionally in the language, agrees not only with the 1SG subject but also with the 2person object, patterns exactly as (61):

- (63) **Kényszerítettek (téged) [te is dolgoz-ni].*
 forced.3pl+2pers you.ACC you.NOM too work-INF
 intended: 'I forced you to work in addition to some else working'

As with nominatives in general, agreement has to be "complete":

- (64) **Kényszerül-ünk [én/te is dolgoz-ni].*
 are.forced.1PL I.NOM/you.NOM too work-INF
 intended: 'We are forced I too to work / you too to work'

Likewise there are no overt nominative subjects in free-standing infinitives that function as rude or military imperatives:

- (65) (**Maga is*) *Távozni!*
 you too leave-inf
 'Leave!'

The possibility of overt nominative subjects with controlled purpose adjuncts is dubious. I cannot decide whether they are marginally acceptable:

- (66) *Péter a balkonon aludt. ?? Bementem a hálósobába én is aludni.*
 'Peter was sleeping on the balcony. I went in the bedroom to sleep too'

5.2 Inflected infinitives

Hungarian has a narrower range of infinitival complements than English, so not all examples that might come to the reader's mind can be tested. However, there is an important case to consider. Inflected infinitives in Portuguese take nominative subjects (Raposo 1987):

- (67) *Era importante [eles saírem].*
 was important they.NOM leave-INF-3PL
 'It was important for them to leave'

Hungarian has optionally inflected infinitives. The suspicion might arise that the nominative subjects in Hungarian infinitives are related to phonetically overt or covert infinitival inflection. But this is unlikely. Inflected infinitives in Hungarian occur only as complements of impersonal predicates that do not carry person-number agreement and, as Tóth (2000) discusses in detail, they always have dative subjects:

- (68) *Fontos volt / Sikerült ...*

important was / succeeded

- a. ... *délre* *elkészül-ni* / *elkészül-n-öm*.
 by.noon be.ready-INF be.ready-INF-1SG
 `to be ready / for me to be ready by noon`
- b. ... *nekem* /* *én* *is* *délre* *elkészül-ni*
 DAT-1SG I.NOM too by.noon be.ready-INF
elkészül-n-öm.
 be.ready-INF-1SG
 `for me too to be ready by noon`
- c. ... *az ebédnek* /* *az ebéd* *délre*
 the lunch-DAT the lunch-NOM by.noon
elkészül-ni / *elkészül-ni-e*.
 be.ready-INF be.ready-INF-3SG
 `for the lunch to be ready by noon`

(Example (68b) is ambiguous: the dative DP `for me` could be either the experiencer of the matrix predicate or the subject of the infinitive. In (68c) the dative DP `for the lunch` cannot be an experiencer, only the subject of `to be ready by noon`.)

Tóth's observations are important, because they show a crucial difference between Hungarian and Portuguese inflected infinitives. Even if inflected infinitives do license overt nominatives in Portuguese and in other languages, infinitival inflection cannot be the universal precondition for the existence of overt nominative subjects in infinitives. This supports the conclusion that the critical factor is agreement with a finite verb.

When the control or raising verb itself is an inflected infinitive, its own infinitival complement cannot have an overt nominative subject. (Adding a dative DP would not make a difference.)

- (69) **Fontos volt [akar-n-om [én is jó*
 important was want-INF-1SG I.NOM too good
jegyek-et kap-ni]].
 grades-ACC get-INF
 intended: `It was important for me to want that I too get good grades`
- (70) **Fontos volt [nem el-kezde-n-em [én is rossz*
 important was not pfx-begin-INF-1SG I.nom too bad
jegyek-et kap-ni]].
 grades-ACC get-INF
 intended: `It was important for me not to begin to get bad grades too`

This confirms that the verbal agreement must be of the kind that normally licenses nominative subjects; we have seen above that agreement on

infinitives never does that.

