

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308723123>

Overtly/Non-Overtly Inflected Infinitives in Romance

Chapter · May 2017

CITATIONS
0

READS
386



Ángel Luis Jiménez-Fernández
Universidad de Sevilla

35 PUBLICATIONS 171 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Manuela Ambar

13 PUBLICATIONS 83 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Negative Preposing in embedded contexts in English and Spanish [View project](#)



Information Structure [View project](#)

Overtly/Non-Overtly Inflected Infinitives in Romance*

Manuela Ambar and Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández

To appear in: M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, 2nd edition. Wiley-Blackwell.

Outline

1. Introduction
2. Distribution of inflected infinitives
 - 2.1. Some distributional parallelisms between Portuguese and Spanish
 - 2.1.1. Sentential subjects
 - 2.1.2. Sentential complements
 - 2.1.3. Sentential adjuncts
 - 2.1.4. Two notes on root inflected infinitives
 - 2.1.5. Inflected infinitives sometimes behave like finite clauses
 - 2.2. Raposo's proposal
3. Infinitives in Italian: Distribution and Rizzi's analysis
 - 3.1. Rizzi's restructuring verbs
 - 3.2. The Aux-to-Comp phenomena
4. More on Aux-to-Comp: Lexical restrictions and aspectual values
 - 4.1. Have+past participle: Finite clauses vs. infinitives and the past effect
 - 4.2. Lexical restrictions on Aux-to-Comp: Single events vs. habitual readings
 - 4.3. Stativity and infinitives
5. PRO, Binding, case and c-selection
6. The Tense approach: Tin C vs. no T in C
7. Conclusions

1. Introduction

European Portuguese displays an array of inflected infinitival structures with no parallel in most languages. In this work we describe these structures and compare them with what we think are equivalent structures in other Romance languages, namely in Italian and Spanish, and try to extract from this comparison some principled manifestation of their behaviour.

As is well known European Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese and Galician have a type of infinitival structures with properties distinct from ordinary infinitives:

- (i) the verbal form of these structures exhibits overt person and number suffixes and
- (ii) the verb enters a relation of overt agreement with the subject, which may be a lexical DP or a (null or overt) pronoun bearing nominative Case.

* We wish to express my gratitude to Henk van Riemsdijk, Martin Everaert and Rita Veloso. Without their intervention this work wouldn't exist. The research by Jiménez-Fernández has been partially supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (FFI2013-41509-P). We thank the anonymous reviewer for his/her comments, which have contributed to the final version of the paper.

This inflected verbal form is traditionally called *personal infinitive* or (more recently) *inflected infinitive*. *Inflected Infinitive* is then distinct from regular *non-inflected infinitive* both morphophonologically and syntactically.

Morphophonologically, they differ in that overt person and number agreement morphemes are present in the former (cf. (i)), but absent from the latter. Syntactically, they differ in diverse aspects of their distribution, e.g. the former takes lexical nominative subjects, with which it agrees (cf.(ii)), whereas the latter does not.

More generally one could say that inflected infinitival structures share properties with both uninflected (non-finite) and inflected structures (finite). These two properties apply to Portuguese inflected infinitives straightforwardly. However, we believe that in other Romance languages such as Spanish infinitives, though not overtly inflected for agreement, may also take a lexical nominative subject. We will propose a unitary approach to both inflected and non-inflected infinitives with subject by suggesting that in languages such as Portuguese the agreement morphology is overt, whereas in other Romance languages such as Italian and Spanish this morphology is simply null. Thus we will use the term inflected infinitives to cover both overtly inflected and non-overtly inflected infinitives.

Whatever finite means, inflected infinitival structures share with finite clauses the property of taking a lexical nominative subject, with which the person/number morpheme in the verb agrees, as referred to above, and exemplified below:

- (1) Lamento que *tu* não vás à festa / Lamento que tú no vayas a la fiesta.
(I) regret that you not go-subj-2sg to the party
I regret that you don't go to the party
- (2) Lamento *tu* não ires à festa /Lamento el haber ido tú a la fiesta.
(I) regret you not go-inf-2sg to the party
- (3) * Lamento *tu* não ir à festa / *Lamento tú haber ido a la fiesta.
(I) regret you not go-inf-∅ to the party

Both in (1) and (2) the lexical subject is possible and has nominative Case, in contrast with (3) where the presence of the uninflected infinitive rules out the presence of the lexical subject in Portuguese.¹

Another property that different authors have considered may range inflected infinitives in the group of non-finite structures is the restriction on their occurrence to embedded contexts:

- (4) Eles vão à festa.
they go to the party
- (5) * Eles irem à festa.
they go-inf-3pl to the party

¹ There is a certain controversy about the grammatical status of inflected infinitives in argument position in Spanish. Authors like Hernanz (1982, 1999), Piera (1987), Rigau (1995) and Torrego (1998) judge argument infinitives with explicit subject as ungrammatical (cf. *María detesta beber Juan* 'Mary detests that John drinks', Hernanz 1982). However, other linguists such as Pérez Vázquez (2007, 2010) gives examples such as *Diego recuerda el haber subido los precios en enero* 'Diego remember that prices had risen in January.' It seems that many factors influence the grammaticality of complement infinitives with explicit subject in Spanish, an issue we return to below.

Note however that on the one hand this is true for declarative or interrogative contexts, though not for counterfactual ones. This is illustrated for Portuguese in (8) and Spanish in (9):

- (8) a. Eles irem à festa! (sem serem convidados..)
they go-inf-3pl to the party (without being invited...)
b. Irem eles à festa! (sem serem convidados..)
go-inf-3pl they to the party (without being invited...)
(9) a. ¡Casarse tu hermano con la hija de Fulgencia! (Hernanz 1999)
b. ¿Decirle yo a Juan lo que pienso de él? (Hernanz 1999)

On the other hand, this property is shared by subjunctive clauses, which are nonetheless usually considered finite structures:

- (9) * Eles comprem o livro.
they buy-subj-3pl the book

Similarly to inflected infinitives, subjunctive root clauses may become well-formed sentences by associating to them another modality value (for example, some sort of wish):

- (10) a. Comprem eles o livro ! (e podem estudar...)/ ¡Que compren ellos los libros!
buy-subj-3pl they the book (and can study...)
b. (Que) venham as chuvas! / ¡(Que) vengan las lluvias!
(That) come-subj-3pl the rains

We will come back to these properties.

The chapter is organized as follows. In this section, the Introduction, we briefly describe the topic of this work, namely, inflected infinitives in European Portuguese. In section 2, we deal with the distribution of inflected infinitives in European Portuguese and establish a parallelism with infinitives with explicit subject (or personal infinitive) in Spanish. We also discuss Raposo's (1987) analysis. Section 3 presents Rizzi's (1982) proposal on Italian Infinitives whose behaviour somehow parallels the Portuguese/Spanish infinitive. Following previous works, in section 4 we show the impact of some lexical restrictions on Aux-to-Comp, related to *eventive* verbs, past participles, and genericity and definiteness on the distribution of inflected infinitives. Section 5 reviews the literature on infinitives dealing with PRO, Binding, Case and categorial selection vs. semantic selection. In section 6 we discuss the presence of T in C, providing evidence drawn from different phenomena – clitic climbing, indicative vs. subjunctive, inflected infinitive vs. uninflected infinitive selection, obligatory vs. non-obligatory control, etc. Finally, section 7 summarises our conclusions.

2. Distribution of Inflected Infinitives

2.1. Some distributional parallelisms between Portuguese and Spanish

In this section we will start by presenting the description of inflected infinitives in European Portuguese based on the influential work on these constructions by Raposo

(1987). Then, we will add other facts to this description, namely on Italian infinitival constructions, guided by the rich set of related phenomena pointed out by Rizzi (1982). Also we will hint at the distribution of Spanish non-overtly inflected infinitives. Finally, we will extend our empirical domain to phenomena observed in other works tying the puzzling behaviour of infinitives to what Ambar (1986 et subseq.) has been claiming since the eighties defines their crucial architecture: Tense.

As described in Raposo (1987), inflected infinitives can occur in subject, complement or adjunct clauses in Portuguese. The same idea underlies works by Hernanz (1982, 1999) and Piera (1987) for Spanish, and Sitaridou (2009) for Romance in general.

2.1.1. Sentential subjects

Examples in (11) illustrate the occurrence of inflected infinitive in sentential subjects:

- (11) a. Eles gostarem de cinema é natural
 they like-inf-3pl cinema is natural
 b. É natural eles gostarem de cinema
 is natural they like-inf-3pl cinema

For Raposo (1987), (11b) is derived from (11a) through extraposition of the sentential subject. Note, however, that (11b) --having one more operation involved in its derivation, namely extraposition – is more natural than (11a). This is a strange result if we assume that derivations with fewer operations should be preferred over the ones with more steps. In other words, if derivations are ruled by economy principles. Similar examples are found in Spanish, though for some speakers there is a mild grammaticality difference when the infinitive is extraposed (cf. Pérez Vázquez 2007):

- (12) a. Telefonar tú primero sería un error. (Piera 1987: 159)
 Telephone-inf-Ø you first would be an error
 b. ?? Sería un error telefonar tú primero.

Although not mentioned in Raposo's work, in this context, the inflected infinitive may be preceded by the definite article, as in factive contexts described below (cf. (16)):

- (13) a. *O* eles terem dito isso assustou-me
 The they have-inf-3pl said that scared-me
 b. *O* terem eles dito isso assustou-me
 The have-inf-3pl they said that scared-me

This option is also available for Spanish as one of the factors influencing the full grammaticality of infinitives with subject as sentential subjects:

- (14) a. Carece de sentido ??(el/el hecho de) irse Juan de Madrid.
 Lacks of sense the/the fact of go-inf-Ø John from Madrid
 b. (El) irse Juan de Madrid carece de sentido. (Pérez Vázquez 2007: 155)

This property is crucially related with factivity and presupposition (or referentiality) of the infinitive clause.

2.1.2. Sentential complements

In sentential complements, inflected infinitives exhibit contrasts that depend on the selection properties of the main verbs: volitive, epistemic/declarative, factive, perception or causative verbs. We will discuss each class in turn.

It is uncontroversial that the inflected infinitive is banned from the complement of *volitive verbs* – obligatory control verbs –, where only the uninflected infinitive is possible:

- (15) a. Os meninos querem brincar
the kids want play-inf-Ø
b. * Os meninos querem brincarem
the kids want play-inf-3pl

Spanish (alongside the rest of Romance languages) patterns with Portuguese in this respect as well. The remaining classes of verbs mentioned above allow inflected infinitive in their sentential complements, though with peculiarities that vary from a class to another. Here we focus on epistemic, declarative and factive verbs.

