

PONTIFÍCIA UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
FACULDADE DE LETRAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS
DOUTORADO EM LETRAS

ADRIANA C. R. QUINELO DA SILVA

ECM, RAISING & CONTROL INFINITIVAL SMALL CLAUSES: CASE
ASSIGNMENT IN ENGLISH AND BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE REVISITED
IN CHOMSKY'S MINIMALIST PROGRAM

Porto Alegre

2012

RESUMO

Esta Tese defende que as sentenças encaixadas do tipo infinitivas flexionadas (Inflected Infinitival Small Clauses - IISCs) em Português Brasileiro (PB) não são tratadas de forma adequada via qualquer abordagem com base em movimento, como a Teoria de Controle via Movimento (Movement Theory of Control - MTC), ao contrário das mesmas infinitivas encaixadas em Inglês. O foco principal para análise dos dados e para corroborar esta Tese sob a abordagem Minimalista de Chomsky (2008), conhecida como Feature Inheritance, são as encaixadas infinitivas como complementos de verbos de Controle em Português Brasileiro e em Inglês, as quais em PB são consideradas como “full φ -CP infinitives/ φ -complete infinitival CPs”, ou seja, complementos do tipo CP-completos, caracterizando uma Phase/Fase intransponível, ao passo que esta possibilidade não está disponível em Inglês. Tal diferença, portanto, contribui para evidenciar que a abordagem adequada a ser adotada para dar conta da atribuição de Caso do sujeito das sentenças encaixadas infinitivas flexionadas em PB é aquela que não envolva movimento do sujeito da sentença encaixada para fora do CP-encaixado; ou seja, para fora da CP-Phase/Fase-CP. Uma vez não havendo o movimento, as features- φ (φ -features) do sujeito da sentença infinitiva encaixada são saturadas dentro da Fase-CP. Dado este contexto em PB, argumento que o sujeito encaixado, uma vez realizado, seja um nome (D/NP) ou um pronome a receber Caso Nominativo. E, bem como, quando não realizado, seja um pro (não PRO) Nominativo, uma vez que o status da sentença encaixada infinitiva flexionada em PB é φ -completo (φ -complete); mais especificamente, uma Fase-CP [+Agr].

Palavras-chave:

Sentenças encaixadas infinitivas flexionadas – complementos de verbos de Controle – Feature Inheritance – Abordagem de Não-Movimento.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation claims that embedded Inflected Infinitival Small Clauses (IISCs) in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) are not well accounted for via any Movement-Approach, such as the Movement Theory of Control (MTC), as opposed to embedded infinitives in English. The main focus for the data analysis and for corroborating this thesis under Chomsky's (2008) Feature Inheritance is Control verb complements in BP and English, which in BP are taken as full φ -CP infinitives/ φ -complete infinitival CPs, characterizing an unbounded Phase, while this possibility is not available in English. This difference thus adds evidence in favor of the approach to be pursued for Brazilian IISCs to be a Non-Movement one, so that the φ -features of the embedded subject can be saturated within the embedded CP-Phase. Concerning the embedded subject within this context, this dissertation then claims that in BP it is a noun (D/NP), pronoun or a pro (not a PRO), given the status of the embedded clause as a φ -complete, hence an [+Agr] infinitival CP-Phase.

Keywords:

Embedded inflected infinitival small clauses – Control verb complements – Feature Inheritance – Non-Movement Approach.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	9
CHAPTER 1.....	13
1.1. FEATURE INHERITANCE - CHOMSKY 2005/2008 (OP); 2007 (AUGB).....	13
1.2 CASE WITHIN FEATURE INHERITANCE, GENERAL PANORAMA.....	26
1.2.1 RAISING, ECM, TOUGH-CONSTRUCTION & BARE INFINITIVE CASE OF EMBEDDED (SUBJECT OF) INFINITIVAL SMALL CLAUSES (ISCS) IN ENGLISH (ENG.) AND BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE (BP): AGREEMENT CONTEXTS AND DEFINITIONS.....	46
1.2.2 DATA ANALYSIS.....	57
CHAPTER 2.....	63
2.1 CONTROL VERBS & CP-COMP INFINITIVAL SMALL CLAUSES.....	63
2.1.1 CONTROL VS. RAISING & ECM: HISTORICAL DIFFERENCES.....	67
2.1.2 CONTROL, PRO DISTRIBUTION, PRO INTERPRETATION, CASE & PROBLEMS.....	79
2.2 AGAINST PRO SHARING CASE WITH ITS CONTROLLER AND THE AGREE APPROACH.....	93
2.2.1 CECCHETTO & ONIGA'S APPROACH: A CASE SHARING ALTERNATIVE.....	94
2.2.2 LANDAU'S (2004) (NON-MOVEMENT) AGREE APPROACH.....	97
2.3 THE MOVEMENT THEORY OF CONTROL (MTC) AS IN BOECKX, HORNSTEIN & NUNES (B, H & N, 2010).....	107
2.3.1 REVISITING CECCHETTO & ONIGA (2004) AND LANDAU (2004) UNDER MTC.....	114
2.3.2 RELATIVIZED MINIMALITY: THE MTC ATTEMPT TO LICIT A-MOVEMENT TO THE MATRIX CLAUSE THROUGH CP ϕ -COMPLETE.....	124
2.3.3 TOUGH CONSTRUCTIONS: PHASE-BOUND (NON-MOVEMENT) FORTO APPROACH TO INFINITIVAL COMPLEMENTATION.....	128
CONCLUSION.....	138
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	140

