

# Movement vs. long distance Agree in raising: Disappearing phases and feature valuation

Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Susi Wurmbrand

University of Stuttgart, University of Crete, University of Connecticut

## 1. Introduction

This paper proposes that cross-linguistic differences in the distribution of subjects in raising constructions follow from whether or not there are phase boundaries between matrix T and the highest subject position in the embedded clause. Languages like (1a) are shown to require movement of the embedded subject, whereas languages like (1b) allow the subject to be licensed in situ via Agree with T. We argue that (1a) is the default structure predicted under a dynamic phase approach, and that (1b) is derived by phase extension due to *v/V*-raising and a particular type of selection of the raising complement.

- (1) a. [TP SUBJECT T [PHASE ... *seem* ... [PHASE SUBJECT ... ] Movement  
b. [TP T+v ... *seem* ... SUBJECT ... ] Agree

## 2. Agree vs. movement languages

While low (infinitive internal) subjects in raising constructions (LSIRs) are prohibited in En(glish) raising such as (2a), such constructions are possible in Gr(eek) and Ro(manian), (2b,c) (Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, Iordachioaia & Marchis [AAIM] 2010, 2012), Sp(anish) (2d) (J. Villa-García, p.c.), Ad(yghe), (2e) (Polinsky and Potsdam [P&P] 2006, 2012), S(tandard) A(rabic), (2f) (Haddad 2012), and possibly other languages (candidates: Hungarian, Italian, Brazilian Portuguese, Hebrew, see Szabolcsi 2009). As shown in (2b-f), in these languages, the subject can occur within the embedded subjunctive (GrRo), infinitive (SpAd), or finite clause (SA); it can be an R-expression (which shows that there is no co-indexed *pro* which would lead to a Principle C effect in the matrix clause); and it agrees with the matrix verb.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* For feedback and helpful comments on this material, we thank the audience at SinfonJA5 (Vienna), the participants of the research seminar at the University of Stuttgart, and the participants of the UConn 2012 and 2013 Spring seminars.

<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, P&P (2006, 2012) and AAIM (2010, 2012) provide evidence that LSIR constructions are biclausal, there is no restructuring, and the subject truly resides within the embedded clause at PF.

- (2) a. \*There stopped {(the) teachers} to {(the) teachers} scold the children. En  
 b. Stamatisan/\*stamatise [na malonun **i daskali** tus mathites]<sub>SUBJ</sub> Gr  
 stopped.3PL/\*3SG [SUBJ scold.3PL **the teachers** the students]<sub>SUBJ</sub>  
 ‘The teachers stopped scolding the students.’ [AAIM 2012: 96]  
 c. Au încetat/\*A încetat [să -i certe **profesorii** pe elevi]<sub>SUBJ</sub> Ro  
 stopped.3PL/\*3SG [SUBJ-CL.ACC scold.3PL **the teachers** ACC students]<sub>SUBJ</sub>  
 d. Dejaron/\*Dejó [de reñir **los profesores** a los alumnos]<sub>INF</sub> Sp  
 stopped.3PL/\*3SG [INF scold the teachers ACC.DOM the students]<sub>INF</sub>  
 e. [ **axe-me** pjəsmə-r a-txə-new ] ø-fjež’akə-x / \*a-fjež’ak Ad  
 [ they-ERG letter-ABS 3PL-write-INF ] [3ABS-began-3PL.ABS] / \*3PL.ERG-began  
 ‘They began to write a letter.’ [P&P 2012: 78; simplified]  
 f. ?awʃakat (?an) tanjaħ(u/a) **l-t’a:liba:t-u** SA  
 were.about.to.3.F.SG (C/to) succeed.3.F.SG **the-students**.F-NOM  
 ‘The female students were about to succeed’ [Haddad, p.c.]

We argue, following P&P (2006, 2012) and AAIM (2010, 2012) that GrSpRo are Agree languages as in (1b), whereas EnAdSA are movement languages as in (1a). We moreover argue that movement languages are further divided into languages that obligatorily involve forward raising (i.e., pronunciation of the higher copy of the subject, as in English) and languages that also allow backward raising (i.e., pronunciation of the lower copy of the subject as in AdSA). In this paper, we concentrate on the grammatical properties triggering the Agree vs. movement configurations (for the forward vs. backward raising distinction see Wurmbrand, In prep).

