Evidence for 'Finiteness' in Telugu

Madelyn J. Kissock

Abstract Surface morphology is notoriously inconsistent both language-internally and cross-linguistically in providing any kind of reliable reflex of covert syntactic features. This paper addresses the difficult question of how the acquirer is able to deduce the presence/absence of particular (covert) features on functional items, here features of finiteness, given that they cannot rely on morphology. The paper has the following goals. First, it makes a fairly narrow empirical claim, specifically, that Telugu does not have PRO in its lexicon (and therefore does not have Control). Clausal subjects can easily be accounted for by *pro*, needed in Telugu for independent reasons. Second, because PRO/Control is so closely associated with finiteness, the paper explores whether there are other elements in Telugu that correspond to those usually associated with finiteness cross-linguistically. Third, the paper argues that, although traditional aspects of finiteness seem to be lacking, a more coherent notion of finiteness, based upon requirements of temporal and logophoric anchoring, should be adopted.

Keywords Telugu · Finiteness · PRO/Control

1 Introduction

This paper presents data from Telugu (Dravidian family, Andhra Pradesh state, India) that raises a number of questions, first in the narrower domain of Telugu syntax regarding the existence of PRO/Control, but ultimately for our understanding of how

Concordia University, Montréal
E-mail: madelyn.kissock@concordia.ca

an acquirer can deduce the existence of particular (covert) features on Lexical Items (LIs) in the frequent cases where surface morphology is either null or misleading. The covert features of particular concern here are those that govern 'finiteness,' a domain with close connections to PRO/Control.[1] The foundational assumption is that UG makes available an invariant set of syntactic features, to be assigned (to LIs) as warranted by the acquirer based on evidence deduced from the PLD (with the hypothesis space delimited by UG). The essential questions here are: 1) whether there exists a coherent definition for 'finiteness'; 2) whether anything in Telugu fits that definition or, conversely, whether there is some other likely property shared cross-linguistically that might make a better claim to 'finiteness'; and 3) what the Telugu acquirer can use to determine how/when to assign features of 'finiteness.' Since much of the paper is spent looking for reflexes of 'finiteness' and, at the same time, illustrating the inadvisability of relying on surface morphology, I will refer to Telugu verb forms as 'NoAgree' or 'Agree', describing literally the absence or presence of overt p/n/g morphology.[2]

The paper begins by looking at the distribution of Agree and NoAgree forms and their syntactic properties in light of some recent work on both Telugu and Tamil. Analyses of a number of other languages suggest that in NoAgree clauses (equivalent to the traditional 'non-finite' class), we might expect some PRO subjects (as well as some ECM and Raising cases). Haddad (2009) has, in fact, proposed that Telugu has PRO/Control, specifically, Forward, Backward and Copy Control in adjunct clauses. I summarize Haddad's claims and then show that the claims are not supported by the data he gives (which is only a subset of the relevant data). Subsequently, I discuss the Tamil facts, as presented in Sundaresan & McFadden 2009 (henceforth SM). These two studies had very different primary goals but both were crucially dependent upon the existence of PRO/Control in the language in question. SM also included an in-depth discussion supporting a PRO vs. *pro* analysis for Tamil which is of immediate relevance.

After a detailed discussion of the Telugu data, including a series of diagnostic tests for the presence/absence of PRO, I conclude that Telugu does not have PRO in its lexicon nor Control structures – that instead, the null subjects can all be accounted for by *pro* (already posited for independent reasons in Telugu). As above, we assume UG makes available a set of syntactic features but, crucially, the particular combinations of features assigned to LIs are a function of the PLD and deductions made by the acquirer about the nature of specific LIs. To take a very close parallel, not all languages have *pro*, for example. Given this claim, we examine other typical avenues for determining the 'finiteness' status of a clause, including overt morphology, utterance independence, and Case. We see that there is little coherence in the way we treat morphology and more generally in our description of 'finiteness' and that Telugu fits very poorly with any of it. However, the examination does reveal several items that require further attention. First, there are commonalities across all clauses in Telugu that still need to be accounted for, such as nominative Case. Since Nominative Case has been

---

[1] For the moment, I will ignore the difference between a PRO/Control analysis and a Copy Theory of Control analysis, from here on referred to as Movement/Control, and refer generally to 'PRO/Control'.

[2] Either form may have a tense component in Telugu, therefore the only truly distinguishing factor is agreement.

strongly associated with Agree (i.e. 'finite') verb forms in syntactic theory, as overt instantiations of tense and agreement features on T (or [+finite] on IP, earlier), an obvious question arises concerning the 'mismatch' in Telugu. Second, there is one somewhat underexplored area, that of utterance (in)dependence, which is promising for a common ground for 'finiteness', crosslinguistically (see Bianchi 2003) as well as within Telugu. Utterance independence is associated with temporal and logophoric anchoring of speech events, with a locus in CP. With 'finiteness' described in these terms, we see that a type of indirect evidence is available to the acquirer regarding the features to be assigned to functional heads such as C.

In the next section, I present some basic information about the structure of Telugu as background to the examples I will be using. In Section 3, I discuss two recent and relevant proposals that involve PRO/Control, Haddad (2009) on Telugu and Sundaresan and McFadden (2009) on Tamil, and apply diagnostics to the Telugu data to determine whether a PRO or *pro* analysis is better supported. Section 4 summarizes the evidence collected, concludes that all the evidence points to a *pro* analysis for the null subjects, and goes on to identify the scope of the still unexplained phenomena — including the unpredicted nominative Case of the subjects. In Section 5, I present a comprehensive comparison of matrix and embedded clauses and the distribution of NoAgree and Agree verbs in an attempt to locate 'finiteness' and the possible source of Nominative Case marking. Section 6 presents a CP analysis of NoAgree clauses with supporting evidence from scrambling and coordination. In Section 7, CP, as the locus of temporal and logophoric anchoring, providing an alternative defining feature of 'finiteness,' is discussed. The implications of this for the presence of covert tense and agreement features in Telugu clauses are examined. Concluding remarks are given in Section 8.

2 General Background

Telugu remains a domain relatively unexplored by researchers in theoretical linguistics. The only explicit work on any type of PRO/Control in Telugu is Haddad (2009). The properties of Telugu that make it particularly interesting for our purposes, constraints on clauses, agreement morphology, Case, and pro-drop, are discussed below.

Telugu Agree forms only appear in matrix clauses.[3] This is not a reciprocal association, as NoAgree forms may appear (as the only predicate) in either matrix or non-matrix clauses. Clausal conjunction between matrix clauses (whether Agree or NoAgree) is not possible, as (1) shows.[4]

---

[3]The one exception to this is clauses marked with the quotative particle *ani*. The quotative marker causes its own content to be opaque to matrix clause syntax, where, as in English, nonsense words, humming, and other behaviors not regulated by the grammar may be included without inducing ungrammaticality.

[4]Unless otherwise indicated, all Telugu examples are from my own work with native speakers, all of whom speak the Coastal dialect with the exception of one Telangana speaker. Note that the Rayalasima dialect of southern Andhra, where it borders on Tamil Nadu, is not represented. Dialect variation in the phonology has been largely ignored in favor of standard spelling as it does not seem relevant to this topic. I would particularly like to thank the consultants who contributed most heavily to the current project and who have been so generous and flexible with their time. They are V. Merapala, S.S. Reddy, S. Kattoju,

(1) *Sridhar   afislo: bho:ʤanam tina:ɖu   (mariju) inʈiki
     *Sridhar-NOM office-in meal-ACC   eat-PST-3MSG (and)   house-DAT
     veʂʂæ:ɖu
     go-PST-3MSG
     'Sridhar ate dinner at the office and went home'

Only a significant pause between the first clause and the second, enough so that the second is considered a separate utterance, will make such a sequence of Agree clauses acceptable.[5] A more complete discussion of these facts will be presented in a later section.

Translations of conjoined structures from English require the use of a NoAgree form, as shown in (2) and (3) below. The order of constituents determines which verb appears in which form.[6]

(2) [Sridhar   afislo: bho:ʤanam tini]   EC inʈiki
     Sridhar-NOM office-LOC meal-ACC   eat-ABS null house-DAT
     veʂʂæ:ɖu
     go-PST-3MSG
     'Sridhar ate dinner at the office and went home'

(3) [Sridhar/atanu   inʈiki   veʂʂi]   EC bho:ʤanam tina:ɖu
     Sridhar/he-NOM house-DAT go-ABS null meal-ACC   eat-PST-3MSG
     'Sridhar/he went home and ate dinner.'

The surface order is ambiguous (for the listener) in these two examples, as the subject 'Sridhar/he' may belong to a fronted embedded clause, as the bracketing indicates, or to the matrix clause *Sridhar/atanu [EC afislo: bho:ʤanam tini] inʈiki veʂʂæ:ɖu, Sridhar/atanu [EC inʈiki veʂʂi] bho:ʤanam tina:ɖu.* A fronted clause with a null subject is also possible, as in (4).

(4) [EC/atanu/Sridhar   inʈiki   veʂʂi]   Sridhar/atanu
     null/he-NOM/Sridhar-NOM house-DAT go-ABS Sridhar/atanu-NOM
     bho:ʤanam tina:ɖu
     meal-ACC   eat-PST-3MSG
     'Having gone home Sridhar/he ate dinner.'

V. Mantha, K. Palepu, and I. Gorti. Examples taken from Telugu reference materials are cited as such. In these cases, 'LL' indicates Lisker (1963), 'K' indicates Krishnamurti & Gwynn (1985). All Telugu and Tamil examples not my own are cited *verbatim*. PERM (Permissive) and OBLIG (Obligative) are the only non-standard glosses. Naturally, all errors are my own.