A) *Epistemic and declarative* verbs select inflected infinitives with an overt lexical subject but require² subject-verb inversion as noted by Raposo (1987):

- (16) a. * Penso os deputados terem votado a proposta
(I) think the deputies have-inf-3pl voted the proposal
b. Penso terem os deputados votado a proposta.
(I) think have-inf-3pl the deputies voted the proposal

Interestingly, in Portuguese the subject occurs most naturally after the infinitive (contra Vanderschueren 2013). It is standardly acknowledged that in Spanish epistemic verbs do not select an inflected infinitive. Hence the corresponding examples to (16) are all anomalous. However, we can find declaratives which take an infinitive with subject as object. Again linguists show a divergent opinion about the full acceptability or marginality of these constructions (cf. Hernanz 1999, Pérez Vázquez 2007, Paz 2013):

- (17) a. Dos testigos declararon [ser tú/yo/él/ella cómplice del robo]. (RAE 1973)
Two witnesses declared be-inf-Ø you/I/he/she accomplice in the theft
b. Nada más entrar en el piso, Sancha García advirtió [estar la puerta del salón abierta...]. (Hernanz 1999: 2268)
Right when she got into the apartment, Sancha Garcia noticed be-inf-Ø the door of the living room open

The position of the subject seems to be always postverbal in Spanish, as shown in (17).

² As we will see, this is the unmarked requirement. There are some contexts, first noted to our knowledge in Ambar (1988) and retaken by Barbosa 2000 recently, where this inversion is dispensed with. The relevant cases are:

- (i) Penso só eles terem votado a proposta
(I) think only they have-inf-3pl voted the proposal
(ii) Penso só o Pedro ter votado a proposta
(I) think only Pedro have-inf-3sg voted the proposal

B) *Factive verbs* also select an inflected infinitive, but differently from epistemic and declarative verbs, they do not obligatorily require the type of inversion illustrated by (18b) below for Portuguese:

- (18) a. Lamento os deputados terem votado a proposta
 (I) regret the deputies have-inf-3pl voted the proposal
 b. Lamento terem os deputados votado a proposta
 (I) regret have-inf-3pl the deputies voted the proposal

As observed by Raposo, in European Portuguese factive verbs accept a determiner - more precisely the definite article *o* ‘the’ - introducing the inflected infinitival complement clause, a fact that confirms the nominal status of these structures (Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970, Zubizarreta 1982). This is exemplified in (19):

- (19) a. Lamento *o* teres dito isso
 (I) regret the have-inf-2sg said that
 b. Lamento *o* terem eles dito isso
 (I) regret the have-inf-3pl they said that
 c. Lamento *o* eles terem dito isso
 (I) regret the they have-3pl said that
 d.* Lamento *o* o Pedro/os meninos ter/terem dito isso
 (I) regret the the Peter /the kids have-inf- Ø/3pl said that
 e. Lamento *o* ter/terem o Pedro/os meninos dito isso.
 (I) regret the have-inf- Ø/3pl the Peter /the kids said that

In Spanish we also find factives which may require an infinitive clause with an explicit subject, and the use of the definite article is obligatory. Furthermore, the position of the subject is always postverbal:

- (20) Lamento el haber andado el niño por ahí. (De Miguel 1996)³
 (I) regret the have-inf-Ø walked the kid over there

2.1.3. Sentential adjuncts

This type of inflected infinitival structure is normally introduced by a preposition (or prepositional locution), which in Raposo’s analysis is a Case assigner for Agr of the inflected infinitive. This is illustrated for Portuguese in (21):

- (21) a. Antes de ires / ? ir ao cinema, faz o trabalho
 before of go-inf-2sg / go-inf-Ø to the cinema do the work
 b. Apesar de não gostarmos / * gostar de praia, vamos contigo
 although of not like-inf-1pl / like-inf-Ø of beach (we) go with you
 c. Depois de apresentares / ?? apresentar o projecto, vais ao cinema
 after of present-inf-2sg / present-inf-Ø the project (you) go to the cinema

³ For some linguists such as De Miguel (1996) and Pérez Vázquez (2007), the use of the article is optional. However, most native speakers agree that the outcome with no article is at best marginal. In addition, most authors point out that inflected infinitives in object position are very rare in Spanish (Torrego 1998, Hernanz 1999). We do not agree with this view and claim that they are productive in Spanish if introduced by the definite article and if the perfective auxiliary *haber* ‘have’ is used.

In most cases, the occurrence of the inflected infinitive in this context is preferable to that of the non-inflected one. This is the case of (21) above. However, some change in the acceptability may be triggered by altering the word order or the preposition (or prepositional locution), as in (22) below:

- (22) a. Sei que fazes o trabalho antes de ir / ires ao cinema
 (I) know that (you) do the work before of go-inf-Ø / go-inf-2sg to the cinema
 b. Eles não saem sem apresentar / apresentarem o trabalho
 They not leave without present-inf-Ø / present-inf-3pl the work
 c. Eles vão ao cinema depois de entregar / entregarem o trabalho
 They go to the cinema after of deliver-inf-Ø / deliver-inf-3pl the work

Clearly, c-command and control are aspects involved. For a detailed and far-reaching work on Portuguese adjunct clauses in general, and infinitival adjunct clauses in particular, see Lobo (2002a, 2002b, 2003).

Infinitival adjunct clauses with explicit subject in Spanish are very productive. They can be temporal (23a), concessive (23b) or conditional (23c), depending on the meaning conveyed by the introducing preposition:

- (23) a. Todo el mundo aplaudió al acabar el concierto. (Rigau 1995: 280)
 All the world applauded in.the finish-inf-Ø the concert
 ‘Everybody applauded after the concert was finished.’
 b. A pesar de vivir la abuela sola, mi tío no va nunca a verla.
 (Pérez Vázquez 2007: 209)
 in spite of live-inf-Ø the grannie alone, my uncle not goes never to see her
 ‘Despite the grannie’s living alone, my uncle never goes and visit her.’
 c. Mi padre se enfadará de suspender mi hermano el examen.
 (Pérez Vázquez 2007: 205)
 My father will get angry of fail-inf-Ø my brother the exam
 ‘My father will get angry if my brother fails the exam.’

Vanderschueren (2013) holds that adverbial infinitives are the only clauses which allow the subject to occupy either a preverbal or postverbal position in Spanish. However, Fernández Lagunilla (1987), Torrego (1998), Pérez Vázquez (2007), a.o., argue that the preverbal position is more emphatic. This obviously has some connection with discourse and the left periphery of adjunct inflected infinitives. For Pérez Vázquez (2007), preverbal subjects in inflected infinitives are dislocated topics, whereas for Schulte (2007) it is a contrastive focus. We leave the issue aside in the hope that we will take it back in our research in the near future.

2.1.4. Two notes on root inflected infinitives

As mentioned in section 1, in examples (8), repeated here as (24), inflected infinitives can surface in root clauses with a *modal or counterfactual* reading in Portuguese, somehow associated with an exclamative prosody, though not in declarative or interrogative contexts. The examples are.

- (24) a. Eles irem à festa! (sem serem convidados...)
 they go-inf-3pl to the party (without being invited...)

- b. Irem eles à festa! (sem serem convidados..)
 go-inf-3pl they to the party (without being invited...)

In Raposo's work, root inflected infinitives are ungrammatical structures. However, it should be noted that Raposo only considers declarative constructions. As will become clearer below, the ungrammaticality of these structures reinforces his hypothesis: having no Tense, no Case will be assigned to Agr; therefore, the subject will not be assigned Nominative Case. The Case filter is violated, and hence the structure is excluded. It has been argued that root inflected infinitives do exist in Portuguese (Ambar 1988), with a modal interpretation and associated with an exclamative intonation.

Similar claims have appeared in the literature for other languages (e.g. English, German, Italian, Spanish), either restricting the phenomenon to child language or not. In the first group are works such as Rizzi (1993), Hoekstra and Hyams (1998) and Wexler (1994), in the latter, Akmajian (1984), Hernanz (1982), Etxepare & Grohmann (1998) Grohmann (1998), a.o. In Spanish, Hernanz (1982) has claimed that root infinitives with explicit subject are possible only in exclamative and interrogative clauses and provides the following examples:

- (25) a. ¡Casarse tu hermano con la hija de Fulgencio!
 marry-inf-Ø your brother with Fulgencio's daughter!
 b. ¿Darles yo consejos?
 give-inf-Ø.them I advice?

In both cases a modal interpretation can be detected, as illustrated with paraphrasing of (25b) in 'Que yo pueda darles consejos es imposible'. In this respect again Portuguese and Spanish pattern together.

The second observation that we want to note is that, when describing infinitives, different properties have been noticed for these structures: incompatibility with fronted wh-phrases, topicalization, perfectivity, etc. Some are uncontroversial, such as the ban on fronted wh-elements, whereas others are relaxed in some languages. This is the case of perfectivity, which seems to be possible in Portuguese and Spanish, though not in English, according to Grohmann (1998), as exemplified in (26a-b) vs. (26c):

- (26) a. Terem eles ido à praia com este frio! É inacreditável!
 have-inf-3pl they gone to the beach with this cold! (It) is unbelievable!
 b. ¡Ir María a la playa con este frío! ¡Es increíble!
 have-inf-Ø Maria gone to the beach with this cold! (It) is unbelievable!
 c. * Helmut have won the elections (in 1994)?! I hated that / I don't think so!

The frequent subject-verb inversion, illustrated in (26a-b) above, and the behaviour of adverbs seem to suggest that the verb is in a high position. Ambar (1988) has proposed that this position is C, where Tense would be licensed by a modal operator. A similar proposal is made by Grohmann (1998), who argues for the existence of a Modal Phrase above VP. The modal morpheme in the Modal Phrase may end up in different positions, such as C, depending on the properties displayed by these constructions across languages.

2.1.5. Inflected infinitives sometimes behave like finite clauses

Before going through Raposo's account of the facts described in (11)-(23), recall that, it is generally assumed that these structures share properties with both finite and non-finite structures. We have seen that the crucial property which characterises the inflected infinitive as belonging to the group of finite structures is its occurrence with a nominative lexical subject with which the inflected infinitive verbal form agrees in number and person. Compare the inflected infinitival forms in (27) with the finite structures in (28):

- (27) a. Lamento os meninos não poderem brincar.
(I) regret the kids not can-inf-3pl play-inf-Ø
b. Lamento *eles* não poderem brincar.
(I) regret them not can-inf-3pl play-inf-Ø
- (28) a. Lamento que os meninos não possam brincar.
(I) regret that the kids not can-subj-3pl play-inf-Ø
b. Lamento que *eles* não possam brincar.
(I) regret that them not can-subj-3pl play-inf-Ø

Sentences (b) in (27)-(28), where the pronoun *eles* 'they' substitutes for the lexical DP *os meninos* 'the kids' in the equivalent (a) sentences, show that nominative is the Case assigned to the subject of the embedded clause. This exhibits the association of inflected infinitives with finite clauses.