GrRoSp differ from AdSA in that only in the latter, LSIRs can establish a (covert) c-command dependency with elements in the matrix clause (other than agreement with the matrix verb). As pointed out by P&P (2006, 2012), the two subject positions in Ad are distinguished by case: embedded subjects bear ergative case, (3a), whereas matrix subjects surface with absolutive, (3b). Importantly, as shown in (3c,d), an ergative (= embedded) LSIR can license a matrix reflexive and can also take high scope).

- (3) a. **axe-r** [ **axe-me** pjəsmə-r a-txə-new ] ø-fjež’akə-x  
 they-ABS [ they-ERG letter-ABS 3PL.ERG-write-INF ] [3ABS-began-3PL.ABS]  
 b. **axe-r** [ **axe-me** pjəsmə-r a-txə-new ] ø-fjež’akə-x  
 they-ABS [ they-ERG letter-ABS 3PL.ERG-write-INF ] [3ABS-began-3PL.ABS]  
 c. [ **axe-me** pjəsmə-r a-txə-new ] **zə-fjež’akə-x** [P&P 2012: 88]  
 [ **they-ERG** letter-ABS 3PL.ERG-write-INF ] [REFL-began-PL]  
 ‘They began to write a letter for themselves.’  
 d. [ **a-š’** **zəm** pjəsmə-r ə-txə-new ] wəxəx [P&P 2012: 88]  
 [ s/he-ERG only letter-ABS 3PL.ERG-write-INF ] stopped  
 ‘Only s/he stopped writing a letter.’ *stop»only; only»stop*

In SA, post-verbal subjects trigger partial (=gender) agreement, whereas preverbal subjects trigger full (gender and number) agreement (cf. (4a,b); see, e.g., Mohammad 1990, 2000, Aoun et al. 1994, Ouhalla 1994, Benmamoun 2000, Soltan 2007). We assume that SA subjects optionally move to Spec,TP. When the subject is in Spec,TP, full agreement

arises, while only partial agreement is realized when the subject remains in Spec,vP. Importantly, in LSIR, (4c), full agreement on the matrix verb is possible, which straightforwardly indicates covert movement of the subject to the matrix Spec,TP (Haddad 2012; partial agreement as in (2f) indicates covert movement to the matrix Spec,vP, since the embedded clause is a phase, see below, and hence movement must take place).

- (4) a. **ʔal-fatayaat-u** qaraʔ-na ʔal-dars-a SA  
**the-girls-NOM** read-3.F.PL the-lesson-ACC [Soltan 2007: 35]
- b. qaraʔ-t **ʔal-fatayaat-u** ʔal-dars-a  
read-3.F.SG **the-girls-NOM** the-lesson-ACC [Soltan 2007: 35]
- c. ʔawʃakna (ʔan) tanjaħ(u/a) **l-tʔa:liba:t-u**  
were.about.to.3.F.PL (C/to) succeed.3.F.SG **the-students.F-NOM**  
‘The female students were about to succeed’ [Haddad, p.c.]

In GrRoSp, on the other, no covert dependencies are possible in raising infinitives. As shown in (5a) for Greek, low subjects in control constructions can agree with a matrix modifier (we assume that this is only possible if the modifier is c-commanded by the NP) and take matrix scope. However, in raising constructions, this is impossible—a LSIR cannot license a matrix modifier, as shown in (5b-d), nor can it take matrix scope (cf. (6)).<sup>2</sup> We therefore conclude that movement of the subject to the matrix clause is possible (in fact necessary) in control constructions, but not in raising constructions.

