

# Chapter 12

## Obligatory controlled subjects in Bùlì

Abdul-Razak Sulemana

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The paper argues that despite the lack of morphological marking to distinguish between finiteness and nonfiniteness, such a distinction does exist in Bùlì. It also argues that unlike the nonfiniteness of the English type languages where nonfinite clauses take a null subject (PRO), the nonfinite clauses of Bùlì obligatorily take overt pronominals. The fact that the controlled element is overt in the language, I argue, shows that phonetic nullness is not an inherent property of the controlled element.

### 1 Introduction

Bùlì does not have overt morphological marking to systematically distinguish finite clauses from nonfinite clauses. As such, notions like these will appear not to be useful descriptive labels in the syntax and semantics of the language. This finite-nonfinite distinction is often manifested differently including the distribution of overt DPs and empty categories: finite verbs license overt DPs while nonfinite verbs cannot without special mechanisms. As an illustration, consider the paradigm in (1) from English. The external arguments of the nonfinite complements which are coindexed with a matrix argument have to be null.

- (1) a. Mary remembered [*\*she/pro* to buy a book]  
b. Mary persuaded John [*\*he/pro* to buy a book]

The goal of this paper is twofold: first to argue that despite the lack of morphological marking to distinguish between finiteness and nonfiniteness, such a distinction exists in the language. Second, I argue that unlike the nonfiniteness of the English-type languages, the nonfinite clauses of Bùlì obligatorily take overt



pronominals which must be coindexed with a matrix argument. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In §2, I present a brief background to this language. In §3, I present a discussion of the finite-nonfinite distinction in the language. §4 argues that with the exception of its overtness, the pronominal in the subject of the nonfinite clause must be controlled. §6 discusses and concludes the paper.

## 2 Bùlì

Bùlì is a Mabia (Gur) language spoken in Sandema in the Upper East Region of Ghana. It has three dialects: Central, Northern and Southern. This paper concentrates on the Central dialect. It is a tone language with three contrastive tones: Low, Mid and High. It is also a noun class language with five singular classes and four plural classes built around the pronouns. Its basic clause structure is SVO. Temporal interpretation of a predicate is sensitive to the eventive/stative distinction in the language (tenseless). Unmarked eventive predicates have default past interpretation while their stative counterparts have present interpretation,<sup>1</sup> (2).

- (2) a. Asibi dà gbǎŋ.  
Asibi buy book  
'Asibi bought a book.'
- b. Asouk sèbi Ajohn.  
Asouk know John  
'Asouk knows John.'

The data in (2) also eliminates the potential for analyzing the low tone on the verb as the past tense morpheme, since both predicates are marked with a low tone. I will therefore consider the low tone as a form of 3rd person agreement. In the next section, I will present various arguments to show that Bùlì meets the general conditions on the finite vs. nonfinite distinction since an adequate classification of some syntactic structures would not be achieved if such a distinction is not assumed.

---

<sup>1</sup>This is related to what are sometimes called factitive constructions which are attested crosslinguistically and in Haitian (Déchaine 1991), and Fòngbè (Avolonto 1992) among others. Stowell (1991) also observes that bare eventive verbs have only a past reading while bare stative verbs are interpreted as non-past in what is called headlines.

### 3 The finite-nonfinite distinction

Since Bùlì is a tenseless (factitive) language, notions like finite-nonfinite will appear not to be useful descriptions in the syntax and semantics of the language. Contrary to this, I present four arguments/diagnostics that will distinguish between them. These diagnostics, I argue, bring out two different kinds of nonfinite clauses: In the first kind, which I call nonfinite obligatory control complement (nonfinite-OC) illustrated in (3–4), the pronominal subject of the embedded clause must be co-indexed with a matrix argument.

(3) Nonfinite-OC: Subject-coindexation

- a. Asouk<sub>i</sub> tìerì      [\*(wà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) dā gbáŋ].  
 Asouk remember 3SG      buy book  
 ‘Asouk remembered to buy a book.’
- b. Núrmà<sub>i</sub>      zèrì [\*(bà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) dā gbáŋ].  
 people.DEF.PL refuse 3PL      buy book  
 ‘The people refused to buy a book.’

