COPiL cambridge occasional papers in linguistics
Volume 6, Article 1: 1–47, 2012 | ISSN 2050-5949

A NEW TAKE ON PARTIAL CONTROL: DEFECTIVE THEMATIC INTERVENTION

account could be extended to cover PC in English and discusses some of the issues which arise for such an extension. Finally, section 7 concludes, raising some issues for future research.

Part A: Control as a challenge for the Movement Theory of Control

2.1 The Problem

Landau (1999, 2000) first drew attention to the phenomenon of Partial Control (PC), whereby PRO is anaphorically dependent on, but not exhaustively controlled by, a higher DP:[2]

(1) (a) * The chair gathered/gathers on a regular basis.
(b) The chair$_i$ would prefer [PRO$_i$ to gather at 6]
(c) * The chair$_i$ would prefer [PRO$_i$ to gather without him$_i$]

only EC in English as their complements are untensed, whereas the complements of factive, propositional, desiderative and interrogative predicates permit either EC or PC, as their complements are tensed, as shown by their ability to support independent temporal reference:[3]

(3) (a) * The chair managed/began [PRO to gather at 6].

(b) * Yesterday John managed/began [PRO to eat tomorrow].

(4) (a) The chair was sorry/preferred/wondered whether [to meet earlier than planned].

(b) Yesterday John was sorry/preferred/wondered whether [to leave tomorrow].

The second important aspect of (2) is the claim that in instances of PC, PRO inherits all its features from its controller with the exception of semantic plurality. As Landau shows, verbs like meet require their subject to be semantically plural in English, but not necessarily syntactically plural, and this proves crucial to his analysis:

(5) The committee met this morning.[4]

As Landau has long pointed out, the properties of PC make it apparently problematic for Hornstein's (1999 et seq) Movement Theory of Control (MTC). This is because, as he notes, PC is a subtype of obligatory Control (OC):

> "PC verbs show all the familiar characteristics of OC: The controller must be local, cannot be arbitrary, PRO is inte26(,)-3942(O)D354(l)02.159(o)-30.8547(cp26

are PC contexts, despite having often been misanalysed as instances of non-obligatory Control (NOC):

(6) John wondered [how PRO to talk about himself/oneself]

Although, the anaphor oneself is possible here, Landau shows that this it does not imply truly arbitrary reference for PRO. Rather oneself appears to be the anaphor which surfaces (somewhat marginally) with PC PRO in English. Crucially, even where oneself is present, PRO must still be partially controlled in OC contexts, as illustrated by (7):

(7) *Johni wondered [how PRO$_i$ to talk to him$_i$ about oneself].
(Landau 2000: 40)

If the ungrammaticality of (7) is again due to condition B, then the binder of oneself cannot be arbitrary PRO, but must rather be PC PRO.

The fact that the controller must be local in instances of PC is illustrated by (8):

(8) The chair$_i$ thought that Mary wanted PRO $_i$ to meet after breakfast.

In (8), PRO must be partially controlled by the local (next-clause-up) DP Mary and is not partially controlled by the non-local DP the chair. This is not to say, of course that the chair cannot be (accidentally/optionally) included in the reference set of PRO, as Landau notes. Crucially, though, whereas Mary must be included in that set, the chair need not be. This is illustrated by the following contrast, again due to condition B:

(9) *The chair$_i$ though that Mary wanted PRO to gather without her

(10) The chair$_i$ though that Mary wanted PRO to gather without him$_i$

The semantics of PC are not straightforward to illustrate, but with some care, it is possible to show that PRO again patterns with obligatory rather than non-obligatory Control in instances of PC. Consider the following example, adapted from Landau (2000: 42):

(11) Johni would prefer [PRO$_i$ to meet after breakfast] and Bill would too (but without *him /John$_i$)

In (11), it cannot be the case that Bill would prefer for John and some other people excluding Bill to meet after breakfast. It must rather be the case that Bill would prefer for himself and some other people (either including or excluding John) to meet after breakfast. As such, (11) displays a sloppy reading, meaning once again that PC PRO patterns with OC rather than NOC. Replicating another of Hornstein's (1999) tests for OC, it can also be shown, with some e□ort, that PC gives rise to a bound variable reading. Thus in (12), the only available reading is one whereby Mrs Shu□ebotham is the only person x **such that** x **wondered where** x **and some other people (say her students) should assemble in the event of**

rather than subextraction, contra (b). As such, it will be proposed that Landau's conclusion is premature, but that previous attempts to accommodate

A new take on partial control

(21) O Pedro queria reunir=se mais tarde.
the Pedro wanted.3SG meet.INF=self.3 more late
'Pedro wanted/would like to meet later on.'