Personal infinitive in Spanish also shows this parallel with finite clauses, as illustrated in (29-30), where the subject of the infinitive is clearly nominative (as in finite clauses):

- (29) a. Lamento el no poder asistir los niños al colegio.
(I) regret the not can-inf- Ø go-inf-Ø the kids to school
b. Lamento el no poder asistir *ellos* al colegio.
(I) regret them not can-inf- Ø go-inf-Ø to school
- (30) a. Lamento (el) que los niños no puedan asistir al colegio.
(I) regret (the) that the kids not can-subj-3pl go-inf-Ø to school
b. Lamento (el) que *ellos* no puedan asistir al colegio.
(I) regret that them not can-subj-3pl go-inf-Ø to school

The exact import of the dichotomy *finite vs. non-finite* is far from being clear. For some authors finite is related to Tense, for others to Mood, or to Person. Rouveret (1980), dealing with inflected infinitives in Portuguese, defines a finite clause as the proposition that has a verb inflected for person and number and takes a nominative lexical or pronominal subject. Following a traditional view, both Raposo (1987) and Rouveret (1980) assume that inflected infinitives do not have Tense.

Conversely, Ambar (1988 et subsequ.) has proposed that infinitives do have tense, which is also the position taken here. In her analysis, *finite-non finite* is to be seen as a continuum: from *-Tense* to *+Tense*. In this continuum, finiteness is associated with the plus or minus strong status of covert or overt Tense. Thus, in Ambar's view the dichotomy finite / non-finite does not exist and should be better stated in terms of plus

to minus Tense.⁴ This explains why the behaviour of infinitives is sometimes similar to that of finite clauses.

Before going through our arguments for claiming that inflected infinitives have Tense (Sections 4 and 6), let us consider the analyses of Raposo (1987) for Portuguese and Rizzi (1982) for Italian.

2.2. Raposo's (1987) proposal

The distribution of inflected infinitives described above is accounted for by Raposo (1987) by assuming that, being nominal, Agr(eement) has to be assigned Case. In finite clauses Agr is assigned Case by Tense. In the absence of Tense, as is the case of infinitives in Raposo's system, Agr has to look for another Case assigner. This Case assigner is located in the higher domain – either the main Infl, for sentential subjects as in (11-12), or the main verb, for sentential complements as in (13)-(19), or the preposition that introduces adjunct clauses as in (21-23).

Based on the word order contrast exemplified in (14a-b), Raposo considers that epistemic, declarative verbs select CP. Following the GB framework, the author assumes that Case is assigned under government. The definition of government in Chomsky (1981) is adopted, in which the status of heads of maximal projections is crucial: if α governs β , $\beta = XP$, then α governs the head of XP. Consequently, in a structure such as (29) below, CP will be a barrier for government of I (=Agr) with respect to the matrix V. However, this matrix V will be able to govern CP and its head C.

(31) Penso [_{CP} [_C [_{IP} eles Agr terem votado a proposta]]]
 (I) think they Agr have-inf-3pl voted the proposal

Therefore, Agr has to raise to C in order to be assigned Case by V. The result will be outputs like (30) with visible subject-verb inversion:

(32) Penso [_{CP} [_{C'} Agr_i-terem_i [_{IP} eles t_i t_i votado a proposta]]]
 (I) think have-inf-3pl they t_i t_i voted the proposal

In complements of factive verbs, the absence of subject-verb inversion is derived through the assumption that these complements are IPs not CPs. Since they are IPs, not CPs as is the case of complements to epistemic predicates, the main verb governs IP. Thus, its head (Agr) is *in situ*, and it can be assigned Case directly:

(33) Lamento [_{IP} eles [_{I'} Agr terem votado a proposta]]]
 (I) regret they have-inf-3pl voted the proposal

Notice that, as observed by Raposo, the nominal status of factive complements finds further empirical support in the examples given in (19) for European Portuguese and (20) for Spanish, where a determiner (the definite article) introduces such complements.

⁴ The notion and the theories of finiteness have raised a lot of controversy. We derive the fact that a sentence is finite from the presence of T and give evidence for this in Sections 4 and 6. For reasons of space we cannot discuss the controversial issues around finiteness here, but refer the reader to Ambar (1988), Landau (2004), Ritter and Wiltschko (2005), and more recently Amritavalli (2014).

Assuming that complements of factive verbs are IPs,⁵ Raposo's analysis correctly predicts the nominal status of these structures provided by the nominal status of its head, Agr.

Why in Raposo's analysis the inflected infinitive is ruled out from sentential complements of volitive verbs is not clear for us. According to the author, volitive verbs select CP, as epistemic and declarative verbs do. However, contrary to epistemic and declarative verbs, volitive verbs do not select nominal complements – this is why Agr cannot raise to C – being nominal it would violate the selection properties of the main verb. As will become clearer in what follows, we reject this hypothesis given that there is empirical evidence against it and assume that volitive verbs do select nominal complements. We endorse the idea that epistemic and declarative verbs, though not volitive ones, select for a Tense operator in their sentential complements (an idea also involved in Rizzi's 1982 analysis):

- (34) a. Penso [_{CP} [_{C'/T} que [_{IP} eles votaram a proposta]]]
 (I) think that they voted the proposal
 b. Quero [_{CP} [_{C'} que [_{IP} eles votem a proposta]]]
 (I) want that they vote the proposal

In Raposo's work the presence vs. absence of the Tense operator in complements of epistemic and declarative as opposed to volitive verbs is empirically motivated by the independence vs. dependence of Tense in the embedded domains to these classes of verbs as exemplified in the contrast between (35) and (36):

- (35) Penso que eles votam / votaram / votarão / votavam / tinham votado a proposta.
 (I) think that they vote / voted / will vote / voted-imperf / had voted the proposal
 (36) Quero que eles votem / tenham votado / * votassem / * votarem a proposta.
 (I) want that they vote-subj-pres / have-subj-pres voted / voted-subj-imperf / vote-subj-fut the proposal

A similar contrast shows up in Spanish, as exemplified in (37) as opposed to (38):

- (37) Creo que ellos votan / votaron / votarán / votaban/ habían votado la propuesta.
 (I) think that they vote / voted / will vote / voted-imperf / had voted the proposal
 (38) Quiero que ellos voten / hayan votado / * votaran / * votasen a propuesta
 (I) want that they vote-subj-pres / have-subj-pres voted / voted-subj-imperf / vote-subj-imperf the proposal

Let us turn now to Italian in order to find some common properties with Portuguese/Spanish infinitives, as described and analysed so far (even if they may be not visible at once). If we succeed in this finding, then we may try a principled account of the behaviour of infinitives across Romance languages (except French, as usual), seen as one of the possible manifestations of the puzzling Tense system.

⁵ As an anonymous reviewer points out, for Raposo, complements of factives are IPs. In his argumentation, Agr needs case and only nominals need case. Hence Agr as the head of IP is nominal, and therefore IP is nominal.

3. Infinitives in Italian: Distribution and Rizzi's (1982) analysis

As is well known infinitives in Italian (in the same vein as Spanish) have no overt morphology, neither for Tense, as in Portuguese, nor for Agreement, differently from Portuguese (for the case of inflected infinitives). However, our suspicion is that Italian infinitival complements have properties similar to those we find in Portuguese. Let us observe two types of infinitives described in Rizzi (1982), which correlate with the Portuguese and Spanish cases observed above.

3.1. Rizzi's restructuring verbs

In his important work on the syntax of Italian, Rizzi (1982) notes that some main verbs taking infinitival complements exhibit distributional properties which are not found with other classes of verbs. Although these phenomena seem to be unrelated, Rizzi suggests a generalization: "the classes of predicates which allow [those] exceptional behaviours are identical". The unifying account is provided by "a *restructuring rule* in Italian Syntax, governed by modals, aspectuals and motion verbs [...] which optionally reanalyses a terminal string $V_x (P) V$ as a single verbal complex" (Rizzi 1982: 5). As the author notes, among those well-defined classes of verbs, there is a vast area of marginal acceptability, especially with conative verbs such as *cercare*, *tentare* and *provare* 'try'.

Rizzi (1982) constructs his argumentation on the basis of the following evidence:

(A) *Clitic climbing*. With the verbs of this class, an unstressed pronoun originating in the infinitival complement can be cliticized either to the main verb or to the embedded verb, as in (38). On the other hand, with other main verbs only the second cliticization is possible, as in (39) (examples from Rizzi 1982):

- (38) a. Piero verrà a parlarti di parapsicologia.
Piero will come to speak to you about parapsychology
b. Piero *ti* verrà a parlare di parapsicologia.

- (39) a. Piero deciderà di parlarti di parapsicología.
Piero will decide to speak to you about parapsychology
b. * Piero *ti* deciderà di parlare di parapsicologia.

(B) *Impersonal sentences*. With 'impersonal *si*' sentences, the direct object of the embedded clause can become the main subject as in (40); with other main verbs this is not possible as in (41):

- (40) a. Finalmente *si* comincerà a costruire le nuove case popolari.
finally *si* will begin to build the new council houses
b. le nuove case popolari *se* cominceranno a costruire.

- (41) a. Finalmente *si* otterrà di costruire le nuove case popolari.
finally *si* will get permission to build the new council houses
b. * Finalmente le nuove case popolari *si* otterranno di costruire.

The phenomena described in (A)-(B) for Italian by Rizzi (1982) find their equivalents in Portuguese and Spanish. For instance, in Spanish clitic climbing is possible with a verb such as *venir* ‘come’, as opposed to *decidir* ‘decide’:

- (42) a. Pedro vendrá a hablarte de parapsicología.
 Pedro will come to speak to you about parapsychology
 b. Pedro *te* vendrá a hablar de parapsicología.
- (43) a. Pedro decidirá hablarte de parapsicología.
 Pedro will decide to speak to you about parapsychology
 b. * Pedro *te* decidirá hablar de parapsicología.

Note that *volitive* verbs are included in the class of restructuring verbs. Note further that these main verbs do not allow inflected infinitive in their embedded domains in European Portuguese; only the uninflected infinitive can occur. Therefore, pronominal or lexical embedded subjects are also banned from this context. We will assume that they constitute the class of *obligatory control* verbs, following Rizzi (1982).⁶ In other terms, in this case the embedded domain is plausibly a Tensed domain (clitic climbing is blocked, inflected infinitives can occur); in obligatory control verbs the embedded domain is plausibly not a Tensed domain (clitic climbing may occur, inflected infinitives cannot).

This is the approach that Ambar (1988-1998) has also argued for: Tense is the category responsible for Rizzi’s phenomena falling under his restructuring rule.

