

## Identity Avoidance with Reflexive Clitics in European Portuguese and Minimalist Approaches to Control\*

### Abstract

In this paper we discuss two types of co-occurrence restrictions involving reflexive clitics in European Portuguese and examine their implications for obligatory control. We argue that these restrictions may shed some light on where the “controller” is generated, thus making it possible to empirically test three minimalist approaches to control: the predicate attraction approach (see Manzini and Roussou 2000), the PRO-based approach (e.g. Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Landau 2000, 2004, and Martin 2001), and the movement approach (e.g. Hornstein 1999, 2001 and Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes 2010). We show that neither of the approaches is able to capture all the relevant data if pursued under a strong lexicalist perspective such as Chomsky’s (1993, 2000) and that only the movement approach can account for all the data in a uniform way under Chomsky’s (2001) weak lexicalist perspective.

*Keywords:* control theory, identity avoidance, Phase Impenetrability Condition, reflexive clitics, indefinite *se*, European Portuguese

### 1. Introduction

In the last two decades the syntax of control has been the object of a rich and at times heated discussion within minimalism, as figuring out what might be the best analysis of control has important theoretical consequences. This paper aims at contributing to this

---

\* The first author’s research for this paper was supported by FCT – *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia*.

debate by examining new empirical phenomena that may help us choose among three of the most prominent approaches to control within minimalism, namely, Manzini and Roussou's (2000) predicate attraction account, PRO-based accounts (e.g. Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Landau 2000, 2004, and Martin 2001), and movement accounts (e.g. Hornstein 1999, 2001 and Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes 2010), as respectively sketched in (1).

- (1) a. *Predicate attraction approach*: [DP<sub>θ1,θ2</sub> ... V<sub>1</sub> [... V<sub>2</sub> ...]]  
b. *PRO-based approach*: [DP<sub>i</sub> V<sub>1</sub> [... PRO<sub>i</sub> ... V<sub>2</sub> ...]]  
c. *Movement approach*: [DP V<sub>1</sub> [... copy<sub>DP</sub> ... V<sub>2</sub> ...]]

Leaving aside a detailed discussion of their technical implementations, we will focus on two of their major architectural differences. The first one regards the number of DPs required to encode a control relation. In Manzini and Roussou's (2000) predicate attraction approach, a single DP (which corresponds to the "controller" in the other approaches) is involved: it is merged where it surfaces and attracts the relevant  $\theta$ -features of both the matrix and the embedded predicate at LF (see (1a)). By contrast, the other approaches resort to two DPs, each of which occupying a  $\theta$ -position at some point in the derivation. The second major difference is related to the nature of the "controlee" and distinguishes between these two last approaches: it is a lexical formative (PRO) under a PRO-based approach (see (1b)) and a trace/copy in a movement approach (see (1c)).

The data to be examined below involve two types of co-occurrence restrictions affecting reflexive clitics in European Portuguese, which we will refer to as *identity*

*avoidance*.<sup>1</sup> The first case, which to our knowledge has not been noticed in the literature, involves deletion of a reflexive clitic within the complement of perception and causative verbs when the embedded subject is an identical clitic, as illustrated in (2).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The relevant empirical paradigms to be discussed below are not shared by Brazilian Portuguese. In this dialect, the existence of constructions that at face value involve deletion of clitics (in particular, reflexive clitics and the indefinite clitic *se*) is completely unrelated to identity avoidance (see e.g. d’Albuquerque 1984, Galves 1987, and Nunes 1991, 1995a).

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the paper judgments are due to the first author. It should be noted that what matters for the following discussion is the availability of deletion of the embedded reflexive clitic in (2) and related structures. We will put aside the issue of why deletion may be mandatory or optional for different European Portuguese speakers. Deletion of reflexive clitics is sensitive to the type of reflexive verb involved and lexical idiosyncrasies may affect speakers’ judgements. Focusing on the ECM environments seen so far, we identify the following hierarchy: deletion is prohibited when the reflexive is a true argument of the verb (cf. (ia)), optional when the verb is inherently reflexive (cf. (ib)), and obligatory with verbs that change their meaning when used with a reflexive (cf. (ic)).

- (i) a. O João ouviu-**me** elogiar-\*(**me**).  
the João heard-me praise-REFL<sub>1SG</sub>  
‘João heard me praise myself.’
- b. O João ouviu-**me** queixar-(**me**) ao director.  
the João heard-me complain-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> to-the director  
‘João heard me complain to the director.’
- c. O João ouviu-**nos** lamentar-(**\*nos**).  
the João heard-us lament- REFL<sub>1PL</sub>  
‘João heard us lamenting.’

- (2) a. A Maria viu-**me** sentar-(\***me**) naquele banco.  
the Maria saw-me sit-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> on-that bench  
'Maria saw me sit on that bench.'
- b. A Maria ouviu-**te** lamentar-(\***te**).  
the Maria heard-you.SG lament-REFL<sub>2SG</sub>  
'Maria heard you lamenting.'
- c. O barco balançou e o João sentiu-**se** desequilibrar-(\***se**).  
the boat lurched and the João felt-REFL<sub>3SG</sub> lose-balance-REFL<sub>3SG</sub>  
'The boat lurched and João felt himself lose his balance.'
- d. O João fez-**nos** encontrar-(\***nos**) com o Pedro.  
the João made-us meet-REFL<sub>1PL</sub> with the Pedro  
'João made us meet with Pedro.'

The intrinsic interest of data such as (2) to the current debate on control is that the identity avoidance effects they display are computed in a local domain. Sentences such as (3), for example, where the identical clitics are separated by a CP boundary, do not give rise to an identity avoidance effect, for the lower instance of *me* cannot be deleted.

- (3) Eu pergunto-**me** se vou arrepender-\*(**me**) depois.  
I ask-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> if go repent-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> after  
'I wonder if I'm going to regret it later.'

As object control constructions may also give rise to identity avoidance effects between the controller and a reflexive in the embedded clause, as illustrated in (4) below, one is led to expect that the controller and the reflexive in (4) be in a local

configuration, comparable to that of (2). Identity avoidance effects such as the ones in (4) thus sets up a scenario for us to examine the empirical coverage of the approaches to control entertained here. As each of them generates the controller in a different position (see (1)), they may make different predictions as to whether or not an identity avoidance effect should obtain.

- (4) a. Foi a mãe que **te** convenceu a pôr-(\***te**) em pé e tentar andar?  
was the mother that you convinced to put-REFL<sub>2SG</sub> on foot and try walk  
'Was it Mom that convinced you to get on your feet and try to walk?'
- b. Os professores autorizaram-**nos** a sentar-(\***nos**) naquele banco.  
the teachers authorized-us to sit-REFL<sub>1PL</sub> on-that bench  
'The teachers allowed us to sit on that bench.'
- c. O médico teve de obrigar-**te** a deitar-(\***te**) na maca.  
the doctor had to force-you to lay-REFL<sub>2SG</sub> in-the stretcher.  
'The doctor had to force you to lay down on the stretcher.'

The second case of identity avoidance we will discuss involves the co-occurrence restriction between the indefinite clitic *se* and the reflexive clitic *se*, as illustrated in (5).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Similar effects are well known from other Romance languages. In Italian, for instance, the ban on two instances of *si* in the same clause is circumvented by means of a suppletive clitic, as illustrated in (i) below (see e.g. Burzio 1986, Cinque 1995). European Portuguese has no analogous repair mechanism to fix the ungrammaticality of sentences like (5).

- (i) a. \*Si si lava. (Italian)  
IND REFL washes  
b. Ci si lava.  
REFL IND washes  
'One washes oneself.'

- (5) \*Levanta-se-se cedo neste país.  
rises-SE<sub>REFL</sub>-SE<sub>IND</sub> early in-this country  
'One gets up early in this country.'

(5) differs from (2) (and (4)) in that deletion of the lower instance of the clitic is not licensed as a repair strategy to allow the structure to comply with identity avoidance. Thus, deletion of the lower instance of *se* in (2c), for instance, leads to a grammatical sentence, but not in (5). The sentence in (6), for example, is fully grammatical, but can only be interpreted as having a referential null subject and a reflexive object; an indefinite interpretation for the subject, which should obtain if deletion of the reflexive clitic in (5) were allowed, is totally excluded.

- (6) Levanta-se cedo neste país.  
rises-SE<sub>REFL</sub> early in-this country  
'He/she gets up early in this country.'/\*'One gets up early in this country.'

The type of identity avoidance illustrated in (5) also brings interesting locality issues to light. On the one hand, it appears to behave like the first type (see (3)) in that a CP boundary between the identical clitics prevents an identity avoidance effect from arising. (7), for example, is grammatical despite the co-occurrence of indefinite *se* with reflexive *se* in the whole sentence.