INTRODUCTION

This work is intended as a continuation of my master's research, a comparative analysis of Case assignment in English and Portuguese Infinitival Small Clauses within Chomsky's GB, now revisited in the Minimalist Program (MP). Thus, throughout this dissertation, the framework to be considered is that of the latest version of MP, within Chomsky's Phase Theory, called Feature Inheritance (FI - 2008). The previous models and developments (from Chomsky's Minimalist Inquiries, MI-2000 on) will not be explained or detailed here, given the extensive literature on them and the fact that the former ones (even prior to MI-2000) have been subsumed by the latest versions (CHOMSKY, 2000-2008), now in force and more developed.

This theoretical framework was chosen due to the natural development of the Principles & Parameters Theory – known as the Minimalist Program – which has also implemented recent developments. Hence, it is worth investigating whether the chosen data corroborates it or not, and perhaps even observe increased advancement, the more data is put to test. Furthermore, in general terms, the Minimalist Program invokes another, ontologically oriented, level of inquiry worth the effort toward a more elegant design. It is very important to highlight the fact that the Minimalist Program does not commit itself to a better description of data; nevertheless, the descriptive improvement comes as a consequence of MP's impact on the design of the grammar, by reducing the internal levels of the previous Government & Binding (GB) model, proving a re-analysis to be even more necessary. Feature inheritance is the latest version that Chomsky has produced; in more technical terms, due to its capacity to capture more data in a transparent manner, as well as a natural simultaneity and parallelism of operations, with a uniform syntactic definition of a Phase. Moreover, in this context, Case-Agreement systems are of particular interest in Minimalism, due to the focus MP has on uninterpretable features (uFs = ϕ -probes and Agree features), by which these systems are triggered.

Regarding Romance Languages, there is still no approach, either quantitative or qualitative, for Brazilian Portuguese (BP). It has not yet been addressed adequately, unlike other more studied Romance languages, such as Romanian, European Portuguese, Catalan or Spanish. At first sight, when comparing BP and English, one

can notice the difference with respect to their infinitival (bare and prepositional) sentences. Similarly to what has been previously noted by Raposo (1986, 1987) for European Portuguese, inflected embedded infinitival sentences in BP can be considered normal finite sentences. These sentences have lexical subjects, differently from uninflected ones without lexical subjects or PRO as their abstract subjects (as in 1.c below). Both ways are equally possible. In BP, the inflected personal infinitive in the embedded sentence (Inf. small clause) is morphologically marked for agreement only, and not for distinguishing verbal tense (which it does not have as an infinitive). On the other hand, English has only one form (as in 2.a below), which is not inflected. The results of my master's thesis (QUINELO, 2008), corroborating Raposo (1986), indicates that this is due to a rare combination of Universal Grammar (UG) for the Parameters involved: The INFL and the Null-Subject Parameters, in which Brazilian Portuguese is valued positive, differently from English (E), which is valued negative, respectively. Since MP approaches these differences within a parameter-free¹ perspective, the explanation for these and other differences in the syntactic structures of infinitival small clauses of BP and E (as well as the similarities) is naturally pertinent in MP's latest context. Hence, this dissertation aims to broaden the discussion on the topic and the evidence of BP in the literature, which is still limited.

Therefore, can the chosen linguistic phenomena (presented above or, in fact, any) be understood by strictly keeping to guidelines of computational efficiency and interface conditions? This is the true aim of any analysis within MP, to be corroborated or not. In the scope of this work, special attention is given to Inflected Infinitival complements (small clauses) of Control verbs in BP, presented in Chapter 2. As a preliminary illustration, take the comparative examples below from 1 to 5:

Preliminary and Illustrative data on Infinitival Small Clauses (ISC) in BP and E.:

1. (a) Sera interessante [elas firmarem um acordo].

'It will be interesting they to-set up- Agr. an agreement.' (...for them to set up ...)

1. (b) * Sera interessante [elas firmar um acordo].

(c) Sera interessante [PRO firmar um acordo].

'It will be interesting to-set up an agreement.'