3.2. The Aux-to-Comp phenomenon

There is a sub-group of infinitival structures in Italian that allow the presence of lexical or pronominal nominative subjects. This was first noted by Rizzi (1978), to our knowledge. The following paradigm exemplifies this type of construction (Rizzi 1982:79-80):

- (44) a. Suppongo non esser la situazione suscettibile di ulterior miglioramenti.
 I suppose not to be the situation susceptible of further improvements
 b. Mario afferma non esser lui in grado di affrontare la situazione

⁶ The vast area of marginal acceptability pointed out by Rizzi for clitic climbing finds its equivalent in Portuguese for the choice of inflected infinitive in this group. If volitives do not occur with inflected infinitive we have another test to define this class. For example, verbs like *decidir* (*to decide*) are usually considered *volitional* verbs. Thus, if we are right in assimilating Rizzi’s restructuring class to obligatory control verbs showing up a cluster of properties, such a verb must be submitted to those behaviours:

- (i) a. * Quero falarmos hoje só de orações relativas.
 (I) want speak-inf-1pl today only about relative clauses
 b. Quero-te ver.
 (I) want-you-Acc see-inf-Ø
- (ii) a. Decidi falarmos hoje só de orações relativas
 (I) decided speak-inf-1pl today only about relative clauses
 b. * Decidi-te ver
 (I) decided-you-Acc see-inf-Ø

Then *decidir* cannot be included in the class of volitional predicates with the same status as verbs such as *querer* (*to want*), the obligatory control verbs.

- Mario asserts not to be he/him able to face the situation
- c. Questa commissione ritiene [aver loro sempre ottemperato agli obblighi previsti dalla legge]
This commission believes to-have they/them always fulfilled the legal duties

Considering an initial structure like the following (op.cit: 77):

- (45) ...V_x [_S' COMP [_S NP infinitive VP]]
[+lex]

where V_x represents the class of epistemic and declarative verbs, Rizzi (1982) observes that NP can never surface as such. Only PRO should be a possible filler for the embedded subject position. However, the outputs whose structure is represented in (45) can be rescued by moving an auxiliary verb into COMP (Aux-to-Comp movement).

Rizzi further observes that the definite article may introduce nominal infinitival constructions in subject position (as in Portuguese and Spanish – see examples (19-20)), the relevant context being illustrated in (46):

- (46) L' [aver lui affermato che ti vuole aiutare non implica che sei fuori dai guai
the to-have he/him asserted that he wants to help you does not imply that you are out of trouble

The Italian Aux-to-Comp class seems then to be equivalent to Raposo's epistemic and declarative class of verbs triggering Agr-to-C movement, except for one difference: in Italian Agr is phonetically null, which is exactly what we are assuming for Spanish.

Summarizing, we have shown that three languages share a set of properties which may be used to distinguish two classes of verbs:

- (47) verbs of the *volitive* type

- (i) allow clitic climbing;
- (ii) require obligatory control
- (iii) don't allow nominative lexical subjects with or without Aux-to-Comp

- (48) verbs of the epistemic / declarative type:

- (i) do not allow clitic climbing
- (ii) do not require obligatory control
- (iii) allow nominative lexical subjects under Aux-to-Comp

4. More on Aux-to-Comp: Lexical restrictions and aspectual values

Ambar (1988-1998) has observed that Aux-to-Comp is subject to lexical aspectual and/or event restrictions. Let us briefly review three types of such restrictions holding for infinitival complements of epistemic and declarative verbs, noted in Ambar (1988, 1992, 1994).

4.1. *Have + past participle: finite vs. infinitives and the past effect*

The first restriction concerns the opposition between finite and infinitival contexts with respect to the value of *have+past participle*, normally used for compound tenses such as Present Perfect. In Portuguese, as in English, and in contrast with French or Italian, the combination of *have (Present) + past participle* gives rise to a temporal interpretation whose starting and ending points are located in the past and in the speech time, respectively.⁷ Consequently, the iterative temporal interpretation associated with this compound tense – *Present Perfect* – excludes the occurrence of perfect temporal adverbs such as *ontem / yesterday* and single event readings involving specific definiteness. This is illustrated by the contrasts in (49) and (50) below, where the specific definiteness provided by the *singular definite article* and the *punctual temporal value* associated with adverbs like *ontem*, as opposed to adverbs such as *ultimamente*, prevents the well-formedness of the sentences:

- (49) a. * Penso que os alunos têm comprado o livro recomendado.
(I) think that the students have bought the book recommended
b. Penso que os alunos têm comprado os livros recomendados.
(I) think that the students have bought the books recommended

- (50) a.* Penso que os alunos têm comprado ontem os livros recomendados.
I think that the students have bought yesterday the books recommended
b. Penso que os alunos têm comprado ultimamente os livros recomendados
I think that the students have bought lately the books recommended

Surprisingly, the contrasts between the a. vs. b. sentences in (49)-(50) disappear if the inflected infinitive substitutes for the present tense of *ter* ‘have’:

- (51) a. Penso terem os alunos comprado o livro recomendado
(I) think have-inf-3pl the students bought the book recommended
b. Penso terem os alunos comprado os livros recomendados
(I) think have-inf-3pl the students bought the books recommended
- (52) a. Penso terem os meninos comprado ontem o(s) livro(s) recomendado(s)
(I) think have-inf-3pl the students bought yesterday the books recommended
b. Penso terem os meninos comprado ultimamente o(s) livro(s) recomendados
(I) think have-inf-3pl the students bought lately the books recommended

What examples (51)-(52) show is that by changing the inflection on *have* from *present* into *inflected infinitive* the *punctual past* reading emerges. We have called this phenomenon *past effect* and attributed it to the presence of the Past Participle in the structure (see Ambar 1996, 1998) for discussion. What is most important for the purposes of this work is that, by having some effect connected with tense, inflected infinitives are proved to contain T.

⁷ For an analysis of differences between Portuguese/English vs. French/Italian based on the barrierhood status of IP, see Ambar (1986).

4.2. Lexical restrictions on Aux-to-Comp: Single events vs. habitual readings

The second fact defining Aux-to-Comp concerns lexical restrictions on the verb that is raised to Comp, as Ambar (1988-1998) has suggested. Similar facts have been observed in the literature (for instance, for English lexical restrictions are claimed by Enç (1991) to apply in the context of ECM verbs). In addition, Rizzi (1982:112, fn.10) notes that some unclear *threshold* of acceptability is involved in the Aux-to-Comp rule, which seems to give better results with some specific verbs than with others.

Recalling what we have observed for Portuguese, the facts seem to reduce to the following generalisation: if the inflected infinitival verbal form of lexical eventive verbs, such as *comer* ‘to eat’ or *comprar* ‘to buy’, replaces the verbal sequence formed by the auxiliary *terem* (bearing the inflected infinitive morphology) plus the past participle, the result is an odd sentence, as illustrated in (53):

- (53) a. * Penso comerem os miúdos este bolo
(I) think eat-inf-3pl the kids this cake
b.* Afirmo comprarem eles o livro
(I) assert to buy-inf-3pl they the book

The acceptability of (53) is improved if a generic or habitual reading is at stake due to the action of the definiteness of the object or to the presence of adverbs conferring that reading to the structure, as in (54)⁸:

- (54) a. Penso comerem as crianças demasiados chocolates
(I) think eat-inf-3pl the kids too many chocolates
b. Afirmo comprarem eles livros habitualmente
(I) declare buy-inf-3pl they books habitually
c. Penso comprarem eles o jornal todas as sextas-feiras
(I) think buy-inf-3pl they the newspaper every Fridays

Some similar factors seem to be behind the anomaly that most authors single out when infinitives with explicit subject occupy an object position in Spanish (Hernanz 1999, Piera 1987, Torrego 1998). Hence, if factives are merged with an argument clause including a generic DP or a specific adverb, the result goes up in the threshold of grammaticality:

- (55) a. *Lamento el comer los niños este pastel.
(I) regret the eat-inf-Ø the kids this cake
b. Lamento el haber comido los niños demasiadas chocolatinas.
(I) regret the eat-inf-Ø the kids too many chocolates
c. Lamento el haber comprado María este periódico cada domingo.
(I) regret the have-inf-Ø bought Maria this paper every Sunday

The past effect certainly is behind the syntax and semantics of inflected infinitives in Spanish, as shown by Pérez Vázquez (2007), who claims that the embedded event must take place before the matrix event by proposing the feature [- prospective].

⁸ Note that in (52c) the definite article in the DP *o jornal* (the newspaper) does not yield a single event reading, rather it denotes an iterative (habitual) reading (but see the works cited for details).

4.3. *Stativity and infinitives*

Another strategy that improves the acceptability of the sentences is the use of embedded *stative* verbs in Portuguese:

- (56) a. Penso estarem eles em condições de apurar a verdade
(I) think be-inf-3pl they in conditions to discover the truth
b. Afirmando serem eles capazes de resolver o problema
(I) declare be-inf-3pl they able to solve the problem
c. Penso ter este governo obrigação de melhorar a vida dos cidadãos
(I) think have-inf-3sg this government obligation to improve the life of citizens

Again, in Spanish the acceptability of inflected infinitives in complement clauses is higher if the infinitive is a stative verb, as shown in (56), which are fully acceptable:

- (57) a. Recuerdo haber sido tú la persona que propuso eso.
(I) remember have-inf-Ø you the person who proposed that
b. Recuerdo el haber estado tú en mejores condiciones.
(I) remember the have-inf-Ø you in better conditions

Building on the data in (49) through (57), we draw the following generalization: the infinitival complements to epistemic verbs require either: (i) an *auxiliary plus past participle* allowing a single event reading, with a *past effect* (as in (51)-(52) above), or (ii) a lexical predicate whose *eventive* value has somehow shifted into a *generic or habitual reading*, through the impact of definiteness and/or adverbial forms, the single event reading being ruled out, as in (53)-(54), or (iii) a *stative predicate* as illustrated in (56)-(57).

The three phenomena briefly described above – the *past tense effect* in infinitives, *generic/habitual requirement* and the *stative* restriction – have motivated Ambar's proposal concerning the presence of a Tense Object Phrase in the clause structure (Ambar 1996, 1998). In this projection, the definite character of the object and properties of Aktionsart of the verbs are combined with valuations of tense in the tense projections. In those works *Aspect* is seen as an epiphenomenon, resulting from one or another type of valuation. Here these three properties are taken to justify the existence of T in inflected infinitives. The role of T in infinitives will be briefly discussed in Section 6, but see Ambar (1996 et subseq.) for a full treatment of this issue.

5. PRO, Binding, Case and selection

The complexity of infinitival structures is instantiated in the need of some special mechanisms and stipulations that have been involved in the account of their distribution all along the development of generative grammar. Two examples are *PRO* and *categorial* selection.

In the Principles and Parameters theory of the GB system, the study of infinitives has involved the understanding of the distribution of *PRO*, and hence of the conditions under which government and binding worked. Since *PRO* is simultaneously an anaphor and a pronominal, it had to escape the scope of principles A and B of Binding theory.

Therefore, it could not be governed. The optimal context for non-government was an infinitival context, where absence of inflection ensured absence of government.

Another factor that was crucial in the eighties for the analysis of these constructions concerned the *categorial status* of infinitival complements. For example, the opposition between Control and Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) constructions was seen as one effect of the clausal boundary of the complement clause selected by the relevant verb. This covered the complementary distribution of PRO and NP-trace in subject position. For Control verbs it was generally assumed that CP was the option as the clausal boundary of the infinitive, for ECM verbs IP was taken to be the maximal projection. In Chomsky's (1981) framework, the problem raised by the CP vs. IP choice was solved by postulating the deletion of S' (CP) in some environments – the raising contexts – to allow subject raising and licensing of its trace.

