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1. Introduction

This paper proposes that cross-linguistic differences in the distribution of subjects in raising constructions follow from whether or not there are phase boundaries between matrix T and the highest subject position in the embedded clause. Languages like (1a) are shown to require movement of the embedded subject, whereas languages like (1b) allow the subject to be licensed in situ via Agree with T. We argue that (1a) is the default structure predicted under a dynamic phase approach, and that (1b) is derived by phase extension due to v/V-raising and a particular type of selection of the raising complement.

(1)  
a. [TP SUBJECT T [PHASE ... seem ... [PHASE SUBJECT ... ]] Movement  
b. [TP T⁺v ... seem ... SUBJECT ... ] Agree

2. Agree vs. movement languages

While low (infinitive internal) subjects in raising constructions (LSIRs) are prohibited in En(glish) raising such as (2a), such constructions are possible in Gr(eek) and Ro(manian), (2b,c) (Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, Iordachioaia & Marchis [AAIM] 2010, 2012), Sp(anish) (2d) (J. Villa-García, p.c.), Ad(yghe), (2e) (Polinsky and Potsdam [P&P] 2006, 2012), S(standard) A(rabic), (2f) (Haddad 2012), and possibly other languages (candidates: Hungarian, Italian, Brazilian Portuguese, Hebrew, see Szabolcsí 2009). As shown in (2b-f), in these languages, the subject can occur within the embedded subjunctive (GrRo), infinitive (SpAd), or finite clause (SA); it can be an R-expression (which shows that there is no co-indexed pro which would lead to a Principle C effect in the matrix clause); and it agrees with the matrix verb.¹

¹ For feedback and helpful comments on this material, we thank the audience at SinfonIJA5 (Vienna), the participants of the research seminar at the University of Stuttgart, and the participants of the UConn 2012 and 2013 Spring seminars.

¹ Furthermore, P&P (2006, 2012) and AAIM (2010, 2012) provide evidence that LSIR constructions are biclausal, there is no restructuring, and the subject truly resides within the embedded clause at PF.
SA subjects optionally move to Spec,TP. When the subject is in Spec,TP, full agreement.

In SA, post-verbal subjects trigger partial (=gender) agreement, whereas preverbal subjects trigger full (gender and number) agreement (cf. (4a,b); see, e.g., Mohammad 1990, 2000, Aoun et al. 1994, Ouhalla 1994, Benmamoun 2000, Soltan 2007). We assume that SA subjects optionally move to Spec,TP. When the subject is in Spec,TP, full agreement
arises, while only partial agreement is realized when the subject remains in Spec,\(\gamma\)P. Importantly, in LSIR, (4c), full agreement on the matrix verb is possible, which straightforwardly indicates covert movement of the subject to the matrix Spec,TP (Haddad 2012; partial agreement as in (2\(f\)) indicates covert movement to the matrix Spec,\(\nu\)P, since the embedded clause is a phase, see below, and hence movement must take place).

(4) a. \(\text{ʔal-fatayaat-u qara?-na ?al-dars-a}\) [Soltan 2007: 35]  
   the-girls-NOM read-[3.F.PL] the-lesson-ACC 

b. qara?-t \(\text{ʔal-fatayaat-u} \) ?al-dars-a  

c. \(\text{ʔawJakna} (\text{ʔan}) \) tanjah(u/a) \(\text{l-t\(\text{ʔa:liba:t-u}\)}\)  
   were.about.to-[3.F.PL] (c/to) succeed-[3.F.SG] the-students-F-NOM  
   ‘The female students were about to succeed’ [Haddad, p.c.]

In GrRoSp, on the other, no covert dependencies are possible in raising infinitives. As shown in (5a) for Greek, low subjects in control constructions can agree with a matrix modifier (we assume that this is only possible if the modifier is c-commanded by the NP) and take matrix scope. However, in raising constructions, this is impossible—a LSIR cannot license a matrix modifier, as shown in (5b-d), nor can it take matrix scope (cf. (6)). We therefore conclude that movement of the subject to the matrix clause is possible (in fact necessary) in control constructions, but not in raising constructions.

