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Abstract. This paper is about infinitival clauses and their subjects in Ancient Greek. Ancient Greek has a tripartite paradigm that involves: (a) infinitives with overt accusative subjects (distinct from main-clause subjects and also coreferential but emphatic), (b) infinitives with null controlled subjects that copy the case of their controller (resulting in the operation of case agreement across copula [CAAC]), and (c) infinitives with null accusative subjects that are referential and arbitrary. To account for this, I first argue that all infinitival clauses are CPs. Arguments for this include the modal distinctions among Ancient Greek infinitival clauses, the coordination of infinitival clauses with finite embedded clauses, the existence of infinitival clauses with overt complementizers, evidence from binding of infinitival subjects as well as enclitic focus particles in Ancient Greek infinitives. Although all infinitives are CPs, I argue that there is a further distinction between strong- and weak-phase CPs, with phasehood being related to features in the left periphery of the clause. Infinitives with overt and null accusative subjects are strong phases, C*Ps, whereas control infinitives are weak phases—CPs that are transparent domains and can therefore allow case agreement to operate across a clause boundary. I also compare Ancient Greek to Latin and argue that the distinction between strong- and weak-phase CPs is also found in the finite domain. The main implication of this proposal is that the availability of a subject is only a property of a clause, defined as a strong-phase CP.

1. Introduction

The syntax of infinitival clauses, in connection to the form, the properties, and the interpretation of their subjects have been a topic of longstanding linguistic interest. This paper focuses on Ancient Greek\(^1\) infinitival clauses, and my aims are both empirical and theoretical: on the one hand, I want to bring in light a set of neglected and intriguing data and, on the other hand, account for the existence of controlled structures and their interchange with overt (and structurally case-marked) infinitival subjects. My main claim has to do with the existence of strong and weak phases at the C level, C and C*, which co-depend with the existence or not of infinitival subjects with independent case versus controlled subjects whose case is inherited from their controllers. Regarding the availability of case for infinitival subjects in Ancient Greek, I propose that default case is available only when an argument is licensed in a particular environment. I therefore follow a Marantz 1991 type of splitting between case and licensing.

In the literature on control, a central claim has been that control domains are related to tensed domains: the tenseness of a clause turns it into an independent domain, opaque from operations from the outside (e.g., control). Here, I argue that phasehood

\(^1\) The term Ancient Greek is equivalent to Classical Greek, and it refers to the Attic dialect of Greek, spoken in Athens in the 5th century B.C.
(that cannot be reduced to tenseness) as the relevant notion of clause opaqueness. The data I present seem to favor an approach whereby controlled PRO is case-marked and purely anaphoric. Noncontrolled null subjects also exist in Ancient Greek; they bear accusative case and have both arbitrary and referential interpretation. Additionally, there exist the overt, independently, and structurally case-marked infinitival subjects that give rise to the construction known as *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* (AcI). These data constitute a tripartite paradigm that needs to be accounted for.

The structure of the paper is the following: first, I present the Ancient Greek data. The patterns that are observed involve both overt and null subjects, whose interpretation is controlled, disjoint reference, and emphatic. I will briefly discuss previous analyses and give some arguments against an exceptional case-marking (ECM) or tense-based approach of overt infinitival subjects. I will identify the main puzzle of Ancient Greek as the alternation between overt and null infinitival subjects with an independent case (accusative for Ancient Greek) and null controlled subjects, which exhibit case agreement with the their controller from the main clause, an operation called case agreement across copula (CAAC; a term due to Andrews [1971]). I will then proceed to give extensive and diverse (semantic, syntactic, and morphological) arguments on the existence of a C layer in all Ancient Greek infinitival clauses. Then I will flesh out the analysis that involves two types of infinitival C—one that is a strong phase and one that is a weak one. I argue that the licensing of the infinitival subject and control correlate with them in an interesting way. I will also argue for a split in the nature of null infinitival subjects based on their case properties: PRO is purely anaphoric and always copies the case of its controller, whereas arbitrary or referential null subject always surfaces with accusative case. In section 4, I compare Ancient Greek to Latin and extend the analysis to the latter. Section 5 is the conclusion.

2. Ancient Greek Data

Before turning to the distinctions among all types of infinitival subjects and their properties, I provide a brief overview on the morphology of Ancient Greek infinitives. The verbal system of Ancient Greek has four morphologically distinct moods: indicative, subjunctive, optative, and imperative in addition to infinitives and participles. The latter two cannot be found in all tense–aspect forms but only in the imperfective, future, aorist, and perfect. There also exist three morphologically distinct voices: active, middle, and passive (although the latter two coincide in the imperfective and the perfect). Regarding Ancient Greek infinitives, consider the data in table 1.

As evident from the table, there are important morphological distinctions in the infinitival paradigm. Although the stems that are used to form the verbal and the infinitival forms are the same (cf. *graph*-o: ‘write’, first-person indicative, and *graph*-ein ‘to write’, imperfective infinitive, active voice), it is commonly assumed (Binnick 1991, Jannaris 1897, among many others) that the stem is temporal when used in the formation of verbs but aspectual when used in the formation of infinitives and participles. Therefore, the infinitive with the stem of the present denotes the imperfective aspect, the one with the past stem denotes the aorist, and the one with the stem of present perfect aspect...
denotes the perfect. The future infinitive falls outside the aspectual paradigm and exceptionally denotes future tense, especially in *oratio obliqua*.

The distribution of infinitival clauses in Ancient Greek is quite wide, and they function as complements to a wide variety of predicates (epistemics, volitionals, verbs of saying, perception verbs, control verbs, etc.); subjects of impersonals, passives, and unaccusatives; and adverbial temporal and resultative adverbial clauses (introduced with overt complementizers). They can also substitute the imperative in main clauses and be introduced by a determiner, in the construction called *articular infinitive*. For reasons of space, in this paper, I focus on the use of the infinitive as a complement, subject, and adjunct clause.

It is well known that infinitival clauses in Ancient Greek can readily appear with overt subjects in the accusative case. Standard control exists as well and is signaled with case agreement between the null infinitival subject and its controller in the main clause. We will look into this alternation in detail in the next sections; I will also introduce the third variety of infinitival subjects in Ancient Greek, that of null accusative infinitival subjects.

### 2.1 Overt Subjects

Ancient Greek allows overt subjects in the accusative case in much more generalized contexts than English ECM—the construction known as *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* (AcI). In fact, there does not seem to exist a verb or verb class that especially disallows the existence of overt infinitival subjects. They are found in disjoint-reference and emphatic contexts, and I will give examples of each in the following sections.

#### 2.1.1 Disjoint-Reference AcI

The most common instance of overt infinitival subject is when it is distinct to that of the main clause.\(^2\)

---

2. The case of the null infinitival subject will be detected in this paper with the use of examples with a copular infinitive taking an adjectival predicate, a technique used by Andrews (1971), Philippaki-Warburton & Catsimali (1989), Spyropoulos (2005), and Sigurðsson (1989, 1991) for Icelandic. Subject–predicate agreement in Ancient Greek is robust and can reveal the case of the null infinitival subject.

3. For reasons of space, I include only one representative example of each construction in the main text. The supplementary appendix includes additional examples that give a more complete view of the situation in Ancient Greek. For a full list of examples with much more detail, see Sevdali 2007.

---

3. For reasons of space, I include only one representative example of each construction in the main text.
In (1), the main-clause verb *he:gomai* ‘I think’ takes an overt nominative subject *ego* ‘I’, whereas the infinitive *einai* ‘to be’ takes the accusative subject *arete:n* ‘virtue’. This construction is found with other verbs like *boulomai* ‘I want’ and *phemi* ‘I say’ (see (1)–(2) in the supplementary appendix [online with this article]). The subject of the main verb can be overt or null (cf. (1) in the main text and (1) in the supplementary appendix) because Ancient Greek, like Modern Greek, is a *pro*-drop language.

2.1.2 *Emphatic AcI*

Ancient Greek also has the option of inserting the infinitival subject even when it is coreferential with that of the main verb:

(2) *Oiomai [eme phaulon einai ze:te:te:n].*

    think-1SG me-ACC bad-ACC to be researcher-ACC

    ‘I consider myself to be a bad researcher.’ (Plato, *Charmides*: 175e)

This example involves a dropped main-clause subject and a coreferential overt infinitival subject. In this case, both the infinitival subject, *eme*, and the adjectival predicate, *ze:te:te:n*, appear in the accusative case. Due to the relative rarity of this construction as well as the fact a (null) controlled subject is the preferable option in cases of simple coreference, this construction is labeled *emphatic* by all major Ancient Greek grammars: Jannaris 1897, Goodwin 1889, Smyth 1920, and Schwyzer 1950. Crucially, a version of this example involving subject control would be as in (3) and there would be no accusative for the infinitival subject.

(3) *Oiomai [PRO phaulos einai ze:te:te:s].*

    think-1SG bad-NOM to be researcher-NOM

I will return to subject control in the next section.

There are two issues concerning emphatic AcI in Ancient Greek that I will come back to: the first has to do with the element used in these cases for the infinitival subject (if it is an pronoun or an anaphor), which is discussed in detail in section 3.3.3; the second involves a comparison of Ancient Greek with Latin (see section 4).

2.2 *Controlled Null Subjects*

The situation in control is quite different from what we have seen so far. In short, control seems to be marked with the absence of an independent case feature in the

---

4 A variation of emphatic AcI is contrastive AcI, where an accusative infinitival subject is inserted because it is directly contrasted with another subject, either in the main clause or in another infinitival clause. I will return to this construction in section 3.1.
infinitival clause, resulting in direct case agreement between the controller and the null infinitival subject (CAAC). I will try to detect the case of the null controlled subject in three environments: subject control, object control, and dative-argument control. The results in all three environments are uniform.