- (7) Soube-**se** ter-**se** ele suicidado.  
knew-SE<sub>IND</sub> have-SE<sub>REFL</sub> he committed-suicide  
'It was heard that he committed suicide.'

On the other hand, when control is at stake, the two types of identity avoidance effects seen in (2) and (5) do not always go hand in hand. In (8a) below, for instance, indefinite *se* is the controller of the subject control verb and triggers an identity avoidance effect with respect to reflexive *se* in the embedded clause. By contrast, the upper instance of *me* in (8b) is also the controller of a subject control verb, but does not induce an identity avoidance effect with respect to the embedded reflexive clitic, as deletion of the lower instance of *me* is blocked. Thus, this contrast raises the question of why the same control configuration gives rise to different results depending on the type of identity avoidance considered.

- (8) a. \*Quer-**se** sentar-**se** (e não se pode).  
wants-SE<sub>IND</sub> sit-3SG<sub>REFL</sub> and not SE<sub>IND</sub> can  
'One wants to sit down but can't.'
- b. Ele fez-**me** tentar sentar-\*(**me**) de outra maneira.  
he made-me try sit-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> of other manner  
'He made me try to sit down in another way.'

Before we start the discussion proper, we would like to make it clear that our goal is not to provide a specific analysis of identity avoidance itself<sup>4</sup> or discuss the specific

---

<sup>4</sup> For relevant discussion see e.g. Golston 1995, Yip 1998, Bošković 2002, Riemsdijk 2008, and the collection of papers in Kuniya and Riemsdijk 2014.

technical details of each approach to control entertained here. What we will do is to use identity avoidance effects in European Portuguese as diagnostics of the relevant configurations that an empirically adequate theory of control should yield. For this tenet, it suffices to rely on the major architectural differences underlying each approach sketched in (1), such as the number and the nature of DPs involved in a control relation.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we show how (2) and (5) can be accounted for in a phase-based system (see Chomsky 2000, 2001). In section 3, we show that a phase-based analysis of control constructions involving potential configurations of identity avoidance is unable to capture all the data if pursued under a strong lexicalist approach such as Chomsky's (1993, 2000). In particular, the movement approach undergenerates in some cases and the predicate attraction and the PRO-based approaches overgenerate in others. When the three approaches are implemented under Chomsky's (2001) weak lexicalist approach instead, the movement approach is able to overcome its undergeneration problem, but the competing analyses still overgenerate. Thus, the overall conclusion, presented in section 4, is that the movement theory of control under a weak lexicalist approach is in better shape to handle identity avoidance effects in European Portuguese.

## 2. Identity avoidance in European Portuguese and phase-based computations

The ungrammaticality of (9a) below (= (5)) along with (9b) shows that the co-occurrence restriction in (9a) is not simply a matter of adjacency, for (9b) displays an identity avoidance effect despite the fact that the identical clitics are not contiguous.<sup>5,6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> It is worth pointing out that clitic climbing of the reflexive in structures with the auxiliary *ir* 'go' is optional, as shown in (i) below (see e.g. Gonçalves 1992). Hence, the unacceptability of (9b) cannot be

Similar considerations apply to the type of identity avoidance effect illustrated in (10): the reflexive is deleted despite the fact that it is not adjacent to the upper instance of *me*.

---

due to lack of clitic climbing. Furthermore, clitic climbing of the reflexive in (9b), as in (ii), yields a sentence with the two instances of *se* cliticized to the auxiliary and is to be excluded on a par with (9a).

- (i) a. O João vai levantar-**se** cedo amanhã.  
the João go.3SG rise-**SE<sub>REFL</sub>** early tomorrow  
b. O João vai-**se** levantar cedo amanhã.  
the João go.3SG -**SE<sub>REFL</sub>** rise early tomorrow  
'João is going to get up early tomorrow.'

- (ii) \*Vai-**se-se** levantar cedo amanhã.  
go.3SG-**SE<sub>REFL</sub>-SE<sub>IND</sub>** rise early tomorrow  
'People are going to get up early tomorrow.'

<sup>6</sup> Of course, this does not preclude other types of co-occurrence restrictions involving indefinite *se* from relying on adjacency. For instance, indefinite *se* in (Standard) European Portuguese cannot co-occur with a third person nonreflexive accusative clitic if they are in an adjacent configuration, as illustrated by the contrast in (i) (see e.g. Naro 1976 and Martins and Nunes 2016).

- (i) a. \*Alugou-**se-o** ontem.  
rented.3SG-**SE<sub>IND</sub>-it** yesterday  
'One rented it yesterday.'  
b. Vai-**se** alugar-**lo** amanhã.  
go.3SG-**SE<sub>IND</sub>** rent-it tomorrow  
'One is going to rent it tomorrow.'

(9) a. \*Levanta-**se-se** cedo neste país.

rises-SE<sub>REFL</sub>-SE<sub>IND</sub> early in-this country

‘One gets up early in this country.’

b. \*Vai-**se** levantar-**se** cedo amanhã.

go.3SG-SE<sub>IND</sub> rise-SE<sub>REFL</sub> early tomorrow

‘People are going to get up early tomorrow.’

(10) A Maria viu-**me** desequilibrar-(\***me**).

the Maria saw-me lose-balance-REFL<sub>1SG</sub>

Maria saw me lose my balance.’

At first sight, the contrasts between (9) and (11) below (= (7)) and between (10) and (12) seem to suggest that identity avoidance computations are clause bounded: an identity avoidance effect may arise when the relevant clitics are within a single clause (see (9) and (10)), but not when they are located in different clauses (see (11) and (12)).

(11) Soube-**se** ter-**se** ele suicidado.

knew-SE<sub>IND</sub> have-SE<sub>REFL</sub> he committed.suicide

‘It was heard that he committed suicide.’

(12) Eles queixaram-**se** de que teriam de inscrever-\*(**se**) no curso.

they complained-SE<sub>REFL</sub> of that would.have of register-SE<sub>REFL</sub> in-the course

‘They complained that they would have to register for the course.’

However, upon closer inspection the situation is not so simple. It is completely clear that the identical clitics in (11) and (12) are generated and remain in different clauses. But the surface word order in (10), with enclisis of the upper clitic to the matrix verb, is somewhat misleading as it masks the fact that the upper clitic does move to the matrix clause, as extensively argued in the literature on this type of ECM construction (see e.g. Gonçalves 1999, Martins 2000). This becomes transparent when the matrix clause contains elements that trigger proclisis such as negation, as illustrated in (13) below. Notice that in (13) the two reflexives are unmistakably in different clauses and deletion is triggered, nonetheless. Thus, the contrast between (10) and (13), on the one hand, and (12), on the other, shows that a simpleminded nonclausal/multiclausal distinction will not do.

- (13) O João não se sentiu desequilibrar-(\*se).  
the João not SE<sub>REFL</sub> felt lose-balance-SE<sub>REFL</sub>  
'João did not feel himself lose his balance.'

A more promising approach may be built based on Chomsky's (2000, 2001) notion of phase. The basic assumption in a phase-based model is that the computational system does not feed the phonological component with the whole structure at once, but rather transfers chunks of the structure under construction at designated derivational points. For concreteness, we assume that the relevant strong phases for our discussion are  $vP$  and CP and that Transfer proceeds in consonance with the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), as defined in (14) below. Given (14), Transfer applies to the complement of a strong phase head when another strong phase head is added to the structure.

(14) *Phase Impenetrability Condition* (Chomsky 2001:14):

The domain of H [the head of the strong phase HP] is not accessible at ZP [the smallest strong phase dominating HP]; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

Let us then consider the effects of (14) for the data in (9)-(13), bearing in mind that a crucial property of reflexive clitics in European Portuguese is that they behave like other clitics in Romance in that they do not remain *in situ*, but move and adjoin to a higher Infl head.<sup>7</sup> Take, for instance, the simplified derivation of the monoclausal sentence in (9b), as sketched in (15).<sup>8</sup>

- (15) a. [<sub>VP</sub> **SE**<sub>IND</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> rise **SE**<sub>REFL</sub> early tomorrow]]]
- b. [<sub>TP</sub> goes-**SE**<sub>IND</sub> rise-v-**SE**<sub>REFL</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>SE.IND</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>rise</sub> *t*<sub>SE.REFL</sub> early tomorrow]]]
- c. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> goes-**SE**<sub>IND</sub> rise-v-**SE**<sub>REFL</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>SE.IND</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>rise</sub> *t*<sub>SE.REFL</sub> early tomorrow]]]]]
- d. Transfer of VP: [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>rise</sub> *t*<sub>SE.REFL</sub> early tomorrow] → OK
- e. Transfer of CP: [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> goes-**SE**<sub>IND</sub> rise-v-**SE**<sub>REFL</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>SE.IND</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]] → \*

After the *vP* phase in (15a) is formed, the light verb, the main verb, the subject clitic and the object clitic all move to the TP domain (see (15b)). When C is introduced in the derivation (see (15c)), the complement of the lowest phase head, namely VP, is

---

<sup>7</sup> On clitic placement in European Portuguese, see e.g. Martins 1993, 2013.

