Squibs
and
Discussion

Transitive NEED Does Not
Imply Transitive HAVE:
Response to Harves and
Kayne 2012
Anton Antonov
  INALCO, CRLAO
Guillaume Jacques
  CNRS, CRLAO

1 Introduction

In a recent article, Harves and Kayne (2012:120–121) propose the following universal:

(1) All languages that have a transitive verb corresponding to *need* are languages that have an accusative-case-assigning verb of possession.

The authors' argument for the validity of (1) is based upon a typological survey of about 50 languages. They introduce the terms *H-languages* and *B-languages* in order to classify languages from the viewpoint of their predicative possessive constructions. H-languages have a transitive verb 'to have' whose subject is the possessor and whose object is the possessee. B-languages, on the other hand, use a construction with a copular or existential verb in which the possessor is marked with an oblique case and the possessee is treated as the subject of an intransitive verb.

This terminology presents two major problems.

First, it neglects the fact that one language can have several competing constructions to express possessive predication. This is for example the case of Latin, which according to table 1 (adapted from Harves and Kayne 2012:126) is an ''H-language,'' whereas the most common predicative possessive construction in this language is of the type normally found in a ''B-language.'' It would thus be more appropriate to talk of B- and H-constructions rather than of B- and H-languages.

Second, the classification of possessive predicative constructions into two classes neglects the recent work of typologists on this topic,

Table 1
H-construction versus B-construction languages and
the presence or absence of a transitive 'need'

	H-construction	B-construction
N-construction	yes	no
N̄-construction	yes	yes

which distinguishes many more categories (Heine 1997, Stassen 2009, 2011). Stassen (2011), in particular, classifies these constructions into five types (*have*-possessive, locational possessive, genitive possessive, topic possessive, conjunctional possessive), to which he adds some transitional types.[1]

Furthermore, Harves and Kayne do not seem to take into consideration the fact that in many languages constructions corresponding to the English verb *need* often have additional (and usually primary) meanings such as 'want', 'have to', and 'lack', and the fact that many languages have distinct constructions for expressing 'need' with inanimate ('I need money') and animate, particularly human, nouns ('I need someone'), as well as with a complement clause ('I need to go'). We will not address these issues in this squib.

Table 1 provides a classification of the languages in Harves and Kayne's survey along the following two parameters: languages with an H- or B-construction versus languages with an N-construction (presence of transitive 'need') or N̄-construction (absence of transitive 'need'). This table, of course, does not consider the possibility that one language may have several types of constructions for the same meaning.

According to Harves and Kayne, while languages that have N̄-constructions can also have B- or H-constructions, there are no examples of languages with N-constructions that at the same time have only a B-construction for expressing predicative possession.

It should be noted that (1) accounts not only for languages with transitive 'have' but also for those that have a quasi-B-type predicative possessive construction in which the possessee receives accusative case. Thus, languages like Finnish that have a transitive verb meaning 'to need' as in (2) and an accusative-case-assigning existential verb as in (3) do not constitute counterexamples to (1) even though they do not have a prototypical transitive verb corresponding to 'have' (Harves and Kayne 2012:129–130).

---

[1] However, to ease comparison with Harves and Kayne's work, we will use the terms *H-construction* to refer to Stassen's *have*-possessive and *B-construction* to refer to all other types of constructions.

(2) Minä tarvitse-n sinu-t.
I.NOM need-1SG you-ACC
'I need you.'
(Harves and Kayne 2012:129)

(3) Minu-lla on häne-t.
I-ADESS be.3SG he-ACC
'I have him.'
(Harves and Kayne 2012:129, adapted from Pylkkänen 1998:4)

Still, (1) suffers from accusativity bias, and so it seems preferable to us to provide a crosslinguistically neutral formulation using Dixon's (1994) syntactic primitives S (sole argument of an intransitive verb), A (subject of a transitive verb), and O (object of a transitive verb).

(4) All languages that have at least one construction corresponding to *need* in which the verb corresponding to *need* is a transitive verb (whose A is the person in need and O the entity needed) are languages that have at least one predicative possessive construction in which the possessed entity has the same morphosyntactic status as the O of a prototypical transitive verb in that language.