2.2.1 Subject control

In subject control, the null infinitival subject seems to bear nominative case, which is overtly manifested on the adjectival predicate of a copular infinitive:

\[(4)\] Elpizei \([\text{dunatos einai archein}].\)
\[\text{hopes-3SG \ able-NOM to be \ to rule} \]
\[\text{‘He hopes to be able to rule.’} \]
\[\text{(Plato, Republic: 9. 573c)}\]

In (4), the adjectival predicate inside the bracketed infinitival clause is nominative, displaying CAAC with the main-clause subject. The main verb, elpizo: ‘I hope’, is obviously not the only verb that exhibits this behavior. Examples (3)–(5) in the supplementary appendix include the verbs boulomai ‘I want’, homologue:so: ‘I maintain’ and phe:mi ‘I say’. All of these verbs can participate in a control construction, even if they are not control predicates in the traditional sense of the term. So, perhaps control in Ancient Greek is possible when a particular configuration obtains, and it is not purely a reflex of the lexical property of certain verbs. Note that verbs like boulomai ‘I want’ and phe:mi ‘I say’ (among others) can appear either with an overt accusative subject or in a control construction, which triggers CAAC. I will come back to this possibility in section 2.4.

2.2.2 Object control

The situation in object control is exactly the same as in subject control: they are both manifested with CAAC. However, with accusative being the most common case of objects in Ancient Greek, object control would be virtually indistinguishable from AcI. This is why Philippaki-Warburton & Catsimali (1989) call (accusative) object-control cases, pseudo-AcI, or concealed object control. For reasons of space, I do not discuss these constructions here (but see (6) in the supplementary appendix). Instead, let us focus on examples like the following, which are the ideal environment for testing object control:

\[(5)\] Kurou edeonto \([\text{ho:s prothumotatou genesthai}].\)
\[\text{Cyrus-GEN pleaded-3PL as most willing-GEN to become} \]
\[\text{‘They pleaded to Cyrus to become as willing as possible.’} \]
\[\text{(Xenophon, Hellenika: I.5.2)}\]

In (5), the main verb deomai ‘plead’ takes a genitive object Kurou ‘of Cyros’. With this object controlling the null infinitival subject, it also agrees with it in case and genitive is transferred to the adjectival predicate prothumotatou ‘most willing’.
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2.2.3 Control by a dative argument

The last environment that gives rise to CAAC is with traditionally referred to as impersonal verbs. These are verbs that usually surface in a default third person and have no overt nominative subject but a dative argument instead.\(^5\) This dative seems to be able to trigger CAAC in cases of control, as in the following example (also see \((7)\) in the supplementary appendix):

\[(6)\] Nun soi exestin [andri genesthai].
Now you-DAT is possible man-DAT to become
‘It is now possible for you to become brave.’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis*: VII.1.21)

This example involves the overt dative soi ‘you’ that accompanies the main verb, controlling CAAC inside the infinitival clause.

2.3 Noncontrolled Null Subjects (Null Accusatives)

So far, the pattern of Ancient Greek infinitival subjects seems relatively straightforward: accusative case is available when the infinitival subject is overt, and CAAC is exhibited in cases of control. This observation could be theoretically translated as the accusative case feature of infinitival subjects being parasitic on the Extended Projection Principle (EPP).\(^6\) However, the data in this section challenge this conclusion, because Ancient Greek seems to have independent accusative even when the subject is not overt, in two cases: when the infinitival subject has an arbitrary interpretation and when it is a referential null subject, like the one found in many pro-drop contexts of null-subject languages. The conditions under which the content of this element will be recovered will be discussed shortly. Let us look into these two instances in turn.

2.3.1 Arbitrary null subject

The following two cases exemplify infinitives with arbitrary subjects:

\[(7)\] Philanthro:pon einai dei.
friendly-ACC-3SG to be must-3SG
‘One needs to love people.’ (Isocrates, *Nicocles*: 15)

\[(8)\] Dro:ndas he:dion (esti) thanein.
acting-PRTCPL-ACC sweeter-NEUT is-3SG to die
‘It is better to die in action.’ (Euripides, *Helen*: 814)

In both of these examples, the null infinitival subject receives an arbitrary interpretation, and it is not possible to assume that they are controlled by a null

---

\(^5\) The status of the dative and the syntax of these verbs is quite complicated, so I do not get into it here for reasons of space. For a first survey on these verbs, see Sevdali 2008.

\(^6\) I thank Ian Roberts (p.c.) for pointing out this possibility.
argument in the main clause⁷ because neither dei ‘must’ or heidion esti ‘it is better’ take any nominal arguments in addition to their infinitival complements. The interesting thing is the variability in the number of this arbitrary null subject, which is singular in (7) and plural in (8). This complicates the situation, given that the standard assumption concerning arbitrary PRO in Chomsky 1981 is that it has only one set of φ-features (either singular or plural). In Ancient Greek, this does not seem to be the case, and the arbitrary infinitival subject varies in number.

2.3.2 Referential null subject

The last type of infinitival subject to be discussed is perhaps the most interesting and is also unique to Ancient Greek (although possibly also Latin; see sect. 4). Contrary to the standard assumption that referential null subject cannot be found in infinitives, Ancient Greek displays a seemingly discourse-constrained pro-drop in infinitives, albeit in the absence of agreement on the infinitival form (see table 1). To see the exact licensing environment of such an operation, consider the following:

(9) All emoige, epe: o: So:crates, didakton einai dokei.
    but me-DAT GE⁸ said-3SG O Socrates taught-ACC to be seems-3SG
    ‘But, he said, at least for my part, Socrates, I think it is teachable (wisdom).’
    (Plato, Euthydemus: 282c)

Example (9) is an answer to the question esti ge he: sophia didakton; ‘can wisdom be taught?’ In (9), the noun ‘wisdom’ is dropped in the infinitival clause and the adjectival predicate surfaces in the accusative case. Because the main verb is the impersonal dokei ‘it seems’, it is impossible for the construction to be an instance of concealed AC1. We can deduce from this that a referential null argument is licensed in the infinitival clause and refers to an entity prominent in the discourse but not syntactically accessible, and that this null argument bears accusative case.

If this analysis of (9) is on the right track, then this is evidence that Ancient Greek has two kinds of null infinitival subjects marked with accusative: arbitrary ones (see (7) and (8)) and referential ones (see (9)). These are clearly distinct from PRO, which exhibits CAAC and is marked with the case of its controller. In other words, we can take the distinction between independent (accusative) and copied case (CAAC) to be a diagnostic in distinguishing between two different types of null infinitival subjects: arbitrary and referential null subject with independent accusative case, on the one hand, and purely anaphoric PRO with CAAC, on the other. This would mean that the puzzle we have to account for is tripartite and has to do with the licensing of the accusative on both overt and null infinitival subjects in addition to the suspension of independent case in control, which results in CAAC.

⁷ Compare Manzini 1983, Manzini & Roussou 2000, and Bhatt & Pancheva 2006 for an alternative account of arbitrary PRO, as controlled by a null argument in the main clause.

⁸ Ancient Greek has a wide variety of discourse particles that are sometimes enclitic. Ge is one such particle, seen here attached to the dative argument emo. I will return to these particles in section 3.2.5.
2.4 Summary

Table 2 provides a summary of infinitival subjects in Ancient Greek. The specific questions we need to address are the following:

- What licenses an independent infinitival subject in cases (a–b) and (e–f)?
- Where do subjects get case from, in the absence of agreement on the infinitival form?
- Why is accusative unavailable in cases of control (c–d)?
- What is the relevance of emphatic infinitival subjects?

In the past, these have been regarded as separate issues, and analyses have been put forward to account either for infinitives with overt, independently case-marked subjects (Romance languages in general: Menching 2000; Italian: Rizzi 1982; European Portuguese: Raposo 1987; Spanish: Sitaridou 2002; Neapolitan and other Southern Italian dialects: Ledgeway 2000) or for case-marked PRO (Icelandic: Sigurðsson 1989, Russian: Landau 2008). The combination of both of these paradigms in Ancient Greek makes an especially complicated case.

Obviously, various analyses have been proposed regarding the theoretical question of the licensing of independent accusative case. For instance, concerning Latin, which also has AcI by and large similar to Ancient Greek (but see sect. 4), it has been argued to involve ECM by Pepicello (1977). This analysis has been extensively argued against by Bolkenstein (1979) and Pillinger (1980), among others, and specifically for Ancient Greek by Philippaki-Warburton & Catsimali (1989, 1999) and Spyropoulos (2005). The more important argument against ECM has been the extent of the distribution of the AcI construction, like AcI infinitives functioning like complements of impersonal verbs, passives, and unaccusatives. Consider the following example:

(10) Homologeitai [te:n polin he:mo:n archaiotate:n einai].
    is accepted-PASS-3SG the town-ACC our-GEN very ancient to be
    ‘It is widely admitted that our town is the oldest.’ (Isocrates, Panegyricus: 23)

In (10), the bracketed infinitival clause is an argument of the impersonal verb (with passive morphology) homologeitai ‘it is admitted’. The accusative subject te:n polin ‘the town’ of the infinitive could not have received case from the verb, which as a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AcI</th>
<th>(a) Disjoint reference</th>
<th>Accusative DP/pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AcI</td>
<td>(b) Emphatic</td>
<td>Accusative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>(c) Subject</td>
<td>NOM PRO (with copied case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>(d) Object dative</td>
<td>ACC/GEN/DAT PRO (with copied case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pro_{ACC}$</td>
<td>(e) Arbitrary</td>
<td>ACC null subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pro_{ACC}$</td>
<td>(f) Referential</td>
<td>ACC null subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
passive does not have an accusative case feature available. Therefore, if one wants a
uniform account of AcI in Ancient Greek, ECM cannot be it, given that it cannot
account for AcI in such examples.

The other major type of approaches concerning the source of the accusative in AcI
relies on the temporal properties of the infinitival clause. The rationale is simple:
nonfinite T can sometimes assign case to its subject like finite T does. Although finite
T always licenses nominative, nonfinite T can assign nominative only when it has
agreement features (as in European Portuguese and Spanish) or accusative when it
has no agreement (as in Ancient Greek\(^9\)). This is in accordance with the longstanding
link between control and tense. Control infinitives are considered CPs, having the
infinitival tense *par excellenc*—namely, that of unrealized future (irrealis) as argued,
for instance, in Stowell 1982. ECM and raising infinitivals are TPs, propositional
infinitives, and are temporally dependent on the main verb. In the more traditional
literature, the existence of independent temporal reference of a clause makes it an
opaque domain, inaccessible to operations from the outside. If control in Ancient
Greek is manifested with CAAC, which requires clausal transparency and accessi-
bility from the main clause, this connection is challenged, and tense does not seem to
play a role in the dependence or independence of an infinitival clause. Consider
examples (11a,b).