[5]The overt conjunction, *mariju*, is not typically used in colloquial, spoken Telugu. Its presence or absence here does not affect the grammaticality status of the string. I have glossed the accusative object ACC even without its accusative suffix just to be clear. Inanimates need not be overtly marked with accusative.

[6]Telugu CPs, TPs, and v/VPs are all strictly head-final.

The Case on overt embedded clause subjects, such as in (3), deserves particular mention. It is Nominative, although the verb form is NoAgree – what would traditionally be considered 'non-finite.' All Agree and NoAgree clauses may have overt subjects and, when overt, those subjects will appear with nominative Case. Examples (3) and (4) illustrate this with the *atanu*, 'he', option.

Disambiguation of clausal boundaries can be achieved through making both embedded and matrix subjects overt, in which case both will be Nominative, as in (5), the matrix subject in this example ambiguous between a co-referent and non-coreferent reading. Alternatively, using a quirky-case predicate (with an experiencer subject marked dative and a nominative DP that the verb agrees with) in one of the clauses will reveal clausemate subjects. (Examples will be given in a later section.)

(5)   [Sridhar   inṭiki   veḷḷi]   atanu   bho:ʤanam tina:ɖu
        Sridhar-NOM house-DAT go-ABS he-NOM meal-ACC   eat-PST-3MSG
        'Sridhar went home and he ate dinner.'

Since examining PRO/Control possibilities entails analyzing null elements, it is worth noting that Telugu allows a discourse-based pro-drop for both subjects and dative or accusative objects. Assuming some appropriate antecedents have been introduced, the following is grammatical. Note that the verb is NoAgree.

(6)   *pro*   *pro*   tina:li
        I/you/he/she/it/we-NOM I/you. . .-ACC eat-OBLIG
        (someone) should eat (something)

In (6), the subject and object pronominals will pick out anteceding referents from the previous discourse, resulting in interpretations like e.g., 'You should eat it.' or 'They should eat them.' and the like. In all of the examples with overt DPs given so far, a null element, minimally *pro*, is also acceptable as long as normal discourse requirements are met.

I present an abbreviated selection of Telugu complement and adjunct clause morphology below.[7]

---

[7]There is no general agreement in Telugu reference materials on these terms or even on the description of the behavior of the various forms. Both Sastri (1985) and Krishnamurti & Gwynn (1985) use the term 'infinitive' for the compounding form of the verb root, which cannot appear unsuffixed and is in no way equivalent to the standard use of 'infinitive', which normally refers to a free form bearing no agreement, no aspect, and, most frequently, no tense. Bossé and Bossé (1991) refer to the same form in *-aḍam* as an infinitive. That the categorical status of this form is verbal as opposed to nominal may be seen by comparing the examples below.

    a.   [Sridhar/atanu   po:ṭi: ippuɖu gelavaɖam] manʧidi
         Sridhar/he-NOM race-ACC now   win-INF   good-NMLZ-3NSG
         'For Sridhar/him to win the race now is good.'

    b.   *[atana   gelavaɖam manʧidi]
         his-GEN win-INF   good-NMLZ-3NSG

(7)

Bound Morphology	Function	Argument/Adjunct
ʧepp-aɖam	'to say'	argument/adjunct
ʧep-tu:	'(while) saying	adjunct
ʧepp-i	'after saying/having said'	adjunct
ʧep-te:	'if X said'	adjunct
ʧepp-ina	'although X said'	adjunct
Overt Complementizer	Function	Argument/Adjunct
ʧepp-in-appuɖu	'when X said'	adjunct
ʧepp-e:-mundu	'before X said'	adjunct
ʧepp-a-ga:ne:	'as soon as X says'	adjunct

Only clauses with infinitive forms (in (7)), the 'to say' form with more detailed discussion in footnote (9)), may act as arguments/complements, as the table above indicates. So, for example, an infinitive clause can appear as the subject, as in (8) below, and is contrasted with a DP subject in the same position in (9).

(8) [Sridhar/atanu   po:ʈi: gelavaɖam] manʧidi
     Sridhar/he-NOM race-ACC win-INF   good-NMLZ-3NSG

     'For Sridhar/him to win the race is good.'

(9) kukka   manʧidi
     dog-NOM good-NMLZ-3NSG

     'The dog is good' (lit: 'Dog (is) good-one')

Clauses with the infinitive form in *-aɖam/-aʈam*, when the clause is a goal or purpose, may be marked with an element homophonous with the dative marker *-ki*. Not surprisingly, a dative-marked infinitival clause is not possible when the clause is the external/subject argument, as in (8) above. Non--*ki*-marked infinitive clauses are potentially ambiguous regarding the goal/purpose/neither aspect of the lower clause but clauses marked with *-ki* are unambiguously either goal or purpose clauses. We turn now to a discussion of two recent proposals regarding PRO/Control, starting with Haddad's (2009) discussion of Telugu.

  '*His to-win is good.'

  c. [atana   gelupu   manʧidi]
     his-GEN victory/winning-NOM good-NMLZ-3NSG
     'His victory is good.'

Complement DPs and adverbials may freely be part of the infinitive clause as in (a). The adverb *ippuɖu* 'now' may only be interpreted as a modifier of 'win the race' and not as a modifier of the matrix clause. Possessive and deictic modification of an infinitive is ungrammatical in Telugu, as in (b) (deictic not shown). Note the grammaticality of the English equivalent, though – 'His winning is good.'. A noun, formed from the verb root, shows quite the opposite behavior as in (c). The behavior of the *-aɖam* form suggests that 'infinitive' is the better characterization and I adopt that here.

3 Recent Proposals

Haddad (2009) has claimed that Telugu has Copy Control as well as Forward and Backward Control in 'non-finite' adjunct clauses (see Polinsky & Potsdam 2006 for a typology of Control clauses). Such a claim, of course, rests crucially on the existence of Control structures, as well as on the adoption of the Copy Theory of Control (Hornstein 1999). Haddad presents two brief arguments in support of PRO/Control over *pro*.

Haddad's first argument in support of a Control analysis over a *pro* analysis is based on the claim that no disjoint subjects are allowed in the two adjunct clauses he has chosen to focus on, the absolutive and the durative (present participle).[8] The argument offered against *pro* is that there should be no such referential disjunction restriction from a pronominal like *pro*. A Control account, on the other hand, either traditionally assumes a [+anaphor] feature on (OC) PRO or, under Movement/Control, uses a copy/movement account, both analyses predicting a lack of disjoint subjects. The claim of disjunction is not supported by the data, however. All of the adjunct clauses, including the two that Haddad targets, allow disjoint subjects, though such subjects appear with greater or lesser frequency depending upon the type of participle. Telugu reference materials as well as consultant judgements reveal cases of disjunction trivially, as shown in (10) to (12) below.

(10) [[A:me   annam   tintu:]   ne:nu bajalude:ra:nu]
      she-NOM food/rice-NOM/acc eat-prespart I-NOM started-out-PST-1sg

      'While she was eating food, I started out.'

(11) [[mi: va:ɖu   kaleʤilo: tʃe:ri]   en   na:ɭɭ
      you-GEN he-NOM college-LOC arrive-ABS how-many day.PL
      ayindi?]
      elapse-PST-3NSG

      'How many days have elapsed since he (your son) went to college?' [LL139]

(12) [[a:yana ra:kuɳɖa]   mi:ru   ra:ru]
      He-NOM come-dur-neg you-pl-NOM come-fut-neg-2pl

      'You won't come without his coming.' [K112]

Like the above, other adjunct clauses all admit disjoint subjects.

Haddad's second argument for a Control analysis over a *pro* analysis is that *if* the null subject was *pro*, then an overt NP/pronoun should be able to substitute for

---

[8]His choice of adjuncts is based on his claim that these two are the only Conjunctive Participles (CNP's) in Telugu, citing Krishnamurti & Gwynn (1985). Not only do Krishnamurti and Gwynn (1985) cite *four* Conjunctive Participles (plus the negative form of each) but Haddad himself retracts his claim regarding disjoint subjects in a footnote. A full discussion of these and other problems with Haddad's data and analysis are given in Kissock (2011).

it. Haddad cites the following example (Haddad 32a), ungrammatical with either full NP or overt pronoun in the CNP clause, as evidence for the Control position.[9]

(13) *[Kumaar$_i$/atanu$_i$ [Kumaar-ki$_i$/atani-ki$_i$ aakali wees-i]   Saandwic
        Kumar/he-NOM   Kumar/he-DAT   hunger be felt-abs sandwich
        tinnaa-Du]
        eat-PST
        'Kumar/he Kumar/he having gotten hungry, ate a sandwich.'

What Haddad fails to note is that when the adjunct clause is initial, an overt NP/pronoun in it is perfectly grammatical, as the reordered string below illustrates.

(14) [[Kuma:r-ki$_i$ a:kali we:s-i]   atanu$_i$ sandwich tinna:ɖu]
        Kumar-DAT hunger be felt-abs he-NOM sandwich eat-PST
        'Kumar$_i$ having gotten hungry, he$_i$ ate a sandwich.'

Given the grammaticality of (14), it seems fairly obvious that the unacceptability of Haddad's example in (13) is an extra-grammatical effect produced by the high degree of redundancy.

Haddad's arguments for Control over *pro* do not go beyond this. Since neither of Haddad's arguments stands up under close scrutiny when the complete set of relevant data is examined, the question of whether there is PRO/Control in Telugu remains unanswered at this point.[10] We turn now to the study by Sundaresan and McFadden (SM) (2009) on Tamil. SM did spend considerable time on answering the foundational question, almost completely ignored by Haddad: Is there evidence for PRO/Control over *pro*? As Tamil and Telugu share at least some properties and SM go through a number of diagnostics for PRO vs. *pro*, it is helpful to apply the same diagnostics to Telugu.