It therefore seems to be the case that some speakers allow fake PC in EP, even where clitic climbing has taken place, contrary to what is usually the case with (true) PC.[13]

The fact that such examples are indeed instances of PC is strongly suggested by the fact that all speakers rejected (22), presumably because of condition B, as is (23):

(22)

(26) O João preferia reunir=se de manhã, e a
the João preferred meet.INF=self.3 of morning, and the
Maria também preferia.
Maria also preferred
'João would prefer to meet in the morning and so would Maria.'

(27) * O João preferia reunir=se de manhã, e a
the João preferred meet.INF=self.3 of morning, and the
Maria$_i$ também preferia mas sem ela$_i$.
Maria also preferred but without her
'João would prefer to meet in the morning and so would Maria (but without her).'

Landau (2003) does not discuss instances of PC in Romance with 1st/2nd person antecedents. 1st/2nd person reflexive clitics are morphologically distinguished for both person and number and thus provide more information as to the features of the embedded subject in instance of fake PC. Interestingly, with singular controllers, only phi-matched reflexive clitics are permitted in instances of fake PC, despite the requirement for verbs like reunir-se 'meet' to take a plural subject:[15]

(28) a. Eu preferia reunir=me mais tarde.
I preferred.1SG meet.INF=self.1SG more late
'I preferred/would prefer to meet later.' [*=1, ?=3, ✓=28]

b. * Eu preferia reunir=nos às 3
I preferred.1SG meet.INF=self.1PL at.the 3
[*=21, ?=5, ✓=6]

c. * Eu preferia reunir=se mais tarde
I preferred.1SG meet.INF=self.3 more late
[*=19, ?=0, ✓=0]

(29) a. Preferias reunir=te mais tarde?
prefer.2SG meet.INF=self.2SG more late
'Would you prefer to meet later on?' [*=3, ?=4, ✓=25]

15 Landau (2004a: 835) seems to suggest that Italian (and presumably other Romance languages with the exception of French) permit *si/se* reflexives in instances of PC because this third person form is unspecified for number, but the data presented here show that this is not the case in EP.

b.

A new take on partial control

(i) 'Would you prefer PRO$_{2PL}$ to meet tomorrow or on Friday?'
(ii) 'Would you prefer PRO$_{1PL}$ to meet tomorrow or on Friday?'

In (35), the embedded subject can be partially controlled by the 1PL matrix subject, including some other second/third party in the meeting. In (36)-(37), the same e□ect holds, meaning that the semantic person of PRO

b. * The chair hoped to sing alike/be mutually supporting.

c. John met/collided/agreed/gathered/interacted with Bill.

d. John doesn't want to meet/collide/agree/gather/interact today.

Landau (2004b) has already raised some problems with the veracity of this claim in relation to English. In fact, a consideration of which predicates can surface in (apparent) instances of PC, strongly suggests that EP fake PC but not English PC involves a covert comitative. There is a strong correlation in EP between the possibility of a comitative and the ability to participate in PC with an uninflected infinitive, whereas the same does not hold for British or American English. While a large class of the predicates requiring a plural subject are comitative, Levin (1993: 62-63) gives two further classes of verbs which require plural subjects in English, both of which are reflexive in EP. The first are those predicates which denote separation/divergence and usually surface with a PP introduced by from in English (di□er, diverge, divide, di-

c. John has been seeing Mary for a while now and he wants to kiss soon.

As such, again, English fails to conform to BHN's predictions. In EP, however, such verbs cannot participate in fake PC, exactly as predicted by the covert comitative analysis:[25]

(43) * Há uma semana que o Pedro anda com a Maria
has a week that the Pedro walks with the Maria
e queria beijar=se/abraçar=se agora
and wants kiss.INF=self.3/embrace.INF=self.3 now
Intended 'Pedro has been seeing Mary for a week and he would like to kiss/cuddle now.'