¹ 'Parameter' here is to be understood as the notion given in GB (switch-on/off); hence parameter-free meaning different from the previous notion.

1. (d) It will be interesting [for them to set up an agreement]. = 1(a)

2. (a) Você me fez dormir - ECM²
 (b) Você fez [eu dormir] - Inflected 1* sing

3. (a) The talk made [me sleep].- (Bare infinitive)/A palestra me fez dormir.
 (b) You helped [me move]./ Você me ajudou a mudar.
 (c) She let me leave./ Ela me deixou sair.
 (d) I saw [John cross the bridge] - (Bare inf.)/Eu vi [João atravessar a ponte].

(ISHIHARA, 2009)

4. (a) Ele me pediu [para [PRO ficar]] - arbitrary PRO =ele/other
 (b) Ele pediu para PRO (ele) ficar - Controlled PRO
 (c) Ele pediu para PRO (eu) ficar -Arbitray
 (d) Ele pediu [para [PRO/pro?? ficarem]]- PRO = eles/elas

5. He asked me [to [PRO stay]] = 4(a)

Given the chosen (Phase-based/Probe-Goal) framework and data, I aim to answer a few guiding questions, which form the basis for the elaboration of a few hypotheses, as follows:

- Can MP's latest version of Phase Theory, called Feature Inheritance, account for the treatment of Abstract Case in Infinitival Small Clauses as complements of ECM, Raising and Control verb types?
- If so, how? What changes should be observed, if any? Why are they more appropriate now?
- What difficulties should the Infinitival Small Clauses in BP pose for the Movement Theory of Control (MTC)?

I hypothesize that MP's latest version of Phase Theory, Feature Inheritance, accounts for the treatment of Abstract Case in Infinitival Small Clauses as complements of ECM, Raising and Control verb types for both English and Brazilian Portuguese. Nevertheless, I also hypothesize that the Inflected Infinitival Small Clauses in BP

² ECM stands for Exceptional Case Marking.

impose a restriction to any movement approach to Case attribution of their embedded subjects, such as the Movement Theory of Control (MTC).

I have two aims within this framework and data scenario, ordered in terms of the focus to be given to each one: (a) to offer a detailed treatment for Case of the subject in Infinitival Small Clauses, as a complement of ECM, Raising & Control verbs in English and Brazilian Portuguese (BP), within the latest version of the Minimalist Program, called Feature Inheritance (CHOMSKY, 2007/8); and (b) to propose a Non-movement Approach for the treatment of Case in the subject position of Inflected Infinitival Small Clauses as Control verb complements in BP, contrary to MTC (Movement Theory of Control) and argue against Null Case, not in absolute terms, but only within this inflected embedded context in BP.

In order to achieve the proposed aims, this work is organized in Introduction and Conclusion and two Chapters (1 and 2).

I assume the reader is familiar with the development of the Minimalist Program up to Feature Inheritance, referring both to the earlier (CHOMSKY's 1990 - 1996) and the later phase (CHOMSKY, 2000 - onwards), especially regarding notions of the Phase Theory Framework, such as the operations involved: Merge, Agree, Move, Transfer,.

Chapter 1 is reserved for Feature Inheritance as a theoretical focus, presenting and revisiting data on Infinitival complements of Raising and ECM verb-types, mainly.

Chapter 2 is based on the theoretical grounds set forth in Chapter 1 (Feature Inheritance) so as to analyze data on Control Verbs and Tough-constructions (CP-complete complements), which actually encompass the elements for the assumptions to be supported in this dissertation.

In the Conclusion, I recapitulate the whole Dissertation and review my assumptions appointing to the results they imply.

CONCLUSION

This proposal was formulated in order to tackle some topics that had remained untreated in my Master's Thesis (Quinelo 2008), like Control verbs and PRO. In order to discuss Control verbs under the realm of MTC, which relates Control with Raising and Raising with ECM (raising-to-the-object), it made sense, in addition to converging with my main objective, to revisit Raising and ECM within Chomskyan's MP last version (FI), which provided the basis for the focus of the discussion.

Also, as controversial as the examples (especially in Brazilian Portuguese) brought to light here may be/have seemed, they serve the purpose of mere objects of the proposed theoretical and meta-theoretical analysis, considering any theory can create its own objects. The problems they may represent, especially regarding their source, reflect the onus as well as the bonus of the approach and analysis conducted here.