The reformulation of (1) as (4) also takes into account the fact, already mentioned, that many languages have several competing constructions used to express predicative possession or necessity.

Still, counterexamples to both (1) and (4) exist in several unrelated languages: Estonian, Arabic (Moroccan and Algerian varieties), Bantu (isiZulu, isiXhosa, and kiSwahili), Kwa (Likpe and Ewe), and Ayacucho Quechua. For reasons of space, we will not include the Kwa data.

2 Estonian

Estonian, a language closely related to Finnish, has two parallel constructions corresponding to English *need*.

First, there is a B-type construction involving what seems to be a petrified abstract noun *vaja* 'need' and the 3rd person singular form of the verb *olema* 'be, exist', in which the person needing something is marked with the adessive (locative) case, but interestingly enough the entity needed is in the accusative.

(5) Meil on vaja teie toetus-t.
1PL.ADESS be.PRS.3SG.SUBJECT need 2PL.GEN support-ACC
'We need your support.'

(6) Tal on vaja sind.
3SG.ADESS be.PRS.3SG.SUBJECT need 2SG.ACC
'She needs you.'

Still, this is not the only possible way of expressing English *need*, and indeed, not the most frequent one either since, just like Finnish,

Estonian has a transitive verb *vajava* whose subject (in the nominative) is the person needing something and whose object (in the accusative) is the entity needed. It is thus possible to reformulate (5) and (6) as follows:

(7) Me vaja-me   teie   toetus-t.
  1PL.NOM need-1PL.SUBJECT 2PL.GEN support-ACC
  'We need your support.'

(8) Ta vaja-b   sind.
  3SG.NOM need-3SG.SUBJECT 2SG.ACC
  'She needs you.'

Thus, Estonian turns out to be a language with an N-type construction, in which case we would expect it to also be an H-type language with a transitive verb used to express predicative possession. Yet this is not the case, as predicative possession is expressed using a B-type construction ('"locative" according to Stassen 2011) almost identical to the one found in Finnish (cf. (3)),[2] except for one crucial difference: the possessee stands in the nominative and not the accusative case.

(9) Meil on   auto(*-t).
  1PL.ADESS be.PRS.3SG.SUBJECT car.NOM(-*ACC)
  'We have a car.'

(10) Meil on   teie toetus(*-t).
  1PL.ADESS be.PRS.3SG.SUBJECT 2PL.GEN support.NOM(-*ACC)
  'We have your support.'

As a language with a transitive verb corresponding to English *need*, but no transitive verb corresponding to English *have*, Estonian is a counterexample to (4).

3 Arabic

The most common construction used to convey the meaning 'to need' in Moroccan Arabic is an Ñ-type construction with a verb meaning 'to be lacking' and an object pronoun encoding the person to whom, literally, something is lacking.[3]

(11) χəsˤsˤ-ni   l-wəld.
  need-1SG.OBJECT DET-son
  'I need a son.' (Lit. 'A son is lacking to me.')
  (Brustad 2000:147)

---

[2] On which the Ñ-type construction presented in sections 5 and 6 is based, the petrified noun *vaja* 'need' appearing in the slot reserved for the possessee.

[3] This verb is also used with completive clauses to express deontic modality, '(someone) must/should (do something)', a well-known reanalysis in the case of constructions with a basic meaning 'need' (Heine and Kuteva 2004: 215–216).

But there is also a quite common verb ḥtaːʒ 'to need', already present in Classical Arabic (ʔiḥtaːʒa إِحْتَاجَ), related to a very common noun ḥaːʒa, which today means 'thing' but which originally meant 'want, need' (Lane 1863:663–664, Badawi and Haleem 2008:241). The latter meaning is still apparent in this noun's use in an N̄-type construction (lit. 'to be in need of'), but the related verb usually (though not always) takes the entity needed as its direct object, unlike in Classical and prescriptive Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) where the preposition ʔilaː must precede it.[4] The following Moroccan Arabic examples are from Caubet 1993:139.[5]

(12) ka-n-ḥtaːʒ   əl-χədma.
     PRS-IPFV.1SG.SUBJECT-need DET-work
     'I need work.'