In relation the basic distribution of the phenomenon, then, there is good reason to believe that fake PC in EP involves EC plus a covert comitative, but the same is not true of English PC.

A second prediction of BHN's approach is that fake PC will behave essentially like EC. There are three ways in which this is true of fake PC in EP.

well known, is also compatible with restructuring. Secondly, recall that fake PC was almost unanimously accepted by speakers of EP, contrary to what has been claimed for true PC, and in line with the facts for EC. Finally, note that in instances of fake PC, anaphors are licensed exactly as they are in EC. The anaphor, in all cases, agrees in all features with its controller, as illustrated in (44):[26]

(44) a.

A new take on partial control

‘Would you prefer to meet tomorrow or on Friday?’ [*=13, ?=3, ✓=17]

(50) % O João preferia reunirem=se mais tarde.
the João preferred.3SG meet.INF.3PL=self.3 more late
‘João would prefer to meet later on.’ [*=13, ?=1, ✓=8]

Here, there is clearly no requirement for the syntactic number or person features of the controlled subject to match those of the controller. In fact, as long as the controller is a potential proper subset of the referent of PRO, the embedded subject has syntactic features to match its semantics, regardless of the features of the controller (as indicated by the inflection and the features of the reflexive clitic). Where the phi-feature specification of controller and controllee makes this impossible (for semantic reasons), ungrammaticality results:[29]

(51) % O João preferia reunirmo=nos mais tarde.
the João preferred.3SG meet.INF.1PL=self.1PL more late
‘João would prefer for us$_i$

A new take on partial control

(53)

must be included in the reference of the embedded null subject, as indicated by the following condition B violation:

(60) * O João$_i$ preferia reunirem=se
the João preferred.3S

b. The chair hoped [[$_{\mathbf{DP}}$ pro t_i

In relation to EP, the most serious problem with the approach, though, is the availability/motivation for subextraction. It is well-known that inflected infinitives never surface in instances of raising (Raposo 1989: 297, Quicoli 1996: 59):

(70) * It is possible that [$_{DP}$ pro **the victim] will meet drunk.**

(71) pro$_i$ **parecem** [t$_i$ **ter razão**]
seem.PRES.3PL have.INF reason

(72) EXPL parece [pro **terem razão**]
seem.PRES.3PL have.INF reason
'They seem to be right.'

(73) ***pro **parecem [pro **terem razão**]
seem.PRES.3PL have.INF reason

This follows if an inflected infinitive assigns nominative Case to its subject,

to result from the Control relation itself, rather than being generally available in contexts of A-movement, something which a big DP approach again cannot capture without additional stipulations. Despite initial appeal, then, the big DP approach does not seem to solve the PC problem. While it is possible to describe PC in in such terms, there is little independent evidence for such an approach, and the kind of movement which it requires is not otherwise attested. An account in terms of defective intervention, on the other hand, has the benefit of (i) explaining why PC should exist, (ii) assimilating the effect to other well attested phenomena such as the Person Case Constraint and (iii) extending to PC in other languages, such as English.

Thus far, it has been argued that inflected PC cannot be accounted for by previous approaches to PC and is thus ripe for a novel analysis. The fact that inflected infinitives assign Case to their subjects explains why they are not compatible with EC, but raises other questions for the MTC. For example, why are referential subjects not permitted in the inflected infinitival complements of desiderative predicates, given that Case appears to be available? How can pro be partially controlled? Crucially, whatever grammatical mechanism serves to give rise to PC here should also serve to explain why inflected infinitives can

(81) ITALIAN:

Gianni sembra
Gianni

(85) GREEK:

*	**Tha**	**su**	**me**	**sistisune**
	FUT	**CL.GEN.2SG**	**CL.ACC.1SG**	**introduce.3PL**

'They will introduce me to you.' (Anagnostopoulou 2008: 16)

