1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to provide a phase-based account of the so-called Subject Condition (a subcase of Huang’s 1982 CED phenomena). We will assume, following Chomsky (2005), that the syntactic opaqueness of subjects follows from the special status of particularly designated positions: the phase edges; we therefore depart not only from Uniformity and Spell-out based approaches to islands (see Takahashi 1994 and Uriagereka 1999a, respectively), but also from those capitalizing on Chomsky’s (2000; 2001) Activity Condition (see Boeckx 2003). A more specific aim of the paper concerns the non-uniform status of the Subject Condition, which as noted by Stepanov (2001) can be circumvented across languages. We propose that this is due to an independently existing process that, under certain conditions, modifies phase boundaries. We call it Phase Sliding.

The paper is divided as follows: section 2 briefly reviews previous minimalist accounts of the Subject Condition, all of which coincide in SPEC-T being a ‘freezing’ position. In section 3 we reproduce Chomsky’s (2005) analysis of edges as Probe-proof domains for sub-extraction; section 4 focuses on a language that systematically violates the Subject Condition, Spanish, a fact we try to relate to an old and well-grounded intuition about the nature of T in Romance languages (see Kayne 1989, Rizzi 1982, Uribe-Etxebarria 1992, among many others), which we recast in phase-based terms; section 5 summarizes the main conclusions.

2. The Subject Condition: previous accounts

Contrary to GB accounts, where the ever-present notion of government was appealed to in order to address island effects, the Minimalist Program can be

---

1 See Boeckx (2003), Stepanov (2001), and Uriagereka (1999a), for recent discussion.
The GB framework tried to unify locality effects by means of the notion of barrier. Within minimalism, however, no such systematic attempt has been made yet: while some islands are taken to follow under Chomsky’s (1995) *Minimal Link Condition* (a minimalist reformulation of Rizzi’s 1990 *Relativized Minimality*) and Chomsky’s (2000) *Phase Impenetrability Condition*, others pertain to conditions on Agree (the *Subject Condition*) and pair-Merge (the *Adjunct Condition*).
(3) *[CP John] seems [CP t] likes Mary]

In (3), the DP John is assigned nominative Case by the embedded C-T complex, so it cannot move to the matrix clause. Graphically:

(4) [CP C [TP [DP ... α ..., [vP t]]]] Freezing in ϕ-complete SPEC-T

By the logic of (2)-(4), it is expected for (1a) to allow sub-extraction: being in its base-position, the DP is not ‘frozen’. It is important to point out, nevertheless, that the freezing under discussion only arises if subject DPs reach, specifically, a ϕ-complete T (in the sense of Chomsky (2001)). Accordingly, sub-extraction is predicted to be again possible from the SPECs of ϕ-defective Ts, such as those in raising (5b) and ECM (5c) contexts. Chomsky (2005) provides (5) as evidence for his view:

(5)
a. *[Of which car] did [TP [the driver t]] [vP t cause a scandal]]
b. [Of which car] is [TP [the driver t]], likely [TP t to [vP t cause a scandal]]
c. [Of which car] did they believe [the driver t] [TP t to [vP t have caused a scandal]]?

[from Chomsky 2005]

The examples in (5) are meant to illustrate the fact that the subject DP the driver of which car allows sub-extraction only when it stops in the position signalled by the boldfaced trace (i.e., t). Since those SPECs belong to the ϕ-defective-T class, full Agree (T, Subj) fails and nominative case is not assigned, resulting in those DPs still being ‘active’.\(^{11}\)

---

\(^{8}\) We assume, with Chomsky (2004; 2005) and following Pesetsky and Torrego that the Locus of Nominative Case is C, not T.

\(^{9}\) Actually, the DP could not be probed under any circumstances, given Chomsky’s (2000; 2001) Phase Impenetrability Condition. See section 3.

\(^{10}\) Data along these lines were actually judged degraded by Kuno 1973. Sabel (2002) concurs, judging directly ungrammatical at least those extractions that involve extraction from the subject of a small-clause. In contrast Kayne (1984) finds some such examples acceptable. We have nothing to say about the judgement variation.

\(^{11}\) The reasoning presupposes (the possibility for) successive cyclic A-movement. This is not obvious, and takes us into the thorny issue of how different A and A-bar systems behave in terms of, at least, cyclicity considerations and reconstruction effects. See Abels (2003), Boeckx (2001), and Chomsky (2005).

\(^{12}\) The relevant aspect for sub-extraction, therefore, is not so much its being in a base-position, but rather establishing full Agree. In other words, in (1a), the DP posters of which candidate and T do not establish full long-distance Agree: the DP only checks [number], while [person] is checked by external Merge of the expletive there. See Boeckx (1999; 2004) for discussion.
In conclusion, under this approach, the island status of subjects derives from agreement and $\varphi$-completeness. This is distinct from (though ultimately compatible with) the conclusion reached by Ormazábal et al. (1994), Stepanov (2001), Takahashi (1994), and Uriagereka (1999a), whose particular implementations leave the key idea largely unaffected: it is in SPEC-T where subject DPs freeze.

In the next section we will see that, although Chomsky’s (2000; 2001; 2005) system also takes $\varphi$-complete T to be a freezing position, the Subject Condition is related to phrase structure properties of base configurations.