(11) a. Ego: men oun (...) phe:mi [pantas panta prattein].
   I-NOM then say-1SG all-ACC all-ACC to do
   ‘I maintain then that everybody does everything [omitted: (only) for
   the sake of pleasure or profit or honour].’
   (Isocrates, *Antidosis*: 217)

b. epeide: kai su phe:s [einai theos] (...)
   because and you-NOM say-2SG to be god-NOM
   ‘since you claim to be a god’
   (Aristophanes, *Frogs*: 635)

Examples (11a,b) constitute a minimal pair: they both have the main verb *phe:mi* ‘to
say’ in the present tense, and they also both have the infinitival *einai* ‘to be’ in the
present tense. The difference is that (11a) is an instance of AcI, with an overt
accusative infinitival subject, but (11b) is an instance of control triggering CAAC. In
a language like Ancient Greek, that in principle has morphological distinction on
tense on infinitives (see table 1), it is hard to argue that the difference between the
two examples in (11) is one of tense. Approaches like Cecchetto & Oniga 2002 for
Latin and Sevdali 2003, Tantalou 2003, and Spyropoulos 2005 for Ancient Greek
(in a different theoretical manner from one another) capitalize on the role of T as a
case licensor either independently or when it has some relation with C. These
approaches cannot account for examples like (11a,b), where the tensedness of the

---

\(^9\) There also exists a third possibility, according to Chomsky & Lasnik (1993), Martin (1996), and
Bešković (1997), whereby nonfinite T licenses null case. It is clear that this cannot work for Ancient Greek
because it would be difficult to assume that the nonfinite T can sometimes license null case (in control) and
sometimes accusative (in AcI). I will not pursue this line of thinking further.
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The infinitival clause does not correlate with the availability of independent case for the infinitival subject.

Before moving on, I would like to mention the analysis of Landau 2000, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009,\(^\text{10}\) which is a theory of control and its alternation with overt case-marked subjects in infinitival and finite clauses (like Balkan subjunctives) and which has been very influential, although it has not been specifically extended to Ancient Greek. In Landau’s system, tense of the embedded clause primarily plays a role in distinguishing partial control (PC) and exhaustive control (EC) complements, where the former but not the latter is confined in tensed clauses. In the more recent version of his theory, Landau minimized the role of nonfinite T and central role has been assumed by the C-T relation as a system of agreement of formal T and Agr features. This calculus of control, as it is referred to, is supposed to account for the interaction between overt and null subjects and the observed case patterns. In his 2008 system, Landau deals with Russian, which also exhibits case independence and case agreement similarly to Ancient Greek, displaying “a nonuniform case-transmission paradigm”. Roughly speaking, according to him, Russian, has obligatory case transmission (CAAC) in subject control; it has optional case transmission in subject control across an object, direct object control, and control across a lexical C; and it has case independence (dative in Russian, accusative in Ancient Greek) in control into a \(wh\)-complement, control by nonaccusative objects and nonobligatory control. Consider the following example (from Landau 2009:269, (2a)), which seems to be an exception to our generalizations so far:\(^\text{11}\)


They-NOM asked Athenians-GEN them-DAT assistants-ACC to become ‘They requested the Athenians\(_i\) PRO\(_i\) to become their assistants.’

Example (12) appears to be an instance of object control without CAAC. The adjectival predicate of the infinitive boe:thous appears in the accusative case although it refers to the genitive object from the main clause Athenai:on. This seems to be an exception to my generalization, whereby control always equals CAAC (sect. 2.2). I propose that such examples are instances of nonobligatory control\(^\text{12}\) (NOC) and therefore CAAC does not actually fail to apply but actually cannot apply. A predicate

\(^{10}\) Landau’s analysis is complex, discusses a lot of data, and has taken many forms over the years. For reasons of space, it is presented briefly here, and I am not able to do it justice in this section.

\(^{11}\) Vanden Wyngaerd (1994) also reports some exceptions to CAAC as a sole mechanism to control. I would argue that any example of control that does not display CAAC is an instance of nonobligatory control.

\(^{12}\) The term obligatory control can be conflated with the term control. Nonobligatory control refers to the phenomenon of accidental coreference, whereby the embedded null subject can or cannot receive its interpretation from a main-clause argument. Here I argue that CAAC is the mechanism reserved for control, when it is obligatory, whereas a nonobligatorily controlled interpretation of the infinitival subject can be also be achieved with AcI.
like *deomai* in (12) is not an obligatory-control (OC) predicate,\(^\text{13}\) and therefore the null subjects of its infinitival complement need not transfer the case of the controller. By analogy to the vast majority of overt infinitival subjects, predicates in these cases surface in the accusative case. This can be taken as an argument that this is an instance of accidental coreference and not true control, and it is only the latter that is manifested through CAAC that fails to be established in these cases. So, CAAC can be regarded as a mechanism reserved by the language for OC cases only and not for any kind of coreference.\(^\text{14}\)

Landau (2008) argues that Russian does not allow for subject control or CAAC across another argument. This is not the case in Ancient Greek, as the following example shows:

(13) Doko: \(\text{moi} \quad \text{[peri ho:n punthaneste]} \quad \text{ouk amelete:tos}\) 
seem-1SG to me-DAT about these-GEN ask-2PL not uninformed-NOM 
einai.
to be 
'It seems to me that I am not uninformed about the things you ask about.' 
(Plato, *Symposium*: 172a)

Here, CAAC obtains between the null nominative subject of *doko*: and the predicate *amelete:tos* even if the dative argument of the main verb intervenes. Such an example is different from the situation in Russian. Another crucial difference between the situation in Russian and that in Ancient Greek has to do with selection of the infinitival clause by the main verb: Landau argues that many of the differences between infinitival Cs that allow for case transmission and those that do not are transferred by the v’s that select them. This cannot be the case in Ancient Greek because the same main verbs (e.g., *phe:mi* ‘I say’ in (11a,b)) can take both controlled infinitival CPs, which allow CAAC, and ones that do not. Landau also claims that the null infinitival subject is PRO across the board, case-marked either with independent case when it is arbitrary or with case that has been transmitted from a main-clause argument when it is controlled. Russian, however, does not have the referential variety of null infinitival subject that Ancient Greek has (cf. (9)), and I cannot see how he could argue that this is PRO as well, something that seems to be crucial in his theory.

---

\(^\text{13}\) An anonymous reviewer asks whether there are any instances where *deomai* is not an obligatory-control predicate. Consider the following:

(i) Deomai archomenos \(\text{te:s die:ge:seo:s} \quad \text{[Mousas te kai Mne:mosune:n epikaleisthai]}\). 
must-1SG starting-PRTCPL-NOM the narrative-GEN Muses-ACC and Mnemosyne-ACC to invoke-PASS 
‘I must begin my narrative with an invocation of Muses and Memory.’  
(Plato, *Euthydemos*: 275d)

In this example, the infinitive is passive and therefore the two accusative arguments are its subjects. Therefore *deomai* in this example is a nonobligatory control predicate.

\(^\text{14}\) Another possible explanation of these cases is to treat them on a par with the phenomenon of Case attraction found in relative clauses in Ancient Greek. Ancient Greek has various well-documented cases of attraction in relative clauses, where an element that canonically receives case A from the relative clause has this case overridden and surfaces in case B by attraction to the argument it modifies in the main clause. To my knowledge, there is no satisfactory analysis for these cases, but should there be one, then this analysis can be extended to capture the exceptional cases, where CAAC seems not to apply in object control.
3. The Role of C in Infinitives in Ancient Greek

This section outlines my analysis of Ancient Greek infinitives. First, I will discuss the contrastive interpretation of overt infinitival subjects and see how they parallel expressed subjects of null-subject languages. Then, I will give extensive arguments about the CP status of all infinitives in Ancient Greek. I will also argue that not all infinitival CPs are the same, and will propose that there exists a strong- versus weak-phase distinction at the C level, a distinction that correlates with the different form and interpretation of subjects. Strong-phase CPs have φ-independent subjects that can appear overtly or covertly according to discourse factors. Weak-phase CPs allow only for control, manifested with CAAC. In the end of this section, I argue that the case of Ancient Greek infinitival subjects is default case.

3.1 Contrast and Ancient Greek Infinitival Subjects

The empirical generalization that emerges from the data in section 2 is that only disjoint reference and emphatic DPs can surface overtly as infinitival subjects. This will be supported further by two types of evidence that I will now present in more detail: the use of strong pronouns and the contrastive schemata with men...de ‘on the one hand...on the other hand’.

Recall (4), which illustrates emphatic AcI. The element used as an infinitival subject in such cases is the pronoun eme. This fact provides some additional evidence about the claim that emphasis is indeed at play in these cases. The oblique cases of personal pronouns of Ancient Greek have strong (stressed) forms, like eme ‘me’ as well as weak forms (at least in the first two persons): me and se. The vast majority of emphatic examples employ the strong form instead of the weak one. The following example illustrates the situation more clearly:

(14) Bouloime:n an, eipon, [eme te dunasthai aute:n apodounai] want-OPT-1SG AN said-1SG me-ACC and to be able her-ACC to give [kai humas komisassthai]. to bring and you-ACC

‘I said that I would want me to give her away and you to take her.’

(Plato, Republic: 6, 507a)

In (14), the main verb has a null subject (standard pro-drop), whereas the first infinitival clause has a subject coreferential to it, expressed with the strong form of the pronoun eme. The repetition of the subject as well as the fact that the strong form of the pronoun is used indicate that eme is emphatic. The second infinitival clause has a different subject hymas and is further contrasted with the subject eme. I will come back to the discourse properties of Ancient Greek infinitival subjects in section 3.3.1.