(5) a. Arhise \(\text{panikovlitos na klidoni mono o Janis}\) tin porta tu  
   Started.3SG panicking,MASC SUBJ lock only the Janis.NOM the door his  
   ‘Only Janis began in panic to lock his door’  
   Backward control

\(^2\) There are two complications concerning the scope facts in (6). First, note that the context in (6) favors a raising structure since ‘stopping to get bad grades’ is not something that Mary can actively control. In contexts favoring control (e.g. ‘stopping to provoke the teacher/to solve the problems’ etc.) high scope is possible. As a result, a sentence like \(\text{Stamatise na prokali mono I Maria ton dhaskalo}\) (stopped SUBJ provoke only the Mary the teacher; ‘Only Mary stopped provoking the teacher’) is ambiguous between the stop\(_{\text{only}}\) and the only\(_{\text{stop}}\) interpretation (in Greek, the low vs. high scope difference is signified by stress). In view of the raising vs. control ambiguity of aspectuals, it is necessary to employ the appropriate predicates when testing for Agree vs. Move (the latter would be backward control structures): inanimate subjects and non-controllable initiations favor raising (Agree), while animate subjects and controllable initiations allow for (backward) control.

The second issue concerns the unavailability of high scope in (6). Since the subjunctive/infinitive XP in GrRoSp is not a phase, as we argue below, one would expect, assuming scope is phase-bound, high scope to be possible, as in Ad. Note, however, that being within the same scope domain (phase) is only a necessary, not a sufficient condition for inverse scope. We propose that the unavailability of high scope in (6) is due to scope rigidity (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2012, Lechner Forthcoming): in scope rigid languages scope depends on overt Movement, and inverse scope is licensed only under very special conditions, e.g. when covert movement is independently needed for theta-licensing, as in backward control. While this makes the lack of high scope a somewhat less conclusive test regarding movement vs. Agree, the difference between Adyghe and GrRoSp is still indicative: In the former, the subject moves for Case reasons, which puts it in the matrix clause and high scope comes for ‘free’ (see also the difference in scope between subjects and other embedded elements in (10) in Adyghe). In the latter, the subject is licensed in situ and high scope is not automatically available, but, assuming scope rigidity, parasitic on other movement operations.
b. Arhi {pikni} [na skeepazi i skoni {pikni} ta epipla ]
   started {dense.FEM} [SUBJ cover.3SG the dust {dense} the furniture ]
   ‘The dust started to cover the furniture densely.’

c. A început {*compactă} [să acopere mizeria {compactă} toată mobila ]
   has started {compact.FEM} [SUBJ cover dir. the {compact} all furniture ]
   ‘The dirt started to cover all the furniture compactly’

d. Empezó {*solo} al final del año [a venir Juan {solo} a la escuela ]
   Began {alone} at the end of the year [to come Juan {alone} to the school ]
   ‘Towards the end of the year, Juan began to come to school alone.’

(6) [AAIM 2012: 98f, 106]
   All: *only > stop
   a. Stamatise na perni mono i Maria kakis vathmus Gr
   b. A încetat să ia numai Maria note slabe Ro
   c. Acabó de tomar solamente María notas malas Sp
   stopped SUBJ/INF get only Mary grades weak
   ‘It stopped being the case that only Maria got bad grades.’

If LSIRs in GrRoSp neither overtly nor covertly raise to the matrix clause, then the Case of the embedded subjects must be licensed in situ. We propose that this is achieved via Agree with matrix T (see e.g., Alboiu 2006, Iatridou 1993, Varloko 1994, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou [A&A] 1999/2002 for the claim that subjunctive T lacking Tense does not license nominative). In contrast, in EnAd, no such Agree relation can be established (see below), and unmoved embedded subjects fail to receive Case. The derivation only succeeds if subject movement takes place (which, in Ad, can involve the pronunciation of the lower copy).

(7) T [vP v [vP V raising [Infinitive/subjunctive … SUBJECT ]]]
   Agree: ✓ GrRoSp
   *EnAdSA

3. Phases in movement languages

In this section, we lay out our basic analysis for movement languages. The structure we propose for raising infinitives is given in (8). As shown, we assume that there are two phase boundaries between the highest position in the raising infinitive and matrix T. For the subject to move to Spec,TP (in English), movement to the phase edges (positions 2 and 3) must apply.