- (5) a. Arhise **panikovlitos** na klidoni **mono o Janis** tin porta tu  
Started.3SG panicking.MASC SUBJ lock only the Janis.NOM the door his  
‘Only Janis began in panic to lock his door’ Backward control

<sup>2</sup> There are two complications concerning the scope facts in (6). First, note that the context in (6) favors a raising structure since ‘stopping to get bad grades’ is not something that Mary can actively control. In contexts favoring control (e.g. ‘stopping to provoke the teacher/to solve the problems’ etc.) high scope is possible. As a result, a sentence like *Stamatise na prokali mono I Maria ton dhaskalo* (stopped SUBJ provoke only the Mary the teacher; ‘Only Mary stopped provoking the teacher’) is ambiguous between the *stop»only* and the *only»stop* interpretation (in Greek, the low vs. high scope difference is signified by stress). In view of the raising vs. control ambiguity of aspectuals, it is necessary to employ the appropriate predicates when testing for Agree vs. Move (the latter would be backward control structures): inanimate subjects and non-controllable initiations favor raising (Agree), while animate subjects and controllable initiations allow for (backward) control.

The second issue concerns the unavailability of high scope in (6). Since the subjunctive/infinitival XP in GrRoSp is not a phase, as we argue below, one would expect, assuming scope is phase-bound, high scope to be possible, as in Ad. Note, however, that being within the same scope domain (phase) is only a necessary, not a sufficient condition for inverse scope. We propose that the unavailability of high scope in (6) is due to scope rigidity (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2012, Lechner Forthcoming): in scope rigid languages scope depends on overt Movement, and inverse scope is licensed only under very special conditions, e.g. when covert movement is independently needed for theta-licensing, as in backward control. While this makes the lack of high scope a somewhat less conclusive test regarding movement vs. Agree, the difference between Adyghe and GrRoSp is still indicative: In the former, the subject moves for Case reasons, which puts it in the matrix clause and high scope comes for ‘free’ (see also the difference in scope between subjects and other embedded elements in (10) in Adyghe). In the latter, the subject is licensed in situ and high scope is not automatically available, but, assuming scope rigidity, parasitic on other movement operations.

- b. Arhise {**\*pikni**} [na skepazi **i skoni** {**pikni**} ta epipla ]  
 started {dense.FEM} [SUBJ cover.3SG the dust {dense} the furniture ]  
 ‘The dust started to cover the furniture densely.’
- c. A început {**\*compactă**} [să acopere **mizeria** {**compactă**} toată mobila ]  
 has started {compact.FEM} [SUBJ cover dirt.the {compact} all furniture ]  
 ‘The dirt started to cover all the furniture compactly’
- d. Empezó {**\*solo**} al final del año [a venir **Juan** {**solo**} a la escuela ]  
 Began {alone} at.the end of.the year [to come Juan {alone} to the school ]  
 ‘Towards the end of the year, Juan began to come to school alone.’  
 [A&A 2012: 107; Julio Villa-García, p.c.]

- (6) [AAIM 2012: 98f, 106] All: *stop»only; \*only»stop*
- |    |           |    |       |                        |               |    |
|----|-----------|----|-------|------------------------|---------------|----|
| a. | Stamatise | na | perni | <b>mono i Maria</b>    | kakus vathmus | Gr |
| b. | A încetat | să | ia    | <b>numai Maria</b>     | note slabe    | Ro |
| c. | Acabó     | de | tomar | <b>solamente María</b> | notas malas   | Sp |
- stopped SUBJ/INF get only Mary grades weak  
 ‘It stopped being the case that only Maria got bad grades.’

If LSIRs in GrRoSp neither overtly nor covertly raise to the matrix clause, then the Case of the embedded subjects must be licensed in situ. We propose that this is achieved via Agree with matrix T (see e.g., Alboiu 2006, Iatridou 1993, Varlokosta 1994, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou [A&A] 1999/2002 for the claim that subjunctive T lacking Tense does not license nominative). In contrast, in EnAd,<sup>3</sup> no such Agree relation can be established (see below), and unmoved embedded subjects fail to receive Case. The derivation only succeeds if subject movement takes place (which, in Ad, can involve the pronunciation of the lower copy).

- (7) T [<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> V<sub>raising</sub> [Infinitive/subjunctive ... SUBJECT ]]] Agree: ✓ GrRoSp  
 \*EnAdSA

### 3. Phases in movement languages

In this section, we lay out our basic analysis for movement languages. The structure we propose for raising infinitives is given in (8). As shown, we assume that there are two phase boundaries between the highest position in the raising infinitive and matrix T. For the subject to move to Spec,TP (in English), movement to the phase edges (positions ② and ③) must apply.