<sup>8</sup> For expository purposes, English glosses will be used in the presentation of derivational steps, copies left by movement that are relevant to our discussion will be annotated with superscript indices and strong phases will be shaded

transferred, as shown in (15d). Finally, when the matrix CP is transferred, the two clitics induce a non-repairable identity avoidance effect (see (9b)).

In turn, the derivation of (10) proceeds along the lines of (16).

- (16) a. [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> *v* [<sub>VP</sub> lose.balance CL.1SG<sup>k</sup>]]
- b. [<sub>TP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> lose.balance-*v*-CL.1SG<sup>k</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>lose.balance</sub> CL.1SG<sup>k</sup>]]]
- c. [<sub>VP</sub> saw [<sub>TP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> lose.balance-*v*-CL.1SG<sup>k</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>lose.balance</sub> CL.1SG<sup>k</sup>]]]]]
- d. [<sub>VP</sub> *v* [<sub>VP</sub> saw [<sub>TP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> lose.balance-*v*-CL.1SG<sup>k</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>lose.balance</sub> CL.1SG<sup>k</sup>]]]]]]]
- e. Transfer of lower VP: [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>lose.balance</sub> **CL.1SG<sup>k</sup>**] → OK
- f. [<sub>TP</sub> Maria saw-*v*-CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>Maria</sub> *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>saw</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> lose.balance-*v*-CL.1SG<sup>k</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]]
- g. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> Maria saw-*v*-CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>Maria</sub> *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>saw</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> lose.balance-*v*-CL.1SG<sup>k</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1SG<sup>i</sup> *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]]]]
- h. Transfer of higher VP: [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>saw</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> **CL.1SG<sup>i</sup>** lose.balance-*v*-**CL.1SG<sup>k</sup>** [<sub>VP</sub> **CL.1SG<sup>i</sup>** *t<sub>v</sub>* [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]] →\*

The first application of Transfer takes place when the matrix *v* is introduced in the derivation, targeting the lower VP (see (16d-e)). Given that the transferred material only contains one instance of the first person singular clitic (see (16e)), identity avoidance is not at stake. In contrast, when the matrix C is added to the computation (see (16g)) and the matrix VP is transferred (see (16h)), there are three instances of the clitic: two copies of the embedded subject chain (CL.1SG<sup>i</sup>) and one copy of the embedded object chain (CL.1SG<sup>k</sup>). Even if Chain Reduction (see Nunes 1995b, 2004) applies to the

embedded subject chain and deletes the lower copy, we are still left with two instances of the first person clitic, which gives rise to an identity avoidance violation unless the reflexive is deleted (see (10)).

Finally, the grammaticality of (11) and (12) despite the co-occurrence of two instances of *se* is accounted for, as there is no derivational step where (copies of) both clitics are simultaneously transferred to the phonological component. Take the derivation of (11), for instance. As shown in (17) below, the copies of reflexive *se* are transferred when the embedded C (see (17b-c)) and the matrix *v* are introduced (see (17d-e)), whereas the copies of indefinite *se* are only transferred when the matrix CP is transferred (see (17i)). Like what happens in other standard instances of movement, Chain Reduction deletes the lower copy of  $SE_{IND}$  in (17i) and identity avoidance is not an issue. In other words, there is no application of Transfer in consonance with the PIC in the derivation of (11) that could give rise to an identity avoidance effect.

- (17) a. [<sub>VP</sub> he *v* [<sub>VP</sub> committed.suicide  $SE_{REFL}$ ]]
- b. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> he has- $SE_{REFL}^k$  committed.suicide-*v* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>he</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>committed.suicide</sub>  $SE_{REFL}^k$ ]]]]]
- c. Transfer of lower VP: [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>committed.suicide</sub>  $SE_{REFL}^k$ ] → OK
- d. [<sub>VP</sub> *v* [<sub>VP</sub> knew [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> he has- $SE_{REFL}^k$  committed.suicide-*v* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>he</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]
- e. Transfer of lower TP: [<sub>TP</sub> he has- $SE_{REFL}^k$  committed.suicide-*v* [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>he</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]] → OK
- f. [<sub>TP</sub>  $SE_{IND}^i$  knew-*v* [<sub>VP</sub>  $SE_{IND}^i$  *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>knew</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]
- g. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub>  $SE_{IND}^i$  knew-*v* [<sub>VP</sub>  $SE_{IND}^i$  *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>knew</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]]
- h. Transfer of matrix VP: [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>knew</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> Δ]]] → OK
- i. Transfer of matrix CP: [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub>  $SE_{IND}^i$  knew-*v* [<sub>VP</sub>  $SE_{IND}^i$  *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]] → OK

Having seen that the PIC provides us with the right domains for the computation of identity avoidance, let us get back to discussion of identity avoidance and control.

### 3. Identity avoidance and obligatory control in European Portuguese

#### 3.1. Basic facts

As mentioned earlier (see section 1), object control constructions may give rise to identity avoidance effects with respect to the controller and a reflexive in the embedded clause, triggering deletion of the latter, as illustrated in (18) (= (4)).

- (18) a. Foi a mãe que **te** convenceu a pôr-(\***te**) em pé e tentar andar?  
was the mother that you convinced to put-REFL<sub>2SG</sub> on foot and try walk  
‘Was it Mom that convinced you to get on your feet and try to walk?’
- b. Os professores autorizaram-**nos** a sentar-(\***nos**) naquele banco.  
the teachers authorized-us to sit-REFL<sub>1PL</sub> on-that bench  
‘The teachers allowed us to sit on that bench.’
- c. O médico teve de obrigar-**te** a deitar-(\***te**) na maca.  
the doctor had to force-you to lay-REFL<sub>2SG</sub> in-the stretcher.  
‘The doctor had to force you to lay down on the stretcher.’

By contrast, textbook examples of subject control constructions do not yield identity avoidance effects involving the controller and the reflexive for an obvious reason: there are no identical clitics in the relevant configurations, as illustrated in (19).

- (19) a. **Ele** tentou levantar-\*(**se**).  
he tried rise-REFL<sub>3SG</sub>  
'He tried to get up.'
- b. **Eu** quero sentar-\*(**me**) naquele banco.  
I want sit-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> on-that bench  
'I want to sit on that bench.'
- c. **Tu** paraste de levantar-\*(**te**) tarde?  
you.SG stopped of rising-REFL<sub>2SG</sub> late  
'Did you stop getting up late?'

Accordingly, in the counterparts of (18) where the object control verb is passivized and the controller is licensed with nominative Case, no identity avoidance effect is observed either, as shown in (20).

- (20) a. **Tu** foste convencido a pôr-\*(**te**) em pé e andar?  
you were convinced to put-REFL<sub>2SG</sub> on foot and walk  
'You were convinced to get on your feet and walk?'
- b. **Nós** fomos autorizados a sentar-\*(**nos**) naquele banco.  
we were authorized to sit-REFL<sub>1PL</sub> on-that bench  
'The teachers allowed us to sit on that bench.'
- c. **Tu** tiveste de ser obrigado a deitar-\*(**te**) na maca.  
you had of be forced to lay-REFL<sub>2SG</sub> in-the stretcher.  
'The doctor had to force you to lay down on the stretcher.'

However, there are more complex cases of subject control that could potentially give rise to an identity avoidance effect (see e.g. (8b)). This is the case of the sentences in (21) and (22) below, for example, where the controller is embedded under an ECM verb. Interestingly, this is a configuration where the reflexive cannot be deleted.

(21) a. Ele fez-**me** tentar levantar-\*(**me**) mais cedo.

he made-me try rise-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> more early

‘He made me try to get up earlier.’

b. A Maria mandou-**nos** parar de levantar-\*(**nos**) tarde.

the Maria ordered-**us** stop of rise-REFL<sub>1PL</sub> late

‘Maria told us to stop getting up late.’

(22) A Maria viu-**me** cair após ter-\*(**me**) levantado da cadeira.

the Maria saw-me fall after have-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> risen from-the chair

‘Maria saw me fall down after having risen from the chair.’