3.1 Sundaresan and McFadden (2009)

SM (2009) present evidence that Tamil has the following: 1) obligatory control infinitives; 2) infinitival complement clauses whose subjects appear as OC PRO or as overt non-coreferent DPs; 3) and adjunct infinitives with OC PRO or non-coreferent DPs. Their primary goal is to account for the non-complementary distribution of PRO and overt DP subjects – a phenomenon counter-predicted by theories of PRO and Control as well as by Case Theory. Their focus is essentially on what mechanism allows DPs to be licensed in the same position as PRO (a position where neither Nominative Case nor any other Case save Null Case has typically been available).[11] Implementing a

---

[9]In order to distinguish the positions of the subjects, Haddad has used a dative subject predicate for the embedded clause. The literal translation of the embedded clause is 'hunger came/having-come to Kumar/to him'.

[10]Given this, any claims of Forward, Backward and Copy Control are premature, at best.

[11]This question is relevant whether or not one adopts the Null Case analysis for PRO – both lack of any Case and Null Case are equally ineffective when a DP requires some non-Null Case.

referential feature-based framework, SM invoke a set of features on the matrix verb, its selected C, and on a DP/PRO in the lower clause. Presence or absence of the relevant features along with Referential feature matching of [+/-R] through Agree gets the variety of Tamil data described.

Since Tamil, like Telugu, allows pro-drop, SM discuss in some detail whether a PRO/ Control analysis, rather than a *pro* analysis, is motivated. They carry out several diagnostic tests to determine the status of the null subjects in Tamil and make several arguments based on distributional facts. From the results of these, they deduce that the Tamil clauses with null, co-referent subjects are, indeed, cases of controlled PRO. A summary of these results is given below.

– The Tamil 'try/*paar*' class behaves exactly as the English 'try' cases, *mutatis mutandis*, and therefore a PRO/Control analysis is required for this set, minimally.
– When the embedded subject is co-referent, it is always null in the *paar* types. Concomitantly, null subjects in the embedded clauses are required to be co-referent with the matrix subject. If *pro* were the null element, what explanation would there be for the consistent co-reference with the matrix subject or for the inability of the null embedded subject in *paar* class to appear as an overt pronoun?
– Tamil is similar to Spanish with respect to Weak Crossover (WCO). *pro* (as well as an overt pronoun, of course) will trigger WCO effects if crossed over by a WH word or quantifier, but PRO does not (a general observation attributed to Jaeggli & Safir 1989).

In the following section, I take these points in turn and discuss them in the context of Telugu data.

3.2 Verb Categories

SM first describe a class of verbs, for convenience identified as the 'try' or *paar* class, whose behavior appears identical to the English control verbs of the 'try' variety. The Tamil form is given below, combining SM's examples (6a) and (6b) to conveniently show the most relevant aspects.

(15) raman$_i$ [PRO$_i$/*$_j$/*anand saadatt-ai saapiḍa] paa-tt-aan
      Raman.NOM PRO/Anand   rice-ACC eat-INF try-PST-3m.sg
      'Raman tried (*Anand) to eat rice.'

(15) illustrates that *paar* verbs: 1) cannot have an overt subject in the embedded infinitive clause; and 2) cannot have disjoint reference between the matrix and embedded subjects.[12] This class of verbs contrasts with the 'want'/*veṇḍ* class, as will be shown shortly. The constraints on the embedded subject are predicted if the embedded subject is (OC) PRO.

---

[12] As SM point out later in their paper, an overt co-referential subject is possible in these cases in the embedded clause.

Telugu has an equivalent, but not cognate, verb meaning 'try,' *prajatninʧu-*. Although it is very common for *prajatninʧu-* to have a null co-referent subject in an embedded complement as shown in (16), neither co-reference nor 'nullness' is a requirement, as shown in (17). (*Sridhar* is a male name and *Pallavi* is female name.)

(16) [EC annam   tinaḍam/tinaḍa:niki] Sridhar   prajatninʧa:ḍu
     EC food-ACC eat-INF-DAT   Sridhar-NOM try-PST-3MSG
     'Sridhar tried to eat (the) food.'

(17) Pallavi$_i$ [Sridhar   a:me:$_i$ dress   ve:sukovaḍam]
     Pallavi-NOM Sridhar-NOM her-GEN dress-ACC put-on-INF
     prajatninʧindi
     try-PST-3FSG
     'Pallavi tried for Sridhar to put on her dress.'

Example (17) reveals several unexpected properties — disjoint reference of matrix and embedded subjects as well as nominative Case on the embedded subject instead of, for example, accusative Case.[13,14]

As there is no constraint in Telugu that the embedded subject of the 'try'/ *prajatninʧu-* class be null, unlike Tamil, we predict that overt *coreferent* subjects might be grammatical. This turns out to be true, as (18) and (19) show.[15]

(18) [Ne:nu po:ṭi: gelavaḍa:niki] ne:nu/ne:ne: prajatninʧa:nu
     I-NOM race-ACC try-INF-DAT   I-NOM/I-NOM-FOC try-PST-1SG
     'I tried to win the race.' [Lit: I tried I win race]

(19) [Sridhar$_i$ annam   tinaḍam] atanu$_i$/atane:$_i$ prajatninʧa:ḍu
     Sridhar-NOM food-ACC eat-INF   he-NOM/he-NOM-FOC try-PST-3MSG
     'Sridhar tried to eat (the) food.' [Lit: He tried Sridhar eat food]

Finally, it is relevant to note that null subjects are not restricted to the embedded clause. Both matrix and embedded subjects may be null, as in (20) below.

(20) [EC annam   tinaḍam/tinaḍa:niki] EC prajatninʧa:ḍu
     EC food-ACC eat-INF(-DAT)   EC try-PST-3MSG
     '(3sgm) tried to eat (the) food.'

---

[13]Presence or absence of *-ki* (discussed earlier in Section 2) has no effect on the embedded subjects in terms of Case assignment (always nominative), co-reference/disjunction, or overt/covertness.

[14]The internal sandhi between the infinitive and the dative suffix follows the same pattern as is found in Sanskrit and Hindi loanwords in [-am] e.g., 'book' *pustakam* (nom) *pustaka:nni* (acc) *pustaka:niki* (dat).

[15]Native speakers find the (linearly) second subject somewhat redundant sounding. When given contrastive focus, such as with the two pronoun forms ending in *-e:*, the emphatic marker, the redundancy disappears.

Note that with a verb like 'try', whose semantics strongly promote co-reference of the embedded subject, even a *pro* null subject in the embedded clause is likely to be interpreted as co-referent with the matrix subject (regardless of the null/overt status of the matrix subject). Jackendoff and Culicover (2003) argue explicitly for a semantic explanation for the behavior of such predicates, claiming that many of the properties of control, including whether or not it is obligatory, fall out directly from semantic considerations.[16]

In addition, if only one subject is null, it may be either the embedded subject, as in (16) or the matrix subject as in (21) below. Because of the surface ambiguity between matrix and embedded subjects when the DP is in initial position, I use an example with dative subject in the embedded clause.[17]

(21) [va:ɖiki*i* ʤwaram   ra:vaɖam] *pro*i prajatninʧa:ɖu
      he-DAT fever-NOM come-INF pro try-PST-3MSG
      '*pro*(3sg) tried for him to get a fever'

Examination of Telugu *prajatninʧu-* thus reveals that it behaves significantly differently from Tamil *paar*. At the same time, SM point out that, in Tamil, the behavior of the *paar* class contrasts distinctly with the behavior of a second set of verbs, the 'want' or *veṇɖ-* class. Verbs of the Tamil *veṇɖ-* class show many of the properties of the Telugu *prajatninʧu-* class. Specifically, they allow disjoint subjects in the embedded clause and those disjoint subjects are marked with nominative Case (dative subject verbs excepted). Examples (22) and (23), cited in SM as (8a-b), illustrate the properties of Tamil *veṇɖ-* with respect to embedded complement clauses.[18]

(22) champa-vukku*i* [PRO*i* oru samosa-vai   saappiɖ-a] veṇɖ-um
      Champa-DAT PRO   a samosa.ACC eat-INF   want-N.3sg
      'Champa wants to eat a samosa.'

(23) champa-vukku [sudha oru samosa-vai   saappiɖ-a] veṇɖ-um
      Champa-DAT Sudha a samosa.ACC eat-INF   want-N.3sg
      'Champa wants Sudha to eat a samosa.'

SM note that the null subject in (22) is obligatorily co-referent with the matrix subject. These same properties – (1) co-reference if the embedded subject is null; (2)

---

[16]We expect to see verbs like 'begin' pattern with the 'try' type for these same reasons.

[17]The notiogedit without tabsn of 'dative subject' is widely assumed for Dravidian languages, however the Telugu data has not been analyzed in a contemporary syntactic framework, as far as I know. More detailed discussion of the matter is certainly necessary but is precluded here for reasons of time and immediate relevance. Furthermore, an anonymous reviewer pointed out that the presence of raising to subject in Telugu, if there was such a phenomenon, could have an impact. However, Telugu has no raising to subject cases, no expletives, and no ECM cases, to my knowledge.

[18]SM provided an earlier example showing that *veṇɖ-* is transitive in simplex clauses, taking just a DP. *veṇɖ-* happens to be a dative subject verb in Tamil. SM points out that, in Tamil, dative subjects in the embedded infinitive clause also occur, noting that this suggests that overt Case on the embedded subject is determined by properties of the embedded clause itself rather than the matrix clause.

overt disjoint subjects; (3) nominative Case on overt subjects of embedded infinitival clauses — are found in infinitive and gerundival adjunct clauses in Tamil as well.

Telugu has no direct correlate of Tamil *veṇḍ-*. Roughly equivalent semantically is *ka:va:li*, meaning 'need/want', but with no agreement (the form is a frozen obligative in *-a:li* which takes a dative subject). As the closest syntactically, I substitute *iṣṭam* 'like' here in 24 and 25.[19] Like Tamil *veṇḍ-*, *iṣṭam* is a dative subject verb.