- (8) [TP SUBJ T [<sub>VP=PHASE</sub> SUBJ ③ [<sub>VP seem</sub> [<sub>XP.INF=PHASE</sub> SUBJ ② [<sub>VP</sub> SUBJ ① ... ]]]]]

Before providing evidence for these intermediate movement steps, let us briefly discuss

<sup>3</sup> Since LSIRs in SA appear in embedded *finite* clauses, it is not clear if obligatory movement can also be attributed to Case, though this would be the most straightforward hypothesis. We leave the motivation for movement in SA aside here.

the theoretical background for the distribution of phases as in (8). We follow recent approaches to phasehood (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand [B&W] 2005, In press, den Dikken 2007, 2012a, b, Bošković To appear, Wurmbrand 2013a, b) according to which phasehood is determined dynamically: the highest projection of a cyclic domain (regardless of size or label) constitutes a phase, where cyclic domains are defined as the extended projection of VP (e.g.,  $\nu$ P) and the extended projection of TP (e.g., CP). This approach predicts that passive and unaccusative  $\nu$ Ps/VPs as well as the top projection of a raising infinitive (XP for simplicity here) constitute phases, exactly as in (8) (see Legate 2003 and Marantz 2007 for the former, Sauerland 2003 for the latter). As we will discuss in detail in section 4, Agree languages, on the other hand, involve processes that eliminate (or extend) these phase boundaries to the matrix TP.

The structure in (8) entails, as desired, that matrix T can neither Agree with an embedded subject in situ (position ①) nor a subject in the embedded Spec,XP (position ②), cf. (2a). Moreover, (8) predicts that raising infinitives are locality domains for movement, and movement must proceed through the edges of both  $XP_{INF}$  (position ②) and matrix  $\nu$ P (position ③). Evidence for this comes from binding, reconstruction, and scope. Following Lebeaux (1995), Fox (1999, 2000), Q(uantifier) R(aising) is impossible out of English raising infinitives (cf. (9)). B&W (In press), Wurmbrand 2013a) attribute the impossibility of QR out of a raising infinitive to the phasal status of raising infinitives and Scope Economy, which prohibits semantically vacuous successive cyclic QR. Case-driven movement of the subject, on the other hand, which is necessary for the derivation to converge, is possible (see, e.g., the *Last Resort* definition given in Bošković 2007), and subjects may therefore take scope outside the raising infinitive. The same holds for Adyghe, as shown in (10). P&P 2012 argue that Adyghe is not a scope-rigid language, and like in English, subjects can take matrix scope (since subjects move for Case reasons), but other QPs cannot undergo QR to the matrix clause.

- (9) a. #This soldier seems to someone to be likely to die in every battle. \*A»E  
 b. #The ball seems to a boy to be under every shell. \*A»E  
 cf. Every shell seems to a (different) boy to be over the ball.
- (10) [ st<sub>w</sub>ədentə pepč      zadače-r      q'-a-šə-new      ] t<sub>w</sub>e fjež'ar  
 [ student    each(ERG) problem.ABS    DIR-3PL.ERG-do-INF ] twice began  
 i. 'Each student began twice to solve a problem.' A»2  
 ii. 'It began twice that each student worked on a problem.' 2»A  
 iii.\*'There is a problem that each student twice began to solve.' \*E»A/2  
 [P&P 2012: 88]

Given the presence of two phase boundaries in a raising construction in (8), movement must pass through the edges of both  $XP_{INF}$  (position ②) and matrix  $\nu$ P (position ③). The former is illustrated by the binding properties in (11) (Chomsky 1973, Pesetsky and Torrego 2007). Assuming that there is a copy of the subject in Spec,XP straightforwardly accounts for the impossibility of the matrix experiencer binding the lower anaphor.

- (11) a. [John seems to Mary [XP John to appear to himself] [<sub>VP</sub> John to be...]]  
 b. \*[Mary seems to John [XP Mary to appear to himself] [<sub>VP</sub> Mary to be ...]]