As we saw in section 2, identity avoidance computations are ultimately subject to the PIC in that two elements can only give rise to an identity avoidance effect if they are part of the same constituent that undergoes Transfer. That being so, the contrast between object control constructions in (18), where deletion of the reflexive clitic is permitted, and subject constructions in (21) and (22), where deletion is disallowed, should be taken to indicate that the reflexive clitics are transferred at the same derivational steps as the controller clitics in (18), but not in (21) and (22).

Having this in mind, let us examine whether the three approaches to control entertained here (see (1)) can yield this result.

### 3.2. To be or not to be a strong phase: that is a crucial question

Let us start our discussion by examining the derivation of the object control construction in (23) below (= (18b)) in more detail.

- (23) Os professores autorizaram-**nos** a sentar-(\***nos**) naquele banco.  
the teachers authorized-us sit-REFL<sub>1PL</sub> on-that bench  
'The teachers allowed us to sit on that bench.'

In order to determine the points where Transfer applies, we first need to identify the relevant strong phases of (23). That the matrix CP, the matrix vP, and the embedded vP should all count as strong phases is not controversial. By contrast, the phasehood nature of the embedded CP is less obvious and may hinge on some theory internal assumptions. Under the null Case approach to control (see e.g. Chomsky and Lasnik 1993 and Martin 2001), for example, the Case/agreement relations involving PRO are determined CP-internally, which renders the embedded CP in (23) a strong phase. On the other hand, approaches based on Agree (see e.g. Landau 2000, 2004), predicate attraction (Manzini and Roussou 2000) or movement (see e.g. Hornstein 1999, 2001 and Boeckx, Hornstein and Nunes 2010) all must (tacitly) assume that the embedded CP in (23) is not a strong phase, as it is transparent to A-relations involving Agree or movement. Without getting into the merits of each option, it is worth noting that they do make different empirical predictions with respect to the identity avoidance effect observed in (23).

Consider the null Case analysis of (23), as sketched in (24).

(24) *PRO-based account/null Case implementation:*

- a. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> t<sub>PRO</sub> t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>sit</sub> CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> on that bench]]]]]
- b. Transfer of lower VP: [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>sit</sub> CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> on that bench] → OK
- c. [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v'</sub> authorized [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> t<sub>PRO</sub> t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]]
- d. [<sub>vP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v'</sub> authorized [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> t<sub>PRO</sub> t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]]
- e. Transfer of TP: [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> t<sub>PRO</sub> t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]] → OK

Given that the embedded C is a strong phase head under the null Case approach, it triggers application of Transfer when it is introduced (see (24a-b)). Transfer then applies to the complement of this C when the matrix *v* is inserted (see (24d-e)). Crucially, each application transfers a copy of the reflexive, but neither affects the clitic that sits in the matrix Spec of VP. Hence, when copies of this clitic are later transferred in the derivation, the copies of the reflexive are long gone and identity avoidance is not an issue. Therefore, the null Case approach makes the incorrect prediction that (23) should not yield an identity avoidance effect.

By contrast, consider the Agree-based analysis of (23) given in (25), for instance.

(25) *PRO-based account/Agree implementation:*

- a. [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v'</sub> authorized [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> t<sub>PRO</sub> t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>sit</sub> CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> on that bench]]]]]]]
- b. [<sub>vP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v'</sub> authorized [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> t<sub>PRO</sub> t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>sit</sub> CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> on that bench]]]]]]]]]
- c. Transfer of lower VP: [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>sit</sub> CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> on that bench] → OK

- d. [TP the teacher authorized-v-CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>the teachers</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v'</sub> *t*<sub>authorized</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>PRO</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]]
- e. [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> the teacher authorized-v-CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>the teachers</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v'</sub> *t*<sub>authorized</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>PRO</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]]]]
- f. Transfer of matrix VP: [<sub>VP</sub> CL.1PL<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v'</sub> *t*<sub>authorized</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> PRO to sit-v-CL.1PL<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> *t*<sub>PRO</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]]]] → \*

Given that the embedded C is not a strong phase in the Agree implementation of the PRO-based approach to control, the first application of Transfer will only take place when the matrix *v* is introduced (see (25b-c)). The transferred VP in (25c) only contains one instance of the clitic and no issue of identity avoidance arises. Later on, when the matrix C is inserted (see (25e)), the matrix VP is transferred (see (25f)). As it contains two instances of the clitic (not related by movement), an identity avoidance configuration arises and deletion must come to the rescue (see (23)).

In sum, the identity avoidance effect displayed by (23) allows us to empirically distinguish two different implementations of PRO-based approaches to control: the Agree-based implementation correctly accounts for the identity avoidance effect in (23), but the null Case implementation doesn't. As for the predicate attraction and the movement approaches, they side with the Agree-based analysis in (25) in assuming that the embedded CP is not a strong phase. Thus, they also resort to applications of Transfer in a way parallel to (25), only differing in their intrinsic aspects such as the number of elements involved in a control relation and the nature of the controllee. The structure of the transferred matrix VP, for instance, is analyzed along the lines of (26):

(26) a. *Predicate attraction approach:*

[<sub>VP</sub> **CL.1PL**<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v</sub> *t*<sub>authorized</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> to sit-v-**CL.1PL**<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]] → \*

b. *Movement approach:*

[<sub>VP</sub> **CL.1PL**<sup>k</sup> [<sub>v</sub> *t*<sub>authorized</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> **CL.1PL**<sup>k</sup> to sit-v-**CL.1PL**<sup>i</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> **CL.1PL**<sup>k</sup> *t*<sub>v</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> Δ]]]]]]] → \*

Under the predicate attraction in (26a), the specifiers of the embedded TP and the embedded vP remain empty, as the upper instance of the clitic is generated in the Spec of the matrix VP and attracts the θ-role of the embedded predicate. In turn, under the movement approach in (26b), the upper instance of the clitic is generated in the embedded Spec of vP and successively moves to the matrix Spec of VP, leaving copies behind. These differences aside, in either approach the VP transferred contains a clitic identical to the reflexive, yielding an identity avoidance effect.

Let us now examine how these competing approaches fare with respect to more complex data.

### 3.3. The puzzle

Consider the (simplified) structure of the first transferred constituent in the derivation of (27) (= (21a)) under each approach to control entertained here, as shown in (28).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Due to space considerations, we will only present the representations of the Agree implementation of the PRO-based approach. As the reader can verify, the two implementations do not differ in their predictions with respect to the data to be discussed below.

- (27) Ele fez-**me** tentar levantar-\*(**me**) mais cedo.  
 he made-me try rise-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> more early  
 ‘He made me try to get up earlier.’

(28) a. *Predicate attraction approach*

[<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> fez [<sub>TP</sub> me<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> tentar [<sub>CP</sub> levantar-me<sup>k</sup> cedo]]]]]]]

Transfer of the intermediate VP: [<sub>VP</sub> tentar [<sub>CP</sub> levantar-**me<sup>k</sup>** cedo]] → OK

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> fez [<sub>TP</sub> me<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> me<sup>i</sup> v [<sub>VP</sub> tentar [<sub>CP</sub> PRO levantar-me<sup>k</sup> cedo]]]]]]]

Transfer of the intermediate VP: [<sub>VP</sub> tentar [<sub>CP</sub> PRO levantar-**me<sup>k</sup>** cedo]] → OK

c. *Movement approach:*

[<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> fez [<sub>TP</sub> me<sup>i</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> me<sup>i</sup> v [<sub>VP</sub> tentar [<sub>CP</sub> me<sup>i</sup> levantar-me<sup>k</sup> cedo]]]]]]]

Transfer of the intermediate VP: [<sub>VP</sub> tentar [<sub>CP</sub> **me<sup>i</sup>** levantar-**me<sup>k</sup>** cedo]] → \*

Once the embedded CP does not qualify as a strong phase under these approaches, as discussed in section 3.2, the first application of Transfer takes place when the matrix v is merged, targeting the VP headed by the control verb. In the predicate attraction (see (28a)) and the PRO-based (see (28b)) approaches, the transferred VP only contains the reflexive clitic, whereas in the movement approach the reflexive co-occurs with a copy of the controller (see (28c)). Thus, the movement approach predicts an identity avoidance effect in (27), contrary to fact. The other approaches, on the other hand, correctly account for the fact that deletion of the reflexive is prohibited in (27), for (the copies of) the reflexive and the controller are transferred at different derivational steps and therefore identity avoidance is not at stake.

A similar conclusion is reached with respect to the adjunct control construction in (29) below, as indicated by the simplified structures in (30).