(4) Nonfinite-OC: Object-coindexation

- a. Mí túlím Asouk<sub>i</sub> zúk [\*(wà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) dā gbáŋ].  
 1SG turn Asouk head 3SG      buy book  
 ‘I convinced Asouk to buy a book.’
- b. Mí túlím núrmà<sub>i</sub>      zúk [\*(bà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) dā gbáŋ].  
 1SG turn people.DEF.PL head 3PL      buy book  
 ‘I convinced the people to buy a book.’

In the second kind, which I call the nonfinite non-obligatory control complement (nonfinite-NOC) as illustrated in (5–6), allows a full DP in the subject of the embedded clause. There is further distinction between those that are not introduced by complementizers (5) and those requiring complementizers (6). The other differences between these constructions will be made clear as the discussion proceeds as the main reason for this section is to defend the finite-nonfinite distinction in the language.

(5) Nonfinite-NOC without COMP

- a. Mí à-yā:      Asouk dā gbáŋ.  
 1SG ASP-want Asouk buy book  
 ‘I want Asouk to buy a book.’

- b. Nà:wǎ tē síuk Asouk dā gbǎŋ.  
chief.DEF give path Asouk buy book  
‘The chief gave permission for Asouk to buy a book.’

(6) Nonfinite-NOC with COMP

- a. Kù à-fē ātī Asouk dā gbǎŋ.  
3SG ASP-necessary c Asouk buy book  
‘It is necessary for Asouk to buy a book.’
- b. Kù nālā ātī Asouk dā gbǎŋ.  
3SG good c Asouk buy book  
‘It is good for Asouk to buy a book.’

The first argument to consider for the finite-nonfinite distinction comes from the Low-tone (Agreement) on the verb. In finite clauses, a third person subject triggers a low tone (agreement) on the verb when there are no preverbal particles intervening between the subject and the verb (7). This is the case for all 3rd person arguments in matrix as well as embedded clauses for different DP including r-expressions and pronouns and regardless of the tone on the argument. Note that the embedded clauses of the nonfinite clauses bear mid tones (see examples (3–6)).

- (7) a. Wà dà gbǎŋ.  
3SG buy book  
‘S/he bought a book.’
- b. Bí:ká wa dà gbǎŋ.  
child.DEF 3SG buy book  
‘S/he bought a book.’
- c. Asouk pàchìim wà dà gbǎŋ.  
Asouk think 3SG buy book  
‘Asouk thought he bought a book.’

The second argument for treating the embedded clauses above as nonfinite clauses is based on the distribution of the future marker. In finite clauses, both matrix and embedded, the future marker is required for future interpretations. This is illustrated in (8).

- (8) Future marker required in finite clauses
- a. Asibi àlì dā gbǎŋ.  
Asibi FUT buy book  
‘Asibi will buy a book.’

- b. Asouk pàchìm Asibi chūm \*(àlì) dā gbáŋ.  
 Asouk think Asibi tomorrow FUT buy book  
 ‘Asouk thought Asibi will buy a book tomorrow.’

In contrast, the future marker is excluded from all the nonfinite clauses. The examples in (9) illustrate this point. The inability of the future marker to appear in nonfinite clauses reminds us of nonfinite clauses in Chinese which cannot take modals like *hui* ‘will’ (Huang 1989).<sup>2</sup>

- (9) Future marker excluded from nonfinite clauses
- a. Asouk sàak \*(wà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) chūm (\*àlì) dā gbáŋ.  
 Asouk agree 3SG tomorrow FUT buy book  
 ‘Asouk agreed to buy a book tomorrow.’
- b. Mí<sub>i</sub> à-yā: Asouk chūm \*(àlì) dā gbáŋ.  
 1SG ASP-want Asouk tomorrow FUT buy book  
 ‘I want Asouk to buy a book tomorrow.’

The third argument for the finite-nonfinite distinction comes from subject questions. In-situ subject *wh*-questions in finite clauses require the obligatory presence of *àli*-ALI in the clausal spine (10).

- (10) Finite clauses: In-situ subject *wh*-questions require ALI
- a. Ká wānā \*(àlì) dā gbáŋ a  
 Q who ALI buy book PRT  
 ‘Who bought a book?’
- b. Asouk pàchìm ka wana \*(àlì) dā gbáŋ a  
 Asouk think Q who ALI buy book PRT  
 ‘Who does Asouk think bought a book?’