(13) ḥtaːʒ-iːt   əs-səkkaːrˤ.
     need-PFV.1SG.SUBJECT DET-sugar
     'I need (some) sugar.'

(14) əl-baːreḥ   ḥtaːʒ-iːt-ək   u
     DET-yesterday need-PFV.1SG.SUBJECT-2SG.OBJECT and
     ma-sˤob-t-ək-ʃ.
     NEG-find-PFV.1SG.SUBJECT-2SG.OBJECT-NEG
     'Yesterday I needed you but I couldn't find you.'

Example (15) is a representative example taken from the Internet that illustrates the present tense use of this verb in modern colloquial Moroccan.[6]

(15) bʁi-t   n-ʕref   weʃ ʁadi
     want-PFV.1SG.SUBJECT IPFV.1SG.SUBJECT-know if   FUT
     n-ḥtaːʒ   l'original   wella la.
     IPFV.1SG.SUBJECT-need DET original or   not
     'I'd like to know if I'll need the original or not.'
     (http://www.9rayti.com/reply/aidez-moi-pleaaaaaaaaase
     -9, last accessed 16 July 2013)

On the other hand, predicative possession in Moroccan Arabic, as well as in Arabic in general, can only be expressed using a B-type construction quite like the Estonian one, in which the possessor is

---

[4] Actual MSA usage often drops the preposition.
[5] Accusative case in Moroccan Arabic is overtly marked only in the case of personal pronouns, for which there are special subject and object affixal forms, glossed as such. While subject markers can be either prefixed or suffixed depending on Tense-Aspect-Mood, object markers are always suffixed. Contrary to what is found in Classical Arabic (and prescriptive MSA), noun phrases on the other hand are never overtly marked for either nominative or accusative case.
[6] This example has been retranscribed using a simplified version of the IPA for the sake of clarity.

preceded by a preposition meaning 'at' and followed directly by the possessed entity with or without an intervening copular element, depending on tense (Caubet 1993:355).

(16) ʕand mˤmˤw-ħa   ʁeːrˤ bniːta.
     at   mother-POSS.3SG only little.girl
     'Her mother had only one daughter.'

Interestingly enough, actual MSA usage seems to allow the transitive use of *ħtaːʒ*, as witnessed by the following example:

(17) ʔa-ħtaːʒ-ək.
     IPFV.1SG.SUBJECT-need-2SG.OBJECT
     'I need you.'
     (Title of a song by a United Arab Emirates singer)

An Internet search for *ʔahtaːʒ* followed by a couple of common nouns such as *waqt* 'time' and *flus* 'money' returned close to a hundred pages of results, showing just how common this construction seems to be.

Furthermore, Algerian Arabic (especially as spoken in Algiers), with no transitive verb of predicative possession (like all other Arabic dialects), uses a transitive verb *sthaqq* 'to need', which has its source in Classical Arabic *ʔistahaqqa* استحق meaning 'to deserve, to merit' (Lane 1863:606–607, Badawi and Haleem 2008:224). The latter meaning is still widely attested in all other varieties, but has shifted to that of 'to need' in the Arabic spoken in Algiers. The following sentences illustrate this quite common use with a direct object, the only possible construction available with this verb (Redouane Djamouri, pers. comm.):

(18) n-stħaqq   flus.
     IPFV.1SG.SUBJECT-need money
     'I need money.'

(19) n-stħaqq-ək.
     IPFV.1SG.SUBJECT-need-2SG.OBJECT
     'I need you.'

Moroccan Arabic, Algerian Arabic, and informal MSA thus seem to be another counterexample to the generalization in (4). This counterexample is all the more noteworthy since it illustrates a case where transitive 'need' is the result of natural evolution running counter to prescriptive grammar, which only allows an intransitive construction. Incidentally, Turkish presents the opposite situation: one in which actual usage favors an intransitive construction over the transitive verb (*gereksemek* 'need') created by prescriptive grammarians, which never really won any currency.[7]

---

[7] Which is why, although it does not have a transitive 'have', Turkish does not constitute a valid counterexample to Harves and Kayne's generalization.

4 Bantu

In this section, we cite three Bantu languages, isiZulu, isiXhosa, and kiSwahili, and present data from two of them.