- (29) A    Maria   viu-**me**   cair   após   ter-\*(**me**)    levantado   da    cadeira.  
          the   Maria   saw-me fall   after   have-REFL<sub>1SG</sub>   risen        from-the chair  
          ‘Maria saw me fall down after having risen from the chair.’

(30) a. *Predicate attraction approach:*

[a Maria viu-me<sup>i</sup> [VP [VP cair] [adjunt island após ter-**me**<sup>k</sup> levantado ...]]] → OK

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[a Maria viu-me<sup>i</sup> [VP [VP cair] [adjunt island após PRO ter-**me**<sup>k</sup> levantado ...]]] →

OK

c. *Movement approach:*

[a Maria viu-me<sup>i</sup> [VP [VP cair] [adjunt island após **me**<sup>i</sup> ter-**me**<sup>k</sup> levantado ...]]] → \*

Consider the subject of the adjunct clause in each of the structures in (30): it is left empty in the predicate attraction approach as the controller is base generated in the upper clause and attracts the  $\theta$ -role of the adjunct predicate (see (30a)); it is occupied by PRO in the PRO-based account (see (30b)); and it is occupied by a copy of the controller in the movement approach (see (30c)).<sup>10</sup> Again, we have a single instance of

---

<sup>10</sup> As extensively discussed by Hornstein (1999, 2001) and Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes (2010), in adjunct control constructions the controller moves out of the clause where it is generated before this clause is adjoined and becomes an adjunct island (an instance of sideward movement in the sense of Nunes 1995, 2001, 2004). Thus, in the case of (30c), the upper clitic moves (to the object position of *cair*) before the temporal clause gets adjoined to the VP

*me* within the adjunct in the predicate attraction and the PRO-based analyses, but two instances in the movement account. In other words, the movement approach sets itself apart from the other approaches in that it incorrectly predicts an identity avoidance effect in (29).<sup>11</sup>

Interestingly, we find the opposite result when we examine identity avoidance involving the indefinite clitic *se*. Consider for instance the (simplified) structures each approach assigns to the data in (31) and (33), as respectively shown in (32) and (34) (see footnotes 9 and 10).

- (31) \*Não se conseguiu sentar-se num bom sítio.  
not SE<sub>IND</sub> managed sit-SE<sub>REF</sub> in-a good place  
'One did not find a good place to sit.'

- (32) a. *Predicate attraction approach:*

[<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> não SE<sub>IND</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> conseguiu [<sub>CP</sub> sentar-SE<sub>REFL</sub> ... ]]]]]

Transfer of the matrix VP: [<sub>VP</sub> conseguiu [<sub>CP</sub> sentar-SE<sub>REFL</sub> ... ]] → OK

---

<sup>11</sup> For purposes of exposition we have equated adjunct islandhood with strong phasehood. Thus, the adjunct clause in (30) is taken to function as a strong phase after it becomes an island, which has consequence for PIC computations. In particular, when the matrix *v* is merged, the TP within the adjunct CP is transferred. Nothing specifically hinges on this assumption, though. It could well be the case that the reflexive is not accessible in the higher domain because a complex adjunct must be independently sent to Spell-Out (see e.g. Uriagereka 1999 and Nunes and Uriagereka 2000). Whatever the ultimate analysis of adjunct islandhood may be, the important point here is that it could in principle be incorporated by the three approaches to control we have been examining and that the movement approach distinguishes itself from the other approaches in including a copy of the controller within the island.

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> não SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> conseguiu [<sub>CP</sub> PRO sentar-SE<sub>REFL</sub> ... ]]]]]

Transfer of the matrix VP: [<sub>VP</sub> conseguiu [<sub>CP</sub> PRO sentar-SE<sub>REFL</sub> ...]] → OK

c. *Movement approach:*

[<sub>CP</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> não SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> conseguiu [<sub>CP</sub> SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> sentar-SE<sub>REFL</sub> ... ]]]]]

Transfer of the matrix VP: [<sub>VP</sub> conseguiu [<sub>CP</sub> SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> sentar-SE<sub>REFL</sub> ...]] → \*

(33) \*Gritou-se muito após ter-se levantado da cama.

screamed-SE<sub>IND</sub> much after have-REFL<sub>3SG</sub> risen from-the bed

‘One screamed a lot after getting up from bed.’

(34) a. *Predicate attraction approach:*

[gritou-SE<sub>IND</sub> ... [<sub>adjunct island</sub> após ter-SE<sub>REFL</sub> levantado da cama]] → OK

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[gritou-SE<sub>IND</sub> ... [<sub>adjunct island</sub> após PRO ter-SE<sub>REFL</sub> levantado da cama]] → OK

c. *Movement approach:*

[gritou-SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> ... [<sub>adjunct island</sub> após SE<sup>i</sup><sub>IND</sub> ter-SE<sub>REFL</sub> levantado da cama]] → \*

Recall that identity avoidance involving indefinite *se* does not trigger deletion as a rescue strategy and its effects are identified simply via the unacceptability of the relevant examples (see (5)-(6)). Thus, the unacceptability of (31) and (33) leads us to expect that there is a step in their derivation in which (copies of) reflexive *se* and indefinite *se* are transferred together, inducing an identity avoidance effect. This is the case under the movement analysis (see (32c)/(34c)), but not under the predicate attraction (see (32a)/(34a)) or the PRO-based approaches (see (32b)/(34b)).

In short, the movement account undergenerates with respect to the first type of identity avoidance effect, failing to predict that sentences such as (27) and (29) are acceptable without deletion (see (28c) and (30c)). On the other hand, the predicate attraction and the PRO-based approaches overgenerate with respect to the second type of avoidance effect, incorrectly predicting sentences such as (31) and (33) to be grammatical (see (32a)/(34a) and (32b)/(34b)).

This undesirable state of affairs appears to indicate that a different domain should be independently postulated for each type of identity avoidance – a smaller domain for the first type and a larger one for the second type. However, such an approach misses the point that when control is not at stake, the two types of identity avoidance do pattern alike and are subject to a uniform phase-based analysis, as shown in section 2. In particular, when the relevant clitics are clearly transferred separately, no identity avoidance effect arises for either type of construction. In (35a) below, for example, deletion of the reflexive is not triggered and (35b) (= (11)) is not ungrammatical.

- (35) a. Eu pergunto-**me** se vou arrepender-\*(**me**) depois.  
I ask-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> if go repent- REFL<sub>1SG</sub> after  
'I wonder if I'm going to regret it later.'
- b. Soube-**se** ter-**se** ele suicidado.  
knew-SE<sub>IND</sub> have-SE<sub>REFL</sub> he committed-suicide  
'It was heard that he committed suicide.'

The task before us is therefore to determine what independent property distinguishes the two types of identity avoidance and why this yet-to-be-determined special property

interacts with control in a way that it seems to affect the size of the domain where identity avoidance is to be computed. This is the goal of the next section.

### 3.3. A single domain but different feature specifications

#### 3.3.1. On the difference between the two types of identity avoidance effects

Recall that the two types of identity avoidance affecting reflexive clitics in European Portuguese differ in that when indefinite *se* is involved, deletion of the reflexive is not available as a repair strategy (see (2) vs. (5)-(6)). This indicates that although phonological identity may be relevant for an identity avoidance effect to obtain, it does not suffice to license deletion.

We believe that this asymmetry stems from an independent difference between indefinite *se* and the other European Portuguese clitics. Like what is found in other Romance languages, in European Portuguese first and second person clitics do not have distinct forms for pronouns and reflexives or for accusative and dative. This syncretism can be interpreted as showing that first and second person clitics are underspecified with respect to these features, which makes them morphologically identical regardless of whether they are used as pronouns or as reflexives or whether they are licensed in dative or accusative configurations. That being so, it is not surprising that deletion in (36) below is sanctioned, despite the fact that in (36a) the upper instance of *me* is used as a pronoun and the lower instance as a reflexive or that in (36b) the upper instance is assigned dative, whereas the lower one is assigned accusative.

- (36) a. A Maria viu-**me** desequilibrar-(\***me**).  
the Maria saw-me lose-balance-REFL<sub>1SG</sub>  
'Maria saw me lose my balance.'

b. Custou-**me** a sentar-(\***me**) naquele banco.

cost-me to sit-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> on-that bench+

‘It was hard for me to succeed in sitting on that bench.’