Although it is generally possible to question the subject of a nonfinite-NOC complement (11a–11b), questioning the subject requires the obligatory absence of *àlì*. The ungrammaticality of example (11c) shows that it is not possible to question the controlled subject of the nonfinite-OC complement. Hence another difference between finite and nonfinite clauses.

- (11) Nonfinite clauses: In-situ subject *wh*-questions doesn’t require ALI
- a. Mí<sub>i</sub> à-yā: ka wana \*(àlì) dā gbáŋ a?  
 1SG ASP-want Q who ALI buy book PRT  
 ‘Who do I want for him to buy a book?’

<sup>2</sup>Whether the future marker *àlì* in Bùlì is a modal or a tense marker is beyond the focus of this paper, however.

- b. Nà:wà tè síuk ka wānā (\*àli) dā gbánj a?  
 chief.DEF give path Q who ALI buy book PRT  
 ‘Who did the chief give permission to buy a book?’
- c. \* Asouk; tierì ka wana (\*àli) dā gbánj?  
 Asouk remember Q who ALI buy book

Is it possible that what we are questioning in (11a–11b) are arguments of the matrix predicates rather than subjects of the complement clauses as a result *àli* is not required, since nonsubjects don’t require an *àli*. This is indeed a possible analysis especially for (11a), however, there is evidence that these arguments are subjects of the complement clauses and as such the absence of *àli* cannot be attributed to questioning a nonsubject argument.

Bùlì employs resumptive pronouns in long distance extraction of a subject, (12a) but not an object, (12b).

- (12) a. (Ká) wānā \*(āti) fi pá:-chīm \*(wà) àli dīg lāmmú:?  
 Q who ATI 2SG think 3SG ALI cook meat.DEF  
 ‘Who do you think cooked the meat?’
- b. (Ká) b<sup>w</sup>ā \*(āti) fi pá:-chīm Asouk dīgì: (\*bu) ?  
 Q what ATI 2SG think Asouk cook 3SG  
 ‘What do you think Asouk cooked?’

If the questioned arguments in (11) above are objects, they should pattern with object extraction and if they are subjects they should pattern with long distance subject extraction. As shown in (13) they pattern with long distance subject extraction by requiring a resumptive pronoun.

- (13) a. (Ká) wānā \*(āti) mi; à-yā: \*(wà) (\*àli) dā gbánj a?  
 Q who ATI 1SG ASP-want 3SG ALI buy book PRT  
 ‘Who do I want to buy a book?’
- b. (Ká) wānā \*(āti) nà:wà tè síuk \*(wà) (\*àli) dā gbánj a?  
 Q who ATI chief.DEF give path 3SG ALI buy book PRT  
 ‘Who did the chief give permission to buy a book?’

The final argument for the finite-non-finite distinction comes from n-word licensing.<sup>3</sup> It has been noted that NPIs and n-words differ in that NPIs can be licensed across the border of a clause, but n-words cannot. N-words in Bùlì are formed by reduplicating indefinite nouns, and they must always occur with negation regardless of their position and number.

<sup>3</sup>For more on NPIs see Zeijlstra (2017).

- (14) a. Asouk \*(àn) dīg jāab-jāab \*(ā).  
 Asouk NEG1 cook thing-thing NEG2  
 ‘Asouk didn’t cook anything.’
- b. Wāi-wāi \*(àn) dīg lām \*(ā).  
 someone-someone NEG1 cook meat NEG2  
 ‘Nobody cooked meat.’
- c. Wāi-wāi \*(àn) dīg jāab-jāab \*(ā).  
 someone-someone NEG1 cook thing-thing NEG2  
 ‘Nobody cooked anything.’

In Bùli and other languages, including Italian and Hebrew, *n*-words can be licensed across the border of nonfinite clauses but not in finite ones, (15).

- (15) a. Asouk àn tīeri wà dīg jāab-jāab \*(ā).  
 Asouk NEG1 remember 3SG cook thing-thing NEG2  
 ‘Asouk didn’t remember to cook anything.’
- b. \* Asouk àn tīeri āsī wà dīg jāab-jāab \*(ā).  
 Asouk NEG1 remember c 3SG cook thing-thing NEG2  
 ‘Asouk didn’t remember that he cooked anything.’