(8) [TP SUBJ T [vP=PHASE SUBJ 3 [vP seem [XP,INF=PHASE SUBJ 2 [vP SUBJ 1 … ]]]]]

Before providing evidence for these intermediate movement steps, let us briefly discuss

---

3 Since LSIRs in SA appear in embedded finite clauses, it is not clear if obligatory movement can also be attributed to Case, though this would be the most straightforward hypothesis. We leave the motivation for movement in SA aside here.
the theoretical background for the distribution of phases as in (8). We follow recent approaches to phasehood (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand [B&W] 2005, In press, den Dikken 2007, 2012a, b, Bošković To appear, Wurmbrand 2013a, b) according to which phasehood is determined dynamically: the highest projection of a cyclic domain (regardless of size or label) constitutes a phase, where cyclic domains are defined as the extended projection of VP (e.g., vP) and the extended projection of TP (e.g., CP). This approach predicts that passive and unaccusative vPs/vPs as well as the top projection of a raising infinitive (XP for simplicity here) constitute phases, exactly as in (8) (see Legate 2003 and Marantz 2007 for the former, Sauerland 2003 for the latter). As we will discuss in detail in section 4, Agree languages, on the other hand, involve processes that eliminate (or extend) these phase boundaries to the matrix TP.

The structure in (8) entails, as desired, that matrix T can neither Agree with an embedded subject in situ (position ①) nor a subject in the embedded Spec,XP (position ②), cf. (2a). Moreover, (8) predicts that raising infinitives are locality domains for movement, and movement must proceed through the edges of both XP_{INF} (position ②) and matrix vP (position ③). Evidence for this comes from binding, reconstruction, and scope. Following Lebeaux (1995), Fox (1999, 2000), Q(uantifier) R(aising) is impossible out of English raising infinitives (cf. (9)). B&W (In press), Wurmbrand 2013a) attribute the impossibility of QR out of a raising infinitive to the phasal status of raising infinitives and Scope Economy, which prohibits semantically vacuous successive cyclic QR. Case-driven movement of the subject, on the other hand, which is necessary for the derivation to converge, is possible (see, e.g., the Last Resort definition given in Bošković 2007), and subjects may therefore take scope outside the raising infinitive. The same holds for Adyghe, as shown in (10). P&P 2012 argue that Adyghe is not a scope-rigid language, and like in English, subjects can take matrix scope (since subjects move for Case reasons), but other QPs cannot undergo QR to the matrix clause.

(9) a. #This soldier seems to someone to be likely to die in every battle. *∀∃
b. #The ball seems to a boy to be under every shell. *∀∃
cf. Every shell seems to a (different) boy to be over the ball.

(10) [stwodentə pepč zadač-e r q'-a-ša-new ] tve fjež’ar
[ student each(ERG) problem.ABS DIR-3PL.ERG-do-INF ] twice began
i. ‘Each student began twice to solve a problem.’ ∀2
ii. ‘It began twice that each student worked on a problem.’ 2∀
iii.*‘There is a problem that each student twice began to solve.’ *∃∀/2
[P&P 2012: 88]

Given the presence of two phase boundaries in a raising construction in (8), movement must pass through the edges of both XP_{INF} (position ②) and matrix vP (position ③). The former is illustrated by the binding properties in (11) (Chomsky 1973, Pesetsky and Torrego 2007). Assuming that there is a copy of the subject in Spec,XP straightforwardly accounts for the impossibility of the matrix experiencer binding the lower anaphor.

(11) a. [John seems to Mary [XP John to appear to himself] [vP John to be…]]
b. *[Mary seems to [John] [XP Mary to appear to himself] [vP Mary to be …]]
Evidence for movement through position ③ is provided by examples such as (12) (from Sauerland 2003). As shown, the subject in a raising construction can take scope below matrix negation, however, importantly, under that interpretation, the subject is nevertheless able to bind a variable embedded in the matrix experiencer. The most straightforward account of the interpretations given in (12) is that the subject occupies a position below matrix negation but above the matrix experiencer in raising constructions at LF. Position ③ in (8), which the subject must have moved through on its way to Spec,TP, is exactly the position necessary to yield these interpretations.