Anagnostopoulou's (2008) account of the strong PCC is as follows. Following Taraldsen (1995), she proposes that datives are defective in the specific sense that they have person but no number features (as a result of the fact that they bear quirky Case). She further proposes, following Adger and Harbour (2007), that 3rd person datives have the specification [−person]. This means that when α probes for φ-features it must first agree with the dative DP (β) for [−person]. The same head α then agree with the next-closest accusative DP (γ) in number only (via cyclic Agree). As long as the accusative DP lacks a person specification as is the case with 3rd person accusatives, the derivation converges. If the accusative has a [+person] feature, however, the derivation crashes, as by hypothesis, in order to receive structural Case, a DP must Agree fully with a Case-assigning head. Given the assumption that 1st and 2nd person accusative pronouns are [+person], this serves to capture the strong PCC. The fact that accusatives unlike datives are fully specified for both number and person features is due to the fact that only the latter require structural Case. The crucial insight behind this approach to the PCC is that a derivation can converge in spite of a defective intervener as long as the relevant feature set of γ is a proper subset of those of β Schematically, this is as follows:

(86) $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{probe}}$ $\mathrm{D}\not\alpha_1$ $\mathrm{D}\not\alpha_2$:
X can agree with DP$_2$ only if it first (partially) agrees with DP$_1$. In such cases, the relevant feature set of DP$_2$

An account of Partial Control

6.1 Thematic roles as features

The crucial assumption at the heart of the MTC is that a single DP can bear more than one theta-role. Hornstein (1999) proposes to couple this as-

Agree, then these patterns would be highly mysterious (cf. also Chomsky 1995 for a defence of configurational theta-assignment).[45]

There are also many fairly obvious problems which arise if theta-roles are features which can be valued by Agree, even in English. Consider, for example, the well-known fact that raising but not Control verbs are compatible with expletive subjects:

(87) * There expected [John to leave]

BHN (2010) note that (87) can be ruled out in the MTC by the fact that expletives cannot absorb theta-roles. Crucially, this is only the case if theta-roles require Merge. If theta-roles could be assigned via Agree, John could simply receive two distinct theta-roles via Agree in (87), with there satisfying the EPP. Crucially, (87) is not ruled out on Case grounds as expect is an ECM verb which, if transitive, can assign accusative Case to the subject of a TP complement (i.e. John). For the MTC to be empirically tenable, then, it seems necessary that theta-role assignment must be configurationally determined.[46]

With facts such as these in mind, let us assume, in line with the second option outlined by BHN (2010), that theta-roles can be discharged only via Merge.[47]

(88) Principle of theta assignment
Theta-roles can only be assigned via External or Internal Merge with a thematic head.

This is identical to the standard position with the exception that internal Merge also serves to discharge theta-roles. It is also very similar to Hornstein's original checking-based proposal except that in the context of Chomsky (2000), it is predicted that where a theta-role is discharged via internal

merge, Agree will be required as a precursor. As such theta-roles retain their configurational nature and their connection to Merge but can be determined

instances of defective intervention, and so values its unvalued uninterpretable D feature. The value assigned to v's [D:] feature is the referential index of said DP, which, if movement were possible, would also be linked to the predicate's theta-grid. Because the DP in question already has Case, however, it cannot, under our/Hornstein's assumptions, raise to merge with v and so cannot absorb v's theta-role. Nevertheless, as v has thematically 'agreed' with said DP, it follows that when v subsequently discharges its theta-role to a distinct, externally merged, DP, the latter will need to be a referential subset of the DP which has valued v's [D:] feature. Just as defective phi-agreement with DP_1 determines the potential person features of DP_2, so too does defective thematic Agree determine the potential referential index of DP_2.

This, in essence, is PC:

(90) PC:
DP $v_{[D:]}$ V [$DP_{i\,[\ Case]}$ T . . .]

a. matrix v probes for a local DP
b. v forms a dependency with DP_i, formally valuing its unvalued uninterpretable feature [D: i]
c. DP_i is inactive and cannot merge with v.
d. DP is externally merged, and thus receives v's theta-role at LF
e. As v bears a valued feature [D: i] as the result of having agreed with DP_i, it follows that the external argument's referential index j must be a proper subset of i.
f. The derivation converges as long as DP gets Case from a higher head

E□ectively, PC arises where a visible but inactive DP enters into a defective thematic relation with a head v, serving to limit the reference of the DP which eventually receives v's theta-role. The movement-like properties of true PC follow from the fact that Agree is subject to locality (because of Relativised Minimality). As such, e□ectively failed movement from a visible complement

probed DP and the externally merged DP because of v

(95) pro escrevi a carta [para (eles) perceberem].
wrote.1SG the letter for them understand.INF.3PL
'I wrote the letter in order for them to understand.'