(24) na:ku kukkalu   iṣṭam
      I-DAT dog.PL-NOM pleasing
      'I like dogs.'

(25) Sridharki$_i$ EC$_i$ annam   tinaḍam iṣṭam
      Sridhar-DAT EC food/rice-NOM eat-INF pleasing
      'Sridhar likes to eat rice/food.'

I include adjunct clauses here in (26)-(28) since, as in Tamil, the Telugu adjunct clauses behave like complement clauses in the relevant respects. The Telugu clause types in (25) and (26) share most, but not all, of the comparable Tamil clause properties. Both Telugu and Tamil show: 1) the possibility of a coreferent null subject in the lower clause; 2) the possibility of overt disjoint subjects; and (3) nominative Case on overt subjects of embedded clauses. The crucial difference between the two is that in Tamil, the null subject of the embedded clause is *necessarily* co-referent with the matrix subject. In Telugu, however, the subject may be disjoint, as in (27) and (28).

(26) A:me   annam   tintu: ne:nu bajalude:ra:nu
      she-NOM food/rice-NOM eat-PRS-PTCP I-NOM started-out-PST-1SG
      'While she was eating food, I started out.'

(27) EC$_i$ da:ni$_i$ dress   ve:sukovaḍam Sridharki$_j$ iṣṭam
      EC her-GEN dress-ACC wear-INF   Sridhar-DAT pleasing
      'Sridhar likes (her) to wear her (non-honorific) dress.'

(28) EC$_i$ ko:ralu   koṇṭe: ne:nu$_j$ vanta   ʧe:sta:nu
      EC vegetable.PL-ACC buy-COND I-NOM cooking do-FUT-1SG
      'If (you) buy vegetables, I'll do the cooking.'

Although discourse factors and the semantics of the matrix verbs are apt to influence how readily a null subject is interpreted as co-referent or disjoint, examples of disjunction are numerous and can be both constructed and found in written materials.[20]

---

[19]There is a verb *ko:ru* 'desire/request' but it is more limited/specialized in its semantics and is far less common. It behaves no differently than the other verbs we are looking at, in any event.

[20]Example (29) is a slightly modified version of Viswanatham (2007)'s example (b) [224] *navvutu: ma:ṭla:ḍite: a:meku ko:pam vastundi* with some additions to show the full clausal structure of the embedded clauses.

(29) [EC$_j$ gaṭṭiga: navvutu:]   [EC$_j$ a:mevenaka$_i$ ma:ṭla:ḍite:] a:meku$_i$
EC   loudly   laugh-PRS.PTCP EC   her-behind   speak-COND   she-DAT
ko:pam   vastundi
anger-NOM come-FUT-3NSG
'If you talk behind her back while laughing loudly, she will get angry.'

The obligatory co-reference for 'try' types in Tamil argues in favor of the existence of PRO/Control in such structures. The requirement of PRO/Control, for even a single predicate (like 'try'), has a significant effect on the analysis of the rest of the Tamil data. Once the need for PRO/Control has been established, it is fairly trivial to invoke it in additional cases. Several additional diagnostics are offered by SM.

3.3 Identifying PRO or *pro*

SM analyze the Tamil data as PRO in the case of null embedded clause subjects (and obviously disjoint subjects are an independent phenomenon). They offer two arguments for choosing a PRO analysis over a *pro* one, noting that Tamil allows pro-drop, making *pro* a logical possible choice. The first of these is evidence from Weak Crossover (WCO) effects which have been shown to react differently to *pro* and pronominals vs. PRO. Citing Jaeggli and Safir (1989) on Spanish, SM illustrate that a WH element may 'cross over' PRO, but not *pro*, with impunity, as the English examples below (SM's 18-19) show.

(30) *[$_{CP}$ Who(m)$_i$ did [$_{DP}$ John$_i$/him$_i$ washing his$_i$ car] upset e$_i$]?

(31) [$_{CP}$ Who(m)$_i$ did [$_{DP}$ PRO$_i$ washing his$_i$ car] upset e$_i$]?

SM offer closely comparable Tamil examples. Tamil shows the same split in grammaticality, with an overt pronoun inducing WCO effects but a null subject no WCO effects. This data supports a PRO over *pro* analysis for Tamil since the null subject acts like PRO.

WCO effects in Telugu are either notably different or not present. First, in Telugu, unlike apparently in Tamil, fronting (non-subject) WH expressions from their *in situ* position is strongly dispreferred. However, informants will marginally accept fronting *evarini* below as well as fronting other, non-Nominative WH words which are marked accusative or oblique. In Example (33), the sentence is no worse when *evarini* is fronted around the pronoun *atani* 'his' than around the unmodified noun.[21]

(32) (a)tana   parikṣa   tappaḍam evarini   ba:dhintʃindi
his-GEN exam-ACC fail-INF   who-ACC sadden-PST-3NSG
'Who$_i$ did it annoy/distress to fail his$_i$ exam?

---

[21]Both *atani* and *tana* are used to translate 'his' in this case, the latter being the root without the deixis prefix. The fact that *tana* (Nominative *tanu*) is often referred to as the reflexive form is misleading, as its distribution is that of a pronoun. (See Kissock 1995 for a complete discussion of reflexivization in Telugu). I give only the deictic pronominal form in the subsequent example simply to avoid multiplication of parentheses.

(33) evarini   (atana)   parikṣa   tappaḍam ba:dhinʧindi
      who-ACC (his-GEN) exam-ACC fail-INF   sadden-PST-3NSG
      'Who$_i$ did it annoy/distress to fail his$_i$ exam?

The Telugu data clearly deserve more exploration.[22] For our purposes, however, it is enough to note that overt Telugu pronouns do not appear to induce WCO effects, and therefore WCO effects will not be an effective way of distinguishing between PRO and *pro* in Telugu.

The second argument that SM provide for choosing PRO over *pro* for the null subjects under discussion rests on the interpretation of those subjects as obligatorily co-referent. SM point out that, in all but the *paar* class, subjects of embedded clauses may be disjoint overt pronominals. At the same time, whenever the embedded clause subject is null, SM note that it must be co-referent with the matrix subject. Since *pro* is simply a phonologically null pronoun, and since overt (disjoint) pronouns are allowed in all except the *paar* class, obligatory co-reference seems unexplained. SM add that this constraint is not present in the Tamil equivalent of a 'that' clause (a 'finite' clause introduced by a complementizer) where null subjects of the 'that' clause may be co-referent or disjoint with the matrix subject. Although co-reference with a null subject is very common, particularly with verbs whose semantics lean heavily toward such a thing, as discussed earlier, an in-depth study reveals that no co-reference constraint on null subjects appears to be present in Telugu as (27)-(29) show.[23]

While it is not of immediate relevance to the Telugu analysis, I believe that there is a possible alternative explanation for absence of disjoint *pro* in Tamil (which will have to be ruled out in some manner, as SM acknowledge). In pro-drop languages, *pro* is less emphatic than its corresponding overt pronoun and there is, in general, a complementary distribution of emphasis/focus elements and null elements, not surprisingly. If a pronoun is to be contrastive or emphatic, it must be overt. Although English does not have pro-drop, one could argue that, for purposes of emphasis/focus, the phonologically reduced forms of pronouns in English are equivalent in their behavior to *pro*. An example of a pronominal subject case, potentially parallel to our subjects cases, is [i] ('he'). The unemphatic/reduced form in (34) below leads to a co-referent interpretation. Co-reference is the unmarked case in the sentence below, and as such requires the reduced form of the pronoun (as anything more will cause it to be marked).

(34) John/he$_i$ went to the store [ɛni]$_{i/*j}$ bought the bread you wanted.

The claim here is not that a reduced/null element must refer to the closest antecedent, nor that it cannot be ambiguous in its antecedency, but rather that the reduced/null element *cannot be contrastive or emphatic* as in (35).[24]

---

[22]Vijayasri (2003) includes a brief and inconclusive discussion of Weak Crossover, showing the *opposite* of the standard WCO effect.

[23]Some native speakers feel that the absence of *both* overt subjects simultaneously is marginal but it appears to be based on pragmatic concerns about picking out a referent for the subject related to the discourse factors governing pro-drop.

[24]See Biezma (2011) and a number of references within for independent discussion and support of such a claim.

(35) John/he$_i$ went to the store [ænd hi]$_{i/j}$ bought the bread you wanted.

Concomitantly, we assume rather trivially that the unmarked interpretation in the null subject clauses under discussion is the co-referent one. The result is that a disjoint referent will be marked (i.e. emphatic/focussed) and overt. The phonologically reduced elements and *pro* cannot carry focus and will naturally be in complementary distribution with overt, stressed pronouns. Therefore, if the null subjects of these clauses are, indeed, *pro*, we would expect them to behave exactly as they do. If the default, unemphatic reading is intended co-reference, then we predict *pro*. If a different (i.e., more marked) reading is intended, non-coreference or contrastive focus, we predict that only phonologically overt pronouns or DPs will be licensed. Crucially, what counts as default in any particular case is influenced by pragmatics, as the Telugu examples like (27) show. Because Sridhar is not expected to wear a dress, the default interpretation is disjoint reference – and therefore *pro* is predicted. In these sorts of cases, we predict that, if the null element is *pro*, it will be able to be disjoint. Exactly this is illustrated in (26) and (29) above.

3.3.1 Overt Coreferent Pronouns

As we have seen, both Tamil and Telugu show overt *non*-coreferent pronouns in subject position of the lower clause (excepting, in Tamil, the *paar* class) as (36) shows.