#### 4. Disappearing phases

In this section, we turn to Agree languages and show how phases ‘disappear’. According to AAIM (2010, 2012), Agree languages are *pro*-drop, have clitic doubling, allow VSO orders with VP-internal subjects (A&A 2001, 2007), as well as EPP licensing via V-movement (A&A 1998). Combining these properties with approaches that assume that movement of certain phase heads extends the phase to the higher projection (den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2005, 2010, Gallego and Uriagereka 2006, B&W In press) immediately accounts for why the matrix *v*P/VP is not a phase in GrRoSp and T can see below *v*P/VP. Following A&A (1998), we propose that GrRoSp have *v*/V-raising, which values  $\varphi$ -features on T, thereby allowing null subjects and extending the matrix phase to TP. Crucially, *v*/V-raising extends the *v*P-phase to TP only when there is  $\varphi$ -feature valuation. In non-*pro*-drop languages such as French, V-raising only involves a T-feature relation between *v*/V and T, and T’s  $\varphi$ -features are not valued by *v*/V but require a DP to move to Spec,TP, prohibiting *pro*-drop as well as phase extension. It would lead us too far afield to spell out here why feature valuation matters for phase extension; we will address this question in future work, linking it to the Clitic Doubling parameter.<sup>6</sup>

Thus phase extension via *v*-movement, creates the structure in (15a) in which T can see into the complement of a raising verb. If the embedded subject is in Spec,XP, Agree would be possible, even if XP is a phase as in English. However, (15b) shows that raising constructions can stack, and agreement is again obligatory in this case. Assuming there is no movement of the subject in these constructions either, we can conclude that T can actually see below the edge of the complement of its V, or in other words, XP in (15a) is not a phase. This is what we propose (but see section 5 for a potential language where the *v*P phase is extended to TP, but the raising complement (XP) remains a phase).

- (15) a. [TP=PHASE T+*v*/V [*v*P [*v*P *t*<sub>seem/begin</sub> [XP ...]]]]  
 b. Arhis-an na stamat-un na ginonte endipsis  
 Started-3PL SUBJ stop-3PL SUBJ happen-3PL investments  
 ‘Investments started to stop taking place’

The languages that allow Agree involve raising complements that are either subjunctives or infinitives. We propose that this is not an accident. The transparency of subjunctives and infinitives is cross-linguistically well-known, and we assume that this is the result of those constructions not being phases. Following B&W (In press), Wurmbrand (2013a), subjunctives and infinitives with a specific selected tense value (e.g., irrealis) involve an obligatory selectional valuation relation between the matrix V and the highest head in the embedded clause. This dependency voids the phasehood of the top embedded projection.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> A question arises concerning languages like Italian which involve *pro*-drop but not clitic doubling and do not allow VSO orders with *v*P-internal subjects (they only allow VOS orders, where the O has raised passed an *in-situ* subject). Are these Agree or Move languages? Our analysis predicts that they allow Agree across the *v*P due to the fact that they have *v*/V raising which values  $\varphi$ -features on T. According to Szabolcsi (2009), Italian indeed is an Agree language, see section 2.

<sup>7</sup> More specifically, phasehood is again extended to the matrix VP. However, since in GrRoSP, the matrix V moves to T (via *v*), phase extension also eliminates the phasehood of VP. For simplicity, we ignore

The same mechanism applies to subjunctives in GrRo, i.e., the subjunctive projection loses phasehood, as well as infinitives in Spanish, given that the specific infinitival marker is selected by the matrix V. Since there are no phases between matrix T and the LSIR in GrRoSp, Case can be valued under Agree, and subject movement cannot be Case-driven. We follow the numerous works on subject movement in these languages according to which movement is triggered by information-structure properties (see Barbosa 1997, A&A 1998, Alboiu 2007, among others).

This account predicts that, in contrast to movement languages, movement through position ③ in (8) (i.e., matrix Spec, $\nu$ P) is not required since  $\nu$ P is not a phase. This prediction is supported by the distribution of floating quantifiers in (16a,b) for GrRo. Unless the quantifier is focused, position ③ is not available for a stranded quantifier.