I have shown in this section that the distinction between finite and nonfinite clauses holds in the language and that the complement clauses in (3–6) are indeed nonfinite. In the next section, I argue that the nonfinite clause in Bùli requires a pronominal subject which covaries with the number and class of the matrix argument that it is coindexed with, and as such, despite its overtness, this pronominal shares all the properties of *PRO*.

#### 4 Obligatory controlled subjects

In the previous section, I argued that certain clauses in the language are nonfinite. However, unlike the “regular” nonfinite clauses, the nonfinite clauses of Bùli require an overt pronominal. In this section, I will argue that the pronominal in the embedded clauses of nonfinite-OC clauses is a subject and must be controlled by a matrix argument. As noted, the subjects of the nonfinite-OC clauses must be co-indexed with a matrix argument. In (16) the co-indexation is with a matrix subject and in (17), it is with a matrix object. Note that the pronominal also covaries with the number and class of the matrix argument it is coindexed with.

- (16) a. Asouk<sub>i</sub> tìerì \*(wà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) dā gbáŋ.  
 Asouk remember 3SG buy book  
 ‘Asouk remembered to buy a book.’  
 b. Núrmà<sub>i</sub> bàŋ \*(bà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) kpāri tókú.  
 people.DEF.PL forget 3PL lock door  
 ‘The people forgot to lock the door.’
- (17) a. Mì túlím Asouk<sub>i</sub> zuk \*(wà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) bāsī dēlā.  
 1SG turn Asouk head 3SG leave here  
 ‘I convinced Asouk to leave.’  
 b. Núr-wá fē bísánjā<sub>i</sub> \*(bà<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>) bāsī dēlā.  
 man.DEF force children 3PL leave here  
 ‘The man forced the children to leave.’

Although the subjects of these nonfinite clauses are overt, applying the diagnostics from Hornstein (1999), Landau (2013), and Williams (1980) for what are often called signature properties of PRO, suggests that the overt pronominal behaves like PRO except for its overtness.

First, like PRO, and unlike pronouns, the subjects of these clauses must pick up their antecedents in the immediately preceding clauses, (18). That is, just like PRO, and unlike a pronominal subject of a finite clause, the pronominal subject of the most embedded clause can only be *núrmà* ‘the people’ which is the subject of the immediately preceding clause. It cannot refer to the singular subject of the matrix clause, (18a). The referential facts are different when the most embedded clause is a finite clause. As shown in (18b), the pronominal subject can freely refer to the subject of the matrix clause.

- (18) Long-distance binding of this pronominal is not possible.
- a. Asouk<sub>i</sub> nyà āsī núrmà<sub>j</sub> tìeri \*(wà<sub>i</sub>/bà<sub>j</sub>) dā gbáŋ.  
 Asouk realize C people.DEF.PL remember 3SG/3PL buy book  
 ‘Asouk realized that the people remembered to buy a book.’  
 b. Asouk<sub>i</sub> nyà āsī núrmà<sub>j</sub> wèin āyìn wà<sub>i</sub>/bà<sub>j</sub> dà gbáŋ.  
 Asouk realize C people.DEF.PL say C 3SG/3PL buy book  
 ‘Asouk realized that the people say that he bought a book.’

Second, non c-command coreference of this pronominal is not possible, (19). The antecedent of a pronominal subject in nonfinite clauses must c-command it, just like PRO (19). In (19a), *Asouk* cannot be the antecedent of the pronominal subject because it doesn’t c-command it. On the contrary, in finite clauses this restriction does not hold (19b).



(19) The pronominal must be c-commanded by its antecedent

- a. Asouk<sub>i</sub> dóamà<sub>j</sub>      bàŋ    \*wà<sub>i</sub>/bà<sub>j</sub> kpārī tókú.  
 Asouk friend.DEF.PL forget 3SG/3PL lock door  
 ‘Asouk’s friends forgot to lock the door.’
- b. Asouk<sub>i</sub> dóamà<sub>j</sub>      pàchìm wà<sub>i</sub>/bà<sub>j</sub> kpārī tókú.  
 Asouk friend.DEF.PL think 3SG/3PL lock door  
 ‘Asouk’s friends thought he locked the door.’

In ellipsis contexts, the pronominal must be construed sloppily. In example (20) which involves a finite complement, the pronominal could be construed strictly or sloppily. In the strict reading, Asouk was the first to say that he bought a book before Asibi said he (Asouk) bought a book.

