

# Backward control, long distance Agree and the nature of nominative Case

---

Artemis Alexiadou<sup>1</sup> & Elena Anagnostopoulou<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Humboldt University of Berlin & Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, <sup>2</sup>University of Crete

artemis.alexiadou@hu-berlin.de, elena@phl.uoc.gr

In this paper, we show that a set of phenomena involving long distance dependencies in control and raising environments cluster together revealing the signature property of null- subject languages: null subject languages (NSLs) have T with interpretable  $\phi$ -features which are not deleted after checking and valuation, thus being able to form Long Distance chains via Agree (cf. Ura 1994). By focusing on Greek, we argue that backward control (BC) is actually an instance of long distance Agree (LDA) related to the non-local assignment of NOM, made possible via long distance chain formation.

As has been discussed in the literature, Greek lacks infinitives and has Obligatory Raising (OR), Obligatory Control (OC) and Obligatory ECM in subjunctives introduced by the particle *na*. We argue that these phenomena take place in a subset of environments usually showing raising, OC and ECM in languages with infinitives, namely when the embedded Tense is simultaneous with the matrix Tense and cannot be modified by an independent temporal adverb. This is realized as present imperfective morphology. By contrast, when embedded T is non-simultaneous with matrix T and is realized as present perfective, agreement between NOM and the matrix verb may be disrupted, resulting in non-obligatory Raising (NOR) and Control (NOC). In the literature, simultaneous Tense has been analyzed as null/no Tense (Wurbrand 2014), leading to the conclusion that Greek OR and OC show an obligatory relationship between a matrix T bearing interpretable features  $T_{[IT]}$  and NOM across an embedded  $T_{[uT]}$  bearing uninterpretable features as in (1), manifested as agreement between one NOM and many fully agreeing T heads, contra Baker (2008).

(1)  $[_{TP1} T_{[IT]-\phi k} \quad [_{TPu} na \quad T_{[uT]-\phi k} \dots \dots [_{VP} NOM_{\phi k} \dots \dots ]]]$

BC and LDA relate to the non-local assignment of NOM in Greek combined with the EPP as analyzed in Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998): NOM can be assigned long distance (if there is **no intervening adjectival agreement**: Greek lacks the counterpart of *The children are likely to win*); since V-Raising satisfies the EPP, NOM may remain in situ. This is not so in ECM as ACC must be assigned locally.