An important thing to keep in mind is that null-subject languages allow only for contrastive, focused, or topicalized subjects to appear overtly, much like Ancient Greek infinitives (Larson & Luján 1984; Montalbetti 1984; Dimitriadis 1994, 1996; Philippaki-Warburton 1987 and Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998 for Modern
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Greek). Unstressed and nonemphatic subjects are dropped. Non-subject languages
have agreement, which is responsible for licensing their subjects (and identifying
small *pro*). In this paper, I want to argue that the licensing of subjects is only
available inside *clauses*. If this proposal is on the right track, all Ancient Greek
infinitives have to be CPs. The following section provides arguments for this.

### 3.2 Are All Ancient Greek Infinitival Clauses CPs?

In the literature, it is not assumed that all infinitives have a uniform status: control
infinitives have been argued to be CPs, whereas ECM infinitives (Stowell 1982) and
raising infinitives have been assumed to be TPs and restructuring infinitives have
been argued to be VPs (Wurmbrand 2003). In this section, I give various arguments
that all^15^ Ancient Greek infinitives are CPs and that the differences in their properties
follow from differences in the feature content of their C heads, and not from the
presence or absence of a C layer. This way we can eliminate the possibility that case
transmission in CAAC structures (control) is a result of a monoclausal structure: the
infinitive being an unsaturated VP à la Wurmbrand. Furthermore, I will argue that
some infinitival CPs are strong phases and some are weak ones, phasehood on the C
level depending crucially on discourse properties (manifested with an edge feature)
and not on the finiteness of the CP in question.

#### 3.2.1 Modal distinctions in nonfinite clauses

The first set of arguments has to do with modal properties of infinitival clauses in
Ancient Greek, which seem to display the whole array of modal possibilities found in
finite clauses, instead of just irrealis modality, which is supposed to be the
prototypical infinitival mood. Ancient Greek has four morphologically distinct
moods: indicative, subjunctive, optative, and imperative. Moreover, it uses two
distinct negative markers to accompany forms with realis and irrealis interpretation
and retains this distinction with infinitives, as shown in the following examples:

\[(15)\] Ei de ti chalepon horo:ien [ouk ananke:n einai
to-share they-DAT
‘But if they saw anything unpleasant, they were under no compulsion to share
it with them.’ (Xenophon, *Hellenika* IV: 3. 13)

^15^ Actually, what we need to focus on is arguments that noncontrolled infinitives are CPs. Control
infinitives have crosslinguistically been considered to be CPs, and therefore we do not need to argue for this
specifically for Ancient Greek. Stowell (1982) has argued that because control infinitives express irrealis
modality, and because modal properties are in C, then control infinitives are uncontroversially CPs. I fully
subscribe to this view and therefore do not give arguments specifically for the status of control infinitives in
Ancient Greek.
In (15), the bracketed infinitival clause\textsuperscript{16} has realis modal interpretation and therefore receives the \textit{ouk} type of negation. In (16), however, where the infinitival clause has irrealis modality, the \textit{me:} type of negation is used. The following example shows another modal use of the infinitive: the potential infinitive, accompanied with the potential marker \textit{an}, usually found with the indicative and the optative of the finite verb giving rise to the counterfactual interpretation.

(17) Akouo: Lakedemoniois an anacho:rein ep’ oikou.
\textit{hear-1SG Lacaedemonians-DAT AN to return-PRES to house-GEN} ‘I am informed that the Lacaedemonians would return to their homeland.’
\textit{(Demosthenes, IX: 48)}

Example (17) is an instance of indirect speech and expression of the counterfactual reading through the infinitive accompanied by the potential particle \textit{an}.\textsuperscript{17} The corresponding direct speech of (17) is example (8) in the supplementary appendix.

The final instance of a modal use of the infinitive involves it substituting for verbs in the imperative mood, as in the following example:

(18) O: xein, angellein Lakedemoniois hoti te:ide keimetha
O foreigner-\textit{voc} to announce Lacaedemonians-DAT that here lay-\textit{1PL tois keino:n rhe:masi peithomenoi.}
the-DAT their-\textit{GEN} words-DAT loyal-\textit{PRCPL-NOM} ‘O foreigner, tell the Lacaedemonians that we lie here, being loyal to their orders.’
\textit{(Herodotus, Historia VII: 228)}

In this example, the main verb \textit{angellein} appearing in the infinitival form, instead of an imperative. This rare use of the infinitive completes the picture, as Ancient Greek infinitives are able to express all the possible mood distinctions found in finite clauses: realis, irrealis, counterfactual, and imperative. These data argue therefore that, just like finite clauses, infinitival clauses in this language can express the full

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{16} Interestingly, the bracketed infinitival clause functions as a main clause, an \textit{apodosis} to the conditional that precedes it.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{17} We come back to particles in section 3.2.5.}
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range of mood distinctions. If Mood is syntactically instantiated on the C system (or a separate head in an extended left periphery; see Rizzi 1997), then these data not only function as arguments for a modal interpretation of infinitival clauses but also as arguments for the existence of infinitival C in all infinitival clauses.

3.2.2 Coordination with finite clauses

In Ancient Greek, many verbs can take both finite and infinitival clauses as complements. Such a case is the verb *oida* ‘know’, which usually it *either* takes a finite clause *or* an infinitival one; in the following example, however, we see the rare occasion of them being coordinated.

(19) Humas pantas eidenai he:goumai [hoti ego men you-PL-ACC all-PL-ACC to know think-1SG that I-NOM on the one hand ortho:s lego:], [touton de skaion einai]. correctly speak-1SG him-ACC on the other hand stupid to be.

‘I think that you have all perceived that I speak correctly, whereas he is stupid.’

(Lysias, Against Theomnestus 1:15, 3)

The two bracketed clauses are linked with the *men…de* ‘on the one hand…on the other hand’ type of coordination. The first clause is a finite declarative clause, introduced with the overt complementizer *hoti*, and the second is an infinitival clause, which displays the AcI construction. However controversial the syntax of coordination may be, it is standardly assumed that coordinated elements have the same (amount of) structure—compare Chomsky 1957 and the “law of the coordination of like categories”, all of them being DPs or VPs or CPs, for example. In English, the verb *believe* that takes both an ECM infinitive (standardly assumed to be a TP) and a *that* clause as complements cannot take them both simultaneously in a structure of coordination:

---

18 The exact position of Mood in Greek has been a matter of debate. The issue has arisen in relation to Modern Greek *na* clauses, and the exact position of *na* as a modal (subjunctive) marker. Terzi (1992, 1997) argues that Mood is not on C and is located lower, in the inflectional domain. Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos (2000) argue that the modal system of Greek underwent a change whereby mood was part of the functional domain in Ancient Greek, while in Modern Greek it is part of the C system, essentially Rizzi’s (1997) lower C head. Roussou (2000) argues that *na* is a modal participle, located in the lower C system. In this paper, I follow Rizzi’s (1997) standard approach, whereby mood is located in the lower C system.

19 Jannaris (1897) discusses instances of coordination between finite and nonfinite clauses, providing a number of examples of the same phenomenon with a wide variety of main verbs (see Jannaris 1897:568).

20 Coordination is a topic that has spurred some debate over the years. The main issues have to do with whether the two coordinated categories have to be of the same semantic or the same syntactic type (Sag et al. 1985) and whether whichever law governs coordination is valid for all coordinated elements: arguments and modifiers. In the case of infinitives in Ancient Greek, the relevant question would be whether a TP infinitival clause can be coordinated with a CP embedded finite clause (see (20)) or whether both clauses have to be CP for this to be possible. This does not matter for our purposes: if coordination is a constraint on semantic type then it is possible to argue that a TP is not of the same semantic type with a CP, because a TP lacks the clause-typing and modal properties of a CP. The fact that we find infinitives coordinated with finite clauses in Ancient Greek (unlike in English) means that they have similar semantic properties, by both of them being CPs. I thank Winnie Lechner (p.c.) for discussing this issue with me and providing the references used here.
(20) *I believe [CP that John is cute] and [TP Mary to be ugly].

Example (19) is therefore another argument for the CP status of Ancient Greek infinitives.

3.2.3 Evidence from binding: Anaphors versus pronouns as infinitival subjects

In the familiar example (4) that illustrates emphatic AcI, the element used as an infinitival subject in such cases is the pronoun eme. The use of a pronoun in this position is in accordance with this proposal that all infinitival clauses are CPs, because according to principle B (Chomsky 1981) a pronoun needs to be free in its governing category. As a matter of fact, we expect never to find an anaphor in this position (because it would undermine this argument). Traditional grammars give examples of the anaphoric element heauton (or emauton) ‘himself–myself’ functioning as an infinitival subject:

(21) Eboule:thē:n ou:n en toutoi emauton epideixai karterein
wanted-1SG then about these myself-ACC to demonstrate to wait
being able-ACC
‘With respect to these things, I wanted to demonstrate that I am able to wait.’
(Isocrates, Nicocles (3): 39)

In (21), the accusative anaphor emauton could either be the object of the infinitive epideixai or the subject of karterein. I argue that it is the former and not the latter and that (21) is an instance of object control, where the null subject of karterein is controlled by the object of epideiksai, which is the anaphoric element emauton. The following example, however,21 cannot be accounted for similarly:

(22) Hege:samenos emauton (...) epieikesteron einai.
Thinking-AOR-PRCPL-NOM myself-ACC honourable-ACC to be
‘Thinking that I was too honourable.’
(Plato, Apology: 36b)

This example raises an obvious problem for my previous claims, because I cannot argue that the main verb hegoumai in (22) (meaning broadly ‘think/consider’) takes two internal arguments, an accusative and the infinitival clause, simply because this verb is never reported to be ditransitives with such a complementation pattern. It is quite clear that in this case the accusative anaphor emauton is the subject of the infinitive in an apparently exceptional manner with respect to binding theory and contra my predictions. To account for this example, I want to challenge the status of eauton as a true anaphor in such cases. It is well known that Ancient Greek does not have a third person (personal) pronoun: the paradigm is incomplete. Ancient Greek only has the first and second person in the singular (ego-, su) and all three in the

21 I would like to thank Geoffrey Horrocks (p.c.) for pointing out this example to me.
plural (*he:meis, huneis, spheis*). This gap is either filled by the emphatic *autos* (which resembles Latin *ipse*) or by the anaphor *eautos*. The problem with a potential use of *autos* in the above example is that it could be taken to mean ‘somebody else’ other than the main verb subject, contrary to the intended interpretation. For this reason the anaphor is exceptionally used, in order to achieve the intended coreferential interpretation. Albeit sketchy, this account seems to be on the right track in arguing that the exceptional character of (22) has more to do with the nature and use of Ancient Greek pronouns and less with the status infinitival clauses. Obviously, more work is needed on the pronominal system of Ancient Greek.