- (20) Finite clause: the pronominal is ambiguous: strict or sloppy  
 Asouk<sub>i</sub> wien wà dà gbán àlégē Asibi<sub>j</sub> wien wà<sub>i/j</sub> dà gbán.  
 Asouk say 3SG buy book before Asibi say 3SG buy book  
 ‘Asouk said he bought a book before Asibi said that he bought a book.’

In contrast, in the nonfinite case (21), the pronominal must be construed sloppily. In (21), Asouk was the first to agree to buy the book before Asibi also agreed to buy a book.

- (21) Non-finite clause: the pronominal must be construed as sloppy  
 Asouk<sub>i</sub> siak wà<sub>i</sub> dā gbán àlégē Asibi<sub>j</sub> siak wà<sub>i/j</sub> dā gbán.  
 Asouk agree 3SG buy book before Asibi agree 3SG buy book  
 ‘Asouk agreed to buy a book before Asibi agreed to buy a book.’

Another observation is that PRO in OC environments is interpreted as a bound variable, i.e. it must be bound by the controller. This results in the difference in interpretation between (22a) and (22b). While the pronoun in the nonfinite complement is limited to the bound variable reading in (22a), the pronoun in (22b) is not.

- (22) The pronominal is interpreted as a bound variable.
- a. Wā:-wāi<sub>i</sub>              àn    tīeri      wà<sub>i/\*j</sub> dā gbán a.  
 someone-someone NEG1 remember 3SG buy book NEG2  
 ‘No one remembered to buy a book.’
- b. Wā:-wāi<sub>i</sub>              àn    wēn wà<sub>i/j</sub> dā gbán a.  
 someone-someone NEG1 say 3SG buy book NEG2  
 ‘No one said that he bought a book.’

Finally, as observed by Chierchia (1989), infinitival controlled constructions are always *de se*. The pronominal subject in these complements must be *de se*. This reading arises when the controller/antecedent is the subject of an attitude predicate and is aware that the complement proposition pertains to him/herself. In any situation where the attitude holder mistakes the embedded subject as someone other than him/herself, the pronominal cannot be truthfully used.

Consider the following Scenario: An old man (Asouk) is listening to the credentials of three people being considered for a chieftaincy title. Not knowing that the credentials of the second person mentioned refers to him (because he hardly remembers anything), he says to his wife ‘this person should be given the title’.

In this scenario, (23) is false, an outcome expected if the pronominal is an instance of a lexicalized PRO.

- (23) Asouk<sub>i</sub> à-zīentī wà<sub>i</sub> chīm nà:b.  
Asouk eager 3SG become chief  
‘Asouk is eager to become a chief.’

It is important to note here that there have been reports in the literature that overt pronominal subjects are possible in controlled infinitives when they are focused (Szabolcsi 2009).<sup>4</sup> There is, however, solid evidence that the controlled pronominal subjects in Bùlì are not focus-marked, thus making it distinct from all the other cases identified where ‘PRO’ is overt. Bùlì makes a distinction between weak and strong pronouns, with strong pronouns sometimes associated with focus. Weak pronouns usually have low tones. In controlled constructions, only the weak pronouns are acceptable (24a). The strong pronouns are grammatical only when they are modified by a scope bearing element like *also/too* similar to what Szabolcsi (2009) identified (24b).

- (24) a. Asouk<sub>i</sub> sàik \*(wà<sub>i</sub>/\*wá<sub>i</sub>) dā gbá.ŋ.  
Asouk agree 3SG buy book  
‘Asouk agreed to buy a book.’  
b. Asouk<sub>i</sub> sàik \*(wà<sub>i</sub>/wá<sub>i</sub>) mē dā gbá.ŋ  
Asouk agree 3SG also buy book  
‘Asouk agreed to also buy a book.’

Crucially, focus is not required to overtly express the subject. This indicates that overtness of the infinitival subject does not depend on focus in this language. Thus what we uncover here is not identical to the cases identified by Szabolcsi (2009) and others.

---

<sup>4</sup>See also Barbosa (2009) and Madigan (2008).