Next, consider 'transparent' (non-island) complement domains. In the complements of raising verbs, inflective infinitives are possible and again pro can be referential as there is no local c-commanding thematic probe:

(96) EXPL parece [pro terem razão]
seem.PRES.3PL have.INF reason
'They seem to be right.'

But the subject of inflected infinitives in the complements of desiderative predicates cannot be referential, as discussed above, plausibly because of (90). This follows if inflected infinitival clauses are generally visible for probing, but defective thematic intervention only arises where a local, c-commanding thematic probe is present. As such, we have a potential explanation as to why the inflected infinitival complements of desiderative predicates are Case domains which do not support overt subjects or subjects with independent reference.

The fact that epistemic and factive Control predicates permit inflected infinitival complements with referential subjects, as discussed above, is apparently problematic for (90). However, as Raposo (1987) notes at length, there is good evidence that these non-finite complements contain hidden structure. The complements of epistemic verbs require obligatory Aux-to-Comp movement, whereas the complements of factive predicates involve either (a) Aux-to-Comp or (b) a concealed DP layer. In both cases, Raposo argues, the clause in question receives Case, and hence must be nominal in some sense. If this is the case then such clauses may be opaque to thematic probing because they themselves function as interveners.

This provides a potential handle on why it is that some clauses are visible for thematic probing, whereas others are not. An additional empirical challenge which has often been discussed in relation to the MTC is the fact that whereas many (though not all) languages allow Control into an embedded clause introduced by a complementiser, raising never does (cf. Landau 2003: 488). BHN (2010: 128-129), following Nunes (2007, 2010) o□er an attractive explanation for this fact. If C bears phi-features then its presence will be su□cient to block phi-related probing into its c-command domain, but these phi-features will not a□ect thematic probing, which is independent of phi-features. By the same logic, it is expected that where C is [+D], it will block thematic probing into its complement domain. Whether an embedded

clause is visible for thematic probing therefore reduces to whether or not it is introduced by a [+D] complementiser. Modern English for appears, by these criteria to be +D as it is incompatible with OC, whereas EP de must lack a D-specification, as it is not:

(97) O Pedro precisa de sair
the Pedro needs of leave.INF

The complements of desiderative verbs in EP, unlike those of epistemic/-factive predicates might lack D either because they are TPs or because they are CPs, where C lacks a D feature. I remain agnostic as to which is the correct analysis in the absence of persuasive evidence in either direction.[51]

The defective intervention analysis explains the semantics of PC as well as the availability of phi-mismatches between controller and the controllee. If PC results from the fact that the referential index of an externally merged subject must be contained in the referential index of the intervener, then this applies semi-independently of phi-specifications. All that is required is for the phi-features of controller and controllee to be compatible with the relationship between their indexicals. Consider the following ungrammatical example:

(98) * Eu preferia [pro_i reunirem=se mais
I preferred.1SG meet.INF.1=3PL=self.3 more
tarde.
late

In such cases, the matrix v thematically agrees with pro_i, picking up the value [D: i]. This means that at LF eu must both (i) pick up v's theta-role and (ii) have an index which is a proper subset of i. In such cases, though, it is not possible to interpret eu as a proper subset of the referent of 3PL pro as, for semantic reasons, 1SG cannot be a member of a 3PL set.[52] A similar problem would arise with an overt non-pronominal DP:[53]

51 This raises the question why CPs headed by a [+D] complementiser do not trigger PC, if they are defective interveners. The answer to this is possibly that they lack a referential index and so fail to constrain the reference of the externally merged subject. Alternatively, in section 7, I argue that the same head cannot probe the same phrase twice for different features. If CPs which are [+D] receive a kind of Case, as author (2011) proposes, then this constraint might independently prevent defective intervention in such cases.