The main aspects of the syntax of infinitives that have received crucial attention have been Control, Exceptional Case Marking, Raising infinitives, expletive *there* structures, and less systematically punctual distinctions between relevant oppositions imposed by different classes of verbs e.g. *wager*-verbs, *try*-verbs, *want*-verbs (Pesetsky 1992). Let us recall some of those important observations.

The contrast between ECM and Control verbs is illustrated in (58) vs. (59) below for English:

- (58) a. Peter believed [_{IP} him to be innocent]
b.* Peter believed [_{IP} PRO to be innocent]

- (59) a.* John tried [_{CP} [_{IP} him to win]]
b. John tried [_{CP} [_{IP} PRO to win]]

In (58), the ECM verb *believe* selects IP, and then it can assign accusative Case to *him*, predicting the grammaticality of (58a), given that only one boundary intervenes. At the same time PRO is forbidden because it would be governed by the matrix verb, violating the PRO theorem and predicting the ungrammaticality of (58b). Conversely, if the Control verb *try* selects IP in (59), the contrast between (58) and (59) could not be accounted for. Thus, in order to exclude (59a) we had to ensure that *try* could not assign accusative Case to *him*. In this view, the solution was then to consider that *try* selects CP, rather than IP. Therefore, the complementary distribution between *him* and PRO would again be successfully predicted.

The IP vs. CP distinction kept on making the right predictions after the introduction of Object Agreement Phrase (AgrOP) in the sentence structure (Chomsky 1995, extending Kayne's 1989 proposal): IP would allow movement of the subject of the infinitive to the matrix spec,AgrOP in order to have accusative Case checked (either at LF or before the spell-out); CP would be a barrier for that movement.

These two mechanisms – PRO and the *categorial status* of infinitival complements – have naturally been subject to different modifications in order to reduce their stipulating status.

Consider first c-selection. As claimed by Grimshaw (1979), categorial selection seems to be independent from semantic selection. Therefore, they are expected to be independently required. Grimshaw argues that lexical entries must encode information concerning both semantic (s-selection) and categorial or syntactic properties (c-selection). A standard example is provided by the following pairs:

- (60) a. John wondered what the time was.
b. * John wondered the time.

- (61) a. John asked what the time was.
b. John asked the time.

Although s-selection is the same in (60) and (61) -- an interrogative complement which carries the feature (+Q)--, c-selection is not, explaining why *wonder* cannot take an NP whereas *ask* can.

Pesetsky (1992), on the contrary, argues that it is not necessary to resort to c-selection to account for contrasts such as those in (60)-(61) above. The opposition between (60b) and (61b) can be explained if we assume that the verb in the latter, though not in the former, is somehow marked as [+accusative]. As such, it can assign accusative Case to its complement. Therefore, c-selection should be abandoned, since the ungrammaticality in (60b) is independently ruled out by the Case filter.

In addition, Pesetsky (1992) claims that all sentential complements are CPs, including Control and ECM structures, and plausibly all clauses, but he does not justify this claim.

Ambar (1988) has also argued that all sentential complements, probably all clauses, are CPs, and suggests that the justification of that claim should be traced back to ideas put forth by den Besten (1977) and Chomsky and Lasnik (1977), according to which C is the locus of Tense specifications. Ambar has developed a system where the so called finite vs. non-finite structures were seen as the result of valuation of tense in different related positions. In her system, a crucial role was played by a Tense feature in C. Thus, as mentioned earlier, the dichotomy *finite* vs. *non-finite* was seen as a continuum from *plus* to *minus* tense, rather than as an opposition between tensed vs. tenseless structures. More precisely, in Ambar's terms, all clauses have Tense, therefore they are always CPs.

The differences across clause types is derived from the interaction of two crucial related aspects. First, the type of sentence depended on the \pm strong status of Tense in the functional Tense Projection (IP) (where overt vs. non-overt played a role). On the other hand, the different clause types could be obtained from the point in the structure where Tense was licensed. For example, *indicative structures* resulted from a strong tense in the Tense projection (the morphological tense), locally valued by a tense feature in its C domain, whereas *subjunctive clauses* were structures whose Tense was not valued by a *tense feature* in its C domain, i.e. licensing of tense was not local. The technicalities of Ambar's system and empirical data concerning the distribution of infinitives and the dichotomy *indicative* vs. *subjunctive* are offered in Section 6 below.

A contrary view is argued for by Bošković (1997). The author agrees with Pesetsky (1992) regarding the elimination of c-selection, but disagrees with respect to the CP

status of clausal complements. Bošković's main goal is to explore the role and effects of the economy principles of the Minimalist Program, such as the Last Resort Condition, on representations. To pursue this objective, the author assumes that prohibiting superfluous symbols from representations, a more economic system is obtained and concludes that all clausal complements are IPs, Control and ECM included.

Bošković argues against what he calls stipulations in Pesetsky's CP unification and singles out "[...] the stipulation that the null complementizer heading the infinitival complement of *believe* is specified as [+ affix] whereas the complementizer heading the infinitival complement of *try* is specified as [-affix]" (op. cit: 40), a stipulation which, according to the author, is reminiscent of Chomsky's (1986b) CP/IP distinction between different types of infinitival complements.⁹ Another type of criticism concerns the concept of government involved in Pesetsky's analysis, which in Bošković's perspective is inconsistent with the minimalist framework.

The author then tries to account for the distribution of infinitival complements by resorting to other type of assumptions. For concreteness, in his analysis a *Case-theoretic* account of the distribution of PRO, inspired in Chomsky and Lasnik's (1993) proposal, is superior to the *Binding-theoretic* approach. In Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) proposal, PRO is always Case-marked¹⁰, but with a null Case restricted to PRO.

Let us extract three main related issues from the discussion above in order to draw clear and solid conclusions: (i) Case, Binding and PRO, (ii) the categorial status of infinitival complements and economy principles and (iii) Tense.

As will become clearer in what follows, our view is that, contrary to Bošković's claim, both the Binding-theoretic account and the Case theoretic account of PRO are stipulations as far as they are specific mechanisms to rule the distribution of one specific category, PRO. However, in Chomsky's (1981) Government and Binding Theory, the Binding approach to PRO followed from the system as a theorem, without needing any further stipulation. On the other hand, from Case theory no such theorem followed: the Case filter stated that phonetically realized NPs should have Case. Thus, because PRO was null, it was not under the scope of that requirement.

As for the categorial status of infinitival structures, or sentential complements in general, it is not clear for us that the elimination of a node such as CP leads to the desired result: a more *economic* derivation. In the absence of an algorithm to measure 'economy', the costs of such a claim would have to be evaluated by comparing the type and number of stipulations stated, the type and number of covered phenomena and the interaction between them, the type and number of predictions on similar and on different phenomena across languages, and so on.

⁹ Note that in Pesetsky's system, the subject in the infinitival structure is governed through syntactic incorporation of the affix, seen as C-affixation.

¹⁰ Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) note that, as illustrated by the pair in (i), PRO must undergo NP-movement from non-Case positions, though not from Case positions:

- (i) a. John tried PRO_i to be arrested t_i
b. * John tried PRO_i to seem to t_i that the problem is unsolvable

The authors then assume that PRO, like other NPs must be Case-marked. However, PRO is marked with a *null* case, restricted to PRO and checked through spec-head agreement with a non-finite Inflection.

Therefore we go directly to the third issue – namely Tense –, in order to show its puzzling effects, resulting from its need to be valued, in sentence structure in general, and in infinitives in particular. In this way, the phenomena discussed in Sections 2 and 3, described by Raposo (1973, 1987) for Portuguese and by Rizzi (1978, 1982) for Italian (alongside their Spanish equivalent), are of vital importance. Actually, inflected infinitives, exhibiting overt morphology, or Rizzi’s overt Italian Aux-to-Comp and restructuring phenomena, have been decisive in the construction of a system based on a crucial requirement: the licensing of different instances of Tense in a given Tense domain.

We will then keep on defending our first intuition on the CP status of clausal complements, or clauses in general, which is nothing but the well-known assumption that C is the locus of tense, an idea we trace back to den Besten (1977). We try to show that this *Tense Approach to infinitives* (and clause structure) is superior because, having no recourse to stipulations for one specific category or structure, it still covers a wider empirical domain. We then try to derive the intermediate proposals according to which clauses may be either CP or IP (Ormazabal 1995, Barbosa 2000) depending on properties of each structure.

6. The Tense approach: T in C vs. no T in C¹¹

Let us come back to Rizzi’s (1982) Italian Aux-to-Comp infinitival complements and to Raposo’s (1987) account of the distribution of inflected infinitives in Portuguese. As we saw in Sections 2 and 3, in both analyses Case is involved. Moreover, in both analyses the Infl raising to Comp – Aux-to-Comp and Agr-to-Comp in Rizzi’s and Raposo’s proposals respectively – is a strategy to assign Case to the embedded subject. Building on an idea put forth by Chomsky (1981), according to which untensed clauses, in contrast with tensed clauses, are base generated without the Comp position, Rizzi makes a clear distinction between control verbs (*preferire* ‘prefer’) and epistemic verbs (*ritenere* ‘consider’) as taking *Comp-less* and *empty-Comp* infinitival complements respectively. Only the latter would have an available landing site for the Aux-to-Comp rule. Thus, underlying Rizzi’s proposal is the hypothesis that Control structures do not have tense, but epistemic structures do have. The same partition is assumed by Raposo, as we have seen in Section 2: epistemic verbs have a Tense operator, control verbs do not.

However, the suggestion that clausal complements of epistemic and declarative verbs do have Tense is restricted in these analyses to the assumption of a CP node in these constructions. From the presence of that node the authors derive the word order effects observed, namely subject auxiliary inversion. The idea that Case is not plausibly the main reason for the distribution of inflected infinitive was suggested by Rouveret (1980), whose analysis of inflected infinitives is based on a puzzling combination of features [\pm N], [\pm V], [\pm topic].

Putting together Rouveret’s observation and Rizzi’s and Raposo’s suggestions about Tense, we would expect Tense (rather than Case) to play a stronger role in the treatment of the issues we have been discussing so far – e.g. why doesn’t a [+tense] C give a

¹¹ What we present in this section is traced back to Ambar (1988), and it is fully developed in Ambar (1992, 1994 1996, 1998).

[+tense] status to its complement, therefore to the head of this complement – I (Agr) – endowing it with the necessary capacity for licensing Case in the subject? On the other hand, extending the analysis to other phenomena involved in these structures, namely to the restrictions on the readings available for *eventive verbs* (generic, habitual) and the *past tense effect*, described in Section 4, we conclude that a Case approach is insufficient for a unifying account of the facts.