## 5 The pronominal is a subject

In the previous section, I established that the overt pronominal in the nonfinite complement clause must be controlled. An alternative view is that PRO is actually null as in other languages, and that this pronominal is an agreement marker found in nonfinite clauses similar to what we see in languages like Brazilian Portuguese. This alternative view, though attractive, faces a number of challenges. First, analogous agreement marking is conspicuously lacking in both finite and other nonfinite clauses (25). In finite clauses in both matrix and embedded contexts, repeating the pronominal as an agreement marker results in ungrammaticality (25a–25b). Similarly, repeating the pronominal in the nonfinite clauses that permit referential DPs as in (25c–25d) is also ungrammatical.

- (25) a. Asibi<sub>i</sub> (\*wà<sub>i</sub>) dà gbánj.  
 Asibi 3SG buy book  
 ‘Asibi bought a book.’
- b. Asouk pàchìm Asibi<sub>i</sub> (\*wà<sub>i</sub>) dà gbánj.  
 Asouk think Asibi 3SG buy book  
 ‘Asouk thought Asibi bought a book.’
- c. Mí à-yā: Asouk<sub>i</sub> (\*wà<sub>i</sub>) dā gbánj.  
 1SG ASP-want Asouk 3SG buy book  
 ‘I want Asouk to buy a book.’
- d. Kù à-fē                   ātī Asouk<sub>i</sub> (\*wà<sub>i</sub>) dā gbánj.  
 3SG ASP-necessary c Asouk 3SG buy book  
 ‘It is necessary for Asouk to buy a book.’

Second, claiming that this pronominal is agreement suggests that it is not in Spec of the embedded clause. However, the placement of adverbials in both kinds of clauses places the pronominal in the same location as matrix and embedded subjects, Spec,TP. The adverb *chúm* ‘tomorrow,’ follows the subject in matrix clauses whether they are referential (26a) or pronominal (26b).

- (26) a. Asibi chúm       àlí dā gbánj.  
 Asibi tomorrow FUT buy book  
 ‘Asibi will buy a book tomorrow.’
- b. Wà chúm       àlí dā gbánj.  
 3SG tomorrow FUT buy book  
 ‘He will buy a book tomorrow.’

In nonfinite clauses too, the adverb follows the pronominal (27). This shows that the pronominal is in Spec, TP just as in matrix subjects and that is not a clitic on the verb as one might assume.

- (27) a. Asouk<sub>i</sub> sàik \*(wà<sub>i/\*j</sub>) chúm dā gbáŋ.  
Asouk agree 3SG tomorrow buy book  
'Asouk agreed to buy a book tomorrow.'
- b. Asouk<sub>i</sub> à-yā: \*(wà<sub>i/\*j</sub>) chúm dā gbáŋ.  
Asouk ASP-want 3SG tomorrow buy book  
'Asouk wants to buy a book tomorrow.'

Finally, the pronominal in the nonfinite clauses can be modified just like any subject, (28).

- (28) a. Asouk mē dà gbáŋ.  
Asouk also buy book  
'Asibi also bought a book.'
- b. Asouk<sub>i</sub> sàik \*(wá<sub>i/\*j</sub>) mē dā gbáŋ.  
Asouk agree 3SG also also buy book  
'Asouk agreed to also buy a book.'
- c. Asouk<sub>i</sub> à-yā: \*(wá<sub>i/\*j</sub>) mē dā gbáŋ.  
Asouk ASP-want 3SG also buy book  
'Asouk wants to also buy a book.'

All these facts put together suggest that the pronominal is not an agreement marker or a clitic on the verb, but a real subject in Spec, TP.

This section has shown that the overt pronominal subject of the nonfinite complement is a subject and must be controlled by a matrix argument. Except for its overtness this pronominal shares the properties of PRO, distinguishing it from the pronouns.

## 6 Discussions and conclusion

The previous sections have established that Bùlì makes a distinction between finite and nonfinite clauses. Secondly, these nonfinite clauses require overt DPs in their specifier position. This conclusion raises a number of interesting questions for the various approaches to Control. I highlight these approaches and argue that the subjectless-based approach to control cannot be extended to Bùlì for obvious reasons. I will, however, leave open the option between the Agree-based model and the movement based model for future studies.

I group the approaches to Control into two:

1. Subject-based Accounts:

- i. Agree-based accounts Landau (2001, 2013) in which the relation between the matrix argument and the embedded subject, PRO (a null nominal element distinct from a trace or copy) is established via an agree operation. On this view, PRO is inherently null because of its association with infinitival T, which only assigns null Case (Chomsky & Lasnik 1993), and
- ii. Movement-based account (Hornstein 1999) which considers the relation between PRO and the matrix argument as involving movement. This approach accounts for the nullness of the subject by considering it as an unpronounced copy of the matrix argument.

