

This therefore provides empirical evidence for Kratzer (2009) and Landau (2015)'s claim that PRO is a minimal pronoun without ϕ -features. Under C&S's framework, this makes it even smaller than a clitic. A summary of the sizes of pronouns under C&S's framework, plus my addition of PRO, is given below.

- (6) a. Strong pronoun: DP > FocusP > Φ P > NP
 b. Weak pronoun: FocusP > Φ P > NP
 c. Clitic: Φ P > NP
 d. PRO: NP

C&S show that whenever a more deficient form of a pronoun is possible as the subject in a sentence, it must be picked over all other alternatives, due to an economy constraint Minimize Structure. I argue that the subject position of an infinitive, Spec,TP, is sensitive to this constraint, too. Because PRO is licensed, it blocks all other alternatives: overt NPs, deficient pronouns and clitics. That is why PRO exists.

This raises the question of how to account for Szabolcsi (2009) and McFadden & Sundaresan (2014)'s observations, in addition to simple *for*-infinitives in English like *I am eager for her to eat pizza*. I point out that all of their examples (with the exception of Tamil, see below) involve either case- or focus-marking, and that it is still highly unusual, if not impossible, for unfocused bare subjects to appear as infinitival subjects. Following Pesetsky (2021), I assume that case-marked infinitival subjects raise out of Spec,TP, obviating the economy constraint. I claim that Focus-marked subjects raise to Spec,FocusP, as well.

Why PRO is licensed in infinitives: Here, I show that there is a fine-grained relationship between clause and subject size. Following Wurmbrand & Lohninger (2019) (W&L), I assume that infinitives can come in three sizes: CP, TP and vP, though I assume that even CP is truncated to some extent following Satik (2022). I show that in different languages, larger subjects than PRO may be allowed in deficient clauses. But these languages obey both the economy constraint and W&L's implicational hierarchy, in that a more deficient clause never allows a larger subject than that is possible in a larger clause. Tamil, for instance, allows overt NPs without case or focus in adjunct infinitives (CP or TP), as in (7a), but never inside vP infinitival complements like those of *try* in (7b):

- (7) a. [Vasu poori porikk-a] Raman maavu vaangi-n-aan.
 Vasu.NOM poori.ACC fry-INF Raman.NOM flour.ACC buy-PST-M.3SG
 'Raman bought flour for Vasu to fry pooris.
 b. Ramani PRO/taan/*Vasu saadatt.ai saappi.d.a paa.tt.aan
 Raman.NOM PRO/self.NOM/*Vasu.NOM rice.ACC eat-INF try.PST.3MSG
 'Raman_i tried [PRO_i for himself_i/*for Vasu to eat the rice].'

Greek and Serbian are similar to Tamil, allowing *pro* (a deficient FocusP pronoun under C&S's framework) in CP or TP embedded clauses but only allowing PRO as a vP-subject.

Raising Constructions: One obvious question the reader may have at this point is whether this economy constraint applies to raising constructions. I provide a tentative account of raising in which it does. As Pesetsky (2021) has shown, Case-based explanations of what drives raising are not sufficient. If accusative Case licensing is what drives raising-to-object, then it would predict the acceptability of (8b), contrary to fact, since CPs don't need Case. Another solution to this puzzle is needed.

- (8) a. * It seems [Mary] to have solved the problem.
 b. * It seems [that the world is round] to be a tragedy.

I will argue that my economy constraint allows for a solution. CPs are simply too large to be licensed as an infinitival subject, and it must raise in order to escape the economy constraint on infinitival subjects.

Selected References

Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns 145–234.

Castañeda, Hector-Neri. 1966. 'He': A study in the logic of self-consciousness. *Ratio* 8. 130–157.

Chomsky, Noam & Howard Lasnik. 1995. *The theory of principles and parameters*. 11–116. MIT Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2). 187–237.

Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar: A research companion*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Landau, Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. MIT Press.

McFadden, Thomas & Sandhya Sundaresan. 2014. Finiteness in South Asian languages: an introduction. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32(1). 1–27. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43697712>.

Müller, Gereon. 2020. Rethinking restructuring. In *Syntactic architecture and its consequences II: Between syntax and morphology*, 149–190. Language Science Press.

Pesetsky, David. 2021. Exfoliation: towards a derivational theory of clause size.

<https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004440>.

Satık, Deniz. 2022. The fine structure of the left periphery of infinitives. In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 52*, GLSA.

Wurmbrand, Susi & Magdalena Lohninger. 2019. An implicational universal in complementation: Theoretical insights and empirical progress. In Jutta M. Hartmann & Angelika Wollstein (eds.), *Propositional arguments in cross-linguistic research: Theoretical and empirical issues*, Mouton de Gruyter.