As already mentioned, the distribution of infinitives in general, inflected and non-inflected, obeys general principles ruling the different behaviour of Tense, and its relation with selection, in both finite and non-finite structures. Accordingly, the valuation of Tense, rather than Case, may account for the puzzling distribution of inflected infinitives. The different behaviours of sentential complements of the different classes of verbs that we have observed are derived from the interaction of different factors: (i) the existence (*vs.* non-existence) of a tense feature in C, lexically selected, (ii) the relation of this feature with the licensing of the tense features in two Tense projections – the Tense Subject Projection and the Tense Object Projection (henceforth TsP and ToP respectively (Ambar 1996, 1998)) –, and (iii) the definite feature of the object and the Aktionsart properties of the verb, codified in ToP.

The crucial ideas in Ambar’s works can be summarized as follows:

(62) Tense licensing

- (i) Tense, more precisely all instances of Tense in a tense domain – CP – has to be licensed (valued).
- (ii) Tense is licensed (valued) either by a Tense feature in C (in its local domain) or by another Tense located outside its C domain (thereby defining an extended tense domain).
- (iii) The presence of [+T] in C triggers indicative and inflected infinitive; its absence triggers subjunctive and uninflected infinitive.
- (iv) There are two Tense Projections in the sentence structure – TsP and ToP; both can be active, or one active and the other inert, but always in need of licensing (valuation); TsP is related to the subject, e.g. Nominative Case, Control, subject-verb agreement; ToP with the object, e.g. Accusative Case, the relation between intrinsic properties of verbs (Aktionsart) and definiteness of the object, object-verb agreement; tense features in ToP must be compatible and licensed by features in TsP, and vice-versa.
- (v) The dichotomy non-finite *vs.* finite is seen as a continuum from *minus to plus* tense.

Let us review some empirical evidence presented in Ambar’s works for sentential complements of different classes of verbs, and see whether her analysis can account for the syntax and interpretation of inflected infinitives in Portuguese and Spanish.

The tense feature in C is selected by some classes of predicates but not by others. Evidence for that claim comes from the different behaviour of sentential complements of volitional, epistemic, declarative and factive verbs. In the next section we present evidence for the presence of the tense feature in C.

6.1. T in C and Selection

In complements of volitive verbs the embedded tense is conditioned by the tense in the matrix clause. As we saw above, Raposo (1987) –alongside Meireles and Raposo (1983), Rizzi (1982), Jakubowicz (1985), among others-- have argued for that claim on the basis of the contrasts illustrated in (35-36) for Portuguese and (37-38) for Spanish. We repeat them below for convenience:

- (63) Penso que eles votam / votaram / votarão / votavam / tinham votado a proposta
(I) think that they vote / voted / will vote / voted-imperf / had voted the proposal
- (64) Quero que eles votem / tenham votado / * votassem / * votarem a proposta
(I) want that they vote-subj-pres / have-subj-pres voted / voted-subj-imperf / vote-subj-fut the proposal
- (65) Creo que ellos votan / votaron / votarán / votaban/ habían votado la propuesta.
(I) think that they vote / voted / will vote / voted-imperf / had voted the proposal
- (66) Quiero que ellos voten / hayan votado / * votaran / * votasen a proposta
(I) want that they vote-subj-pres / have-subj-pres voted / voted-subj-imperf / vote-subj-imperf the proposal

The morphological tenses in the embedded and matrix clauses have to match in volitive, or obligatory Control contexts, as shown in (64) and (66): present tense in the main verb triggers present tense in the embedded verb. This is not the case for complements of epistemic verbs as illustrated by (63) and (65). Here the matrix tense may be different from the embedded one.¹²

Ambar has claimed that other behaviours tear apart epistemic, declarative and factive from volitive verbs, indicating that the former, though not the latter, select tensed domains. In her analysis this was codified in the structure through the presence of a tense feature in the first contexts as opposed to its absence in the latter. In other words, if there is [+T] in C, the embedded clause is independent from the matrix one, as far as tense is concerned. Contrariwise, if there is no Tense feature in C, i.e. if C is [-T], the embedded clause is dependent on the matrix one. Among the tests discussed in Ambar (1992, 1998) as evidence for positing this [\pm T] in C are the distributional properties of inflected infinitives and factivity.

The distribution of inflected infinitives reflects the opposition between volitive *vs.* epistemic, declarative and factive verbs described so far. Since the former are not tense selectors, they do not allow the inflected infinitive as their complement (cf. (66a)). In contrast, given that the latter are tense selectors they do allow the infinitive (cf. (66b-c)):

- (66) a. * Quero teres comprado este livro
(I) want have-inf-2sg bought this book
b. Penso teres comprado este livro
(I) think have-inf-2sg bought this book

¹² Recall that this does not cover all the facts involved in the combination of tenses. Other factors seem to be involved. Ambar (1992-1998) call them *semantic and pragmatic factors*. Pesetsky & Torrego (2004) call them *encyclopaedic information*.

- c. Lamento teres comprado este livro
(I) regret have-inf-2sg bought this book

As far as factivity is concerned, two crucial properties have been observed in the literature, since at least Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970), for complements of factive verbs, namely their nominal status and their truth value. Here we focus on the former. In our view, the occurrence of an idiosyncratic DP – *o facto* (*the fact*) – in such complements encodes those two properties and therefore constitutes a test to distinguish the factive class from other verbal classes. Thus, volitional verbs pattern with epistemic, isolating the special behaviour of factive predicates, illustrated in (67) for Portuguese and (68) for Spanish:

- (67) a. *Quero o facto de ter(es) saído nesse dia
(I) want the fact of have-inf-2sg(Ø) left that day
b. *Penso o facto de ter(es) saído nesse dia
(I) think the fact of have-inf-2sg(Ø) left that day
c. Lamento o facto de ter(es) saído nesse dia.
(I) regret the fact of have-inf-2sg(Ø) left that day
(68) a. *Quiero el hecho de haberte tenido que ir tú ese día.
(I) want the fact of have-inf-Ø had to go you that day
b. *Pienso el hecho de haberte tenido que ir tú ese día.
(I) think the fact of have-inf-Ø had to go you that day
c. Lamento el hecho de haberte tenido que ir tú ese día.
(I) regret the fact of have-inf-Ø had to go you that day

Following Ambar (1988, 1992), complements of factive verbs are DPs, whose D selects CP. Moreover, the empirical evidence provided by examples such as the one in (63)-(68), we are led to suggest that factive verbs are [+T] selectors, but that the locus of Tense is D, not C:

- (69) ...V_{factive} [DP D+T [CP [IP T]]]

Direct evidence for (69) comes from the realization of the Determiner, which can only be the *definite* article – *o/el* (*the*). The indefinite *um/un* (*a*), for example, is excluded. Further support is given by the inherent semantic properties of the noun *facto/hecho* (*fact*), which encodes perfectivity, and hence *tense* in our view (for a similar perspective, with evidence drawn from semantics, see Peres 1993).

By assuming that D in (69) has both nominal and tense features, one plausible way to explain why structures exemplified in (63-68) cut across the regular pattern exhibited by epistemic, declarative and factive verbs vs. volitive verbs (concerning clitic climbing, and selection of inflected infinitives, among others) could be built as follows.

Propositional DPs may occur just with factives, because only factives select for a *D + tense*, thereby satisfying both the nominal and tense properties of those nominals. We suggest that the ban on this type of nominals as complements of epistemic verbs is due to lack of nominal features checking. This explains why volitive verbs allow clitic climbing, whereas epistemic and declarative or factive verbs do not. The relevant examples are provided for Portuguese in (70):

- (70) a. Quero-os comprar
 (I) want-themAcc buy-inf-Ø
 b. * Penso-os comprar
 (I) think-themAcc buy-inf-Ø
 c. * Lamento-os comprar
 (I) regret-themAcc buy-inf-Ø

In our view, absence of clitic climbing is attributed to C being filled by the [+Tense] feature; in other words, [+Tense] domains disallow clitic climbing.

Furthermore, as Ambar has also claimed, the choice between *Indicative* and *Subjunctive* is easily derived in our system. Indicative is the option available whenever there is [+T] in C, i.e. whenever the morphological tense (in the Tense projection) of the embedded domain is valued in its local domain (i.e. in the embedded C domain). This is why the embedded tense is independent from the matrix one as illustrated by (63) and (65); otherwise Subjunctive is chosen, with the consequence that the embedded tense is dependent on the matrix one, as illustrated by (64) and (66).

Notice that in the structure proposed in (69), the case of factive verbs, there is no tense feature in C; the locus of [+T] selected by the main verb is D, not C. Therefore, despite being [+Tense] selectors, factive verbs pattern with volitives, not with epistemic verbs, with respect to the choice between indicative vs. subjunctive. In both contexts there is no [+T] in C, even if factives are [+T] selectors and volitives are not. Conversely, in CP complements of epistemic verbs, the indicative will show up, given the presence of [+T] in their C. This is illustrated in (71) below for Portuguese:

- (71) a. O Pedro quer que o João vá/*vai ao cinema.
 Peter wants that John go-subj/go-ind to the cinema
 b. O Pedro afirma que o João vai/*vá ao cinema.
 Peter states that John go-ind/go-subj to the cinema
 c. O Pedro lamenta que o João vá/*vai ao cinema.
 Peter regrets that John go-subj/go-ind to the cinema

In two of these three classes of verbs – volitives and factives –, the choice is obligatory, i.e. complements of these classes can never surface with Indicative. However, with epistemic and declarative verbs, i.e. in the indicative cases, the obligatory status of the choice is weakened. In fact, having recourse to extra strategies, epistemic and declarative verbs may surface with Subjunctive. It seems then that Subjunctive cannot shift into Indicative, but Indicative can shift into Subjunctive. The paradigms that follow in (72-76) illustrate the relevant cases for the change of indicative into subjunctive:

- (72) a. O Pedro pensa que o João vai ao cinema.
 Peter thinks that John go-ind to the cinema
 b.?? O Pedro pensa que o João vá ao cinema.
 Peter thinks that John go-subj to the cinema
 c. O Pedro pensa que o João possa ir ao cinema.
 Peter thinks that John may-subj go-inf-Ø to the cinema

This behaviour is associated with some vague threshold of acceptability. With epistemic verbs like *pensar* or *creer* ‘think’, the results are fine, but with declarative verbs such as *afirmar* ‘state’, the acceptability may be weakened (73a) if an overt modal is not inserted (73b):

- (73) a. * O Pedro afirma que o João vá ao cinema
 Peter states that John go-subj to the cinema
 b. O Pedro afirmou que o João possa vir a decidir ir ao cinema
 Peter states that John may-subj come-inf-Ø to decide-inf-Ø go-inf-Ø to the cinema

On the other hand, declarative verbs obligatorily require the indicative into subjunctive shifting for demand or command readings, as in (74), and for negation with scope over the embedded verb (or/and Tense), as illustrated by (75):

- (74) a. O Pedro disse que o João fechasse a porta
 Peter said that John close-subj-imperf the door
 (75) a. O Pedro não pensa que o João vá ao cinema
 Peter not thinks that John go-subj to the cinema
 b. Ninguém pensava que o João fosse ao cinema
 Nobody thought that John go-subj-imperf to the cinema

Similar data are provided by Spanish. For example, the use of negation in the matrix verb automatically requires subjunctive in the complement clause:

- (76) a. Pedro no cree que Juan vaya al cine.
 Peter not thinks that John go-subj to the cinema
 b. Nadie creía que Juan fuera al cine.
 Nobody thought that John go-subj-imperf to the cinema

Ambar has suggested that in (72)-(75) the +Tense feature in C is bound (and deleted, updating the proposal in minimalist terms) by either a modal operator or negation operator, the consequence being that C would remain empty, giving rise to Subjunctive in Portuguese. We extend this analysis to Spanish, which parallels the Portuguese selection for Subjunctive, as shown in (76). See Harrington & Pérez-Leroux (2016) for a multifactorial explanation of the subjunctive shift in negative contexts.