The finite clause whose verb agrees with the infinitival subject need not be subjacent to that infinitival clause. In (71) the intervening infinitives *akarni* ‘want-inf’ and *elkezdeni* ‘begin-inf’ do not carry inflection, although they could agree with *én* if they were finite.¹⁰

- (71) *Nem fogok akarni elkezde-ni [én is rossz jegyek-et kap-ni].*
 not will-1SG want-INF begin-INF I.NOM too bad
 grades-ACC get-INF
 ‘I will not want to begin [to get bad grades too]’

5.3 One finite verb, multiple overt subjects

Most of the examples discussed so far contained only one overt subject, either in the finite or in an infinitival clause. The examples were natural, because Hungarian is an Italian-type null subject language: unstressed subject pronouns are not pronounced. But notice that *pro* subjects occur in the same environments as overt subjects. Therefore not only the overt infinitival subject but also the null finite subject must agree with the finite verb. In other words, our control constructions require multiple agreement. The availability of multiple agreement is the default assumption in Minimalism. Support for this analysis comes from the fact that it is

¹⁰ The “long-distance” character of indiscriminate subject agreement is reminiscent of indiscriminate long-distance object agreement in Hungarian. Hungarian verbs have two conjugations. One is selected when there is a direct object that is, roughly, definite (according to Bartos (1999), if it is a DP, as opposed to a smaller projection) and the other is selected elsewhere. The conjugation of a finite control or raising verb is always determined by the direct object of the lowest infinitival complement. The phenomenon is entirely independent of restructuring. Compare *fogok* ‘will-1SG subject’ in (71) with *utálom* ‘hate-1SG subject.definite object’ in (i), where the direct object is definite:

- (i) *Utálok elkezde-ni [én is ezek-et a jegyek-et kap-ni].*
 hate-1SG.DEF begin-INF I.NOM too these-ACC the grades-ACC get-INF
 ‘I hate to begin [to get these grades too]’

In contrast to the infinitival subject, the infinitival direct object does not require the presence of such a conjugation. It is perfectly happy in sentences without any definite conjugation:

- (ii) *Fontos volt [elolvas-ni a könyv-et].*
 important was [read-INF the book-ACC]
 ‘It was important to read the book’

So, while both the subject and the object may agree with finite verbs that they are not arguments of, in the former case it is the subject and in the latter case it is the definite-conjugated finite verb that seeks out its distant mate.

perfectly possible for multiple overt subjects to co-occur with a single agreeing finite verb. The sentences below require a contrastive context, but when it is available, they are entirely natural and indeed the only way the express the intended propositions. Imagine a situation where a group of people, including János, is faced with a crowded bus: some will certainly have to walk.¹¹

- (72) *János nem akart [megpróbál-ni [csak ő men-ni busszal]].*
 János not wanted-3SG try-INF only he go-INF
 bus.with
 ‘John didn’t want to try to be the only one who takes the bus’
- (73) *Én se akar-ok [csak én men-ni busszal].*
 I neither want-1SG only I go-INF bus.with
 ‘Neither do I want to be the only one who takes the bus’
- (74) *Senki nem akart [csak ő men-ni busszal].*
 nobody not wanted-1SG only he go-INF bus.with
 ‘Nobody wanted to be the only one who takes the bus’
- (75) *Nem akarok [én is megpróbálni [csak én men-ni busszal]].*
 not want-1SG I too try-INF only I go-INF bus.with
 ‘I don’t want to be another person who tries to be the only one who takes the bus’

The status of multiple overt subjects in raising constructions is not clear to me:

- (76) *? János el-kezdett [csak ő kapni szerepeket].*
 János PRT-began.3SG only he get-INF roles-ACC
 ‘It began to be the case that only John got roles’
- (77) *?* Nem fog-ok [én is el-kezdeni [nem én kap-ni szerepek-et]].*
 not will-1SG I too PRT-begin-INF not I get-INF
 roles-ACC
 ‘It will not happen to me too that it begins to be the case that it is not me who gets roles’

¹¹ This generalization revises the judgment in Szabolcsi 2005, where multiple nominative examples were judged to be marginal. I maintain my judgment of those particular sentences, but I have since realized that it is possible to construct many better examples. I am grateful to Márta Abrusán and Huba Bartos for discussion.

Both *de re* and *de se* readings occur with quantificational antecedents as well:

- (81) *Every guy wanted to get a medal.* (only *de se*)
 (82) *Every guy wanted only him to get a medal.* (*de re* or *de se*)

The standard assumption is that coreferential/bound pronouns in propositional attitude contexts are ambiguous between *de re* and *de se*; only controlled PRO is designated as a *de se* anaphor. This view is initially confirmed by the interpretation of those subjunctives that are exempt from obviation, i.e. where they can be bound by the matrix subject.

