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Goals: - argue for the existence of a defective version of C
- explore the connectivity effects of subjunctive dependents
- provide an Agree-based account of long-distance obviation

1. Defectivity

✗ Some Core Functional Categories (CFC) are φ-incomplete

✗ v_comp / v_def

(1) [ C [ John_i T_comp [ t_i v_def [ V t_i ] ] ] ]

✗ T_comp / T_def

(2) [ C [ John_i T_comp [ t_i v_def seems [ t_i T_def to t_i love Mary] ] ] ] Raising

(3) [ C [ I_z T_comp [ t_z v_comp believe John_i [ t_i T_def to [ t_i v_comp love Mary] ] ] ] ECM

✗ The CFC asymmetry (noted by Jordi Fortuny p.c., see Fortuny 2007)
   T and v come in both ‘complete’ and ‘defective’ flavors – C never does (but see Raposo & Uriagereka 2000)

✗ Reasons for there being a C_def
   - C should be the locus of ‘subordination’
   - If T is parasitic on C (see Chomsky 2005), then T could not appear alone
2. Subjunctive as “defective C”

Romance subjunctives as English ECMs

(4) \[ \text{CP C\text{\text{def}}} \ldots \text{TP T\text{\text{def}}} \ldots \] ]

Defective features:
- \( \varphi \)-features (see Chomsky 2000; 2001)
- Case/T features (see Pesetsky & Torrego 2007)

What does ‘defectivity’ mean? – lack of feature (see Chomsky 2000; 2001)
- lack of value (see Pesetsky & Torrego 2007)

Freezing: - maxima checking of \( \varphi \)-features (see Boeckx 2006)

(5)

a. \[ \text{VP V} \quad \text{CP C}_{\varphi\text{-def}} \quad \text{TP Subject T}_{\varphi\text{-def}} \ldots \] ] English

b. \[ \text{VP V} \quad \text{CP C}_{\varphi\text{-comp}} \quad \text{TP Subject T}_{\varphi\text{-comp}} \ldots \] ] Romance

\( (Long\text{-distance}) \text{ obviation} \)

(6) Jack, believed \{*him/ himself\} [TP t\text{i} t_{\varphi\text{def}} to be immoral ]

(7) Capone quiere \[ \text{CP C que \{*pro/\*él\} mate a Ness} \] (Spanish)

‘Capone wants for him to kill Ness’

(8) *Capone quiere \[ \text{CP C que TP sí (mismo) T mate a Ness} \] (Spanish)

‘Capone wants himself to kill Ness’
Raising (1): English vs. Romance

(9)

a. *Juan considera [\textit{v*} a María; \textit{v*} [\textit{t} \textit{t}; \textit{ser} [\textit{sc} \textit{t}; inteligente]]] (Spanish)
   ‘Juan believes María to be intelligent’

b. *Juan cree [\textit{v*} a María; \textit{v*} [\textit{t} \textit{t}; \textit{ser} [\textit{sc} \textit{t}; inteligente]]] (Spanish)
   ‘Juan believes María to be intelligent’

c. **Juan quiere [\textit{v*} a María \textit{v*} [\textit{t} \textit{t}; llamar a su hermano]] (Spanish)
   ‘Juan wants María to call her brother’

(10)

a. Juan considera [\textit{CP que María es inteligente}] (Spanish)
   ‘Juan considers that María is intelligent’

b. Juan cree [\textit{CP que María es inteligente}] (Spanish)
   ‘Juan believes that María is intelligent’

c. Juan quiere [\textit{CP que María llame a su hermano}] (Spanish)
   ‘Juan wants that María call her brother’

(11)

a. *[CP Quel garçon tu crois vous être le plus intelligent de tous]? (French)
   ‘Which boy do you believe to be the most intelligent of all?’

b. *Je crois [\textit{TP Jean être [sc t; le plus intelligent de tous]]} (French)
   ‘I believe Jean to be the most intelligent of all’

[from Kayne 1984]

(12)

a. *[CP Qué problema C crees [\textit{TP t; ser [sc t; irresoluble]]]? (Spanish)
   ‘Which problem do you believe to be irresolvable?’

b. *[CP A qué alumno C crees [\textit{TP t; ser [sc t; inteligente]]]? (Spanish)
   ‘What student do you believe to be intelligent?’