Finally, Ambar has argued that further empirical evidence for the claim that volitive verbs select [-T], epistemic and factive verbs [+T] complements could be drawn from the distribution of Subjects with respect to their [\pm controlled] status, a controversial issue which has been taken up by Hernanz (1982), Rigau (1995), Torrego (1998) and Pérez Vázquez (2007) for Spanish Personal Infinitive.

As observed by Raposo (1985) and Meireles and Raposo (1983) for Portuguese, in finite complements of volitive verbs the embedded subject cannot be correferential with the matrix subject. On the contrary, in complements of epistemic and factive verbs coreference is possible:

- (77) a. * O Pedro_i quer que [-_i] tenha comprado o livro.

- Peter_i wants that [-_i] have-subj bought the book
- b. O Pedro_i pensou que [-_i] tinha comprado o livro.
Peter_i thought that [-_i] have-ind bought the book
- c. O Pedro_i lamenta que [-_i] tenha dito isso.
Peter_i regrets that [-_i] have-subj said that

This is again paralleled in Spanish:

- (78) a. * Pedro_i quiere que [-_i] haya comprado el libro.
Peter_i wants that [-_i] have-subj bought the book
- b. Pedro_i creyó que [-_i] había comprado el libro.
Peter_i thought that [-_i] have-ind bought the book
- c. Pedro_i lamenta que [-_i] haya dicho eso.
Peter_i regrets that [-_i] have-subj said that

The explanation that we can provide for this contrast is as follows. Verbs selecting [-T] complements, such as volitives, lead to the so-called obviation phenomenon (Ruwet 1987, Kampers-Mahne 1992, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, a.o.); epistemic and factives do not.

But this is not the end of the story. In Section 4.1 we discussed different subtle contrasts which raise when the auxiliary *have* + *past participle* is replaced by a simple verbal form, where *eventive* verbs are used in infinitival complements of epistemic verbs. These contrasts also show up in complements of factives:

- (79) a. * O Pedro_i quer que [-_i] compre o livro.
Peter_i wants that [-_i] buy-subj the book
- b. O Pedro_i pensa que [-_i] compra o livro.
Peter_i thinks that [-_i] buy the book
- c. *? O Pedro_i lamenta que [-_i] diga isso.
Peter_i regrets that [-_i] say-subj that

Borer (1986) proposed that Control Theory could be subsumed under the Binding system, applying to the functional category Agr. Agr of infinitival Control structures would behave as an anaphor, being governed by the matrix predicate and finding its antecedent in the matrix Agr.

Combining Borer's proposal with Ambar's theory of Tense described so far, the contrasts in (79) are derived in the following way: assuming that Tense and Agr in the functional projections have to be licensed (valued), we consider that the obligatory disjoint reference of the matrix and embedded subjects in (79a) is due to absence of T in C. Since C carries the feature [-T], it is unable to value (govern) Tense in IP. The embedded domain is extended to the higher domain, where the matrix Tense is able to license the embedded Tense through a head-head relation, in the spirit of Chomsky (1986).

But also Agr would be in need of licensing. The closer candidate to govern it is Tense, which in turn is coindexed with the matrix Tense due to its own licensing, as we have seen. The result is then that the embedded Agr could not have the higher Agr as antecedent. Given that Agr is pronominal (evidence provided by the overt morphology),

it would be bound in its governing category (its binding domain) – the matrix clause –, violating principle B of Binding Theory, and predicting the ungrammaticality of (79a).

Examples in (79b-c) are derived similarly. The difference lies in the presence of [+T] in the embedded C. Since it is locally licensed by [+T] in C, its Binding domain ends up being the embedded CP, with the consequence that the embedded morphological Tense would not be coindexed with the higher Tense. The independence of the embedded and matrix Tenses follows, as well as the possibility for the embedded Agr (and hence for the embedded subject due to their spec-head agreement relation) to be coreferential with the matrix Agr. Because Agr is pronominal, it will not be bound in its Binding (governing) domain. Therefore, no violation of principle B shows up. Furthermore, it is correctly predicted that (82b-c) are not instances of obligatory Control – the embedded Agr might be coindexed with the higher Agr, but does not have to be.

Things become more intriguing when the phenomena of Control in the finite sentences above are related with their equivalents in infinitives. Starting with inflected infinitival control structures, consider (80), the equivalent infinitives of (79) above:

- (80) a. * Os meninos_i querem [-_i] terem comprado o livro
the boys_i want [-_i] have-inf-3pl bought the book
b. Os meninos_i pensam [-_i] terem comprado o livro
the boys_i think [-_i] have-inf-3pl bought the book
c. Os meninos_i lamentam [-_i] terem comprado o livro
the boys_i regret [-_i] have-inf-3pl bought the book

As we saw in (68iii) above, inflected infinitives are ruled out from volitional complements due to the absence of Tense in C – note that (80a) would be ungrammatical also with disjoint subjects.

For infinitives in general, and inflected infinitives in particular, the mechanism presented above for excluding the embedded subject to be controlled by the matrix subject in volitional contexts is combined with a condition on Tense and Agr licensing: Tense and Agr of (inflected) infinitives, being empty, should be governed in addition to being valued by another tense (the +T feature) in C or in the higher Tense domain.¹³ Consider some of the consequences of this assumption.

If, to the mechanism used in deriving the finite equivalent of (80a) – namely (79a) – we add the stipulation of government requirement for empty heads, the Tense of the infinitive will have to raise to C to be governed by the matrix verb, ending up coindexed with the main tense for valuation. Assuming that Agr and Tense in a head receive the same index (due to licensing of Agr by Tense), then the embedded Agr will be coindexed with the matrix one. Since Agr in inflected infinitives is pronominal, it will then be bound in its governing domain (the matrix clause), always violating principle B (either in control or non-control structures complements of volitives).

The acceptability of (80b-c) is derived by assuming that *ter* governs Tense in the functional projection, which does not then need to be governed by the matrix verb. The presence of [+T] in C, for epistemics as in (80b), or in D, for factives as in (80c), ends the process of tense licensing, valuing it as usual through a head-head relation, limited

¹³ In Ambar (1998) it was assumed that the highest Tense, in the matrix domain, was valued by a default Tense feature in C.

to the embedded domain. Thus the pronominal Agr will be free in its binding domain, though optional coindexation with the matrix Agr is still possible.

Moreover, it is predicted that in epistemic and factive contexts Control is *non-obligatory* – note that in (80) the embedded subject may be coreferent or disjoint from the matrix one –, as opposed to volitive contexts, where Control is *obligatory*.¹⁴ In the latter both Tense and Agr in the infinitive are empty. Thus they need to be governed by a lexical head and valued by another Tense. This governor and this Tense are found in the matrix domain. Therefore only an anaphoric Agr (empty) will be the appropriate choice: being anaphoric it will be obligatorily coindexed with the main Agr, predicting the grammaticality of (81a) as opposed to the ungrammaticality of (81b):

- (81) a. Os meninos querem sair
 the boys want leave-inf- \emptyset
 b. * Os meninos querem saírem
 the boys want leave-inf-3pl

The proposed analysis can easily be extended to Spanish infinitives with explicit subject. T in infinitives needs valuation. If we assume with Rigau (1995) and Torrego (1998) that there is a D mediating between C and T, we predict the disjoint reference in inflected infinitives as complements, adjuncts and sentential subjects:

- (82) a. Recordaré siempre el haber dado Chomsky su primera charla en mi universidad.
 (I) will always remember the have-inf- \emptyset given Chomsky his first talk at my university
 b. Juan se atragantó al tomar la palabra. (Rigau 1995: 290)
 John choked to.the take-inf- \emptyset the word
 c. Abandonar todo el mundo la sala al mismo tiempo fue una insensatez. (Hernanz 1982)
 Leave-inf- \emptyset everybody the room at the same time was a stupid mistake

The reason why in all subordinate clauses in (82) the temporal interpretation is independent from the main clause is crucially connected with the existence of T in the subordinate C, which values the Tns in T.

Two relevant points are in order. First, in the three constructions the explicit definite D is either an option, as in (82c), or obligatory, as in (82a-b). Second, the examples instantiate the occurrence of lexical DP subjects and their nominative case. For the first aspect, we hold that the possible insertion of the definite article is accounted for in our analysis by projecting D between C and T. This D can be lexically realized or null.

As for the second aspect, the nominative case of the infinitive subject is explained by the combination of nominal features in Agr and the [+ T] feature under T, similar to indicative clauses. In other words, T is strong enough to license nominative in personal infinitives. Rigau (1995) claims that T is weak and it receives interpretation only from a temporal operator. It licenses nominative because it has weak T, but strong Agr. Agr is morphologically unspecified, but syntactically present. This combination will be in charge of assigning nominative case.

¹⁴ For this distinction, see a.o. Landau (2000)

As a final remark, there is another possibility for subjects in inflected infinitives, namely they can be null subjects. There has been a certain controversy as to the status of this null subject. For Spanish, some authors such as Rigau (1995) have argued that the null subject in these infinitives is *pro*, whereas for other linguists such as Torrego (1998) this will be PRO. For Portuguese, Pires (2001) claims that *pro* will be the subject in inflected infinitives and PRO in uninflected infinitives (see also Sitaridou 2009).

Following Rigau (1995), Torrego (1998) claims that the subject of infinitival clauses in Spanish is little *pro*, (though it can also be big PRO), on the basis that pronominal verbs can be used in infinitives and obligatorily agree with PRO in person and number, but not with *pro*:

- (83) Yo me propuse PRO dormirme/*dormirte.
I intended PRO to asleep-myself/*yourself
- (84) Al desmayarte empezaron a chillar.
To.the faint-inf-Ø-yourself pro began to shout

PRO is licensed in complement and adjunct clauses. However, in NOC contexts *pro* is the only possibility, which accounts for the difference in (85-86):

- (85) El presidente lamenta [PRO comunicarte que no podrá asistir a la reunión]
The president regrets tell-inf-you that he won't be able to attend the meeting
- (86) El presidente lamenta [el *pro* no haber asistido tú a la reunión].
The president regrets the not have-inf-Ø attended you to the meeting

Further research is needed to explore the consequences of having a lexical subject, a big PRO or little *pro* in infinitives.