First, isiZulu and its closest relative isiXhosa (Nguni, Bantu) offer another example of a typical N-type construction. These two languages have a transitive verb *ukudinga* corresponding to English *need*, whose subject is the person needing something and whose object is the entity needed. Although noun phrases in Nguni languages do not receive accusative case marking, they are unambiguously indexed on the verb by way of subject and object concord prefixes. The following examples are from isiZulu:

(20) a. Si-dinga   i-mali   e-ningi.
       1PL.SUBJECT-need CL9-money CL9-many
       'We need more money.'

    b. Si-yi-dinga.
       1PL.SUBJECT-CL9.OBJECT-need
       'We need it.' (The object belongs to class 9—for example, 'the money'.)
       (http://www.parliament.gov.za/live/commonrepository /Processed/20091112/88542_1.doc, last accessed 16 July 2013)

(21) Ba-si-dinga   kakhulu kunalokho
    3PL.SUBJECT-1PL.OBJECT-need much   than
    si-ba-dinga   bona.
    1PL.SUBJECT-3PL.OBJECT-need them
    'They need us more than we need them.'
    (http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/wsf.pdf, last accessed 16 July 2013)

However, contrary to the prediction in (1) or (4), predicative possession in isiZulu (and isiXhosa) is of the B-type (or ''conjunctional''; Stassen 2011). In it, the noun class concord marker corresponding to the possessor (whose presence as an overt noun phrase is optional) is attached directly to the preposition *na* 'with' with or without an intervening copular element depending on tense (cf. (22c) and (22d)). It is then followed by the possessed entity either directly, in case of indefinite reference (22a), or in case of a referential possessee, redundantly outside of the prepositional phrase after a class concord marker coreferential with the possessee has been attached to the preposition *na* (22b).[8]

---

[8] Now, since this construction is a semantic extension of the ordinary 'be with' construction, it can be ambiguous in certain cases between this and a possessive reading.

(22) a. U-na-i-mali.
      3SG.SUBJECT-with-CL9-money
      'She has money.' (Lit. 'She's with money.')

    b. U-na-yo   i-mali.
      3SG.SUBJECT-with-CL9 CL9-money
      'She has the money.' (Lit. 'She's with it, the money.')

    c. U-be-na-i-mali.
      3SG.SUBJECT-COP.PST-with-CL9-money
      'She had money.' (Lit. 'She was with money.')

    d. U-be-na-yo.
      3SG.SUBJECT-COP.PST-with-CL9
      'She had it.' (Lit. 'She was with it.' The object belongs to class 9—for example, 'the money'.)

Note that it is impossible to use the object concord prefix in the predicative possession construction, which accounts for the ungrammaticality of the following example:

(23) *U-yi-na.
      3SG.SUBJECT-CL9.OBJECT-with
      Intended meaning: 'She has it.'

There is thus no doubt that the predicative possessive construction with *na* 'with' cannot be analyzed as a case of an accusative-case-assigning verb of possession.

This situation is by no means unique among Bantu languages. Indeed, kiSwahili for instance also has a transitive verb corresponding to English *need*.[9] Note that agreement marking in this language follows the same principles as in Nguni languages.

(24) a. Ni-na-taka   ku-nunua gari, lakini mimi
      1SG.SUBJECT-PRS-want INF-buy   car   but   1SG
      ni-na-hitaji   fedha.
      1SG.SUBJECT-PRS-need CL10.money
      'I want to buy a car, but I need money.'

    b. Ni-na-zi-hitaji.
      1SG.SUBJECT-PRS-CL10.OBJECT-need
      'I need it.' (The object belongs to class 10—for example, 'the money'.)
      (http://artsci.wustl.edu/~mmutonya/Gazeti.html, last accessed 16 July 2013)

KiSwahili thus has an N-type construction that according to (4) would entail the existence of a transitive verb of possession; but this is not the case, as predicative possession is expressed as in most other

---

[9] Which, incidentally, seems to have been borrowed from Arabic (*ʔiḥ-taːʒa* إحْتَاجَ).

Bantu languages by means of the preposition *na* 'with', just as in isiZulu and isiXhosa (cf. (22)).