[from Torrego 1998]

Raising (1): into the matrix clause: binding
(13) ?*[CP [TP: The DA proved the defendants; [TP: to be guilty] . . . during each other’s trials] ]

(14) *[CP [TP: I wanted very much [CP: for [TP: those men; to be fired ]] . . . because of each other’s statements ] ]

[from Lasnik & Saito 1999]

(15) *Maria quería [CP: que Javier y Pedro hicieran un brindis] . . .
María wanted-3.SG that Javier and Pedro made a toast
... during the wedding of one and other
‘María wanted Javier and Pedro to make a toast . . . during each other’s weddings’

3. The Nature of $C_{def}$: Weak (Left-) Periphery and High Connectivity

Torrego & Uriagereka (1992) note a cluster of asymmetries between indicative and subjunctive dependents

1. Consecutio temporum

(16) a. Platón dice [CP C que Aristóteles [leer/leía/leerá] a Sócrates] (Spanish)
Plato say-3.SG that Aristotle read-[PRES/PAST/FUT]-3.SG to Socrates
‘Plato says that Aristotle {reads/read/will read} Socrates’
b. Platón dijo [CP C que Aristóteles [leer/leía/leerá] a Sócrates] (Spanish)
Plato say-PAST-3.SG that Aristotle read-[PRES/PAST/FUT]-3.SG to Socrates
‘Plato said that Aristotle {reads/read} Socrates’

[from Torrego & Uriagereka 1992]

(17) a. Platón quiere [CP que Aristóteles [leer/*leyera/*leyere] a Sócrates] (Spanish)
Plato want-3.SG that Aristotle read-SUBJ-[PRES/PAST/FUT]-3.SG to Socrates
‘Plato wants Aristotle to {read/read/will read} Socrates’
b. Platón quería [CP que Aristóteles [*leer/*leyera/*leyere] a Sócrates] (Spanish)
Plato wanted-3.SG that Aristotle read-SUBJ-[PRES/PAST/FUT]-3.SG to Socrates
‘Plato wanted Aristotle to {read/read/will read} Socrates’

[from Torrego & Uriagereka 1992]

2. Topicalization
a. Aristóteles creía que, en cuanto a la Tragedia, debía... Aristotle thought that, as far as Tragedy was concerned, there must be three units

b. *Aristóteles quería que, en cuanto a la Tragedia, ... Aristotle wanted that, as far as Tragedy was concerned, there were three units

Focalization

a. Juan dijo que muchas cosas pro había visto... Juan said that a lot of things he had seen!

b. *Juan quería que muchas cosas pro viera... Juan wanted a lot of things for him to see!

Speaker oriented adverbs

a. Juan dice C que francamente el Deportivo ganará la Liga... Juan says that frankly Deportivo will win the League

b. *Juan quiere C que francamente el Deportivo gane la Liga... Juan wants frankly for the Deportivo to win the League
NEG raising

(21)

a. Sancho no decía [CP que Don Quijote desvariaba] (Spanish)
   Sancho not said-3.SG that Don Quijote acted-crazily-3.SG
   ‘Sancho did not say that Don Quijote acted crazily’
b. Sancho no quería [CP que Don Quijote desvariase] (Spanish)
   Sancho not wanted-3.SG that Don Quijote acted-crazily-SUBJ-3.SG
   ‘Sancho did not want Don Quijote to act crazily’

[from Torrego & Uriagereka 1992]

NPI Licensing

(22)

a. *El Cid no dijo [CP que lo vio moro ni cristiano] (Spanish)
   the Cid not said-3.SG that CL-him saw-3.SG moor nor Christian
   ‘The Cid did not say that nor moor nor Christian saw him’
b. El Cid no quería [CP que lo viese moro ni cristiano] (Spanish)
   the Cid not wanted-3.SG that CL-him saw-SUBJ-3.SG moor  nor Christian
   ‘The Cid did not want for moor nor Christian to see him’

[from Torrego & Uriagereka 1992]