By contrast, the standard assumption regarding indefinite *se* is that it is specified as being intrinsically nominative (see e.g. Cinque 1988, Raposo and Uriagereka 1990 and D’Alessandro 2004 for relevant discussion). This property renders it morphologically distinct from reflexive *se* and, we would like to suggest, this is what blocks deletion. Evidence that indefinite *se* is intrinsically nominative is provided by data such as (37) below. (37a) and (37b) respectively show that indefinite *se* cannot be licensed with accusative Case by a selecting verb or in an ECM configuration.<sup>12</sup> (37c-d) further show that the problem with (37a) is not that indefinite *se* cannot be interpreted as an internal argument, for it is compatible with the internal argument of unaccusative (see (37c)) and passivized verbs (see (37d)), provided that nominative Case is available.

---

<sup>12</sup> It should be pointed out that a construction superficially similar to (37b) is grammatical in European Portuguese, as shown in (i) below. However, the verb *ver* ‘see’ in European Portuguese may also select for an inflected infinitival clause, with a nominative subject, as illustrated in (ii). Thus, *se* in (i) is to be analyzed as the nominative subject of the embedded inflected infinitival.

(i) Eu não vi comprar-se as ferramentas.

I not saw buy-SE<sub>IND</sub> the tools

‘I didn’t see people buy the tools.’

(ii) Eu não vi tu comprares as ferramentas.

I not saw you.SG.NOM buy-INF-2SG the tools

‘I didn’t see you buy the tools.’

(37) a. \*Eu vi-SE<sub>IND</sub>

I saw-SE<sub>IND</sub>

‘I saw people.’

b. \*Eu não se vi comprar as ferramentas.

I not SE<sub>IND</sub> saw buy the tools

‘I didn’t see people buy the tools.’

c. Chegou-se tarde à festa.

arrived.3SG-SE<sub>IND</sub> late to-the party

‘People arrived late at the party.’

d. Aqui não se é admitido sem boas recomendações.

here not SE<sub>IND</sub> is admitted without good recommendations

‘Here one is not admitted without good recommendations.’

As we will see below, this intrinsic specification of indefinite *se* as nominative not only sets it apart with respect to deletion as a repair strategy to circumvent identity avoidance, but also proves crucial for establishing the specific domain where identity avoidance is to be computed when control is involved.

### 3.3.2. Feature value specification and identity avoidance

The discussion of section 3.3.1 invites us to reconsider the conflicting results found in section 3.2 with respect to how the approaches to control entertained here fare with respect to identity avoidance effects. Up to now, the discussion has tacitly proceeded under a strong lexicalist perspective, according to which lexical items enter the derivation fully inflected and have their feature specification appropriately checked in

certain designated configurations (see e.g. Chomsky 1993, 2000). The distinction between indefinite *se* and the other clitics in European Portuguese suggests that a weak lexicalist phase-based approach such as the one outlined in Chomsky 2001 may be better suited to account for the phenomena under investigation. The unmarked case under this view is for uninterpretable features to be unvalued as they enter the derivation and gain their values via agreement with valued features. However, in marked situations such as the Case feature of indefinite *se*, an uninterpretable feature may be inherently valued (see Pesetsky and Torrego 2007 for extensive discussion). In this situation, the inherently valued uninterpretable feature must still enter into an Agree relation with a feature of an appropriate head in order to be licensed (deleted for LF purposes).

Bearing these considerations in mind, let us reconsider the derivation of (38) (= (27)).

- (38) Ele fez-**me** tentar levantar-\*(**me**) mais cedo.  
he made-me try rise-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> more early  
'He made me try to get up earlier.'

Both clitics in (38) enter the derivation with their interpretable features (person and number) valued and their Case feature unvalued. The lower instance has its Case feature valued as accusative after agreeing with the most embedded light verb and the upper instance, after agreeing with the matrix light verb. This means that any copies of either clitic that were eventually left behind prior to these agreement relations had their Case features unvalued, which in turn has consequences for computations of identity avoidance. After all, it makes sense to assume that if an element is not fully valued, it

cannot be identical to one that has all of its features valued; hence, any two such elements cannot trigger an identity avoidance effect.

That being so, the structure of the transferred VP in (28) should actually be as in (39).

(39) a. *Predicate attraction approach*

[VP tentar [CP levantar-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:ACC] ...]] → OK</sub>

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[VP tentar [CP PRO levantar-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:ACC] cedo]] → OK</sub>

c. *Movement approach:*

[VP tentar [CP CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:u]] levantar-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:ACC] cedo]] → **OK**</sub></sub>

Like what was seen earlier in (28), the predicate attraction and the PRO-based approaches correctly predict lack of an identity avoidance effect, for only the lower clitic is transferred. The relevant change regards the movement approach. The controller is generated as the external argument of the most embedded clause and undergoes successive cyclic movement to the Spec of intermediate vP, where it receives the  $\theta$ -role of the controller, before it finally ends in a position where it agrees with the matrix light verb and has its Case feature valued as accusative. Crucially, the copies left behind – in particular, the copies left in the most embedded clause – do not have their Case feature valued. Hence, contrary to what the discussion of (28c) led us to think, the transferred VP in (39c) cannot yield an identity avoidance effect: the upper instance of the clitic does not have its Case feature valued and cannot be taken as identical to the lower instance, which is valued as accusative.

The same considerations apply to the structures assigned to (40) below (= (29)), as shown in (41). Despite the fact that the spelled-out island has two instances of the clitic under the movement approach to control in (41c) (see footnotes 10 and 11), the upper copy is not fully valued and, therefore, cannot yield an identity avoidance effect.

- (40) A Maria viu-**me** cair após ter-\*(**me**) levantado da cadeira.  
 the Maria saw-me fall after have-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> risen from-the chair  
 ‘Maria saw me fall down after having risen from the chair.’

(41) a. *Predicate attraction approach:*

[adjunct island após ter-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:ACC]</sub> levantado ...] → OK

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[adjunct island após PRO ter-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:ACC]</sub> levantado ...]] → OK

c. *Movement approach:*

[adjunct island após CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:u]</sub> ter-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[1SG, Case:ACC]</sub> levantado ...]] → **OK**

The interim conclusion is that contrary to what the discussion in section 3.2 led us to believe, the movement approach does not undergenerate with respect to the first type of identity avoidance effect, as it correctly predicts that deletion of the reflexive should not be triggered in either (38) or (40). The problem regarding empirical coverage that the movement account sketched in section 2 faced stemmed from its strong lexicalist commitments. Once these commitments are abandoned and the valuation procedure of Chomsky 2001 is assumed, the analysis of the first type of identity avoidance changes, circumventing the earlier empirical problems (see (28c)/(39c) and (30c)/(41c)).

On the other hand, the analysis of identity avoidance involving indefinite *se* by and large remains the same. If indefinite *se* inherently has all of its features valued, it should be computed basically in the same way, be the analysis lexicalist or not. That is, under Chomsky's (2001) system, the relevant transferred constituents in (42) (= (31)) and (44) (= (33)) are to be analyzed as (43) and (45), respectively.

(42) \*Nã o se conseguiu sentar-se num bom sítio.  
 not SE<sub>IND</sub> managed sit-SE<sub>REF</sub> in-a good place  
 'One did not find a good place to sit.'

(43) a. *Predicate attraction approach:*

[VP conseguiu [CP sentar-CL<sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]...</sub>]] → OK

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[VP conseguiu [CP PRO sentar-CL<sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]...</sub>]] → OK

c. *Movement approach:*

[VP conseguiu [CP CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:u]</sub> sentar-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]...</sub>]] → \*

(44) \*Gritou-se muito após ter-se levantado da cama.  
 screamed-SE<sub>IND</sub> much after have-REFL<sub>3SG</sub> risen from-the bed  
 'One screamed a lot after getting up from bed.'

(45) a. *Predicate attraction approach:*

[adjunct island após ter-CL<sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]</sub> levantado da cama]] → OK

b. *PRO-based approach/Agree implementation:*

[adjunct island após PRO ter-CL<sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]</sub> levantado da cama]] → OK

c. *Movement approach:*

[<sub>adjunct island</sub> após  $CL^i$ <sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:u]</sub> ter- $CL^k$ <sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]</sub> levantado da cama]] → \*

The three analyses in (43) and (45) are similar in that the indefinite clitic licenses its nominative Case after agreeing with the matrix T. However, they diverge with respect to the position where this clitic is first merged: in the matrix Spec of TP (or wherever it surfaces) under the predicate attraction approach, in the matrix Spec of vP under the PRO-based approach, and in the most embedded Spec of vP under the movement approach. This small detail makes all the difference, though. Given that the indefinite clitic is *lexically* specified as nominative, a given occurrence of this clitic can provide the system with the information that it is to be realized as *se* in the morphological component, regardless of whether or not its Case feature has been checked. Put differently, any occurrence of the indefinite clitic can induce an identity avoidance effect with respect to a third person reflexive clitic if they undergo Transfer together, as is the case of the representations in (43c) and (45c).