(12) a. Every child, doesn’t ✓ seem to his father [ *vb bd to be smart] ¬» ∀
b. A boy, doesn’t ✓ seem to his father [ *vb bd to be a loser]. ¬» ∃

An important consequence of our proposal is that English there-constructions cannot possibly involve syntactic Agree since both XP_{INF} and vP are phases. We follow Hazout (2004a, b), who has independently suggested this. Hazout argues that there is no Agree relation between matrix T and the associate in there-constructions, but that the ‘associate’ is licensed in a subject (there) — predicate (associate) configuration. There is first merged in vP and then raised to TP for Case-theoretic reasons (Belletti 1988, Lasnik 1999, cf. also Deal 2009), and apparent long-distance agreement between the verb and the associate is a manifestation of subject-predicate agreement, in this case holding between the (moved) expletive subject and the predicate nominal (see Hazout 2004b for an extension of this analysis to locative/presentational constructions like There arrived a man). Note that infinitive-internal subjects are restricted to existential and locative/presentational constructions such as (13) in English, agreement with the there-associate is optional, as shown in (13a), and impossible with conjoined singular NP associates (13b), in contrast to conjoined subjects in Spec,TP (Sobin 1997, 2004). In all these respects, this contrasts sharply with the properties of GrRoSp (cf. (2b,c), (14)), which would be unaccounted for if English also involved an Agree relation between T and the embedded subject.

(13) a. Essentially there seems/seem to be five compelling issues that…
b. There seems/*seem to be a pirate and a knight at the party.
c. A pirate and a knight seem/*seems to be at the party.

(14) a. Arxis-*an na kalipt-un i skoni ke xioni ta epipla Gr
     Started-3PL SUBJ cover-3PL the dust and the snow the furniture
b. Arxis-*an/*e na lin-onte/*ete polla simantika provlimata
     Started-3PL/*3SG SUBJ solve-3PL/*3SG many important problems

---

4 There may be prescriptive pressure to use agreement. However, the studies that have been provided (see for instance Koopman 2004 for a data survey) and simple corpus searches confirm that agreement is clearly not necessary, and for some speakers even dispreferred (P. Smith, p.c.).

5 Greek also allows first/closest conjunct agreement (instead of full agreement with the conjoined NP) in cases such as (14a) where the subject is post-verbal. This is common across languages (see Corbett 2006). The important point, however, is that in English, full agreement, which is necessary when the subject is in Spec,TP, is impossible (or highly dispreferred; see Sobin 1997, 2004) in there constructions. This indicates that there is no syntactic Agree relation between matrix T and the embedded subject, but that agreement, when it occurs, is triggered by a different mechanism.
4. Disappearing phases

In this section, we turn to Agree languages and show how phases ‘disappear’. According to AAIM (2010, 2012), Agree languages are pro-drop, have clitic doubling, allow VSO orders with VP-internal subjects (A&A 2001, 2007), as well as EPP licensing via V-movement (A&A 1998). Combining these properties with approaches that assume that movement of certain phase heads extends the phase to the higher projection (den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2005, 2010, Gallego and Uriagereka 2006, B&W In press) immediately accounts for why the matrix vP/VP is not a phase in GrRoSp and T can see below vP/VP. Following A&A (1998), we propose that GrRoSp have v/V-raising, which values ϕ-features on T, thereby allowing null subjects and extending the matrix phase to TP. Crucially, v/V-raising extends the vP-phase to TP only when there is ϕ-feature valuation. In non-pro-drop languages such as French, V-raising only involves a T-feature relation between v/V and T, and T’s ϕ-features are not valued by v/V but require a DP to move to Spec,TP, prohibiting pro-drop as well as phase extension. It would lead us too far afield to spell out here why feature valuation matters for phase extension; we will address this question in future work, linking it to the Clitic Doubling parameter.6

Thus phase extension via v-movement, creates the structure in (15a) in which T can see into the complement of a raising verb. If the embedded subject is in Spec,XP, Agree would be possible, even if XP is a phase as in English. However, (15b) shows that raising constructions can stack, and agreement is again obligatory in this case. Assuming there is no movement of the subject in these constructions either, we can conclude that T can actually see below the edge of the complement of its V, or in other words, XP in (15a) is not a phase. This is what we propose (but see section 5 for a potential language where the vP phase is extended to TP, but the raising complement (XP) remains a phase).

\[(15) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [_{TP=\text{PHASE}} T+V/V [_{vP} [_{vP} v \, \text{seem/begin} [_{XP} \ldots]]]] \\
\text{b. } & \text{Arhis-an na stamat-un na ginonte ependisis} \\
& \text{Started-3PL SUBJ stop-3PL SUBJ happen-3PL investments} \\
& \text{‘Investments started to stop taking place’} 
\end{align*} \]