No embedded indirect questions

(23)

a. *Juan [desea/pregunta] [CP cuántos libros tengas] (Spanish)
   Juan [wish/ ask]-3.SG how-many books have-SUBJ-3.SG
   ‘Juan wishes/asks how many books you have’
b. No sé [CP qué te diga] (non-Peninsular Spanish)
   not know-1.SG what CL-to-you say-SUBJ-3.SG
   ‘I do not know what to tell you’

Que deletion

(24)

a. Me rogaron [CP ¿(que) tuviese cuidado con la carretera] (Spanish)
   CL-to-me begged-3.PL that had-SUBJ-1.SG care with the road
   ‘They told me to be careful while driving’
b. Me dijeron [CP *(que) vienen mañana] (Spanish)
   CL-to-me said-3.PL that come-3.PL tomorrow
   ‘They told me that they are coming tomorrow’

In sum, $C_{def}$ manifests:
- weak left peripheral (fronting-like) activity
- high (long-distance) connectivity effects
A Morphological Parameter
Morphological tense richness ‘boosts’ the fronting capacity of phase heads
 creation of ‘extra SPECs’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(26a) Indicative Mood</th>
<th>(26b) Subjunctive Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo canto</td>
<td>Yo cante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sing-1.SG</td>
<td>I sing-SUBJ-1.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simple past tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo canté</td>
<td>Yo cantase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sing-PAST-1.SG</td>
<td>I sing-SUBJ-PAST-1.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperfect past tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo cantaba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sing-PAST-1.SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present perfect tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo he cantado</td>
<td>Yo haya cantado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have-1.SG sung</td>
<td>I have-SUBJ-PAST-1.SG sung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anterior past tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo hubo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have-PAST-1.SG sung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past perfect tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo habida</td>
<td>Yo hubiera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have-PAST-1.SG sung</td>
<td>I have-SUBJ-PAST-1.SG sung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo cantaré</td>
<td>Yo cantare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sing-FUT-1.SG</td>
<td>I sing-SUBJ-FUT-1.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future perfect tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo habré</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have-FUT-1.SG sung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo cantaría</td>
<td>Yo hubiere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sing-COND-1.SG</td>
<td>I have-SUBJ-PAST1.SG sung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional perfect tense</strong></td>
<td>Yo habría</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have-COND-1.SG sung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Not used in present-day Spanish
An extra-SPECs strategy for Wh-islands (see Bošković 2005 and Rizzi 1990)

(27)

a. *[CP Which student do you wonder [CP how j t] could solve the problem t] ?
   b. [CP Che studente; non sai [CP come j t] potrà risolvere il problema t] ? (Italian)
   ‘Which student don’t you know how could solve the problem?’
   [from Rizzi 1990]

(28)

a. (?)No sé [CP quién j a quién z C ha enviado [TP ti tk una carta tz] ] (Spanish)
   ‘I do not know who has sent a letter to whom’
   b. *No sé [CP por qué; cómo z C han derrotado [TP pro tk al Barcelona tt z] ] (Spanish)
   ‘I do not know why Barcelona has been defeated how’
   [from Uriagereka 2005]

The analysis

• Torrego & Uriagereka’s (1992) paratactic analysis

(29)

a. Platón quiere [CP C que Aristóteles lea a Sócrates] (Spanish)
   ‘Plato wants Aristotle to read Socrates’
   b. Platón dice [DP pro] [CP que Aristóteles lee a Sócrates] (Spanish)
   ‘Plato says that Aristotle reads Socrates’
   [from Torrego & Uriagereka 1992]

• Our account: C_{comp} vs. C_{def}

(30)

a. V [CP C_{comp} . . . [TP T_{comp} . . . ]] \textit{Indicative Dependent}
   --- subject to PIC ---

b. V [CP C_{def} . . . [TP T_{def} . . . ]] \textit{Subjunctive Dependent}
   --- immune to PIC ---
Reprojection: subjunctives as “indefinites” and LF Islands (see Hornstein & Uriagereka 2002 and Quer 1998; 2001; 2006)

In the spirit of Hornstein & Uriagereka (2002), we take $T_{comp} / T_{def}$ to be a quantifier that moves to $C_{comp} / C_{def}$ in order to get its second complement (its scope). Importantly, only $T_{comp}$ forces reprojection at LF.