- (16) a. {Oles} i apergies stamatisan {??oles} [ na epirezun tus politikus ]  
 {all} the strikes.PL stopped.3PL {??all} [ SUBJ influence.3PL the politicians ]  
 ‘All the strikes stopped influencing the politicians.’  
 b. {Toate} grevele au încetat {\*toate} [să-i influențeze pe politicieni]  
 {all} the.strikes have stopped.3PL {\*all} [SUBJ.CL influence.3PL ACC politicians]  
 [G. Iordachioaia, p.c.]

Lastly, the licensing of minimizers in GrRo further supports the non-phasal status of subjunctives. As shown in (17), minimizers such as ‘a single penny’ are sharply ungrammatical when they occur within an indicative clause without negation. Matrix negation cannot license a minimizer across an indicative CP, which we assume is impossible due to the phasal status of indicative CPs. On the other hand, minimizers in subjunctive complement can be licensed by matrix negation, which provides evidence for our claim that the top projection of a subjunctive clause is not a phase.<sup>8</sup>

- (17) a. Dhen thimame \*oti / ✓na iche dhrachmi Gr  
 Not remember.1ST.SG \*that / ✓SUBJ had.3SG drachma  
 ‘I don’t remember that he had a single penny/him having a single penny.’  
 b. Nu-mi amintesc \*că i-am dat / ✓să-i fi dat niciun leu Ro  
 Not-me remember \*that him-have given / ✓SUBJ-him be given no leu  
 ‘I don’t remember that I gave him any penny/giving him any penny.’  
 [G. Iordachioaia, p.c.]

## 5. Conclusion and outlook

In this article, we have argued that cross-linguistically raising constructions differ regarding whether or not there are phase boundaries between matrix T and the highest subject position of the embedded clause. Languages like (1a) ( $\approx$  (18a)) were shown to require movement of the embedded subject as indicated, whereas languages like (1b) ( $\approx$  (18b)) allow the subject to be licensed in situ via Agree with T due to the lack of phase bounda-

---

this intermediate step here.

<sup>8</sup> The same point can be made for standard NPIs in Greek, but we avoid using them here as they present additional complications discussed at length in Giannakidou (1998) and much subsequent work.

ries between T and the embedded Spec,vP. We have proposed that the presence/absence of phases is derived by phase extension due to v/V-raising and a particular type of selection of the raising complement.

- (18) a. [TP SUBJ T [<sub>vP</sub>=PHASE SUBJ [<sub>vP</sub> seem [<sub>XP</sub>=PHASE SUBJ [<sub>vP</sub> SUBJ ...]]]]] En/Ad/SA  
 b. [TP=PHASE T+v/V [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> seem/begin [<sub>XP</sub>=PHASE [<sub>vP</sub> SUBJ ...]]]]] GrRoSp

This approach now opens the possibility for two further configurations. First, there could be a constellation where the vP is a phase like in (18a) (no phase extension to TP takes place) but the embedded XP is selected as in (18b) and hence not phase. Second, our system allows a configuration where the vP phase is extended to TP as in (18b), but where XP is not selected and hence remains a phase as in (18a). The first case is given in (19a), and this is exactly the constellation that B&W (In press), Wurmbrand (2013a) propose for subjunctives, control, and ECM infinitives in English. The second case is given in (19b) and we speculate that Hu(ngarian) may be such a language.

- (19) a. [TP SUBJ T [<sub>vP</sub>=PHASE SUBJ [<sub>vP</sub> try/believe [<sub>XP</sub>.INF=PHASE PRO/DP ...]]]] En  
 b. [TP=PHASE T+v/V [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> seem/begin [<sub>XP</sub>=PHASE SUBJ [<sub>vP</sub> SUBJ ...]]]]] Hu?

As shown in Szabolcsi (2009), Hungarian also allows LSIRs. In Hungarian, focused XPs must precede the verb of the clause they appear in. Since in (20a) the subject (marked with the focus element *only*) follows the matrix verb, it cannot be in the matrix clause. If the subject is in the embedded clause, the focus positioning is correctly met—the subject precedes the verb of the clause it appears in, namely the embedded verb. Since Hungarian infinitives do not occur with a particular selected infinitival marker, the top projection of a raising infinitive remains a phase (unless the infinitive is tense selected). If Hungarian involves V-v-T movement, it would make it a language of the type given in (19b): the vP phase is extended to TP, but XP is a phase, which allows T to see down to the edge of XP. A LSIR would then be licensed inside the embedded clause if it appears at the edge of the embedded clause, i.e., in Spec,XP (or adjoined to XP). For some speakers, this is reflected in examples such as (20b-d), which are judged as ungrammatical, and LSIRs occurring not at the edge of the infinitive are only possible when they receive a secondary focus interpretation (A. Liptak, p.c.). However, we have also encountered speaker variation, which may indicate a more complex left periphery or covert positions of the subject. At this point, we therefore leave Hungarian as only a hypothetical language of type (19b).