3.2.4 *Infinitival clauses with overt complementizers*

If this analysis is on the right track, and Ancient Greek infinitival clauses are indeed CPs, a straightforward prediction would be that the C position should be in principle overtly realized. In this section, we see that this prediction is borne out. I will present evidence of two types infinitival clauses being introduced with overt complementizers: adjunct and complement clauses.

Infinitival clauses in Ancient Greek can function as adjunct clauses of two specific kinds: temporal clauses and result clauses. Although these clauses are introduced with various complementizers, nonfinite adjunct clauses can be introduced with two complementizers: temporal *prin* ‘before’ (see (23)) and result *ho:ste* ‘so that’ (see (9) and (10) in the supplementary appendix).

(23) *Eboulo:m e:n d’an [touto se proteron noe:sai] [prin wanted-1SG AN this-ACC you-ACC before to understand before eme tas ple:gas labein]. me-ACC the wounds-ACC to receive

‘I would like you to understand this before I am beaten.’

(Aristophanes, *Frogs: 672–673*)

(24) *Apopempousin auton, prin akousai.*

send off-3PL him-ACC before to hear

‘They sent him off, before listening to him (to what he had to say).’

(Thucydides, *Historia II: 12.2*)

Example (23) is an instance of contrastive AcI, where the subject *eme* of the adjunct infinitival clause is overtly expressed because it is distinct from the subject of the previous infinitival clause (complement to the main verb *eboulo:m e:n*) although it is the same as that of the main verb itself. This example is similar to (14) earlier. Example (24) is a straightforward case of control. CAAC cannot be detected, however, because the infinitival verb is not copular.

22 An anonymous reviewer proposes the following possibility for these cases: emphatic anaphors can function as subjects of a CP because they count as intensifier pronouns and not as anaphors. In other words, emphasis turns an anaphor into a pronoun and it subsequently obeys principle B of binding theory. Such a claim is promising and is also supported by the distribution of anaphors in Latin, which I consider in some detail in section 4.
The following example is from Jannaris (1897:568–569) and illustrates a rare but interesting case of Ancient Greek syntax: infinitival complement clauses introduced with overt complementizers *hoti* and *ho:s* ‘that’, which are usually reserved for finite clauses:


say-PST-1SG that first me-ACC to must-PRES to turn-PRES against myself  

‘I said that first I must try to turn against myself.’ (Legg. 892 D)

Examples (25) here and (11) in the supplementary appendix are both instances of infinitival clauses as complements to predicates like *lego:* ‘say’ and *prosdiamartureo:* ‘testify’ that are introduced with complementizers *hoti* and *ho:s*, respectively. Both examples are instances of AcII and are perhaps the most direct evidence found for the existence of a C layer in infinitival clauses. The data in this section show quite clearly another aspect of Ancient Greek infinitival syntax: infinitives have their own internal structure and their own syntactic properties regardless of their relationship with the main verb. Infinitives function as subjects, objects, or adjuncts and always retain their CP structure and the possibility of both overt accusative and controlled case-copying subjects.

3.2.5 Enclitic focus particles in Ancient Greek

In this section, I discuss focus particles, especially enclitic ones that attach to the elements that they modify. Phonological prominence (e.g., emphatic stress) is a standard focus mechanism found in Ancient Greek, whereby *wh*-pronouns, for example, are distinguished from the homophonous indefinite ones because they bear (emphatic) stress; compare *tis* (*wh*) and *tis* (indefinite). Additionally, enclitic particles also seem to be associated with emphasis. As shown in Denniston 1956 and Arad & Roussou 1997, Ancient Greek has a wide variety of focus particles available, which are *e:, de:, gar, ara, men,... de, ge,* and *i,* among others. Leaving the semantic differences among all these particles aside, it suffices to say that all of them are focus particles in some way or other, denoting contrast, limitation, determination, and so on (see Denniston 1956 for a detailed description). Two of these particles, namely *i* and *ge,* can also be enclitic:

(26) Pantes eran *emoige* edokoun autou.  

all-NOM to love me-DAT GE seem-3PL him-GEN  

‘It seemed to be that all people liked him.’ (Plato, Charmides: 154c)

We can see the particle *ge* being attached on a nominative subject pronoun (see (12) in supplementary appendix) and also on a dative argument (see (26)). Curiously, however, *ge* cannot attach to an accusative pronoun, rendering a combination like *emege* ungrammatical. One might think the reason is that enclitic particles are incompatible with accusative elements in general. This assumption is challenged by data with the particle *i* (see also (14)–(16) in the supplementary appendix).
Oi theoi ouk apodechontai tas poluteleis taautasi pompas te
The gods-NOM not accept-3PL the costly-ACC these-ACC-I processions
and sacrificies-ACC
‘The Gods cannot accept these costly processions and sacrifices.’
(Plato, Alcibiades II: 149c; cited in Devine & Stephens 1999:28, (53))

In (27), i is found attached on the accusative form of the demonstrative pronoun, taautas that functions as the direct object of the main verb. In the following example, the particle ge is part of the infinitival clause:

(28) All’ e:toi keinon ge ton tauta bouleusanta dei
but surely him-ACC GE the these-things-ACC PL thought-PRTCPL must
die-INF
‘Either this guy, the contriver of this plot must die.’
(Herodotus, Historia I. 11)

In this example, ge accompanies and intensifies the infinitival subject keinon ‘him’, essentially turning a pronoun into a deictic pronoun ‘him there, that guy over there’. The pairing of the particle ge with the subject of the infinitival clause can function as an argument about the structure of the infinitival clause. As Denniston (1956) first notes and Arad & Roussou (1997) elaborate on, all these Ancient Greek particles are found quite early in the clause.23 Arad & Roussou follow Rizzi (1997) and argue that these particles can also be hierarchically placed on a split-C system. The presence of ge in infinitival clauses can thus function as an argument for the existence of a C layer on infinitives.

3.2.6 What do all these data tell us?

The data in the sections above give arguments in favor of the CP status of infinitives in Ancient Greek. Some are more semantic, like the modal interpretation of infinitival clauses, whereas some others are more syntactic, like the arguments from binding or the existence of overt complementizers with some infinitival clauses. Finally, there are also some morphological arguments, like the existence of the potential marker an with infinitives, the existence of two distinct negative markers as well as the existence of discourse particles.

The important thing to keep from all these data is that they argue that all infinitival clauses are CPs. This is prima facie unexpected, if we wish to extend previous observations about English to Ancient Greek. As I mentioned before, it is commonly assumed that not all infinitives have the same clausal structure: control infinitives are CPs, whereas ECM and raising ones are TPs (Stowell 1982, among others), and

23 Ge is a particularly difficult particle to place (it is found sometimes in FocP, sometimes in TopP), but as a discourse particle it too is somewhere in C.
restructuring infinitives have been argued to be as small as VPs (Wurmbrand 2003). This variety in clausal architecture is said to covary with more changes in the semantic make-up of infinitives, such as being propositional or nonpropositional, or temporally dependent or not. Moreover, they might also mirror differences in the transparency of infinitival domains, given that, for example, raising out of a CP is not allowed, but raising out of a TP is.

Considering the data that presented in section 2, we are faced with a problem: if all infinitives are CPs, with apparently similar properties, where do all the differences in subject availability stem from? In the following section, I argue that these differences follow from infinitives being two types of phases: strong and weak ones. It has been recently argued that phase strength is found in the C level, as it is found in the v level (see Basse 2008). Following Basse, I argue that phasehood is related to the force of assertion. But I also adapt his proposal to incorporate the discourse properties of expressed infinitival subjects. Let us turn to how this distinction relates to Ancient Greek infinitives and their different subject properties.

3.3 Some CPs Are Better Than Others

3.3.1 Strong and weak phases in C

As discussed, the Ancient Greek data I want to account for are of three types:

- overt accusative subjects
- null controlled subjects (with copied case)
- null accusative subjects

Initially, it might seem that the main question concerns what gives case to the infinitival subjects. A deeper question, however, before we even get to case, is how Ancient Greek infinitives can have subjects in the first place, given that infinitives canonically are environments where we find control. If this can be answered, then we can find how the case for their subjects is licensed. Having argued that all Ancient Greek infinitives are CPs, I need to show what distinguishes infinitives with accusative independent subjects (overt or null) from the traditional controlled infinitives with CAAC (PRO with copied case). This is the role of this section.