The reader can easily see that the approach sketched above also applies to more complex data such as (46) below, which apparently involves a long distance computation of identity avoidance with respect the indefinite and the reflexive.

- (46) a. \*Conseguiu-**se** evitar sentar-**se** na última fila.  
 managed- $SE_{IND}$  avoid sit- $SE_{REF}$  in-the last row  
 ‘One managed to avoid sitting in the last row.’
- b. \*Tentou-**se** conseguir evitar sentar-**se** na última fila.  
 tried- $SE_{IND}$  manage avoid sit- $SE_{REF}$  in-the last row  
 ‘One tried to manage to avoid sitting in the last row.’

The sentences in (46) involve a subject control predicate embedded under another subject control predicate, with indefinite *se* as the controller. The fact that they are ungrammatical indicates that in both, indefinite *se* and the reflexive should not be too far apart so that they can be computed for purposes of identity avoidance. More concretely, (a copy of) the reflexive must be transferred together with (a copy of) the indefinite clitic. Under the proposal presented above, there is a copy of indefinite *se* in the most embedded clause and this copy can induce an identity avoidance effect with respect to the reflexive.

To sum up, if a strong lexicalist view is pursued, the three approaches to control make different empirical predictions, but neither of them captures all the facts, as the movement theory undergenerates with respect to the first type of identity avoidance and the competing alternatives overgenerate with respect to the second type (see section 3.2). By contrast, if a phase-based weak lexicalist approach such as Chomsky (2001) is assumed, the movement approach makes the same prediction as the other approaches with respect to the first type and maintains its superior coverage in the case of the second type. By achieving the same degree of success as the competing approaches in accounting for the first type of identity avoidance, the movement approach now emerges as the only approach to control entertained here that can account for all the data involving the two types of identity avoidance. Importantly, it does so without resorting to different domains for computing identity avoidance. Even complex data such as (46), which at first sight seems to require an extension of the relevant domain for computing identity avoidance, are amenable to a uniform phase-based account.

### 3.4. Further evidence

The movement approach also accounts for two other related sets of facts. The first one involves object control with indefinite *se*. An object control sentence such as (47a) below, for instance, is to be excluded for the same reason a simple sentence such as (47b) is to be ruled out, namely, the indefinite clitic is intrinsically nominative and it cannot be licensed in the object position of an accusative Case assigning verb. When the object control verb is passivized, the internal argument now becomes compatible with the indefinite clitic, as shown in (48), because *se* can have its nominative Case specification licensed by the matrix T.

(47) a. \*Eu forcei-se a sair da sala.

I forced-SE<sub>IND</sub> to leave of-the room

‘I forced people to leave the room.’

b. \*Eu vi-se.

I saw-SE<sub>IND</sub>

‘I saw people.’

(48) Nada funciona quando não se é convencido a contribuir para o debate.

nothing functions when not SE<sub>IND</sub> is convinced to contribute to the debate

‘Nothing works when one does not get convinced to contribute to the debate.’

That being so, the movement account predicts that a licit object control configuration with indefinite *se* as the controller should exhibit an identity avoidance effect with respect to a reflexive in the embedded clause. That this prediction is correct is illustrated

by the sentence in (49a), for instance, whose (simplified) structure under a movement analysis is given in (49b).

- (49) a. \*Aqui não se é forçado a inscrever-se em todas as disciplinas.  
 here not SE<sub>IND</sub> is forced to register-REFL<sub>3SG</sub> in all the courses  
 ‘Here one is not forced to register in all courses.’

b. *Movement approach:*

[aqui não CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:ν]</sub> é [VP CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:u]</sub> [V' forçado a [CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:u]</sub>  
 inscrever-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]</sub> em todas as disciplinas]]]

Interestingly, the identity avoidance effect persists even in more complex configurations such as (50a) below, where a subject control structure is embedded under an object control verb with *se* as the controller. Under the movement approach, the indefinite clitic is generated in the lowest clause, as illustrated in (50b), and the copy it leaves behind on its way to the matrix clause is close enough to induce an identity avoidance effect with respect to the reflexive clitic.

- (50) a. \*Aqui não se é forçado a tentar levantar-se cedo.  
 here not SE<sub>IND</sub> is forced to try rise-REFL<sub>3SG</sub> early  
 ‘Here one is not forced to try to get up early.’

b. *Movement approach:*

[TP aqui não CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:ν]</sub> é [VP CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:u]</sub> [V' forçado a [CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:u]</sub>  
 tentar [CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:u]</sub> levantar-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]</sub> cedo]]]]]

The other set of related facts accounted for by the movement approach involves raising constructions. As Martins and Nunes (2005) point out, the acceptability of indefinite *se* with specific raising verbs is subject to variation among European Portuguese speakers. What is relevant for our purposes is that the raising verbs that allow indefinite *se* exhibit identity avoidance effects with respect to a reflexive clitic in the embedded clause, as illustrated in (51) with the raising verb *demorar* ‘last’.

- (51) a. \*Demorou-se muito a levantar(-se) da cama.  
 lasted-SE<sub>IND</sub> much to rise-SE<sub>REF</sub> from-the bed  
 ‘It took us a long time to get up from bed.’

b. *Movement approach:*

[TP CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:∇]</sub> demorou a [CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:∇]</sub> levantar-CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]</sub> da cama]]]

Interestingly, the addition of a control structure intervening between the raising verb and the clause containing the reflexive, as in (52a) below, does not interfere with the identity avoidance effect exhibited by (51a). Similar to what we saw in (50a), movement of indefinite *se* leaves a copy in the most embedded clause, triggering an identity avoidance effect with respect to the reflexive.

- (52) a. \*Demorou-se muito a tentar levantar(-se) da cama.  
 lasted-SE<sub>IND</sub> much to try rise-SE<sub>REF</sub> from-the bed  
 ‘It took us a long time to get up from bed.’

b. *Movement approach:*

[TP CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:~v]</sub> demorou a [CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:~u]</sub> tentar [CL<sup>i</sup><sub>[3SG, IND, NOM:~u]</sub> levantar-  
 CL<sup>k</sup><sub>[3SG, REFL, ACC]</sub> da cama]]]]

4. Summary and conclusion

In this paper we have undertaken a comparison among three approaches to control, namely, Manzini and Roussou's (2000) predicate attraction account, PRO-based accounts (e.g. Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, Landau 2000, 2004, and Martin 2001), and movement accounts (e.g. Hornstein 1999, 2001 and Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes 2010). The comparison has focused on their fitness to account for control data in European Portuguese involving the deletion of a reflexive clitic in the presence of an identical controller, as in (53) below (= (23)), for instance, and the ungrammaticality of examples in which the reflexive clitic *se* and the indefinite clitic *se* co-occur, as in (54) (= (31)), for example.

(53) Os professores autorizaram-**nos** a sentar-(\***nos**) naquele banco.  
 the teachers authorized-us to sit-REFL<sub>1PL</sub> on-that bench  
 'The teachers allowed us to sit on that\* bench.'

(54) \*Não se conseguiu sentar-se num bom sítio.  
 not SE<sub>IND</sub> managed sit-SE<sub>REF</sub> in-a good place  
 'One did not find a good place to sit.'

As each of the approaches to control examined here generates the controller in different positions, as sketched in (55), they may make different predictions with

respect to whether or not a controller should induce an identity avoidance effect with respect to a reflexive clitic in the embedded clause.

- (55) a. *Predicate attraction approach*: [DP<sub>01,02</sub> ... V<sub>1</sub> [... V<sub>2</sub>-CL<sub>REFL</sub>]]  
 b. *PRO-based approach*: [DP<sub>i</sub> V<sub>1</sub> [... PRO<sub>i</sub> V<sub>2</sub>-CL<sub>REFL</sub>]]  
 c. *Movement approach*: [DP V<sub>1</sub> [... copy<sub>DP</sub> V<sub>2</sub>-CL<sub>REFL</sub>]]

We have examined these predictions under both a strong lexicalist perspective such as Chomsky (1993, 2000) and a weak lexicalist perspective such as the one in Chomsky (2001). We have shown that under a strong lexicalist perspective, the impossibility of deletion in nonlocal configurations such as in (56) (= (27)) cannot be fully accounted for by the movement approach, whereas the ungrammaticality of analogous configurations involving the indefinite clitic *se* as in (57) (= (46b)) cannot be captured by the predicate attraction and the PRO-based approaches.

- (56) Ele fez-**me** tentar sentar-\*(**me**) de outra maneira.  
 he made-me try sit-REFL<sub>1SG</sub> of other manner  
 ‘He made me try to sit down in another way.’