To sum up, focusing on sentential complements, the following structures correspond to the three types of verbs that we have considered:

- (87) ...To Vy [CP + T [IP ... Tns ... [ToP To [VP V
- (88) ...To Vx [CP [IP ... Tns ... [ToP To [VP V
- (89) ...To Vz [DP D +T [CP [IP ... Tns ... [ToBP To [VP V

y -> epistemic / declarative
x -> volitive
z -> factive

7. Conclusions

We have shown that the different behaviours concerning complementation both in finites and in infinitives can be derived from the presence of a T feature in C. We have discussed different classes of verbs (epistemic/declarative, volitive and factive) which select an inflected or personal infinitive in Portuguese, and extended the discussion to Spanish., in an attempt to provide a unifying analysis. All infinitives have been

claimed to project a CP. The distributional properties of inflected infinitives have been shown to depend on the presence of D in the structure of sentential complements of factive verbs and the presence or absence of T in C in the structure of epistemic and volitive verbs. What all these classes share is the fact that their infinitival complements contain a T category, which is marked as [+ T] or [- T]. Depending on this marking the relevant clause is finite or not.

Inflected infinitival structures are one of the possible combinations of properties selected in the set of Tense features and Agr-features. In this view they are not defective structures, since their T carries the same grammatical features as any other T.

References

- AKMAJIAN, A. (1984), «Sentence Type and Form-Function Fit», *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2, 1-23.
- AMBAR, M. (1986), «Auxiliary Inversion and the Barrierhood of IP», ms., talk presented at *Going Romance 2*, University of Utrecht, Holland.
- AMBAR, M. (1988), *Para uma Sintaxe da Inversão Sujeito Verbo em Português*, Lisbon, Edições Colibri, 1992.
- AMBAR, M. (1992), «Temps et Structure de la Phrase», in H.-G. OBENAUER and A. ZRIBI-HERTZ (eds.), *Structure de la Phrase et Théorie du Liage*, Paris, Sciences du Language, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- AMBAR, M. (1994), «Aux-to-Comp and Lexical Restrictions on Verb Movement», in G. CINQUE, J. KOSTER, J.-Y. POLLOCK, L. RIZZI and R. ZANUTTINI (eds.) *Paths Towards Universal Grammar: Studies in honour of Richard Kayne*, Washington D. C., Georgetown University Press.
- AMBAR, M. (1996), «Participles vs. Infinitives», *Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL96)*, City of Mexico, Mexico, Universidade Autonoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa.
- AMBAR, M. (1998), «Inflected Infinitives Revisited: Genericity and single event», *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 43, 1, 5-36.
- AMBAR, M. (2004), «V-to-C in EP and BP», talk delivered at *Journées d'Etudes sur le Portugais*, Paris, Université de Paris VIII, November 2004.
- AMBAR, M. (2005), «Tense and Sentence Structure II», talk delivered at Universidade de Campinas and at Universidade de S. Paulo – USP, Brasil, January 2005.
- AMRITAVALLI, R. (2014), «Separating tense and finiteness: anchoring in Dravidian», *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 32, 283-306.
- BARBOSA, P. (2000), «Clitics: A window into the null subject property», in J. COSTA (ed.) *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative studies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 31-93.
- den BESTEN, H. (1977), «On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules», *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 20, 1981, 1-78.
- BORER, H. (1986), «Anaphoric AGR», in O. JAEGGLI and K. SAFIR *The Null Subject Parameter*, Dordrecht, Boston, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989, 69-109.
- BOŠKOVIĆ, Z. (1997), *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An economy approach*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- CINQUE, G. (1990), *Types of A' Dependencies*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, N. (1981), *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- CHOMSKY, N. (1986), *Barriers*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

- CHOMSKY, N. (1995), *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, N., & LASNIK, H. (1977), «Filters and Control», *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 425-504.
- CHOMSKY, N. & LASNIK, H. (1993), «The theory of principles and parameters», In J. von Stechow, A. Jacobs, W. Sternefeld & T. Vennemann (eds.) *Syntax: an International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- DE MIGUEL, E. (1996), *El Aspecto en la Sintaxis del Español: Perfectividad e Impersonalidad*, Madrid, Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- DERMIDACHE, H., & URIBE-ETXEBARRIA, M. (2000), «The Syntax of Temporal Relations: A uniform approach to tense and aspect», *WCCFL* 17.
- DOBROVIE-SORIN, C. (1994), *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- DUARTE, I. (1993), «Complementos Infinitivos Preposicionados e outras Construções Temporalmente Defectivas em Português Europeu», *Actas do VIII Encontro da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística*, Lisboa, Colibri, 145-158.
- EMONDS, J. (1976), *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax: Root, structure preserving and local transformations*, New York, Academic Press.
- EMONDS, J. (1978), «The Verbal Complex V'-V in French», *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 151-175.
- ENÇ, M. (1991), «On the Absence of the Present Tenses Morpheme in English», ms., Madison, University of Wisconsin.
- ETXEPARRE, R., & GROHMANN, K. (1998), «Conjunction of NACs and the Null Modal Hypothesis», paper presented at *Workshop on Ellipsis in Conjunction*, Berlin, FAS.
- GRIMSHAW, J. (1979), «Complement Selection and the Lexicon», *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 279-326.
- GROHMANN, K. (1998), «Infinitival Exclamatives», in S. AOSHIMA, J. DRURY and T. NEUVONEN (eds.) *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics*, 213-238.
- HARRINGTON, S. & A.T. PÉREZ-LEROUX (2016), «Subjunctive and subject pronoun realization: a study of "no creo que"», *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, 5 (1), 87-106.
- HERNANZ, M. L. (1982), *El Infinitivo en Español*, Bellaterra, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- HERNANZ, M. L. (1999), «El Infinitivo», in I. BOSQUE and V. DEMONTE (dir.) *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, Vol. II, ch. 36, Madrid, Editorial Espasa Calpe, S. A., 2197-2356.
- HOEKSTRA, T., & HYAMS, N. (1988), «Aspects of Root Infinitives», ms., Los Angeles, Holland Institute of Linguistics/Rijksuniversiteit Leiden and University of California.
- JAKUBOWICZ, C. (1985), «Do Binding Principles Apply to INFL?», *Proceedings of NELS 15*, GLSA, Amherst, University of Massachusetts, 188-206.
- KAMPERS-MAHNE, B. (1992), «The French Subjunctive and the ECP», in R. BOK-BENNEMA and R. van HOUT (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- KAYNE, R. (1989), «Facets on Romance Past Participle Agreement», in P. BENINCÀ (ed.) *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Foris, 85-103.
- KIPARSKY, P., & KIPARSKY, C. (1970), «Fact», in M. BIERWISCH and K. E. HEIDOLPH (eds.) *Progress in Linguistics*, The Hague, Mouton, 141-173.
- LANDAU, I. (2000), *Elements of Control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*, Dordrecht, Boston, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- LANDAU, I. (2004), "The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 22, 811-877.
- MEIRELES, J. & RAPOSO, E. (1983), «Subjunctives and Disjoint Reference in Portuguese: Some implication for the Binding Theory», paper presented at *Colloqui Internacional de Linguística Teòrica I Llengües Romàniques*, Sitges.
- ORMAZABAL, J. (1995), *The Syntax of Complementation: On the connection between syntactic structure and selection*, PhD thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- PERES, J. (1993), «Towards an Integrated View of the Expression of Time in Portuguese», *Cadernos de Semântica* 14, Lisboa, Universidade de Lisboa.
- PAZ, J. (2013), *La distribución e interpretación de los sujetos léxicos de infinitivo en español: un caso problemático para la teoría del caso*. PhD thesis. U. of Arizona.
- PÉREZ VÁZQUEZ, M^a E. (2007), *El infinitivo y su sujeto en español*, Bologna, Gedit.
- PESETSKY, D. (1992), *Zero Syntax*, Vol. II, ms., Cambridge, Mass., MIT.
- PESETSKY, D., & TORREGO, E. (2004), «The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features», ms., Cambridge, Mass., MIT.
- PIERA, C. (1987), «Sobre la estructura de las cláusulas de infinitivo», in V. Demonte and M. Fernández Lagunilla /eds.) *Sintaxis de las Lenguas Románicas*, Madrid, Ediciones el Arquero, 148-166.
- PIRES, A. (2001), «Inflected Infinitives, Subjects and Agreement in Portuguese: Using structural triggers to explain change and variation», paper presented at *GLOW 24, Workshop on Language Change and Variation*, Oporto.
- RAPOSO, E. (1973), *Estudos sobre o Infinitivo em Português*, Lic. Diss., Lisboa, Universidade de Lisboa.
- RAPOSO, E. (1985), «Some Asymmetries in the Binding Theory in Romance», *The Linguistic Review* 5, 75-110.
- RAPOSO, E. (1987), «Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese», *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 85-109.
- RIGAU, G. (1995), «The properties of the temporal infinitive constructions in Spanish and Catalan», *Probus* 7, 279-301.
- RITTER, E. and M. WILTSCHKO. (2005). «Anchoring events to utterances without tense», in John Alderete et al. *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Somerville, Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 343-351.
- RIZZI, L. (1978), «Nominative Marking in Italian Infinitives and the NIC», paper presented at the *II GLOW Conference*, Amsterdam, printed in F. HENY (ed.) *Binding and Filtering*, London, Croom Helm.
- RIZZI, L. (1982), *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- RIZZI, L. (1993), «Some Notes on Linguistic Theory and Language Development: The case of root infinitives», *GenGenP*, Vol. I, n. 2, 15-25.
- ROUVERET, A. (1980), «Sur la Notion de Proposition Finie: Gouvernement et inversion», *Languages* 60, 75-107.
- RUWET, N. (1987), «Je veux partir / *Je veux que je parte», ms., Université de Paris VIII.
- SITARIDOU, I. (2009), «Romance infinitives with subject, subjunctive obviation and control theory», In Luis Eguren & Olga Fernández-Soriano, *Coreference, Modality and Focus. Studies on the syntax-semantics Interface*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- TORREGO, E. (1998), «Nominative Subjects and Pro-drop Infl», *Syntax* 1, 206-219.
- VANDERSCHUEREN, C. (2013), *Infinitivo y sujeto en portugués y español. Un estudio de los infinitivos adverbiales con sujeto explícito*. Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter.

- WEXLER, K. (1994) «Optional Infinitives, Verb Movement and the Economy of Derivation in Child Grammar», in D. LIGHTFOOT and N. HORNSTEIN (eds.) *Verb Movement*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 305-350.
- ZUBIZARRETA, M. L. (1982), «Theoretical Implications of Subject Extraction in Portuguese», *The Linguistic Review* 2, 79-96.