In the domain of complementation, normally, infinitives are environments of control, and finite clauses are environments of disjoint reference and emphasis. In other words, infinitives are environments of obligatory coreference, and embedded finite clauses are environments of disjoint reference. In Ancient Greek, however, embedded finite and infinitival complements are in free variation and behave alike with respect to availability of embedded subjects. Consider the following examples that involve a finite and an infinitival complement of the verb lego: 'to say':

---

24 It is unclear whether Ancient Greek embedded finite clauses are environments of finite control, like Modern Greek na clauses. The issue is not central to this analysis. I return to the issue of finite control within the two phases approach on CPs, in section 4 on Latin.
(29) Legei d’ ho:s hubriste:s eimi.  
\[\text{say-3SG then that arrogant-NOM be-1SG}\]
\[\text{‘He says that I am arrogant.’}\]  
(Lysias: XXIV, 15)

(30) Elegon ou kalo:s te:n Helladan eleutheroun auton.  
\[\text{say-3PL not well the Greece-ACC to free-INF him-ACC}\]
\[\text{‘They said that he wouldn’t free Greece in a right way.’}\]  
(Thucydides, Historia III: 32.2)

In these examples, the finite and the nonfinite complement clause are entirely equivalent semantically. Unexpectedly, the infinitive is used with a disjoint reference subject, and a finite clause is used for coreference, the entire opposite of standard universal tendencies. It seems that Ancient Greek infinitival clauses with AcI behave essentially exactly like clauses of a pro-drop language: they license overt subjects when they are discourse prominent or when they are distinct from a previous subject. In all other cases, they license null subjects (for such an analysis of pro-drop, see Dimitriadis 1994, 1996; Montalbetti 1984; Larson & Luján 1984, among others. For an analysis that treats subjects of pro-drop languages as topics, see Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998). The difference between Ancient Greek infinitival clauses and other clauses of a pro-drop language is that Ancient Greek infinitives do not have agreement. Therefore, this is a curious environment for pro-drop to exist. However, this is not entirely odd—subject drop can happen in other contexts even in the absence of agreement. In particular, there are three cases in the literature where this has been fairly well established:

- Languages without agreement morphology on the verb such as Chinese (as argued by Huang [1984]) can license null subjects (when subjects are topics or null variables).
- Languages without agreement morphology can license exceptional null subjects in specific contexts. These are the cases of diary-style pro-drop in English as argued by Haegeman & Ihsane (2001), where they also argue explicitly that the null category involved is a small pro.
- Other infinitives without agreement fluctuate between having overt and null (controlled or not) subjects (Russian, Icelandic, Spanish, Southern Italian dialects; see references in sect. 2.4).

There is therefore something in the syntax of Ancient Greek infinitival clauses with AcI that makes them behave like in the cases above. Note that these cases are not uniform with respect to the category of the null subject.

On the other hand, control infinitives in Ancient Greek behave like traditional infinitives with no overt subjects. The only curious thing in the Ancient Greek case (as sometimes also in Icelandic) is that control is manifested through case agreement. It is conceivable that control might always be accompanied with case agreement; with this phenomenon being fairly understudied, however, I leave this issue for further research.

So, how can the paradigm of Ancient Greek be accounted for, incorporating the claim that all infinitives in Ancient Greek are CPs? The descriptive generalization is
that a subject can be licensed only in a clausal environment. If this happens, then this subject will be case-marked with some case that is subject to language-particular restrictions. In other words, if an environment licenses a DP argument, then this DP will get case from somewhere. Under these assumptions, control infinitives do not have independent case for their subjects merely because they cannot have overt subjects in the first place, and the reason for this is that they are not full clauses.

Regarding the availability of independent case for the infinitival subject, the generalization is as follows: when the $\phi$-features of an infinitival subject are licensed from the infinitive itself, then this element has independent case (accusative in Ancient Greek). When the $\phi$-features are licensed from the main clause, then the case feature is transferred along as well. Note that the availability of independent case for the infinitival subject is orthogonal to the whether the subject is overt (cf. arbitrary and referential accusative pro). It is also worth noting that the availability of a $\phi$-feature independent subject is not related to agreement in Ancient Greek infinitives; instead, it is related to them being clauses, strong-phase CPs. Strong-phase Cs head clauses, can have $\phi$-independent subjects, and so forth, whereas weak-phase Cs are not clauses, cannot have independent subjects, and allow only for control. The availability of an independent subject has been a diacritic of a sentence since Aristotle’s “On Interpretation,” where a sentence is defined as a unit with a subject and a predicate. Under this definition, clauses that are weak-phase CPs or TPs cannot have overt subjects. This is further supported by known facts on raising, language acquisition, and imperatives.

Under standard assumptions, raising infinitives are TPs. Their basic property is that they can never have an overt subject. Unraised versions of these constructions under standard analyses (Pesetsky 1991, among many others) involve embedded CPs that turn into TPs when subjects raise out of them. It therefore looks as if TPs are not allowed to have subjects, not because they do not have a position for them (Spec,TP is obviously available) but because they are not clausal in the relevant sense. Moreover, in language acquisition, children’s subjectless sentences arguably involve truncated clausal structures (TPs and not CPs; Rizzi 1994). In these constructions, children only produce utterances with subject drop, whereas in full CP structures subjects can be produced as well. Again, it seems then that subjects are available only in CPs and not in any kind of clause-type structure. Finally, imperatives that are predominantly subjectless structures are arguably TPs and not CPs, according to Jensen (2003). She argues that even when imperatives have subjects, they are crucially VP-internal subjects. What all of these structures tell us is that only a full clause can have a subject. Any other construction, clausalike as it may seem, cannot have a subject.

In Ancient Greek infinitives, what differentiates the two types of CPs, with the properties observed? I argue that the diacritic for strength on the clausal level is not

---

25 I will come back to the issue of case in the next section.

26 This is in accordance to a possible account of similar facts from Latin (see sect. 4) made by Cecchetto & Oniga (2004). Cecchetto & Oniga argue that perhaps PRO is like anaphors in that both of them inherit features from their antecedents. Anaphors inherit $\phi$-features only, whereas PRO inherits $\phi$-features and case.
finiteness, as one would assume, but clausality. My analysis draws on that of Basse (2008), who argues that the differences between factive and nonfactive complements can be captured in terms of the difference between defective and nondefective phases. Basse focuses on finite complements of factive and nonfactive predicates and wants to account for asymmetries in wh-extraction and A-movement (reconstruction) between defective and nondefective embedded finite CPs. He argues that factive complements are defective phases, because they lack an assertion feature in the ForceP of their left periphery. As defective phases, factive complements lack an edge feature (essentially an EPP feature), they are not subject to the PIC, and movement out of them is not allowed. The problem here is the opposite: I need to find a way to disallow control into some infinitival clauses, not movement out of them.

To answer this question, I draw on recent literature on the discourse structure of Ancient Greek, especially Matic (2003). Matic argues that Ancient Greek is a discourse-configurational language, in the sense of É. Kiss (1995, 2001), and as such the order of constituents is determined by their pragmatic or discourse role in the clause and not by their grammatical relation. According to him, the generalized order of Ancient Greek is: [Topic–Focus–Verb–pragmatically unmarked material]. So, according to Matic (2003:573), “the image we get of the Ancient Greek sentence is one of a highly grammatically differentiated and strictly structured left periphery, a predicate position serving as a boundary and a completely unordered right periphery.” One of his main aims is to theoretically unify elements that appear in the left periphery of the Ancient Greek clause. These elements include contrastive topics, topic-switches, and newly introduced or reintroduced topics. Following Jacobs (2001), he calls all of these “frame-setting” elements, which essentially posit a referential frame within which the utterance is to be interpreted. Interestingly, for my purposes, these elements are exactly the elements that appear as φ-independent elements in Ancient Greek infinitival clauses, marked with accusative case: disjoint reference subjects (topic-switches), emphatic or contrastive subjects (contrastive topics), and accusative small pro (reintroduced topics).

Combining Basse’s and Matic’s intuitions, I argue that, similarly to the v domain (Chomsky 2001, 2004, 2006), there also exist strong and defective phases on the C level. Strong phasehood is signaled (among other things) by an edge or EPP feature. In infinitival clauses, this means that strong-phase CPs can have φ-independent subjects. These subjects are contrastive topics, topic-switches, and newly introduced or reintroduced topics—in other words, frame-setting elements. The feature that differentiates between strong and defective phases is a frame-setting feature. In some cases (see the ones discussed by Basse), this feature is an assertion feature that regulates movement out of a phase. In other cases, such as Ancient Greek infinitives, this feature is indeed a frame-setting feature that regulates what types of elements can function as infinitival subjects.

The paradigm I presented for Ancient Greek follows from this proposal: only frame-setting elements can appear in strong-phase CPs. Defective phase CPs (control infinitives) do not have this frame-setting feature and therefore cannot license φ-independent subjects. Of course, this system allows that the features that define
phasehood on the C level can vary crosslinguistically. In section 4, I discuss Latin, which manifests a different system that also follows from my proposal.

A last point of discussion has to do with the tense–aspect morphology of Ancient Greek infinitives, and an important question to be addressed is whether this “rich morphology” plays any role in their behavior. It is clearly not related to the interchange between AcI and CAAC, given that Ancient Greek infinitives are inflected in all cases, unlike European Portuguese infinitives, for example, which are inflected (for agreement) when they have independent subjects but are uninflected when they are controlled. My proposal regarding the role of tense–aspect inflection in Ancient Greek infinitives is that it effectively disallows them to stay as VPs and give rise to restructuring. If infinitives have some morphologically expressed inflectional features, then they cannot be VPs, and they can project up to the C level. Or to put it differently, infinitival clauses need to have some morphology as a cue to acquisition, so that learners can tell that these are special cases of infinitives.

3.3.2 Default case

So far, I have refrained from stating an explicit proposal regarding the availability of case for the infinitival subject. Because Ancient Greek infinitival subjects are truly independent from selecting predicates, the availability of case must come somewhere from within the infinitival clause. Also, given the productivity of this phenomenon, we would expect that this is an instance of structural case assignment.

Within current minimalist assumptions, (structural) Case valuation for the subject is done in one of two ways. According to Chomsky (2001, 2004, 2006), structural Case is a reflex of φ-feature agreement between features on T and on the subject DP. This way, case is no longer an uninterpretable feature on a DP that needs to be checked off. Instead it is the reflex of an agreement relation, or to put it differently, it is the (sometimes) visible expression of this relation. This proposal leaves no room for case to exist independently of agreement, although there have been some interesting recent proposals that have argued exactly that (Nevins 2004, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2002, among others). Infinitival clauses with no agreement features but with overt and case-marked subjects like the ones discussed here but also found in Spanish, Russian, and Icelandic are also counterexamples to this generalization. In the past, uninterpretable case features could be found in either Tense or Agreement nodes, making it possible to argue that a temporally independent nonfinite clause (preferably with some tense morphology) could also license case for its subject. This is no longer a possibility.