52 This is because 1st person is dominant over 2nd and 3rd person, just as 2nd person is dominant over 3rd. Thus a mixed group of 1st and 3rd person gives rise to a 1PL referent.

53 Note, however, that in Spanish, a language which permits 3PL DPs to be interpreted as 1PL, PC of 3PL DPs appears to be possible, as noted by Torrego (1996), and discussed also

(99) * Eu preferia
I preferred.1SG

control phenomena do not follow from the [MTC–MS]". I have argued that they do, as in many cases they arise via defective thematic intervention of a kind that is to be expected if theta-roles can be assigned via either External or Internal Merge. While many questions remain concerning the viability of the MTC, PC, once a thorn in its side, may turn out to be a lot less problematic than previously thought. In fact, its very existence may turn out to be crucial evidence that thematic roles can be assigned via Internal as well as External Merge.

EFERENCES

Adger, David, and Daniel Harbour. 2007. Syntax and syncretisms of the Person Case Constraint. Syntax 10:2-37.

Alboiu, Gabriela. 2007. Moving forward with Romanian backward control and raising. In New horizons in the analysis of control and raising, eds. William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 187- 213. Dordrecht: Springer.

Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordachioaia, and Mihaela Marchis. 2010. No objections to backwards control. In Movement Theory of Control, eds. Norbert Hornstein and Maria Polinsky, 89-118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions: a feature checking analysis. In Clitic and A□x Combinations, eds. Lorie Heggie and Fernando Ordóñez, 199-235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2008. Notes on the Person Case Constraint in Germanic (with special reference to German). In Agreement Restrictions, eds. Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, 15-47. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark C. 1997. Thematic roles and syntactic structure. In Elements of grammar, ed. Lilianne Haegeman, 73–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Bobaljik, Jonathon, and Idan Landau. 2009. Icelandic Control is not A-movement: The Case from Case. Linguistic Inquiry 40:113-132.

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2004. Movement under Control. Linguistic Inquiry 35: 431–452.

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2006a. Control in Icelandic and theories of Control. Linguistic Inquiry 37: 591–606.

Boeckx, Cedric, and Norbert Hornstein. 2006b. The virtues of Control as movement. Syntax 9:118–130.

Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010. Control as movement. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levin, Beth. 1993. English verb classes and alternations : a preliminary investigation. Chicago / London: University of Chicago Press.

Madeira, A. 1994. On the Portuguese inflected infinitive. UCL working papers in linguistics. 6: 179-203.

Martin, Roger Andrew. 1996. A minimalist theory of PRO and control. University of Connecticut: PhD dissertation.

Martin, Roger. 2001. Null Case and the Distribution of PRO. Linguistic Inquiry. 32:141–166.

McGuinnes, Martha. 1998. Locality in A-movement. MIT: Ph.D thesis.

Modesto, M. 2007. Inflected infinitives in Brazilian Portuguese as an argument both contra and in favor of a movement analysis of control. Revistas letras Curitiba. 72: 297-309.

Modesto, M. 2010. What Brazilian Portuguese Says about Control: Remarks on Boeckx & Hornstein. Syntax. 13 (1): 78-96.

Nunes, Jairo. 2007. A-over-A, inherent case and relativised probing. GLOW newsletter 58.

Nunes, Jairo. 2010. Relativizing Minimality for A-movement: phi and theta relations. Probus. 22:1-25.

Nunes, Jairo. 1999. Linearization of chains and phonetic realization of chain links. In Working Minimalism., eds. Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 217-250. Cambridge, Mass. & London, England: MIT Press.

Nunes, Jairo. 2004. Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, David. 1991. Zero Syntax: vol. 2: Infinitives., Ms., MIT.

Pires, Acrisio. 2001. PRO, movement and binding in Portuguese. In Romance syntax, semantics and L2 acquisition: Selected papers from the 30th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages., eds. Joachim Camps and Caroline Wiltshire. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pires, Acrisio, and Rothman, Jason. 2010. Building bridges: Experimental L1 and [illegible]

Interfaces. 121:605-622.

Varlokosta, Spyridoula. 1994. Issues on Modern Greek Sentential Complementation. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland.

Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. Linguistic Inquiry. 11:203-238.

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

mls54@cam.ac.uk
www.sites.google.com/site/michellesheehan54/home