(25) a. Ni-na   fedha.
       1SG-with CL10.money
       'I have money.' (Lit. 'I am with money.')
    b. Ni-na-zo.
       1SG-with-CL10
       'I have it.' (Lit. 'I am with it.' The object belongs to class 10—for example, 'the money'.)

As in Nguni languages, the ungrammaticality of the following example shows that we are not dealing with an accusative-case-assigning verb of possession:

(26) *Ni-zi-na.
      1SG.SUBJECT-CL9.OBJECT-with
      Intended meaning: 'I have it.'

This does not mean that this kind of construction cannot be reanalyzed and undergo what Stassen (2011) calls an H-drift, thus moving toward a more transitive-like construction. This is what seems to be happening in the Bantu language seTswana, to cite but one example (Creissels 2013).

5 Quechua

Peruvian (Cuzco, Cajamarca, Huallaga) and Bolivian Quechua are presented by Harves and Kayne (2012) as examples of B-languages without transitive 'need'. While we have been unable to verify this claim, Ayacucho Quechua has a transitive verb whose primary meaning is 'want', but which is the normal (and seemingly only) way to translate English *need* (Soto Ruiz 2010:102 et passim). Its subject in the (unmarked) nominative is the person needing something, and its object in the accusative is the entity needed.

(27) (Ñuqa)   Hatun wasi-ta-m   muna-n-i.
     (1SG.NOM) big   house-ACC-ASSERT need-PRS-1SG.SUBJECT
     'I need a big house.'

(28) (Ñuqa)   Mana-m   pay-ta-chu   muna-n-i.
     (1SG.NOM) NEG-ASSERT 3SG-ACC-NEG need-PRS-1SG.SUBJECT
     'I don't need him.'

Now this makes Ayacucho Quechua a language with an N-type construction, and we would expect it to also have an H-type construction with a transitive verb used to express predicative possession. Yet this is not the case, as predicative possession is expressed using a B-type construction with the copula verb *kay* (Zariquiey and Córdova 2008:181), in which the possessor either is encoded in the genitive and cross-referenced on the possessee by the corresponding possessive suffix (see (29)) or else appears in the nominative while the possessee carries a special possessive suffix -*yuq* meaning 'provided with' (see (30)).

(29) (Ñuqa-pa) Hatun wasi-y-mi
     (1SG-GEN) big   house-POSS.1SG-ASSERT
     ka-n.
     be-PRS.3SG.SUBJECT
     'I have a big house.' (Lit. 'My big house exists.')

(30) (Ñuqa)   Pichqa wawa-yuq-mi
     (1SG.NOM) five   child-with.POSS-ASSERT
     ka-n-i.
     be-PRS-1SG.SUBJECT
     'I have five children.' (Lit. 'I am provided with five children.')

6 Discussion

The facts presented in this squib offer a challenge to Harves and Kayne's (2012) generalization, as languages from four unrelated language families spoken on three different continents without any H-construction turn out to have an N-type construction. The authors' hypothesis is thus unlikely to be valid as an absolute universal.

    This is not all that surprising, for at least three reasons.

    First, the sample used by Harves and Kayne (2012) has a clear Eurasian bias. Although some non-Eurasian languages are included (Amharic, Guarani, Mapudungun, Purépecha, Mohawk, and Quechua), they represent only approximately one-eighth of the sample. It is well-known that Eurasia as a whole constitutes a large linguistic area (Dryer 1989:274–275). Therefore, the observed correlation might be a by-product of a genetically and areally unbalanced sample.

    Second, the proposed generalization runs counter to Tsunoda's (1985) verb type hierarchy (see table 2). This hierarchy classifies predicates into seven classes based upon the affectedness of the participants. Predicates that are higher on this hierarchy tend to be coded as prototypically transitive verbs, while those on the lower end tend to be expressed as intransitive predicates whereby one of the participants receives oblique case. According to this hierarchy, verbs like *have*

Table 2
Tsunoda's (1985) verb type hierarchy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Effective action	Perception	Pursuit	Knowledge	Feeling	Relation	Ability
hit, kill	see, hear	search, look for	know, understand	love, like	**have**, lack	be able to, capable
break, shoot eat	find, look listen, smell	wait	remember forget	want, fear **need**	resemble correspond	proficient good

(class 6) rank lower than verbs like *need* (class 5) and therefore should be less prone to be expressed by transitive predicates within the same language.