The second possibility in the literature capitalizes on the relationship between tense and Case in a different way (Pesetsky & Torrego 2001, 2004). According to Pesetsky & Torrego, Case is an uninterpretable Tense feature on D (uT), and tense features like are found in C. This possibility does not fit the Ancient Greek data, exactly because as

---

27 An anonymous reviewer regards the term “rich morphology” as semantically void. Although I agree with this comment, I am merely using this term as conventional label, referring to the fact that Ancient Greek infinitives have “some” morphology more than English ones. This clearly does not explain anything, and the term is used here in the simplest, most expository sense possible.
I argued in section 2.4, tense availability plays no role in the licensing of the case of the infinitival subject.

The obvious question then, is how it is possible to have case-marked subjects, in the absence of both agreement morphology on the verbal form and temporal independence of the clause. My proposal is that although infinitival subjects look as if they have structural case from somewhere, they actually have default case. In general, default case is assumed to be very restricted, and the environments that it is found are not directly comparable with the data of this paper. Schütze (2001) argues that default case is in operation in the licensing of DPs in cases like the following (among many others) (Schütze 2001:210–211):

(31) Me, I like beans.

(32) —Who wants to try this game?
    —Me./Not us.

Clearly, these are not cases of subjects of infinitives. My version of default case is more related to Marantz’s (1991) idea about case and licensing. Marantz’s basic premise is that the Case Filter is not the right way to capture the distribution and licensing of DPs. Instead he argues that abstract case is superfluous and the role of licensing can be solely taken over by the EPP. This line of thought has given rise to a lot of interesting work that regards case as a purely morphological phenomenon and not a licensing requirement (McFadden 2004, among others).

Such a characterization of case seems appropriate for the Ancient Greek data discussed in this paper. In particular, what seems to be happening here is that infinitival subjects are licensed because the environment that they are found in is clausal. Case, then, comes for free, by virtue of the subjects being licensed in the first place. Or to quote Marantz (1991:17): “the issue…is…whether sentences are licensed if there is no subject.” As noted in the previous section, the important thing for Ancient Greek infinitival subjects is that they can appear overtly, in a context that does not canonically allow them. They appear in strong-phase infinitival CPs, exactly because they are full clauses and, as such, have the edge or EPP feature. After they are licensed, they get default case. In the absence of agreement (at least in Ancient Greek), this case is accusative. Under my approach, the availability of case is not the main question regarding infinitival subjects. Case comes for free, if a DP is licensed in a particular environment. And strong-phase CPs, clauses are such an environment.

3.3.3 Implications

Let us now look at how derivations of emphatic AcI, control-CAAC, and null accusative subjects work under this analysis.28

In (33) we see that the structure of emphatic AcI, which is also similar to disjoint reference AcI, involves an infinitival clause that is strong-phase C*P. Strong phases

---

28 In the following structures, sentences have been simplified, and some elements are left out.
have the edge or EPP feature and can therefore license a subject. Case is available by default in this construction, exactly because the infinitive is a full clause. The subject has to occupy Spec,CP at some point of the derivation (possibly at LF via LF movement) when it is emphatic. The curved line shows the domain of operations, which is the phase.

The diagram in (34) represents all control-CAAC structures (subject control as well as object and dative argument control) and shows how it is possible for the null controlled infinitival subject to agree in case with its controller in the main clause. The infinitival CP is a weak phase (illustrated here by the dotted line). This domain is not a clause in the relevant sense, the defective C does not have an edge or EPP feature, and a distinct subject cannot be licensed there: control is the only option available for these structures. The null infinitival subject agrees in case with its controller, and this is possible only because the two elements are in the same phase.\textsuperscript{29} Case is therefore transferred across a weak phase to the controlled PRO and from there to the adjectival predicate.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29} I leave aside the issue of v in the main clause and its phase status. For all relevant purposes, the main-clause subject originates inside the main-clause v, and at that stage it is within the same (strong) phase with the infinitival clause.

\textsuperscript{30} This second Agree, the one between PRO and the adjectival predicate, looks like concord. I do not have anything particularly insightful to say about how this operation works.
Finally, consider (35), which looks similar to (33), involving a null accusative subject. This can be arbitrary (cf. (7) and (8)) or referential. In both cases, the important thing is that the null subject is accusative, the independent case of the infinitival subject. The null infinitival subject can be construed as a small pro, as argued for diary-style pro drop by Haegeman & Ihsane (2001).31

If this analysis is on the right track, Ancient Greek shows us three things. First, finiteness is not directly relevant to the availability of subjects. This is a welcome conclusion, given the extent of exceptional cases of infinitives with subjects that have always been considered marginal under standard assumptions. Also, a clear prediction is that there should also exist finite weak-phase CPs. I will discuss this

---

31 It is difficult to be entirely certain about what the null element involved in these cases actually is. Arguably, the existence of an accusative small pro would be contingent on the existence on object drop in Ancient Greek. Ancient Greek does have object drop, but it has not been systematically examined. It also worth noting that analyses on object drop range from arguing that the null element involved is small pro (Rizzi 1986) or a variable (van der Wurff 1994 for Latin), or sometimes object-drop structures can be confused with instances of VP (or even DP) ellipsis. Note, however, that even if this type of infinitival subject is indeed small pro, this does not contradict the fact that controlled null subjects are PRO. If we follow Bouchard (1984), the infinitival subject is not a homogeneous category; instead, it sometimes is purely anaphoric (when it is controlled) and sometimes functions as a pronoun (when it is arbitrary). Under this approach, we expect to find two distinct types of infinitival subjects, with distinct properties (e.g., case), as we do in Ancient Greek. This seems like a promising possibility, but it needs further scrutiny.
in the next section on Latin, and we will see that the prediction is borne out. Second, clauses should be defined in an Aristotelian way: if you have a predicate and subject, then you are a clause, if not you are not. Being a clause is orthogonal to having agreement, and this links us to the previous point. Finally, there is something to be said about the case of the subject. According to my analysis, if you are a clause, you can license an overt subject. But what regulates the case for this subject? I think that the generalization that needs to be made has to do with the availability of agreement morphology on the verbal form. If a clause has agreement (as a finite verb or inflected infinitive; cf. European Portuguese and Hungarian), then its subject will necessarily have nominative case. This seems to be a universal property of languages. If a clause does not have agreement, however, then the subject can have another case (accusative for Ancient Greek, dative for Russian) whose use is subject to language-specific conditions.

32 This is especially true regarding embedded clauses, although it is unclear to me why this is so. This point might also be related to a cluster of phenomena that are referred to as “root phenomena.” I leave this issue open for further research.
4. Latin

In this section, I examine some aspects of complementation in Latin and compare it to the Ancient Greek paradigm. I will focus on two aspects of Latin syntax: infinitival clauses and *ut/ne* clauses, leaving out *Nominativus cum Infinitivo* (nominative with infinitive), which is akin to raising, for reasons of space.

4.1 Infinitives

Latin infinitives inflect in three tenses: present, future, and present perfect in both active and passive voice. Interestingly, the present perfect of the active voice and the future and the present perfect of the passive voice are periphrastic forms, which are made up with the verb’s participles and the infinitive of the auxiliary ‘to be’ (see table 3).34

In terms of their morphology, therefore, infinitives in Latin and Ancient Greek are fairly similar. Cecchetto & Oniga (2002) characterize them as [+T,–Agr]. With respect to their syntactic behavior Latin infinitives take generalized overt accusative subjects in cases of disjoint reference, exhibiting AcI, similar to Ancient Greek. This is illustrated in the following examples with an AcI infinitive as a complement of a ditransitive verb (see also (17) and (18) in the supplementary appendix):

(36) Eam admoneo [eos profectos esse].
her-ACC admonish-1SG them-ACC left-ACC-PL to have
‘I admonish her that they have left.’

What seems not to be available in Latin is the use of emphatic AcI, as used in Ancient Greek (see (2)). When the infinitival subject in Latin is coreferential with an argument of the main clause, the situation is quite diverse from Ancient Greek. Ernout & Thomas (1953) report that in cases of control, an accusative infinitival subject is retained after *verba dicendi & declarandi*, although it is normally dropped after volitionals; in these contexts, where infinitives are most often found, the infinitival subject is overtly expressed, even when it is coreferential with that of the main verb,

---

33 The data of this section are taken from Cecchetto & Oniga 2002 and the following Latin grammars: Ernout & Thomas 1953, Hale & Buck 1903, and Gildersleeve & Lodge 1895.

34 This could lead some to believe that Latin infinitives are inflected for subject agreement. Cecchetto & Oniga (2002) explicitly argue against this possibility.
without any apparent effect in the interpretation of the clause. Consider the following example (Cecchetto & Oniga 2002:(7)):

(37) Ad portum se aiebat ire  
     to port himself-ACC said to go  
     ‘He said that he was going to the port.’  

In this example, the anaphoric element *se*, which is the subject of the infinitival clause, is coreferential with the main-clause subject, and, although it appears overtly, it does not seem to be emphatic. An important reason that leads all major Latin grammars to this remark is the overwhelming frequency of examples like (37) in Latin, as opposed to their relative rarity in Ancient Greek, where coreferential AcI is considered emphatic. This interesting difference between Ancient Greek and Latin infinitival syntax leads to the first question to be addressed: why does Latin allow for this sort of overt control, but Ancient Greek does not?

A second important difference between Ancient Greek and Latin concerns the element used as an infinitival subject in (37)—namely, the anaphor *se*. The Latin pronominal system is very elaborate, but I will briefly discuss the two anaphoric elements *se* and *ipse*. They both mean ‘himself’, but their uses are fairly distinct. Latin grammars such as Ernout & Thomas 1953 and Gildersleeve & Lodge 1895 claim that *ipse* is the emphatic anaphoric element, contrary to *se*, which is a mere reflexive, carrying no emphasis whatsoever. This remark is corroborated by Harris (1978) and Vincent (1997), who elaborate on the role of *ipse* as an emphatic reflexive pronoun, which is used to bring back the focus on an element that has been used before in the discourse but has fallen into the background of the conversation. Interestingly, *ipse* is never used as an infinitival subject in Classical and Vulgar Latin (Hertzenberg 2009), whereas *se* usually is, as we saw in (37). One could argue that it is exactly the emphatic use of *ipse* that prevents it from appearing as an AcI subject. It therefore looks as if the position of infinitival subject does not carry any emphasis in Latin. Examples like (37) can be referred to as *vacuous AcI*, where an infinitival subject that is coreferential with that of the main clause appears overtly, although it is not focused and has no effect in the information structure of the clause. This leads us to the second question: what disallows emphatic infinitival subjects in Latin but not in Ancient Greek?