The languages that allow Agree involve raising complements that are either subjunctives or infinitives. We propose that this is not an accident. The transparency of subjunctives and infinitives is cross-linguistically well-known, and we assume that this is the result of those constructions not being phases. Following B&W (In press), Wurmbrand (2013a), subjunctives and infinitives with a specific selected tense value (e.g., irrealis) involve an obligatory selectional valuation relation between the matrix V and the highest head in the embedded clause. This dependency voids the phasehood of the top embedded projection.7

---

6 A question arises concerning languages like Italian which involve pro-drop but not clitic doubling and do not allow VSO orders with vP-internal subjects (they only allow VOS orders, where the O has raised passed an in-situ subject). Are these Agree or Move languages? Our analysis predicts that they allow Agree across the vP due to the fact that they have v/V raising which values ϕ-features on T. According to Szabolcsi (2009), Italian indeed is an Agree language, see section 2.

7 More specifically, phasehood is again extended to the matrix VP. However, since in GrRoSP, the matrix V moves to T (via v), phase extension also eliminates the phasehood of VP. For simplicity, we ignore
The same mechanism applies to subjunctives in GrRo, i.e., the subjunctive projection looses phasehood, as well as infinitives in Spanish, given that the specific infinitival marker is selected by the matrix V. Since there are no phases between matrix T and the LSIR in GrRoSp, Case can be valued under Agree, and subject movement cannot be Case-driven. We follow the numerous works on subject movement in these languages according to which movement is triggered by information-structure properties (see Barbosa 1997, A&A 1998, Alboiu 2007, among others).

This account predicts that, in contrast to movement languages, movement through position 3 in (8) (i.e., matrix Spec,vP) is not required since vP is not a phase. This prediction is supported by the distribution of floating quantifiers in (16a,b) for GrRo. Unless the quantifier is focused, position 3 is not available for a stranded quantifier.

(16) a. {Oles} i apergies stamatisan {??oles} [ na epireazun tus politikus ]
   {all} the.strikes.PL stopped.3PL {??all} [ SUBJ influence.3PL the.politicians]
   ‘All the strikes stopped influencing the politicians.’
   b. {Toate} grevele au încetat {*toate} [să-i influențeze pe politicieni]
   {all} the.strikes have stopped.3PL{*all} [ SUBJ.CL influence.3PL ACC politicians]
   [G. Iordachioaia, p.c.]

Lastly, the licensing of minimizers in GrRo further supports the non-phasal status of subjunctives. As shown in (17), minimizers such as ‘a single penny’ are sharply ungrammatical when they occur within an indicative clause without negation. Matrix negation cannot license a minimizer across an indicative CP, which we assume is impossible due to the phasal status of indicative CPs. On the other hand, minimizers in subjunctive complement can be licensed by matrix negation, which provides evidence for our claim that the top projection of a subjunctive clause is not a phase.8

(17) a. Dhen thimame *oti / √ na iche dharchmi Gr
   Not remember.1ST.SG *that / √ SUBJ had.3SG drachma
   ‘I don’t remember that he had a single penny/him having a single penny.’
   b. Nu-mi amintesc *că i-am dat /√ să-i fi dat niciun leu Ro
   Not-me remember *that him-have given /√ SUBJ-him be given no leu
   ‘I don’t remember that I gave him any penny/giving him any penny.’
   [G. Iordachioaia, p.c.]

5. Conclusion and outlook

In this article, we have argued that cross-linguistically raising constructions differ regarding whether or not there are phase boundaries between matrix T and the highest subject position of the embedded clause. Languages like (1a) (≈ (18a)) were shown to require movement of the embedded subject as indicated, whereas languages like (1b) (≈ (18b)) allow the subject to be licensed in situ via Agree with T due to the lack of phase bounda-

---

8 The same point can be made for standard NPIs in Greek, but we avoid using them here as they present additional complications discussed at length in Giannakidou (1998) and much subsequent work.
At this point, we therefore leave Hungarian as only a hypothetical language of type (\textit{18a}) (no phase extension to TP takes place) but the embedded XP is selected as in (\textit{18b}) and hence not phase. Second, our system allows a configuration where the vP phase is extended to TP as in (\textit{18b}), but where XP is not selected and hence remains a phase as in (\textit{18a}). The first case is given in (\textit{19a}), and this is exactly the constellation that B&W (In press), Wurmbrand (2013a) propose for subjunctives, control, and ECM infinitives in English. The second case is given in (\textit{19b}) and we speculate that Hu(ngarian) may be such a language.