(36) vāḍu   rākapōvaḍam   nāku   naccadu
      he-NOM to-not-come-INF. me-DAT not-like
      'I don't like his not coming.' (Usha Devi 1988)

Telugu can also have overt *co-referent* pronouns in the lower clause.[25] Example (37) is pragmatically awkward with co-referent subjects, just as it is in English, but becomes more acceptable given an appropriate discourse context.

(37) Sridhar$_i$ a: sangatulu   vini   atanu$_i$/atane:$_i$ iṇṭiki
      he-NOM that news.PL-ACC hear-ABS he-NOM   home-DAT
      veḷḷa:ḍu
      go-PST-3MSG
      'Sridhar$_i$ having heard the news, he$_i$ went home.'

Speakers judge *atanu* in the above example to be slightly emphatic/stressed and are much more willing to accept the sentence if the pronoun has the emphatic clitic [-e:] attached. (Note that the more emphatic interpretation is predicted assuming that the earlier discussion of constraints on *pro* is on the right track.)

This comparison of Tamil and Telugu highlights several significant differences between the two. The support that SM have for a PRO analysis in Tamil is absent in the Telugu data. The SM study is, itself, concerned primarily with how to handle

---

[25]It turns out that Tamil can, as well. Sundaresan p.c.

the distribution of PRO and full DPs since Case theory does not serve. The contradictory requirements of zero or Null Case for PRO and (holding everything else constant) Nominative Case for overt subjects in the Tamil provides the impetus for an alternative analysis of the distribution of these lexical items in terms of selection, rather than Case. Although Case will ultimately be an issue in Telugu, the particular problem encountered is slightly different, so we end our comparison with SM's study here.

3.4 Further Diagnostics for PRO vs. *pro*

There are several additional diagnostics that may still be applied to help identify the nature of the null subject in Telugu. First, it has been noted in the literature (cf., for example, Hornstein 1999 for both *de se/de re* and the strict/sloppy distinction that follows) that (OC) PRO only allows *de se* interpretations whereas an overt pronoun allows both *de se* and *de re* interpretations.[26] If the null subjects of the embedded clauses we are examining are indeed (OC) PRO, then we might expect to obtain only *de se* readings in sentences like (38) and (39) below.

 Context: Sridhar, a clown, does a comedy routine where he dresses up in elaborate women's clothing. After filming a routine for TV, Sridhar suddenly develops amnesia and loses all knowledge of his previous actions/career. We later find Sridhar watching his own comedy skit on TV without realizing that the clown (heavily made-up) was actually him.

(38) Sridhar$_j$ [EC$_i$ tana$_{j//i}$ dress   ve:sukovaḍam] prajatninṭʃa:ḍu
      Sridhar-NOM EC   his/her-GEN dress-ACC wear-INF   try-PST-3MSG

      'Sridhar tried (for her) to put on his/her dress.'

(39) Sridhar$_i$ [EC$_i$ bahumati   gelavaḍam] a:çinṭʃa:ḍu
      Sridhar-NOM EC   prize-ACC win-INF   hope-PST-3MSG

      'Sridhar hoped to win the prize.'

The Telugu in both (38) and (39) may be interpreted as either *de se* or *de re*.[27] *de re* and *de se* readings are typically discussed in terms of truth conditions (see Schlenker 2003a, for example), where the utterance receives a 'false' or 'true' designation depending upon the pragmatic conditions. Juxtaposing the English translation as an illustration, (38) would be labelled 'false' under the context introducing that example. However, the Telugu version is found to be 'true' by native speakers (i.e., it can have a *de re* reading). Similarly for (39), where Sridhar got amnesia right after performing in a competition but before they announced the results of which competitors

---

[26]I thank the reviewer who suggested both this and the following strict/sloppy interpretation as additional diagnostics.

[27]Note that, in this particular case, the co-indices indicate real world reference as opposed to a reference assigned by the speaker.

won which prizes. Sridhar saw, on TV, the competitors waiting for the judges' results (but did not recognize himself as one of the competitors because he has a helmet on). The English version will receive a 'false' designation, because it only allows a *de se* reading. The Telugu, however, since, unlike English, it also allows a *de re* reading, is fine.

An additional diagnostic that we can use is the availability of strict or sloppy interpretations under ellipsis. (OC) PRO allows only a sloppy interpretation (Bouchard 1985, and subsequent), whereas overt pronouns allow both strict and sloppy interpretations. *pro* patterns with overt pronouns.

(40) Pallaviki$_i$ [EC$_i$ tana$_i$ dress   ve:sukovaḍam] iṣṭam
      Pallavi-DAT EC   self-GEN dress-ACC wear-INF   pleasing
      Sridharki   ku:da:
      Sridhar-DAT too
      'Pallavi likes to wear her dress and Sridhar does too'

(41) Pallavi$_i$ [EC tana$_i$ dress   ve:sukovaḍam] prajatnintʃindi
      Pallavi-NOM EC   self-GEN dress-ACC put-on-INF   try-PST-3FNSG
      Sridhar   ku:da:
      Sridhar-NOM too
      'Pallavi tried to put on her dress and Sridhar did too.'

The sentence in (41) has two interpretations: (a) Pallavi tried to put on her dress and Sridhar tried for Pallavi to put on her dress (strict); (b) Pallavi tried to put on her dress and Sridhar tried for himself to put on her dress (sloppy). Similarly, the sentence in (40) has two interpretations: (a) Pallavi likes to wear her dress and Sridhar likes for Pallavi to wear her dress (strict); and (b) Pallavi likes to wear her dress and Sridhar likes to wear her dress (sloppy). The referent for the elided material in both examples is interpreted in exactly the same way as when an overt pronoun is in the subject position of the embedded clause – either strict or sloppy – suggesting that the null subject patterns with *pro* not PRO.[28]

4 Interim Summary

The results of our investigation into the null subjects of embedded complement and (selected) adjunct clauses are summarized in the following list. Because adjunct and complement clauses show the same behaviors for the relevant parameters, there seems no need to refer further to the argument/adjunct status.

– Null embedded subjects may be coreferent or disjoint with matrix subjects

---

[28]These judgements are quite robust, with speakers noting the ambiguity immediately and without any prompting for 'want'. With the appropriate contextual setting, even 'try' – noted earlier as already much more difficult semantically with disjoint subjects – has both readings. Crucially, speakers' behavior with 'try' was identical whether or not the subject of the lower clause was an overt pronoun or null.

– When an embedded subject is co-referent with a matrix subject, it may be null or overt (i.e. take the form of pronoun/R expression)
– Overt embedded subjects are Case-marked Nominative (except for quirky dative subjects as described earlier)
– No overt (verbal) agreement with the embedded subject is present in any form. (Verb forms may show tense/aspect/modality but no agreement.)
– Null embedded subjects allow either *de se* or *de re* interpretations
– VP ellipsis of such clauses results in both strict and sloppy interpretations
– No evidence for WCO effects (in general, in Telugu)

Several other general considerations are worth mentioning here. First, there is no reason to assume that every language will have PRO/Control any more than there is reason to assume that every language will have retroflex consonants. UG gives a set of syntactic and a set of phonological *features*. Particular combinations of those features are built up by the acquirer into their LIs. Whether an individual's lexicon will have the set of features necessary for a retroflex consonant or the set of features necessary for PRO will be a function of what was in the PLD and how the acquirer analyzed it. Moreover, just from a logical perspective, since there is cross-linguistic diversity in the set of control verbs, it is true that any verb might *not* be a control verb. It follows directly that in a particular language, *every* verb might not be a control verb (resulting in no Control). My claim about absence of PRO is a claim about Telugu only. However, absence of Control has already been argued for, as in Dukes (1996). Dukes provides an extensive discussion of 'potential' PRO/control structures in Tongan and shows that their behavior is very much opposite to what might be expected (overt nominative subjects in the lower clause, controller/co-reference not required, and so on). His conclusion is that Tongan does not have Control.[29]

Second, the extraordinary diversity of properties seen in phenomena labelled 'Control' leads one to question what the unifying factors could be across these various instantiations. Instances of proposed control with unexpected properties include: Control into subordinate complementizer clauses whose verbs are 'finite' (Ghomeshi 2001 and Karimi 2008 for Persian); Case-marking (Nominative) for PRO (Icelandic, Sigurdsson 1991); Control of *pro* (not PRO) in 'finite' clauses (Korean, Lee 2009); overt pronouns as surface manifestations of PRO (Szabolcsi 2009); 'multidirectional' Control – forward/backward (various languages, Polinsky and Potsdam 2006); and many others. Since virtually every feature of the 'traditional' Control structure (Chomsky 1982, inter alia) can be absent in one or another language, it follows (parallel to the above argument) that none of those features can be the feature(s) that unifies phenomena into what we call 'Control.' The 'moving target' nature of Control makes it difficult, in my view, to argue effectively about it, either for or against.

Finally, both as a matter of general scientific principles and as adherents to a syntactic framework that emphasizes economy considerations, we are committed to choosing the 'null' hypothesis whenever possible, and, failing that, the hypothesis

---

[29]Note, however, that there has been a very strong general assumption in the scholarly literature that a language *will* have PRO/Control. This may be partially responsible for the extremely wide range of phenomena for which proposals of PRO/Control have been made.

that requires the least additional machinery. As pointed out at the start, Telugu has pro-drop. Pro-drop is found in a wide environment – the same environment as overt pronouns, essentially, including accusative- and dative-marked object positions. The null subjects in the clauses we have looked at can all be analyzed as *pro*, and *pro* subjects come for free. Choosing PRO, on the other hand, adds something completely extra and unneeded, at a cost to the lexicon and to the acquirer in terms of abstractness of representation. A Movement/Control choice will have its own (different) cost.[30] Economy considerations, however, can only tip the balance in the case of equally supported analyses, when choosing the most economical would be required. For Telugu, the support of *pro* for the null subjects in question is empirically well-founded as well as economical.