I review below what was done in each chapter:

In Chapter 1, I focused on both the theoretical aspects/concepts of Feature Inheritance (the latest version of the Chomskyan Phase Theory). I worked mainly with infinitival complements of Raising and ECM verb-types (in English and Portuguese) and on how to accommodate the older Parametric view of the existing Parameters concerning Case attribution, which are different in both languages (BP & E) within MP's Phasehood criteria. This chapter was meant to set the theoretical grounds and framework for the analysis intended there (Raising and ECM) as well as for the subsequent analysis in the following chapter, namely, Control, offering a general panorama of Case in MP. This panorama reflects the more universal view of the different grammars given language can be couched within Phases and use the same mechanisms, namely, operations. Some use more operations within a Phase than others, yet under the same Phasal principles. In turn, morphological richness varying among languages can be accounted for, corroborating the Minimalist view. Phasehood becomes a strong criterion of universality and in this way, a more felicitous theoretical option. Once Control-type verbs (Tough-Constructions included) in BP were questioned concerning Case attribution of the subject of its embedded inflected infinitival clauses under a Movement approach (in this case MTC), understanding the relation among these three verb types under this Movement approach was made useful as well as necessary, especially once Phasehood was respected.

In Chapter 2, I exposed the problems regarding PRO pointed out so far by some authors and exposed the similarities of recent non-movement approaches with the one I argue for, which led to my claim in favor of a Nominative *pro* as the unrealized embedded subject of the BP's inflected infinitival clauses instead. In this sense, I have positioned myself against any Movement approach to account for this phenomenon (Inflected infinitival complements) in BP. Furthermore, I argued for a semantically-dependent, though syntactically-independent embedded CP.

To conclude, then, given the theoretical definitions and assumptions adopted and defended throughout this work regarding the topics that are most relevant to the assumptions I make are as follows: T-inflections [Tense, Agr]/ Finiteness, Defectiveness/Completeness, Pro-based/Non-Movement Approach. I restate my claim for a Non-Movement/Pro-Based Approach to Control (N-M/PBAC) in Inflected infinitival Small Clauses (IISC) in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) as in (44), repeated below. This, in turn, goes against the most recent view on Control, that of Movement Theory of Control (MTC) and others alike whose main arguments are for grammatical sentences mediated by movement.

Repeating (44) Primary Assumptions:

The Inflected Infinitival clause as complements in Brazilian Portuguese configures [+/- T, +Agr];

The [+Agr] configuration means there is subject-verb conjugation, which is expressed in the morphology of the verb;

If there is subject-verb agreement/conjugation [number, person], then the structure is analogous to that of a normal sentence, especially in Control verbs, which are also considered [+Tense]. Though [+Tense] is not a good device to distinguish the types of verbs (Control, Raising, ECM) in terms of their infinitival complements, it does not mean that these readings (irrealis/future) are not available in these complements; they actually are available;

Given (i, ii, iii), I argue that the very/only presence of [+Agr] in a clause (Infl) is enough to consider it ϕ -complete (agreement in number and person), thus a CPcomp and, therefore, finite, [+Finite];

This configuration (as in iv) in a complement clause implies that its (embedded) subject cannot be Case checked by a matrix verb, nor can it or any element move out of the

complement clause (full CP) to Check its Case, once a full CP is a phase and a blocking category (BC);

It also implies, as I am arguing, that its embedded subject is a *pro*, not a *PRO*, under these conditions. Indeed, a *pro* or a D/NP, occupying an argumental position, is hence entitled to check Case.

Though my arguments relate to a more traditional view in Generative Grammar, at least concerning Brazilian Portuguese, they account for BP's facts more accurately for they do not ignore BP's morphological realization, nor do they exclude this morphological realization from happening within the Phases, allowing it to trigger Transfer having saturated all features. With this work, though, I do not intend to ignore the minimalist virtues of MTC, for I recognize it is the null hypothesis of Control, conceptually, methodologically and empirically speaking. Yet, it is still wrong for Brazilian Portuguese Inflected Infinitival complements; thus, my assumptions and proposal apply for BP more appropriately. Hence, in BP's Control structures, matrix CP and its embedded inflected infinitival CP are two syntactically independent elements, defining two different phases. Therefore, matrix subject/object is syntactically independent from the embedded subject. This means that the embedded subject (NP/ pronoun or a *pro*) of an inflected infinitival complement and the matrix subject/ object are bound only semantically (co-referentially). This is because they represent the same element, sharing the same phi-features, bearer of two (different) theta-roles, one in each (CP)phase, though not necessarily checking the same Case. Everything fits Chomsky's (2008) Feature Inheritance phasehood notion, thus confirming my hypothesis:

a) MP's latest version of Phase Theory, Feature Inheritance, does account for the treatment of Abstract Case in Infinitival Small Clauses as complements of ECM, Raising and Control verb types for both English and Brazilian Portuguese, accounting as well for the more universally operational differences previously viewed as Parameters in the earlier GB Model;

b) The Inflected Infinitival Small Clauses in BP impose a restriction, that of a Phase boundary, to any movement approach to Case attribution of their embedded subjects, such as the Movement Theory of Control (MTC).