\begin{align*}
\text{(18) a } & \quad [\text{TP SUBJ } [\text{vP=PHASE SUBJ } [\text{VP seem [XP=PHASE SUBJ [vP SUBJ \ldots]]]}]] \quad \text{En/Ad/SA} \\
\text{b } & \quad [\text{TP=PHASE } T+V/V [\text{vP seem/begin [XP=PHASE [vP SUBJ \ldots]]}]] \quad \text{GrRoSp}
\end{align*}

This approach now opens the possibility for two further configurations. First, there could be a constellation where the vP is a phase like in (\textit{18a}) (no phase extension to TP takes place) but the embedded XP is selected as in (\textit{18b}) and hence not phase. Second, our system allows a configuration where the vP phase is extended to TP as in (\textit{18b}), but where XP is not selected and hence remains a phase as in (\textit{18a}). The first case is given in (\textit{19a}), and this is exactly the constellation that B&W (In press), Wurmbrand (2013a) propose for subjunctives, control, and ECM infinitives in English. The second case is given in (\textit{19b}) and we speculate that Hu(ngarian) may be such a language.

\begin{align*}
\text{(19) a } & \quad [\text{TP SUBJ } [\text{vP=PHASE SUBJ } [\text{VP try/believe [XP,INF=PHASE PRO/DP \ldots]}]]] \quad \text{En} \\
\text{b } & \quad [\text{TP=PHASE } T+V/V [\text{vP seem/begin [XP=PHASE SUBJ [vP SUBJ \ldots]}]]] \quad \text{Hu?}
\end{align*}

As shown in Szabolcsi (2009), Hungarian also allows LSIRs. In Hungarian, focused XPs must precede the verb of the clause they appear in. Since in (\textit{20a}) the subject (marked with the focus element \textit{only}) follows the matrix verb, it cannot be in the matrix clause. If the subject is in the embedded clause, the focus positioning is correctly met—the subject precedes the verb of the clause it appears in, namely the embedded verb. Since Hungarian infinitives do not occur with a particular selected infinitival marker, the top projection of a raising infinitive remains a phase (unless the infinitive is tense selected). If Hungarian involves V-\textit{v}-T movement, it would make it a language of the type given in (\textit{19b}): the vP phase is extended to TP, but XP is a phase, which allows T to see down to the edge of XP. A LSIR would then be licensed inside the embedded clause if it appears at the edge of the embedded clause, i.e., in Spec,XP (or adjoined to XP). For some speakers, this is reflected in examples such as (\textit{20b-d}), which are judged as ungrammatical, and LSIRs occurring not at the edge of the infinitive are only possible when they receive a secondary focus interpretation (A. Liptak, p.c.). However, we have also encountered speaker variation, which may indicate a more complex left periphery or covert positions of the subject. At this point, we therefore leave Hungarian as only a hypothetical language of type (\textit{19b}).

\begin{align*}
\text{(20) a } & \quad \text{Elkezdtek/*Elkezdett [XP csak a fiúk dolgozni éjszaka]INF} \quad \text{Hu} \\
& \quad \text{began.3PL/*3SG [XP only the boys work]INF at.night}]INF \\
& \quad \text{‘It began to be the case that only the boys work at night’ \quad [Szabolcsi 2009: 18]} \\
\text{b } & \quad \text{%Elkezdtek minden könyvet idejében visszavinni a fiúk a könyvtárba} \\
& \quad \text{began.3PL every book.ACC in.time back.take.INF the boys the library.to} \\
& \quad \text{‘It began to be the case that the boys took back every book to the library in time.’} \\
\text{c } & \quad \text{%Elkezdtek visszavinni a fiúk minden könyvet idejében a könyvtárba} \\
& \quad \text{began.3PL back.take.INF the boys every book.ACC in.time the library.to} \\
\text{d } & \quad \text{%Elkezdtek nem visszavinni a fiúk minden könyvet idejében a könyvtárba} \\
& \quad \text{began.3PL not back.take.INF the boys every book.ACC in.time the library.to}
\end{align*}
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