- (20) a. Elkezdtek/\*Elkezdett [<sub>XP</sub> **csak a fiúk** dolgozni éjszaka]<sub>INF</sub> Hu  
 began.3PL/\*3SG [<sub>XP</sub> **only the boys** work.INF at.night]<sub>INF</sub>  
 ‘It began to be the case that only the boys work at night’ [Szabolcsi 2009: 18]  
 b. %Elkezdtek minden könyvet idejében visszavinni a fiúk a könyvtárba  
 began.3PL every book.ACC in.time back.take.INF the boys the library.to  
 ‘It began to be the case that the boys took back every book to the library in time.’  
 c. %Elkezdtek visszavinni a fiúk minden könyvet idejében a könyvtárba  
 began.3PL back.take.INF the boys every book.ACC in.time the library.to  
 d. %Elkezdtek nem visszavinni a fiúk minden könyvet idejében a könyvtárba  
 began.3PL.not back.take.INF the boys every book.ACC in.time the library.to

## References

- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2006. Are we in agreement? In *Agreement Systems*, ed. by C. Boeckx, 13-39. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2007. Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising. In *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*, ed. by S. Dubinsky & W. Davies, 187-213. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word order, V-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16.3:491-539.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1999/2002. Raising without infinitives and the nature of agreement. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 18*. [Reprinted in: *Dimensions of movement: From features to remnants*, 17-30.]
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2001. The subject-in-situ generalization and the role of case in driving computations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.2:193-231.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2007. The subject-in-situ generalization revisited. In *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?*, ed. by H-M. Gaertner & U. Sauerland, 31-59. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordachioaia, and Mihaela Marchis. 2010. No objection to Backward Control. In *Movement theory of Control*, ed. by N. Hornstein & M. Polinsky, 89-118. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordachioaia, and Mihaela Marchis. 2012. In support of Long Distance Agree. In *Local modeling of non-local dependencies*, ed. by A. Alexiadou, G. Müller & T. Kiss, 55-81. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Aoun, Joseph, Elabas Benmamoun, and Dominique Sportiche. 1994. Agreement, word order, and conjunction in some varieties of Arabic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:195-220.
- Barbosa, Pilar. 1997. Subject positions in the null subject languages. *Seminarios de Linguística* 1:39-63.
- Belletti, Adriana. 1988. The case of unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.1:1-34.
- Benmamoun, Elabbas. 2000. *The feature structure of functional categories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D., and Susi Wurmbrand. 2005. The domain of agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23.4:809-865.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D., and Susi Wurmbrand. 2012. Word order and scope: Transparent interfaces and the 3/4 signature. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43.3:371-421.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan D., and Susi Wurmbrand. In press. Suspension across domains. In *Distributed Morphology Today: Morphemes for Morris Halle*, ed. by A. Marantz & O. Matushansky. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2007. On the locality and motivation of Move and Agree: An even more minimal theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38.4:589-644.
- Bošković, Željko. To appear. Now I'm a phase, now I'm not a phase: On the variability of phases with extraction and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. by S. R. Anderson & P. Kiparsky, 232-286. New York: Holt.