It should be noted that predicates' behavior in individual languages does not always conform exactly to this hierarchy as first formulated. Indeed, Malchukov (2005) has proposed a more fine-grained two-dimensional classification that discriminates between affectedness of the more subject-like and more object-like participants. Still, the revised version of Tsunoda's hierarchy has not contested the validity of Tsunoda's ordering of verb type classes 5 and 6, which are directly relevant to the present discussion. Thus, the generalization one would be tempted to make on the basis of this hierarchy predicts that if a language has a transitive verb 'to have', it should also have a transitive verb 'to need', exactly the opposite of Harves and Kayne's (2012) proposal.

Third, generalizations in lexical typology are made with respect to semantic classes rather than individual items since the latter often show exceptional behavior in individual languages. It is thus unlikely that an exceptionless universal can be established on the basis of translational equivalents of individual items taken from any particular language.

Still, Harves and Kayne's (2012) findings seem to challenge Tsunoda's hierarchy and so the crosslinguistic correlation between N-type constructions and H-type constructions that they posit is certainly worth investigating. As Kayne (2013) points out, the way this generalization has been formulated allows it to be easily tested on other languages. We think, however, that further work on a larger sample is necessary in order to ascertain whether or not it remains statistically significant and can thus be used in studies in comparative syntax.

Furthermore, future work on the subject should include a diachronic study in order to ascertain the possible origins of constructions that correspond to English *need*.

References

Badawi, Elsaid M., and Muhammad Abdel Haleem. 2008. *Arabic-English dictionary of Qur'anic usage*. Leiden: Brill.

Brustad, Kristen. 2000. *The syntax of spoken Arabic: A comparative study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti dialects*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Caubet, Dominique. 1993. *L'arabe marocain, tome II*. Paris: Peeters.

Creissels, Denis. 2013. Control and the evolution of possessive and existential constructions. In *Argument structure in flux*, ed. by Elly van Gelderen, Jóhanna Barðdal, and Michela Cennamo, 461–476. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1989. Large linguistic areas and language sampling. *Studies in Language* 13:257–292.

Harves, Stephanie, and Richard S. Kayne. 2012. Having 'need' and needing 'have'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:120–132.

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession: Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2004. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 2013. Comparative syntax. *Lingua* 130:132–151.

Lane, Edward William. 1863. *An Arabic-English lexicon*. London: Williams and Norgate.

Malchukov, Andrej. 2005. Case pattern splits, verb types, and construction competition. In *Competition and variation in natural languages: The case for case*, ed. by Mengistu Amberber and Helen de Hoop, 73–119. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 1998. The 'be' of possession in Finnish. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Soto Ruiz, Clodoaldo. 2010. *Quechua-Spanish-English functional dictionary, Ayacucho-Chanka*. Available at http://www.clacs.illinois.edu/documents/quechua/QuechuaDicc.pdf.

Stassen, Leon. 2009. *Predicative possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stassen, Leon. 2011. Predicative possession. In *The world atlas of language structures online*, ed. by Matthew S. Dryer and Martin Haspelmath. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1985. Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 21:385–396.

Zariquiey, Roberto, and Gavina Córdova. 2008. *Qayna, kunan, paqarin: Una introducción práctica al quechua chanca*. Colección Intertextos N.º 3. Lima: Estudios Generales Letras/Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

MaxElide and Clause
    Structure in Scottish
    Gaelic
Gary Thoms
    University of Edinburgh

1 Goidelic Clause Structure

The Goidelic languages (Scottish Gaelic, Irish) have basic VSOX word order in finite clauses, and many authors have proposed that this order is derived by moving the finite verb to T, as in Romance, but leaving the subject in situ in Spec,vP (see McCloskey 1983, 1991, 1996, Ramchand 1997). The most compelling evidence for this structure—in particular, the proposal that the verb moves to T—is that the verb only moves in finite clauses; in nonfinite clauses, the verb stays in situ, with the subject to its left. Finiteness distinctions condition verb movement to T in French and other languages (Pollock 1989), so it