- (57) \*Tentou-**se** conseguir evitar sentar-**se** na última fila.  
 tried-SE<sub>IND</sub> manage avoid sit-SE<sub>REF</sub> in-the last row  
 ‘One tried to manage to avoid sitting in the last row.’

When a weak lexicalist model such as Chomsky 2001 is adopted instead, the movement approach is able to capture data such as (56), while maintaining its superior

empirical coverage with respect to data such as (57). The key difference between the two types of identity avoidance is that, as opposed to the upper clitic in (56), indefinite *se* has its Case feature lexically specified as nominative. Hence, lower copies of the upper clitic of (56) with unvalued Case will not be able to induce an identity avoidance effect because they are not identical to the reflexive; in contrast, indefinite *se* has all of its features valued and is available for being computed for purposes of identity avoidance as soon as it enters the derivation. Thus, control involving indefinite *se* may shed light on the issue of where the “controller” is generated. This becomes clear when we consider the contrast between (57), where the indefinite *se* triggers an identity avoidance effect with respect to the reflexive embedded three clauses down, and (58), where the indefinite and the reflexive surface in contiguous clauses but do not trigger an identity avoidance effect.

- (58) Soube-**se**        ter-**se**        ele    suicidado.  
      knew-**SE**<sub>IND</sub>    have-**SE**<sub>REFL</sub>    he    committed-suicide  
      ‘It was heard that he committed suicide.’

The contrast between (57) and (58) shows that what matters is not the number of clauses separating the surface position of indefinite *se* and the reflexive, but where they are generated. Under the movement approach, the controller indefinite *se* in (57) is generated as the external argument of the most embedded verb. Thus, the copy it leaves behind may trigger an identity avoidance effect within the most embedded clause, for it is fully valued. By contrast, in (58) the two clitics are never local to one another as they are generated in different clauses; hence, there is no identity avoidance effect in (58).

The predicate attraction and the PRO-based approaches, by contrast, do not have an account of (57). The fact that the Case feature of indefinite *se* is (exceptionally) lexically specified does not make room for a local computation of identity avoidance in (57), because the controller is taken to be generated outside the embedded clause under these approaches (see (55a-b)). And crucially, if the identity avoidance domain is extended to include the position where the controller surfaces in order to account for the ungrammaticality of (57), one runs into two incorrect predictions: that (58) should also be ungrammatical and that deletion of the reflexive in a sentence such as (56) should be enforced.

In sum, the movement approach is able to provide a unified analysis for both types of identity avoidance effects if pursued under a weak lexicalist perspective such as Chomsky's (2001) (see section 3.2.1). From a conceptual point of view, the empirical achievements of the movement approach to control with respect to the topic under discussion are not surprising. The type of identity avoidance effects we have been examining are sensitive to phonological and morphological information (see section 2.1) and if the "controlee" is a copy of the "controller", we expect it to be subject to whatever computations and restrictions may independently apply to the "controller" in the phonological component.

The overall conclusion is that the movement approach to control is better equipped to account for the intricate set of data involving identity avoidance in European Portuguese. We take this result to be of some importance in that the argument has focused on the architectural properties of each approach, highlighting their key foundational assumptions: whether the control relation requires just the "controller" (see (55a)) or a "controller" and a "controlee" (see (55b) and (55c)) and whether the "controlee" is a lexical formative like PRO (see (55b)) or a residue of movement (see

(55c)). Thus, unless the architecture of the approaches examined is changed, adjustments of technical implementation in either of them should in principle not affect the gist of the argumentation explored here and the conclusion reached.

## References

- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein, and Jairo Nunes. 2010. *Control as movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. On multiple wh-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:351-383.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax: A Government-Binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Keyser, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The Theory of Principles and Parameters. In *Syntax: an international handbook of contemporary research*, ed. by Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld and Theo Vennemann, 506-569. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1988. On *si* constructions and the theory of *Arb*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 521–581.

Martins, Ana Maria & Jairo Nunes (2017). Identity Avoidance with Reflexive Clitics in European Portuguese and Minimalist Approaches to Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48.4: 627-649.  
[https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/full/10.1162/LING\\_a\\_00256](https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/full/10.1162/LING_a_00256)

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1995. *Italian syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

d'Albuquerque, Alair. 1984. A perda dos clíticos num dialeto mineiro. *Tempo Brasileiro* 78/79.

D'Alessandro, Roberta. 2004. Impersonal si constructions: Agreement and interpretation. Doctoral dissertation. University of Stuttgart. Electronic Dissertation Series, Stuttgart University Library. URL: <http://elib.uni-stuttgart.de/opus/volltexte/2004/1630>

Galves, Charlotte. 1987. A Sintaxe do Português Brasileiro. *Ensaio de Linguística* 13: 31-50.

Golston, Chris. 1995. Syntax outranks phonology: evidence from Ancient Greek. *Phonology* 12: 343-368.

Gonçalves, Anabela. 1992. Para uma sintaxe dos verbos auxiliares em português europeu. Master thesis. Universidade de Lisboa.

Gonçalves, Anabela. 1999. Predicados complexos verbais em contextos de infinitivo não preposicionado do português europeu. Doctoral dissertation. Universidade de Lisboa.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69-96.

Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French syntax: The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control. Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811-877.

Martins, Ana Maria & Jairo Nunes (2017). Identity Avoidance with Reflexive Clitics in European Portuguese and Minimalist Approaches to Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48.4: 627-649.  
[https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/full/10.1162/LING\\_a\\_00256](https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/full/10.1162/LING_a_00256)

Manzini, Maria Rita and Anna Roussou. 2000. A minimalist theory of A-movement and control. *Lingua* 110:409-447.

Martin, Roger. 2001. Null case and the distribution of PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:141-166.

Martins, Ana Maria. 1993. Enclisis, VP-deletion and the nature of Sigma. *Probus* 6: 173-205.

Martins, Ana Maria. 2000. A minimalist approach to clitic climbing. In *Portuguese syntax: New comparative studies*, ed. by João Costa, 169-190. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Martins, Ana Maria. 2013. A posição dos pronomes pessoais clíticos. In *Gramática do Português*, ed. by Eduardo Buzaglo Paiva Raposo, Maria Fernanda Bacelar do Nascimento, Maria Antónia Mota, Luísa Segura and Amália Mendes, 2231-2302. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Martins, Ana Maria and Jairo Nunes. 2005. Raising issues in European and Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 4: 53-77.

Martins, Ana Maria and Jairo Nunes. 2016. Passives and *Se* Constructions. In *The Handbook of Portuguese Linguistics*, ed. by Leo Wetzels, Sergio Menuzzi and João Costa, 318-337. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Naro, Anthony. 1976. The genesis of the reflexive impersonal in Portuguese: A study in syntactic change as a surface phenomenon. *Language* 52: 779-810.

Nasukawa, Kuniya and Henk Riemsdijk (eds.). 2014. *Identity relations in grammar*. Boston/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Nunes, Jairo. 1991. *Se* apassivador e *Se* indeterminador: O percurso diacrônico no português brasileiro. *Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos* 20: 33-57.

Nunes, Jairo. 1995a. Ainda o famigerado *Se*. *D.E.L.T.A.* 11: 201-240.

Martins, Ana Maria & Jairo Nunes (2017). Identity Avoidance with Reflexive Clitics in European Portuguese and Minimalist Approaches to Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48.4: 627-649.  
[https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/full/10.1162/LING\\_a\\_00256](https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/full/10.1162/LING_a_00256)

Nunes, Jairo. 1995b. The copy theory of movement and linearization of chains in the minimalist program. Doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland.

Nunes, Jairo. 2001. Sideward movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 303-344.

Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Nunes, Jairo and Juan Uriagereka. 2000. Cyclicity and Extraction Domains. *Syntax* 3: 20-43.

Pesetsky, David and Esther Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In *Phrasal and clausal architecture*, ed. by Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian and Wendy Wilkins, 262-294. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Raposo, Eduardo Paiva. 1987. Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 85-109.

Raposo, Eduardo Paiva and Juan Uriagereka. 1990. Long-distance case assignment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 505-537.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 2008. Identity avoidance: OCP-effects in Swiss Relatives. In *Foundational issues in linguistic theory. Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 227-250. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Uriagereka, Juan. 1999. Multiple Spell-Out. In *Working Minimalism*, ed. by Samuel D. Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 251-282. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Yip, Moira. 1998. Identity avoidance in phonology and morphology. In *Morphology and its relation to phonology and syntax*, ed. by S. G. Lapointe, D. K. Brentari and P. M. Farrell, 216-246. Stanford, CA: CSLI.