The evidence from Telugu that we have examined points solidly toward the null subjects of (the relevant) embedded clauses being *pro*. This result is convenient from two standpoints – it is both the economical choice, and it avoids a problem that is encountered in Tamil. SM themselves point the problem out, which is that in those cases where a disjoint overt subject is grammatical, it is difficult to know how to block the occurrence of *pro*. Phonological content (or absence thereof) is not something that the syntactic component can identify and therefore not something it could compute over. A separate mechanism will have to be added to account for these cases. Although the *pro* analysis for Telugu does not face the difficulty noted for Tamil, we do identify at least one problem arising out of the Telugu data. It turns out that this problem, concerning the unexpected Nominative Case of the embedded subject, extends well beyond the domain of complement and adjunct clauses of the type we've looked at so far. In examining this issue, we take a closer look at the realm of 'finiteness.'

5 The Search for 'Finiteness'

As we have seen, unlike in English and a number of other languages, the subject of a NoAgree form in Telugu, and, indeed, of all NoAgree verb forms, if overt, will be in the nominative Case (in dative subject cases, the 'other' argument will be in the Nominative). There is no demonstrable difference between the subject of a NoAgree clause, like the embedded clause in (42), and the subject of an Agree form, as a matrix version of the same string shows in (43).[31]

(42) Ne:nu Sridhar   baza:r-ki   veḷḷaḍam ko:ra:nu
      I-NOM Sridhar-NOM baza:r-DAT go-INF   desire-PST-3MSG
      'I desired Sridhar to go to the bazaar.'

---

[30]Specifically, the cost of the movement itself (Hornstein 1999). However, it should be noted that Movement/Control is not inconsistent with some of the features noted above.

[31]If we consider any of these clauses in a historical perspective, they are essentially perfect from the standpoint of the Projection Principle and the Theta Criterion. Had Telugu and its Dravidian relatives been the initial object of study instead of English and a few other Indo-European languages, it seems likely that the theory would have taken a rather different trajectory.

(43) Sridhar   baza:r-ki   ve[[a:ɖu
      Sridhar-NOM baza:r-DAT go-PST-3MSG
      'Sridhar went to the bazaar.'

The above seems anomalous from the perspective of the properties of a functional head, T, which we are receiving contradictory information about. On one hand, the (lack of) overt morphology on the verb is often (but rather arbitrarily) taken to be a sign that T is [-finite]. On the other hand, the Nominative Case of the subject suggests that the T had Tense and Agreement features (i.e., is [+finite]).[32]

5.1 Lack of Coherent Definition

Although exploration of this topic was prompted by the nature of complement and adjunct clauses in Telugu—specifically, the fact that Agree and NoAgree clauses do not seem to be differentiated in the expected ways—the relevant data in Telugu extend far beyond this limited set of clauses. In some real sense, of course, the problem of defining 'finiteness', with its fairly dramatic range of cross-linguistic variation and corresponding number of proposals to capture the same, is very much a cross-linguistic one (see Gair 2007 for Sinhala; Amritavalli and Jayaseelan 2005 for Malayalam and Kannada; Landau 2004; *inter alia*). Similarly, the question of its utility to current theory has been discussed (Adger 2007). For the moment, we are looking only at Agree/NoAgree (aka 'finiteness') within the circumscribed domain of Telugu, though we will ultimately propose an analysis that has a broader scope.

Claims about 'finiteness', in a context where 'finiteness' lacks any coherent definition, are not very compelling. Moreover, the difficulties associated with defining the 'finite/non-finite' distinction are legion and well-known and, by their very existence, form part of an argument against 'finiteness' as a useful component of syntactic theory. If we try to identify the properties associated with 'finite/non-finite' forms we come up with a fairly routine list of diagnostics, no one (nor even any set) of which is deterministic. Tense and agreement are often associated with 'finiteness' (but not necessarily, see Amritavalli and Jayaseelan 2005 for Malayalam, where they propose that Mood takes the place of tense/agreement as the identifier of 'finiteness'). Nominative Case is often associated with 'finiteness' (but not necessarily, as the current paper as well as literature on Icelandic control clauses show – for example, Sigurdsson 1991). Conversely, lack of tense and/or agreement is typical of 'non-finite' forms (but not necessarily, see Raposo 1987; Pires 2007 for Portuguese infinitivals with agreement, paralleling the tensed 'non-finite' forms in Telugu herein). Similarly, there is an assumption that matrix clauses must be 'finite' (but not necessarily, cf. the Latin historical infinitive; and upcoming examples in both Telugu and English). And

---

[32] From GB through Minimalism, structural Nominative CASE has been associated with Tense-Agr/'finite' properties of T. Recently, it has been suggested that these features are inherited from C (Chomsky 2007 and citations therein). This connection between T and 'finiteness' is not the only approach to Case in the literature, of course, just the approach that is part of the theoretical framework of this particular paper.

finally, there is the 'evidence' provided by the presence or absence of overt morphology, whose murky waters seem to lead to many unwarranted assumptions.

5.2 Overt Morphology

Because it appears to be the source of so many unclarities, we discuss the relevant overt morphology in Telugu first. It is important to recall at the outset that there are essentially no entailment relations between abstract syntactic features and overt morphology. If there is overt morphology present (agreement or Case markers, for example) then it seems likely that, at an abstract level, some comparable syntactic features are present. Since there are exceptions to this, however, the existence of overt morphology cannot be used deterministically (see multiple Case assignment discussions of Massam (1996) and references cited therein). If there is, instead, *no* overt morphology, then we can draw *no conclusion* (current practices notwithstanding).[33]

Telugu has a fairly transparent set of markers for tense and agreement although they appear together in fairly limited circumstances, occurring in only the *indicative* present, future-habitual, and past positive forms and the future negative form. A partial paradigm for the verb *tin* 'eat' is given in Table (1).

Person	Pres	Fut/Hab	Past	Fut Neg
1s	tin-tunna:-nu	tiŋ-ʈa:-nu	tinn-a:-nu	tin-a-nu
2s	tin-tunna:-vu	tiŋ-ʈa:-vu	tinn-a:-vu	tin-a-vu

Negative forms of the present and past tenses show no agreement. The tense distinction is marked by use of the infinitive as a base in the former and the root as a base for the latter, as Table (2) shows.

Person	Pres.Neg	Past Neg
1s	tin-aɖam-le:du	tin-le:du
2s	tin-aɖam-le:du	tin-le:du
1pl	tin-aɖam-le:du	tin-le:du
3pl	tin-aɖam-le:du	tin-le:du

Overt tense marking is found without any accompanying agreement on some number of additional forms, characterized traditionally as 'non-finite'. For example, *ʧe:stu:* 'while doing' and *ʧe:stunna* both indicate continuous or immediate present tense while *ʧe:si* indicates past (contrast *ʧe:stunnappuɖu* 'when X is doing' with *ʧe:sinappuɖu* 'when X did').[34]

If 'finiteness' is an independent parameter, and we assume that all present tenses share the same value for 'finiteness', then these examples suggest that there is no correlation between overt agreement and 'finiteness'. The only overt shared property in

---

[33]Of course, we must use syntactic arguments to determine abstract features, though the risk of circularity is extremely high and must be guarded against.

[34]*appuɖu* is the complementizer.

all of the present forms is tense. However, tense is a feature shared by both Agree and NoAgree forms (including NoAgree forms traditionally labeled 'non-finite'). Similarly, pro-drop has no obvious relation to presence/absence of agreement. [35]

5.3 Utterance Independence

There is general agreement that only 'finite' clauses can function as independent utterances (see Shlonsky 1997, for example). In Telugu, we see a number of forms in matrix clauses that have neither overt tense nor overt agreement – forms which have been traditionally considered 'non-finite.' In addition to the negative past and present noted above (which may, by connection to the positive, be argued to have covert tense and agreement) there are a number of forms indicating different modalities or aspects, such as the 'obligative' (OBLIG) *ʧejja:li* 'must do', and the 'permissive' (PERM) *tinavaʧʧu* 'may eat' which never show agreement.

Moreover, the same infinitive form *-aḍam* that we see in complement clauses appears in matrix clauses.

(44) manam   annam   enduku tinaḍam?
      We-NOM food/rice-ACC why   eat-INF

      'Why do (should) we eat food?' (K 232, glosses mine)

(45) wa:r(u)   eppuDu ra:waḍam?
      They-NOM(honor) when   come-INF

      'When is he/she coming?' (K 232, glosses mine)

These infinitive sentences are not unlike the comparable English sentences save that they appear to be less restricted (able to add arguments and modifiers much like a 'finite' clause). For example, 'What to do?' is perfectly acceptable in the context of being faced with a broad selection of tasks, or 'When to go?' when faced with a broad selection of dates for travel.

It would be somewhat opportunistic and circular to ascribe covert tense and agreement features and/or covert T[+finite] to clauses with this morphological form only when it appeared in matrix clauses as above, but [-finite] features and no tense/agreement when in complement clauses. Notice that there is no overt difference between the two clauses, matrix or non-matrix – both have a subject DP with Nominative Case (unlike the English 'what to do?'/'*What John to do?'). (And from English, we know that it is not the embedding *per se* that requires non-finite verb morphology.) Rather, in

---

[35]This is just one of a number of contradictory cases (see Huang 1984 for Chinese among others). In fact, the notion of connecting overt tense and agreement to pro-drop seems to be due to a misunderstanding of whether we are modelling the processing ability of the 'listener' or the linguistic computational knowledge of the 'speaker'. The syntax cannot constrain or regulate pro-drop based on (phonological) information it does not have.

Telugu, it seems that verbal morphology is not a reliable indicator of which covert features may or may not be present.[36]

5.4 Case

Finally, we do, in practice, rely very heavily on the presence of (overtly) nominative Case marked subjects to tell us whether a form is 'finite'. Following that rule of thumb would essentially make every clause in Telugu a 'finite' clause (not necessarily problematic), including clauses used for nominal modification – the equivalent of a relative clause but structurally very different from relative clauses in English. Telugu has preposed clausal/attributive modification that takes the form shown in (46).

