

Alleged obligatory control inflected infinitives

Pilar P. Barbosa

University of Minho

pbarbosa@ilch.uminho.pt

In recent years, it has been proposed that there are languages in which there are two kinds of obligatory control (OC), the familiar type that is attested in non-inflected, Caseless infinitives, and a new type of OC, found in infinitives in which the null subject has Case, as in Portuguese, a language with two types of infinitives, non-inflected (1a) and inflected (1b):

- (1) a. *A mãe convenceu as filhas_i a [-]_i sair mais cedo.*
the mother convinced the daughters to leave more early
b. *A mãe convenceu as filhas_i a [-]_i saírem mais cedo.*
the mother convinced the daughters to [-] leave.3PL more early
'Their mother convinced the children to have lunch earlier.'

Modesto (2010) and Sheehan (2014) argue that (a) and (b) are instances of OC. On the other hand, it has been known at least since Pires (2006) that non-inflected infinitives differ from inflected infinitives (I-infinitives) in crucial ways. The differences detected can be accounted for under the assumption that examples such as (1a) are genuine cases of OC while examples such as (1b) are not (and rather contain a *pro* subject). This talk will examine the arguments given in favor of the OC analysis of I-infinitival complements and it will argue that there are no reasons to posit this new kind of OC. The cases that have been analysed as falling under this new species of OC can all be explained as instances of (accidental) coreference.

There are severe restrictions on the reference the subject of an I-infinitive embedded under OC verbs and these contribute to the illusion of OC. We will adopt Jackendoff and Culicover (2003)'s suggestion that Unique Control (OC) reduces to the theory of the content of basic predicates that select actional arguments. OC verbs require their infinitival complement to be a volitional Action and impose restrictions on the choice of Actor. We argue that inflected infinitival complements denote Situations (which may include Actions), just like ECM or finite complements. Whenever inflected infinitival complements are embedded under verbs that select actional complements only, they must be coerced into volitional actions. Coercion explains the semantic restrictions imposed on I-infinitival complements of OC verbs.

References: • Jackendoff, R. & P. Culicover. 2003. The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79. 517–556. • Modesto, M. 2010. What Brazilian Portuguese says about control: remarks on Boeckx & Hornstein. *Syntax* 13(1). 78–96. • Pires, A. 2006. *The minimalist syntax of defective domains: Gerunds and infinitives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Sheehan, M. 2014. Portuguese, Russian and the theory of control. In H. Huang, E. Poole & A. Rysling (eds.), *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Northeast Linguistics Society* 43/2, 115–126. Amherst: GLSA.