- Corbett, Greville G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2009. The origin and content of expletives: evidence from “selection”. *Syntax* 12.4:285-323.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2007. Phase Extension: Contours of a Theory of the Role of Head Movement in Phrasal Extraction. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33.1:1-41.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2012a. On feature interpretability and inheritance. Ms., City University. New York.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2012b. The Phase Impenetrability Condition and successive cyclicity: A reconsideration. Ms., City University. New York.
- Fox, Danny. 1999. Reconstruction, binding theory, and the interpretation of chains. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30.2:157-196.
- Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and semantic interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press/MITWPL.
- Gallego, Ángel. 2005. Phase sliding. Ms., University of Barcelona.
- Gallego, Ángel. 2010. *Phase theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Gallego, Ángel, and Juan Uriagereka. 2006. Sub-extraction from subjects. Ms., University of Barcelona and University of Maryland.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)Veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haddad, Youssef. 2012. Raising in Standard Arabic: Forward, backward, and none. In *Arabic language and linguistics*, ed. by R. Bassiouney & G. Katz, 61-78. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Hazout, Ilan. 2004a. Long-distance agreement and the syntax of *for*-to Infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.2:338-343.
- Hazout, Ilan. 2004b. The Syntax of Existential Constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.3:393-430.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1993. On nominative Case assignment and a few related things. In *Papers on case and agreement II*, ed. by C. Phillips, 175-198. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 19. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.
- Koopman, Hilda. 2004. Agreement-lite: A short summary of judgment patterns of 17 speakers for plural agreement in English there-insertion constructions, depending on interveners. Ms., UCLA. Los Angeles.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. *Minimalist analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lebeaux, David. 1995. Where does binding theory apply? In *Papers in Syntax, Syntax-Semantics Interface and Phonology*, ed. by R. Echeperé & V. Miglio, 63-88. College Park: University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Lechner, Winfried. Forthcoming. A calculus for reconstruction and anti-reconstruction. In *Reconstruction effects in relative clauses*, ed. by M. Schenner & M. Krifka. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2003. Some Interface Properties of the Phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.3:506-516.
- Marantz, Alec. 2007. Phases and words. In *Phases in the theory of grammar*, ed. by S-H. Choe, Y-S. Kim, S-H. Kim & A. Marantz, 191-220. Seoul: Dong In Publisher.

- Mohammad, A. Mohammad. 1990. The problem of subject-verb agreement in Arabic: Towards a solution. In *Perspectives in Arabic Linguistics I*, ed. by M. Eid, 95-125. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Mohammad, A. Mohammad. 2000. *Word order, agreement and pronominalization in Standard and Palestinian Arabic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ouhalla, Jamal. 1994. Verb movement and word order in Arabic. In *Verb movement*, ed. by D. Lightfoot & N. Hornstein, 41-72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In *Phrasal and clausal architecture*, ed. by S. Karimi, V. Samiian & W. Wilkins, 262-294. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Polinsky, Maria, and Eric Potsdam. 2006. Expanding the scope of control and raising. *Syntax* 9:171-192.
- Polinsky, Maria, and Eric Potsdam. 2012. Backward Raising. *Syntax* 15.1:75–108.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2003. Intermediate adjunction with A-movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.2:308-314.
- Sobin, Nicholas. 1997. Agreement, default rules, and grammatical viruses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28.2:318-343.
- Sobin, Nicholas. 2004. Expletive constructions are not "Lower Right Corner". *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:503-508.
- Soltan, Usama. 2007. On formal feature licensing in Minimalism: Aspects of Standard Arabic morphosyntax. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2009. Overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements cross-linguistically: Data, diagnostics, and preliminary analyses. In *Papers in Syntax 2*, ed. by P. Irwin & V. Vázquez Rojas Maldonado. New York: NYU WPL.
- Varlokosta, Spyridoula. 1994. Issues on Modern Greek sentential complementation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2013a. QR and selection: Covert evidence for phasehood. In *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistics Society Annual Meeting 42*, ed. by S. Keine & S. Sloggett, 619-632. Amherst: GLSA.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2013b. Stripping and topless complements. Ms., UConn. Storrs.

Artemis Alexiadou  
University of Stuttgart  
Institute of Linguistics: English  
Keplerstr. 17, 70174 Stuttgart

artemis@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de

Elena Anagnostopoulou  
University of Crete  
Department of Philology, Linguistics  
74100 Rethymno, Crete

elena@phl.uoc.gr

Susi Wurmbrand  
University of Connecticut  
Department of Linguistics  
337 Mansfield Road, Storrs, CT 06269-1145

susanne.wurmbrand@uconn.edu