In Hungarian, subjunctive complements of volitional verbs are exempt from obviation in at least two cases (Farkas 1992). One is where the matrix subject does not bear a responsibility relation to the event in the complement proposition. For Farkas 1992, responsibility is the hallmark of canonical control.

- (83) *Miért tanul Péter olyan sokat?*
 nem akar-ja, hogy pro rossz jegy-et kap-j-on.
 not want-3SG that pro bad grade-ACC get.SUBJ-3SG
 `Why does Peter study so hard? He doesn't want that he get
 a bad grade'

The person who gets the grade does not bear full responsibility for what grade he/she gets, since someone else assigns the grade. The subjunctive in (83) has a null subject, but it could be made overt if it bears stress. If such pronouns bear stress, even the non-agentive predicate in the complement is not necessary. I believe the reason is that the responsibility relation is necessarily impaired. One may be fully responsible for whether he/she takes the bus, but not for whether he/she is the only one to do so:

- (84) *Nem akarja, hogy ő is rossz jegyet kapjon.*
 `He doesn't want that he too get a bad grade'
 (85) *Nem akarta, hogy csak ő menjen busszal.*
 `He didn't want that only he take the bus'

It is important to observe now that the coreferential/bound non-obviative overt subject of the subjunctive in Hungarian can be interpreted either *de re* or *de se*. E.g.,

- (86) *A(z amnéziás) hős nem akarta, hogy csak ő*
 the amnesiac hero not wanted.3SG that only he
kap-j-on érdemrend-et.
 get-SUBJ-3SG medal-ACC
 ‘The (amnesiac) hero did not want that only he get a medal’
de re or de se

This contrasts sharply with the interpretation of the overt infinitival subject of control complements, as observed by Márta Abrusán (p.c.):

- (87) *A(z amnéziás) hős nem akart csak ő*
 the amnesiac hero not wanted.3SG only he
kap-ni érdemrend-et.
 get-INF medal-ACC
 ‘The (amnesiac) hero did not want it to be the case that only
 he gets a medal’
 only *de se*

The interpretation of (87) differs from that of the run-of-the-mill control construction (88) just in what the operator *csak* ‘only’ attached to the subject contributes.

- (88) *A(z amnéziás) hős nem akart PRO érdemrend-et kap-ni.*
 the amnesiac hero not wanted-3SG medal-ACC get-INF
 ‘The (amnesiac) hero did not want to get a medal’
 only *de se*

The same observations hold for all the other Hungarian control verbs, including *utál* ‘hate’, *elfelejt* ‘forget’, etc. So,

- (89) Abrusán’s Observation About *De Se* Pronouns
 The overt pronoun in the subject position of infinitival control complements is interpreted exclusively *de se*.

The standard assumption is that the *de se* interpretation of PRO is a matter of the lexical semantics of PRO. What we see, however, is that an obligatorily controlled infinitival subject is always interpreted *de se*, irrespective of whether it is null (PRO) or an overt pronoun. There are two possibilities now. One is that our overt pronouns are simply phonetically realized instances of PRO, the *de se* anaphor. The other is that *de se* interpretation is forced on any pronominal by the semantics of the infinitival control relation. This latter position seems preferable. Descriptively, it fits better with the fact that in other, non-control propositional attitude contexts the overt pronouns are optionally interpreted *de re* or *de se*, and that non-*de se* PRO is perfectly possible in non-controlled contexts (viz., arbitrary

PRO). This position also holds out the hope that once the semantics of infinitival control is better explicated, the obligatoriness of the *de se* reading is explained. The lexical *de se* anaphor proposal would simply stipulate that control constructions only accept lexical *de se* anaphors as subjects.

Languages differ in exactly what exemptions from obviation they allow in subjunctives, but the *de se* interpretation of overt infinitival control subjects is a diagnostic to look for when one wishes to ascertain whether a language exhibits the same phenomenon as Hungarian.