2. Subjectless-based accounts: these approaches take the lack of overt subjects in the embedded complements as evidence for the lack of a subject (Bresnan 1982, Dowty 1985, Jackendoff & Culicover 2003, Wurmbrand 1998, 2004, Chierchia 1989) essentially arguing that there is no PRO. Wurmbrand (1998, 2004), for example, considers infinitival complements as instances of restructuring where the matrix verb selects a VP complement.

In the previous sections, I have argued that the overt pronominal found in nonfinite complements under control shares all the properties of PRO. The clear fact that nonfinite controlled complements surface with overt subjects raises interesting questions for theories of Control which deny the syntactic presence of a subject. Thus approaches to Control which take the lack of an overt subject in control complements as evidence for the lack of a subject, essentially arguing against the existence of PRO, cannot be extended to Bùli for obvious reasons. The fact that the controlled element is overt in Bùli, I argue, shows that phonetic nullness is not an inherent property of the controlled element. Hence any approach to control that necessarily requires controlled elements to be null cannot be universal. The present data also presents a challenge for standard theories of DP distribution based on abstract Case. It has been standardly assumed that DPs are licensed in structural positions where Case assignment is possible. Subject DPs are assumed to get nominative Case from finite clauses. Since the complement clauses are nonfinite, the prediction of abstract Case theory is either that their subjects be null or that the DPs should be getting Case from elsewhere. An open question is thus how the overt pronominal is licensed.

## Abbreviations

1	First person	c/COMP	Complementizer	PL	Plural
2	Second person	DEF	Definite	SG	Singular
3	Third person	FUT	Future		
ASP	Aspect	NEG	Negation		

## Acknowledgments

For helpful discussions, I thank İsa Kerem Bayırlı, Kenyon Branam, Suzana Fong, Sabine Iatridou, David Pesetsky, Norvin Richards, Michelle Sheehan, the audience of ACAL 49, and two anonymous reviewers. Any and all errors are my own.

## References

- Avolonto, Aimé. 1992. Les particules modales en fongbe et la nature de INFL dans les phrases injonctives. In Chris Collins & Victor Manfredi (eds.), *Proceedings of the Kwa comparative syntax workshop*, vol. 17, 1–25. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Barbosa, Pilar. 2009. A case for an agree-based theory of control. *Lingbuzz*. <http://lingbuzz.auf.net>.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982. Control and complementation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(3). 343–434.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1989. Anaphora and attitudes *de se*. In Gennaro Chierchia, Renate Bartsch, Johan van Benthem & Peter van Emde Boas (eds.), *Semantics and contextual expression*, vol. 11, 1–31. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam & Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of Principles and Parameters. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*, 506–569. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 1991. Bare sentences. In Steven K. Moore & Adam Zachary Wyner (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st Semantics and Linguistic Theory conference (SALT 1), held April 19–21, 1991 at Cornell University*. DOI: 10.3765/salt.v1i0.2773.
- Dowty, David R. 1985. On recent analyses of the semantics of control. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 8(3). 291–331. DOI: 10.1007/BF00630916.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1). 69–96. DOI: 10.1162/002438999553968.

- Huang, CT James. 1989. Pro-drop in Chinese: A generalized control theory. In Osvaldo Jaeggli & Kenneth Safir (eds.), *The null subject parameter*, 185–214. Springer.
- Jackendoff, Ray & Peter W. Culicover. 2003. The semantic basis of control in English. *Language* 79. 517–556. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4489464>.
- Landau, Idan. 2001. *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in Generative Grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Madigan, Sean William. 2008. *Control constructions in Korean*. Newark, DE. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Stowell, Tim. 1991. Empty heads in abbreviated English. *GLOW Newsletter* 26. 56–57.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2009. Overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements cross-linguistically: Data, diagnostics, and preliminary analyses. *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics* 2. 1–54.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(1). 203–238. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178153>.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 1998. *Infinitives*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2004. Two types of restructuring: Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* 114(8). 991–1014. DOI: 10.1016/S0024-3841(03)00102-5.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2017. Universal quantifier ppis. *Glossa: A journal of general linguistics* 2(1).