Another important difference between these languages has to do with the nature of *se* as an anaphor that obeys principle A of binding theory. As already noted, Ancient Greek uses the pronoun *eme*, which obeys principle B. My analysis argues that Ancient Greek infinitives are CPs across the board, so we expect pronouns to be able to surface as their subjects. A way to account for the difference between Latin and Ancient Greek therefore, would be to argue that their different choice of pronoun as an infinitival subject also implies a difference in the status between Ancient Greek and at least some Latin infinitival clauses—in other words, to argue that Latin infinitives are not CPs. But consider the following example, where an infinitive is found coordinated with a finite clause:
(38) Constituerunt optimum esse domum suam quemque reverti
determined-3PL best-ACC to be home-ACC their-ACC them to return
et (…) undique convenirent.
and from all the sides assemble-3PL
‘They were determined that it would be best for all to return to their homes
and should assemble from all sides.’ (Caesar, De Bello Gallico: 2, 10, 4)

In section 3.2.2, I used similar sentences to argue that Ancient Greek infinitives are
CPs. This example shows that things are not as straightforward as to attribute the
use of reflexive pronouns in the position of infinitival subjects to whether the
infinitival clauses lacks the C layer. Another related issue that needs to be taken into
consideration is the nonlocal binding of anaphors in Latin, as is illustrated in the
following example:

(39) (Isi) pueros a se i discedere vetuit.
he boys-ACC from himself-ABL to go away forbade-3SG
‘He forbade the boys to leave him.’ (Val. Max. 1,7,7)

In (39), the anaphor is inside a PP object of the infinitive, and its antecedent is the
main-clause subject is. This illustrates that possibly the nature and the licensing
conditions of anaphors may very well be different in English, Ancient Greek, and
Latin.

4.2 Control into Infinitives and Ut/Ne Clauses

Perhaps the most interesting difference between Latin and Ancient Greek comes in
the domain of control. Although by and large Ancient Greek and Latin follow the
same pattern as a mechanism of control, with a case-marked PRO that induces
CAAC, Latin has also control into a finite clause. Consider (40), which illustrates the
first option (CAAC; also see (19) in the supplementary appendix).

(40) Statui [esse bonus].
decided-1SG to-be good-NOM
‘I decided to be good.’

In (40), the subject-control verb statuo ‘decide’ takes a complement infinitival clause
with a copular infinitive and a predicate in nominative (exactly as in Ancient Greek;
see (4)). Case agreement of the adjectival predicate and the main-clause subject
enable us to infer two things: first, the empty category, which is the subject of the
infinitive, must also be nominative (assuming uncontroversially that subject–
adjectival predicate agreement is the same in Latin and Ancient Greek), and second,

35 Most of the examples that I used to argue that Ancient Greek infinitives are CPs cannot be duplicated
for Latin for independent reasons. For example, Latin does not have adjunct infinitival clauses with overt
complementizers or the Ancient Greek system of double negation.
CAAC signals control in Latin just as in Ancient Greek. Example (19) in the supplementary appendix shows the same phenomenon with an object-control verb. The final important difference between Latin and Ancient Greek to be discussed here is the extensive use of *ut* and *ne* clauses instead of controlled infinitives. Volitional and impersonal verbs take quite freely either the infinitive as a complement or *ut* clauses (and *ne* if they are negative), as in the following two examples:

(41) Placuit ei legatos mittere.
    is liked-3SG they-PL-NOM ambassadors-ACC send off-INF
    ‘They preferred to send off the ambassadors.’

(42) Placuit ei *ut* legatos mitteret.
    is liked-3SG they-PL-NOM *that* ambassadors-ACC send off-SUBJ-3SG
    ‘They preferred to send off the ambassadors.’
    Lit. ‘They preferred that they send off the ambassadors.’

The choice of an infinitival complement over a finite subjunctive clause cannot be straightforwardly attributed to lexical idiosyncrasies of the selecting predicates. For example, *iubeo* ‘order’ takes an infinitival complement, whereas *impero* ‘command’ takes an *ut/ne* subjunctive clause. In general, the two types of complements alternate quite freely with a lot of predicates (see (20)–(22) in the supplementary appendix with the verbs *impero* ‘order’, *moneo* ‘warn’ [object control] and *stauo* ‘decide’ [subject control] taking finite [subjunctive] *ut/ne* clauses as complements with controlled subjects.) There are several interesting things to be pointed out concerning the use of *ut/ne* clauses in Latin and control. First, there is the somewhat exceptional character of finite control. This is not a unique characteristic of Latin; it is also found in Modern Greek subjunctive *na* clauses that also allow controlled subjects. However, Modern Greek does not have the alternative of infinitives, and this is the most interesting fact about Latin: the alteration between both infinitival and finite control clauses. The real issues that we need to address are the interchange between finite and nonfinite control in Latin and the reason why Ancient Greek disallows this phenomenon entirely.

### 4.3 Null Accusative Subjects

The last piece of data to be discussed involves noncontrolled null subjects in Latin infinitival clauses. Like Ancient Greek, Latin has arbitrary PRO marked with accusative:

(43) Non esse *cupidum* pecunia est.
    not to be covetous-ACC wealth is
    ‘To not be covetous is wealth.’

36 Cecchetto & Oniga (2004:143, n. 2) argue that dative controllers exist in Latin but are rare and have exceptions. I will not discuss this issue here for reasons of space, and I assume, given examples like (38), that control is manifested through CAAC in Latin as in Ancient Greek.

37 Ancient Greek also has the alternation between finite and infinitival complements (cf. (29) and (30)), but crucially not in cases of control.
As in Ancient Greek, the infinitival verbs are copula and their adjectival predicate (*cupidum*) appears in the accusative. Given standard rules of subject–predicate agreement, it is possible to infer that the missing infinitival subject is also accusative. This conclusion is fairly uncontroversial and in a sense in accordance with what we have seen so far. Consider, however, the following example as well:

(44) *Iam hic ad futurum aient eum. Nondum ad venisse miror.*

They say he is arriving here. I am surprised that he has not arrived yet.

(Pl. *Truc.*: 205)

According to Cecchetto & Oniga (2002), (44) is an instance of an accusative *pro*, which is licit only when its content is very easily recovered from the context. This seems similar to the Ancient Greek example in (9), and accordingly to diary-style *pro* drop, as argued for English by Haegeman & Ihsane (2001). However, (44) is considered to be fairly unique (unlike the situation in Ancient Greek, which seems more productive), and moreover it is not possible to check the case of the null subject as we did for Ancient Greek.\(^{38}\)

### 4.4 The Relevance of Latin Data

Table 4 recapitulates the properties of Ancient Greek and Latin infinitival syntax. The biggest differences between the two languages are the following:

- Latin, uniquely, has finite control.
- Ancient Greek, uniquely, has emphatic infinitival subjects.
- Latin uses an anaphor as an infinitival subject, whereas Ancient Greek uses a pronoun.

The analysis I provided for Ancient Greek relies on the existence of infinitival C, as well as the distinction between strong-phase and weak-phase CPs on the nonfinite domain. Latin infinitival clauses can be coordinated with finite clauses, which is an argument in favor of their CP status. However, the fact that they do not allow for emphatic Acl means that infinitival subjects cannot be discourse prominent. This is an indication that Latin does not have strong-phase infinitival C*Ps. Moreover, it can be argued that the Latin data show that the distinction between C and C* is not only instantiated in the nonfinite domain. Controlled *ut/ne* clauses can also be considered CPs that are weak phases. Crucially, I do not want to argue that all subjunctive clauses are weak phases: only subjunctives that allow for obligatory control are. In my system, all embedded clauses can be either C or C*, with all the properties that this distinction implies. This distinction is orthogonal to the finiteness of the clause,

---

\(^{38}\) For this analysis of Ancient Greek, I hinted that such cases might involve an accusative *pro*. A proper characterization of this element, in both Latin and Ancient Greek, is beyond the scope of this paper.
given that both finite and nonfinite clauses can be either strong-phase or weak-phase CPs, with the distinction being related to discourse features on the left periphery instead.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I focused on infinitival clauses in Ancient Greek and the interchange among control, overt subjects, and null accusatives. The paradigm was tripartite; infinitives in Ancient Greek participate in three constructions:

- *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* with overt accusative subjects that have either disjoint reference from the main-clause subjects or are emphatic or contrastive
- control that leads to CAAC
- noncontrolled structures with null accusative subjects that are either referential of arbitrary

To account for this, I argued that although all infinitival clauses are CPs, there are strong-phase and weak-phase CPs. AcI infinitives and noncontrolled infinitives with null accusative subjects are strong-phase CPs (labeled C*Ps), which are opaque from operations from outside, contrary to controlled CPs, which are weak phases and are transparent domains. C*Ps are defined as full clauses, with an edge or EPP feature that allows them to have subjects. Subjects are only licensed in clauses, not in weak-phase CP or TPs. Accusative is given by default in this position.

An important consequence of this proposal is that the distinction between strong and weak phases exists in the C domain, as it does in v. This distinction is orthogonal to finiteness of the clause: Ancient Greek has nonfinite clauses that are strong phases and Latin has finite clauses that are defective phases. In this paper, I showed that phasehood correlates with the availability of a $\phi$-independent subject. Subjecthood is a property of clauses, and only strong-phase CPs are clauses.
Although it has been discussed in the literature before, the pattern presented in this paper has been considered somewhat marginal. I hope to have shown that phenomena such as nonfinite “strong” phases, finite control, CAAC, and accusative small pro as an infinitival subject are far from rare crosslinguistically, and we can only come up with a definitive theory of control if we take them into account as well.
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