(46)   Ne:nu ʧeppina   pustakam eppuɖu ʧaduvuta:vu
       I-NOM tell-ADJ.PTCP book-ACC when   read-FUT-2SG
       'When will you read the book I told you about?'

The literal translation — 'the I told you (about) book' — makes the clausal structure clearer. Such adjectival forms bring along all the idiosyncratic Case properties of 'finite' forms, including dative-marked subjects in the case of experiencer verbs.

6 Discussion

The result of looking at this fairly broad range of data is a failure to find any discernible and consistent 'finite/non-finite' distinction in Telugu that revolves around the usual suspects of Case and/or tense and/or agreement. It is tempting to conclude, therefore, that the search for a definition of 'finiteness' as either an atomic entity, a feature, or even as a convenient label for a set of entities/features is unnecessary, and only adds an extra and undefinable layer of 'finiteness' which is both unmotivated and uneconomical. However, there is another perspective on 'finiteness' which deserves consideration, and that is its role in anchoring time and participants to a speech event. Before turning to that (and foundational for it), we propose an analysis that unifies Agree/NoAgree clauses structurally and accounts for their Case similarities as well.

6.1 A CP Analysis

Chomsky (2007) has proposed that T only has features through inheritance from C. This includes both Tense and Person/Agreement features, the latter of which is implicated in Case assignment via a T probe. Subjects are assigned Nominative Case by properties of C (inherited by T). This offloading of Case to C has direct implications for us here, as it paves the way for a CP analysis of Telugu clauses. I propose that,

---

[36]By our own earlier argument, it is perfectly possible that these surface 'non-finite' forms have underlying tense and/or agreement features. If we take those features to be indicative of 'finiteness' and assume that the features are present here, we have, of course, an unremarkable independent clause.

unlike in English, all clauses in Telugu are headed by CP – there are no bare TP's.[37] A CP analysis of this type would account for the uniformity of Nominative Case across all of these clauses given certain featural properties of C. Although this analysis has no necessary impact on the presence of overt/covert tense and/or agreement, it might lean in a particular direction. We offer some evidence that this analysis is on the right track below.

6.1.1 Scrambling Constraints

If we take a bare TP to be the normal instantiation of a 'non-finite' complement clause such as the 'want' (ECM) type, then diagnostics that focus on the difference between CP and TP may provide some evidence for the status of the Telugu clauses. For example, Latin is said to allow scrambling out of infinitive clauses (bare TP's) but not out of CP's. We compare scrambling with 'want' and 'try' below.

(47) Ne:nu Sridhar   Elu:rlo: parugu   gelakundaḍa:niki
      I-NOM Sridhar-NOM Eluru-LOC race-ACC win-NEG-INF-DAT
      prajatnintʃa:nu/ko:ra:nu
      try/want-PST-1SG
      'I tried/wanted for Sridhar not to win the race in Eluru.'

(48) *parugu Ne:nu Sridhar   parugu   gelakundaḍa:niki
      race-ACC I-NOM Sridhar-NOM win-NEG-INF-DAT Eluru-LOC
      Elu:rlo: prajatnintʃa:nu/ko:ra:nu
      try/want-PST-1SG
      'I tried/wanted for Sridhar not to win the race in Eluru.' (Accusative scrambled out)

(49) *Elu:rlo: ne:nu Sridhar   parugu   gelakundaḍa:niki
      Eluru-LOC I-NOM Sridhar-NOM race-ACC win-NEG-INF-DAT
      prajatnintʃa:nu/ko:ra:nu
      try/want-PST-1SG
      'I tried/wanted for Sridhar not to win the race in Eluru.' (Locative scrambled out)

As the examples indicate, none of the scrambled versions is grammatical on the intended reading, suggesting all are CPs. This is a uniform finding across the clauses that we have examined, shared by the absolute, present participles, and, not surprisingly, by all adjunct forms whether or not they show overt complementizers.[38]

---

[37]Other languages, like Tongan and Persian, show a similar pattern and therefore this is far from the first proposal of this general type, cf. Bošković 1997, inter alia, but it is the first for Telugu and runs counter to proposals for Malayalam (Jayaseelan 2004).

[38]Chomsky (2007) noted that C never seems to manifest Tense in any language, though it does occasionally manifest *phi* features. Telugu may be an exception to reflexes of Tense on C, however. Several of

Clausal coordination is also likely to provide some evidence for a CP analysis. It is a difficult diagnostic in Telugu, not least because there are no overt coordinators in normal, colloquial speech. We assume, fairly uncontroversially, that coordination is only possible between constituents of the same type. So the English examples are fine as long as either two CP's or two TP's are coordinated.

(50)   That John was always late and that he never excused himself annoyed Mary.

(51)   To be late all the time and to not give a hoot annoys some people.

(52)   *That John was always late and to not give a hoot annoyed Mary.

Conjoining a DP and CP/TP produces ungrammaticality.

(53)   *ne:nu t͡ʃeppina   pustakam mariju Sridhar   tinna:ɖu
       *I-NOM tell-ADJ.PTCP book-ACC and   Sridhar-NOM eat-PST-3MSG
       *'Sridhar ate and the book I told (you) about'

The Telugu examples below show various combinations of NoAgree forms, including forms with overt complementizers coordinated with infinitive forms (the latter being most likely to be TP and the former almost certainly not).

(54)   Sridhar   vat͡ʃt͡ʃi   annam   tinaɖam Sailajani
       Sridhar-NOM come-ABS food-ACC eat-INF Sailaja-ACC
       bha:dhint͡ʃindi
       annoy/distress-PST-3NSG
       'Sridhar coming and eating (his) meal annoyed Sailaja.'

(55)   Sridhar   vat͡ʃt͡ʃi   annam   tinakapo:te: ne:nu
       Sridhar-NOM come-ABS food-ACC eat-COND-NEG I-NOM
       tinanu
       eat-NEG-FUT-1SG
       'If Sridhar doesn't come and eat (his) meal, I will not eat.'

As far as we can tell, all Agree/NoAgree coordination combinations are allowed (though some are more pragmatically awkward than others). This suggests that, at the minimum, the clauses are the same type of constituent. Since it would be difficult to argue that a clause with a complementizer was a TP instead of a CP, CP seems like the correct choice.

_____

the NoAgree forms that show tense appear to show it in exactly the position of a complementizer. Exploration of this possibility would take us too far afield here but merits further work. For a comprehensive discussion of these and related issues, see Epstein, Kitahara, and Seely (forthcoming) and Epstein, Obata, Kitahara, and Seely (forthcoming).

6.1.2 CP complements

For the purposes of characterizing the null subjects of NoAgree clauses earlier, we provided examples of complements with 'infinitive' forms. It turns out that even verbs like 'try' allow CP complements with the quotative marker *ani* as in (56) – a common alternative to the infinitive form below.[39]

(56) ne:nu   va:ʧʧu   bho:ʤanam tina:lani   prajatninʧa:nu
      I-NOM they-NOM meal-ACC   eat-OBLIG-QUOT try-PST-1SG
      'I tried for them to eat the meal.'

These sorts of examples show that a CP complement with an overt complementizer (*ani* sometimes translated as 'that' in English) is possible, unlike with 'try' in English. This potentially provides some additional evidence that 'try' in Telugu is not syntactically parallel to 'try' in English.

   One result of this analysis is the likely conclusion that Telugu has no bare TP's at all. The majority of the clause types discussed were already analyzed as CP's (and are usually analyzed that way cross-linguistically). In addition to the CP analysis providing a better account of the clause-internal syntax of the NoAgree complement clauses we examined, it has the positive outcome of unifying a set of clauses which share many significant characteristics. It is the one property not shared by all these clauses that we turn to now to finally resolve the status and identifiability of 'finiteness' in Telugu.

7 The Relationship of Independent Clauses to Speech Events

It has been proposed that the ultimate role of a FinP projection (as in the expanded CP of Rizzi 1997) is to allow the Temporal and Participant features of the Speech Event to be interpreted *vis à vis* speaker context/attitude (Bianchi 2003; Enç 1987; Platzack, 1995; Higginbotham 2000; and many others).[40] Further, that it is only through 'anchoring' of this type that an utterance is able to stand independently for interpretation.[41] This relationship of syntactic features/structure to the Speech Event has been instantiated in CP in various ways, including logophoric anchoring through the use of Speech Event features, as in Sigurdsson (2004), or through a Logophoric Centre in FinP, as in Bianchi (2003).[42] The general claims are of interest for two reasons: first, because we take them to be universal (in the general sense that the Speech Event

---

[39]External sandhi between final and initial vowels produces the form *tina:lani* from *tina:li* and *ani*.

[40]I take the use of 'Fin' in 'FinP' to have approximately the same status as the use of 'C' of 'CP.' That is, the label is only a reflection of its historical source within the field and in no way determinative as to the interpretation of the function of the domain, just as 'Complementizer' is no longer an accurate description of many roles of 'C'-elements.

[41]The presence of such features is a necessary but not sufficient condition for utterance independence since such features occur in dependent utterances as well. Bianchi (2003) touches upon one way of instantiating this difference by proposing both 'Internal' and 'External' Logophoric Centres.

[42]I am adopting the general notion here rather than any particular theoretic implementation of the relationship, something that would require much more time and consideration than space allows.

must have anchoring) and therefore we should look for their reflexes in Telugu; and second, because the only observed distinctions between the clauses we have been examining are in their ability to stand as independent utterances.