(31) Reprojection (step 1)

(32) Reprojection (step 2)
4. Long-Distance Obviation: Binding through Multiple Agree

 Accounts we build on: most notably, Kempchinsky (1987) and Picallo (1985)

(33)

a. *La Maria vol [CP que pro, tingui pocs problemes] the Maria want-3.SG that pro have-SUBJ-3.SG few problems ‘Maria wants that she has few problems’
b. La Maria diu [CP que pro té molts problemes] the Maria say-3.SG that pro have-3.SG many problems ‘Maria says that she has many problems’

but:

(34)

a. O Rei Sabio espera de si mesmo que pro solucione … the king wise expect-3.SG of SE same that solve-SUBJ-3.SG … a paradoxa que lle puñeron os matemáticos. (Galician) the paradox that CL-to-him put-PAST-3.SG the mathematicians ‘The Wise King expects of himself to solve the paradox that the mathematicians put on him’

[from Uriagereka 1988]

(35) John called him. (where John ≠ him)

(36) Transparency Condition

In the absence of a more specific indication to proceed otherwise, where formal feature bags $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are grammatically distinct, the speaker cofines the range of $\alpha$’s context variable differently from the range of $\beta$’s context variable.

[from Uriagereka 1997]

(37) Probe-Goal Binding

$\alpha$ binds $\beta$ if they are both Goals of a single relevant Probe; otherwise, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are obviative.

[from Uriagereka & Gallego in progress]

(38)

a. [CP C [TP Subject T S [-->P tSubject [Object-\*P] [VP V tObject ]]]]] Binding // Condition (A)

b. [CP C [TP Subject T S [-->P tSubject \*P [VP V Object ]]]] Obviation // Condition (B)
(39) John\[\text{T}_{\text{Nom}}\] called him\[\text{T}_{\text{Acc}}\]

(40) Assumptions: $T_{\text{def}}$ bears $[uT/\text{Case}]$
$[uT/\text{Tense}]$

(41)
\begin{align*}
a. \text{P. quiere} & \left[ T_{[T_{\text{Acc}}]} [\text{TNS:present}] \ [\text{que} \ C_{[T]} [\text{TNS}] \ \text{Aristóteles}_{[T]} \ \text{lea} \ T_{5[T]} [\text{TNS}] \ [\ldots \ a \ \text{Sócrates}]] \right] \\
& \text{Multiple Agree} \\
b. \text{P. quiere} & \left[ T_{[T_{\text{Acc}}]} [\text{TNS:present}] \ [\text{que} \ C_{[T_{\text{Acc}}]} [\text{TNS:present}] \ \text{Aristóteles}_{[T_{\text{Acc}}]} \ \text{lea} \ T_{5[T_{\text{Acc}}]} [\text{TNS:present}] \ [\ldots] \right]
\end{align*}

(42)
\begin{align*}
a. \text{Juan} & \text{ deseara} \ [\text{CP C que} \ \text{él}_{[5/k]} \ \text{admire} \ \text{a} \ \text{Charlie Mingus}] \quad \text{(Spanish)} \\
& \text{Juan wants that he admire Charli Mingus’} \\
b. \text{Juan} & \text{ desea} \ [\text{CP C que} \ \text{a} \ \text{él}_{[5/k]} \ \text{le} \ \text{guste} \ \text{Charlie Mingus}] \quad \text{(Spanish)} \\
& \text{Juan wants that he like Charlie Mingus’} \\
& \text{[from Uriagereka & Gallego in progress]}
\end{align*}

(43) Pedro obligó \ a María \ [\text{CP que pro limpiase} \ \text{la habitación}] \quad \text{(Spanish)} \\
\text{Pedro forced María to clean the room}

5. Conclusions

- Both $v$ and $C$ come into defective and complete versions –thus filling a gap.

- Subjunctives manifest two particularly interesting properties:
  a) Weak peripheral activity (related to morphological richness) 
  b) Strong long-distance connectivity (related to lack of PIC application)

- Both local and non-local obviation fall into place from this analysis, as long as the embedded subject receives Case (here, independent from $\varphi$-fetaures, in line with Pesetsky & Torrego 2001; 2004; 2007) from matrix $T\text{O}$. 
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