7. Conclusion

This paper has argued that infinitival complements of subject control and subject-to-subject raising verbs in Hungarian can have overt nominative subjects. It was proposed that simple assumptions of Minimalism, such as long-distance Agree and multiple Agree, together with standard Binding Theoretic considerations, suffice to explain their availability and distribution. It was pointed out that it seems neither necessary nor advantageous to invoke inflected infinitives, government of the subject from C, or backward control.

If overt nominative subjects in infinitives come so cheap, the question arises why we do not find them in language after language. Szabolcsi (2007) argues that we actually do find them in various languages, although the most intensively studied ones, English, German, Dutch, and French are not among them. What controls this cross-linguistic difference is probably the most interesting research question here. The present paper hopes to facilitate that research by providing a careful description of the Hungarian data and offering a preliminary analysis.

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordachioaia and Mihaela Marchis. 2008. "A stronger argument for backward control." *NELS* abstract.
- Bartos, Huba. 2000. "Object agreement in Hungarian: A case for minimalism." In: Alexandrova & Arnaudova, eds., *The Minimalist Parameter: Selected Papers From the Ottawa Linguistics Forum, 21-23 March, 1997*, 327-340. John Benjamins, Philadelphia.
- Bartos, Huba. 2006a. "És mégis mozog?" In: László Kálmán, (ed.), *KB 120: A titkos kötet*. Tinta, Budapest, 49-67.
- Bartos, Huba. 2006b. "Eppur si muove? Backward control in Hungarian." Abstract for the 8th *International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian*, <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/Linguistics/events/ICSH8/program.html> .

- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein & Jairo Nunes. 2007. "Overt copies in reflexive and control structures. A movement analysis."
<http://www.ling.umd.edu/publications/volume15/> .
- Brody, Michael and Anna Szabolcsi. 2003. "Overt scope in Hungarian." *Syntax* 6: 19-51.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1989. "Anaphora and attitudes *de se*." In Renate Bartsch et al. (eds.), *Semantics and Contextual Expression*. Foris, Dordrecht, 1-33.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. "Minimalist inquiries: The framework." In: Richard Martin et al. (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. The MIT Press, Cambridge. 89–155.
- Chomsky, Noam 2008. "On Phases." Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Farkas, Donka. 1992. "On obviation." In Ivan A. Sag & Anna Szabolcsi, (eds.), *Lexical Matters*. Stanford, CSLI Publications, 85-110.
- Hiraiwa, Ken 2001. "Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 40: 67-80. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2005. *Dimensions of Symmetry in Syntax: Agreement and Clausal Architecture*. PhD, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge UP.
- Koopman, Hilda & Anna Szabolcsi. 2000. *Verbal Complexes*. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1998. "Additive particles under stress." *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistics Theory* 9: 111-130.
- Maier, Emar. 2006. *Belief in Context: Towards a Unified Semantics of De Re and De Se Attitude Reports*. PhD, Nijmegen.
- Marantz, Alec. 1991 [2000]. "Case and licensing." In Eric Reuland, (ed.), *Arguments and Case: Explaining Burzio's Generalization*. John Benjamins, 11-31.
- May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form: Its Structure and Interpretation*. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- McFadden, Thomas. 2004. *The Position of Morphological Case in the Derivation: A Study on the Syntax-Morphology Interface*. PhD, U. of Pennsylvania.
- Perlmutter, David. 1970. "The two verbs *begin*". In Roderick Jacobs & Peter Rosenbaum, eds., *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Blaisdell: Waltham, Mass. 107—119.
- Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam. 2002. "Backward control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 245–282.
- Postal, Paul. 1966. "On so-called 'pronouns' in English." In *Report of the*

- 17th Annual Roundtable Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, 177–206. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. [Reprinted in David Reibel & Sanford A. Schane, (eds.), *Modern Studies in English*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.]
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. “Case theory and INFL-to-COMP: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 505-537.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2005. “Overt infinitival subjects (if that’s what they are...)” In: Hans Broekhuis et al., (eds.), *Organizing Grammar. Festschrift for Henk van Riemsdijk*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 618–625.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2007. “Hidden in plain sight: Overt subjects in infinitival control and raising complements.”
<http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000445>.
- Tóth, Ildikó. 2000. *Inflected Infinitives in Hungarian*. PhD, Tilburg.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1996. *Multiple Feature-Checking: A Theory of Grammatical Function Splitting*. PhD, MIT.