Our earlier examples of clausal coordination in Telugu, (1), (2) and (3), gave a partial illustration of the constraints on conjunction in Telugu. With the full set of data, we see, crucially, that the constraints against conjunction are limited to forms (both Agree and NoAgree) which can stand in independent utterances.[43]

(57)   nuvvu   iṇṭiki   veḷḷi   annam   tina:li
       you.SG-NOM house-DAT go-ABS food-ACC eat-OBLIG

       You should go home and eat. (You should go home and you should eat.)

(58)   *nuvvu   iṇṭiki   veḷḷa:li   annam   tina:li
       you.SG-NOM house-DAT go-OBLIG food-ACC eat-OBLIG

       You should go home and eat. (You should go home and you should eat.)

(59)   (nuvvu)   iṇṭiki   veḷḷi   annam   tinu
       (2SG-NOM) house-DAT go-ABS food-ACC eat-IMP

       Go home and eat! (K 330:6c)

(60)   *(nuvvu)   iṇṭiki   veḷḷu   annam   tinu
       (2SG-NOM) house-DAT go-IMP food-ACC eat-IMP

       Go home and eat!

By contrast, there are no (syntactic) constraints on the number of, for example, absolutive NoAgree forms that can be coordinated, as in (61) below, nor can absolutives stand independently the way the obligative NoAgree form can (cf. (62) with (63)).

(61)   Sridhar   gaṭṭiga: navvi,   baza:r-ki   naḍiʧi,   samudram-lo:
       Sridhar-NOM loudly   laugh-ABS baza:r-DAT walk-ABS ocean-LOC
       ida:ḍu
       swim-PST-3MSG

       'Sridhar laughed loudly, walked to the bazaar, and swam in the ocean.'

(62)   *atanu   iṇṭiki   veḷḷi
       he-NOM house-DAT go-ABS

       He go home.

---

[43]It is, of course, perfectly possible to have a sequence of independent utterances, in which case there is no violation of the conjunction constraint. The two key differences between conjoined utterances and sequential utterances are in the absence/presence of a pause and the different intonational patterns (no sentence-final vs. sentence-final).

(63) atanu   iɲʈiki   veɭɭa:li
      he-NOM house-DAT go-OBLIG
      He should go home.

I propose that the unifying factor between independence and (lack of) coordination is a completely predictable limit on primary/external Speech Events per utterance – a one to one matching.[44],[45] Arguably, the difference between the grammaticality of the English coordinated structures and the ungrammaticality of the Telugu ones revolves around the scope of the conjunction head vis á vis FinP.

Based on this evidence and on the arguments for the CP status of clauses, I propose the following.

– That we have indirect but nevertheless convincing evidence that finiteness (in the sense described in this section), as a necessary factor in licensing independent speech events, plays a role in Telugu.
– That, as the ability to anchor a clause to a Speech Event rests upon having temporal and participant referents, matrix clauses in Telugu include *covert* tense and person/agreement features.
– That a unified and economical analysis is one in which non-matrix CPs *also* have covert tense and person/agreement features. We have found no evidence for distinguishing among embedded clauses in structural or Case terms.

I return briefly here to the fact that we do not generally find morphologically identical forms in both matrix and non-matrix CPs. I take this to be parallel to the many other cases in natural language where subordination requires particular morphology for superficial mechanical reasons (subjunctives, tense sequencing, and the like). Although our tradition leads us to fasten more quickly onto the absence of Agree forms in non-matrix clauses, there is no reason to treat them any differently than their fellow independent NoAgree forms (which also do not occur in non-matrix clauses).

8 Conclusions

This paper presented evidence against PRO/Control in Telugu (contra Haddad 2009), noting that on virtually no dimensions were the facts similar to those in standardly motivated instances of PRO/Control, nor did the null subject in Telugu pass any of the diagnostics for PRO. Instead, I argued that the null subjects of complement and adjunct clauses were simple instances of *pro*, independently required for pro-drop. The connection of 'non-finite' forms with PRO/Control led to a general examination of the distribution of forms traditionally labelled 'finite' or 'non-finite' and the

---

[44] Additional evidence for this comes from the fact that matrix clauses coordinated with 'or' are grammatical in Telugu. Presumably this reflects the effects of the disjunctive nature of 'or' on the number of Speech Events entertained. I am currently exploring these distinctions.

[45] Subordinate clauses are already treated separately as being anchored internally to the matrix clause rather than externally (see Bianchi 2003).

corresponding difficulty of determining the presence/absence of covert features without appeal to the often unrevealing surface morphology. Traditional notions of finiteness, centered on areas of tense and agreement, failed to explain the major uniformity across Telugu clauses. I proposed that a unifying feature of all the Telugu clauses was that they were CP's and supported this with evidence from scrambling and coordination. In addition, I proposed that only a definition of finiteness as the temporal and logophoric anchoring necessary to a speech event seemed consistent with the data and also a necessary part of the syntactic machinery. Crucially, though not surprisingly, the overt morphology was not only not a reliable indicator of covert syntactic features but was instead quite misleading. We assume that the acquirer can find, as we did, sufficient indirect evidence to set up feature bundles for functional heads that will produce, under computation, the kind of empirical data we have examined.

References

Adger, David. 2007. Three domains of finiteness: a minimalist perspective. In *Finiteness: theoretical and empirical foundations*, ed. Irina Nikolaeva, 23–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Amritavalli, R., and K. A. Jayaseelan. 2007. Finiteness and negation in Dravidian. In *Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*, eds. G. Cinque and R. Kayne, 178–220. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bianchi, Valentina. 2003. On finiteness as logophoric anchoring. In *Temps et point de vue/tense and point of view*, eds. Jacqueline Guéron and Liliane Tasmovski, 213–246. Paris: Université Paris X.

Biezma, Maria. 2011. Multiple focus strategies in pro-drop languages: evidence from ellipsis. Ms., Carleton University.

Bošković, Zeljko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: an economy approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bossé, Deena, and Olivier Bossé. 1991. *Manuel de télougou*. Paris: Harmattan.

Bouchard, Denis. 1985. Pro, pronominal or anaphor. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16 (3): 471–477.

Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2007. Approaching UG from below. In *Interfaces + recursion = language?*, eds. U. Sauerland and H. M. Gärtner, 1–29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dukes, Michael P. 1996. On the nonexistence of anaphors and pronominals in Tongan. PhD diss, University of California, Los Angeles.

Enç, Murvet. 1987. Anchoring conditions for tense. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 633–657.

Epstein, Samuel D., Hisatsugu Kitahara, and Daniel Seely. 2011. Derivations. In *Oxford handbook of linguistic minimalism*, ed. Cedric Boeckx. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Epstein, Samuel D., Miki Obata, Hisatsugu Kitahara, and Daniel Seely. 2013. Economy of derivation and representation. In *The cambridge handbook of generative syntax*, ed. Marcel den Dikken. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gair, James W. 2005. Some aspects of finiteness and control in Sinhala. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*.

Ghomeshi, Jila. 2001. Control and thematic agreement. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 46 (1/2): 9–40.

Haddad, Youssef. 2009. Copy control in Telugu. *Journal of Linguistics* 45 (1): 69–109.

Higginbotham, James. 2000. On events in linguistic semantics. In *Speaking of events*, eds. James Higginbotham, Fabio Pianesi, and Achille C. Varzi, 49–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30 (1): 69–96.

Huang, C. T. James. 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531–574.

Jackendoff, Ray, and Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79 (3): 517–556.

Jayaseelan, K. A. 2004. The serial verb construction in Malayalam. In *Clause structure in South Asian languages*, eds. Veneeta Dayal and Anoop Mahajan, 67–91. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Karimi, Simin. 2008. Raising and control in Persian. *Aspects of Iranian Linguistics*.

Kissock, Madelyn J. 1995. Reflexive-middle constructions and verb raising in Telugu. PhD diss, Harvard University.

Kissock, Madelyn J. 2011. Against copy control in Telugu. Workshop on South Asian Syntax and Semantics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, March 19-20, 2011.

Krishnamurti, Bh., and J. P. L. Gwynn. 1985. *A grammar of modern Telugu*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22 (4): 811–877.

Lee, Kum Y. 2009. Finite control in Korean. PhD diss, University of Iowa.

Lisker, Leigh. 1963. *Introduction to spoken Telugu*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies.

Massam, Diane. 1995. Clause structure and case in Niuean. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 14.

Pires, Acrisio. 2007. The derivation of clausal gerunds. *Syntax* 10 (2): 165–203.

Platzack, Christer. 1995. The loss of verb second in English and French. In *Clause structure and language change*, eds. Adrian Battye and Ian G. Roberts, 200–226. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polinsky, Maria, and Eric Potsdam. 2006. Expanding the scope of control and raising. *Syntax* 9 (2): 171–192.

Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: the inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18 (1): 85–109.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar: handbook of generative syntax*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Safir, Ken, and Osvaldo Jaeggli. 1989. *The null subject parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sastri, Koradeva M., and Klaus L. Janert. 1985. *Descriptive grammar and handbook of modern Telugu: with key*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Schlenker, Phillippe. 2003. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26 (1): 29–120.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1997. *Clause structure and word order in Hebrew and Arabic: an essay in comparative semitic syntax*. Oxford University Press.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1991. Icelandic case-marked PRO and the licensing of lexical arguments. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 9 (2): 327–363.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2004. The syntax of person, tense, and speech features. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 16: 219–251.

Sundaresan, Sandhya, and Thomas McFadden. 2010. Subject distribution and finiteness in Tamil and other languages: selection vs. case. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 2 (1).

Szabolcsi, Anna. 2009. Overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements in Hungarian. *Approaches to Hungarian* 11.

Usha Devi, A. 1988. Are complex sentences really complex? *OPIL* 14: 55–63.

Vijayasri, N. 2003. *Anaphora in Telugu*. Sri Venkateswara University.

Viswanatham, K. 2007. *Structure of Telugu phrases*. Central Institute of Indian Languages.