3. **Phase theory and phase edges**

The discussion in the previous section concentrated on accounts whereby the Subject Condition is explained through the freezing nature of SPEC-T, by means of Chomsky’s (2000; 2001) Activity Condition. As we saw, such an approach nicely predicts that only in situ subjects (those remaining in their first-Merge position, like that of (1a)) can ‘obviate islandhood’. This view has recently been challenged by Chomsky (2005), who claims that the Subject Condition is related to what he calls phase edges. As Chomsky (2005) argues, if SPEC-T were the offending position, both (6a) and (6b) should be out. Unexpectedly, only (6a) is:

(6)

a. *[CP [Of which car]$_z$ did [TP [the driver t]$_z$; [\*P t; cause a scandal] ]]?  
b. [CP [Of which car]$_z$ was [TP [the driver t]$_z$; [P awarded t; a prize] ]]?  

[from Chomsky 2005]

Chomsky (2005) takes the facts in (6) to indicate that it is base positions that matter for sub-extraction.\footnote{The precise derivational history pursued by Chomsky (2005) is far more complex, involving operations being carried out ‘in parallel’. See previous footnote.} Chomsky (2005), however, is cryptic about what the specific cause of this locality problem is:

It remains to explain why the probe for $\textit{wh}$-movement cannot readily access the $\textit{wh}$-phrase within the external argument of $\alpha$. That could reduce to a locality condition: $\textit{which}$ in $\alpha$ is embedded in the lower phase, which has already been passed in the derivation. We know that the external argument itself can be accessed in the next higher phase, but there is a cost to extracting something embedded in it.  

[from Chomsky 2005:14]

Plausibly, this formulation of the Subject Condition aims to strengthen the computational role of phase edges: in Chomsky’s phase system these alone are the positions involved in successive cyclic movement, counting as full
reconstruction sites and yielding various interpretive semantic effects. It is thus good to, yet again, ascertain their somewhat privileged status.

By parity of reasoning, Chomsky (2005) pushes the general logic to C’s edge, where the same locality problems are expected. As far as we can tell, this is basically true, as Lasnik & Saito (1992) observed:

(7)
a. ??[CP Who do you wonder [CP [which picture of t]]; Mary bought t]?
b. ??[CP Who do you wonder [CP [which picture of t]]; t is on sale]?

[from Lasnik & Saito 1992]

Simply put, the relevantly peculiar configuration is one where XPs hang from edge positions. These seem to be exploited by the semantic component(s) (SEM) in order to obtain familiar semantic effects (specificity, focus, reconstruction, and the like). However, for some reason syntax cannot operate with their internal structure. This observation can be stated as in (8) (or an analogous counterpart like Rizzi’s 2004 *Critical Freezing*):

(8) **Edge Condition**

Syntactic Objects in phase edges become internally frozen.

Given (8), all that counts for subjects to be ‘Probe-proof’ is whether they occupy a phase edge.14 The question then is whether (8) can account for apparent counterexamples like (1a), which we repeat below as (9).

(9) [CP [Which candidate] were [TP there [vP [posters of t] all over the town]]]?  

Chomsky’s (2005) analysis can essentially be maintained in cases like (9). The key is that (9)’s verbal phrase is headed by a weak (unaccusative) phase head, a ϕ-defective v (see Chomsky 2001), whose SPEC(s) do(es) not qualify as a phase edge in relevant regards.15

Also pertinent in this context is the fact that only weak phases allow for higher Probes to target their complement domain, hence overriding Chomsky’s (2000; 2001) *Phase Impenetrability Condition*.

(10) **Phase Impenetrability Condition**

The domain of [a strong phase head] H is not accessible to operations outside HP; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.  

[from Chomsky 2001]

---

14 (8) is not a ban on moved XPs as such, but rather a ban on XPs moved to particular derivational positions (again, strong edges). The analysis can be extended to shifted objects, if those occupy SPEC-ϕ*, but we do not explore this possibility here, due to space limitations.

15 At first glance, this is at odds with Legate’s (2003) findings about passive and unaccusative verbs, which also leave reconstruction sites. The question to ask, then, is why weak edges, although fine for reconstruction purposes, pose no locality problems.
Since $v$ is not a strong phase head, the formulation of (10) allows for $C$ and $T$ to respectively target the $wh$-phrase of which car and the driver of which car in the base position of passive structures like (6b), repeated here as (11):  

$$\text{(11) } [\text{CP } C ] [\text{TP } T [\text{vP awarded [DP the driver of which car] a prize]}]]?$$

---

A-Probe (φ-triggered)  
A’-Probe (EPP-triggered)

The analysis just sketched, although plausible on conceptual and empirical grounds, is not without difficulties. Here we want concentrate on Romance languages such as Spanish, which allow sub-extraction from subjects. In particular, as noted by Uriagereka (1988), post-verbal subjects (which we take to be in situ), allow sub-extraction:

$$\text{(12) De qué conferenciantes, te parece que ...}$$  
\text{(Spanish)}  
\text{Of what speakers CL-to-you seem-3SG that...}

a. ... me$_2$ van a impresionar$_v$ [$vP [\text{DP las propuestas t}_1 t_2 t_v]?$  
\text{CL-to-me go-3SG to to-impress the proposals}

b. ... [*[DP las propuestas t]$_1$ me$_2$ van a impresionar$_v$ [$vP t_1 t_2 t_v]?$  
\text{the proposals CL-to-me go-3SG to to-impress}

‘Which speakers does it seem to you that the proposals by will impress me?’

[from Uriagereka 1988]

The relevance of examples such as (12a) is that the post-verbal subject las propuestas de qué conferenciantes (Eng. the proposals by which speakers) is in the base (first-Merge) position of a transitive predicate, that is, in a

---

16 It could be claimed that the operations in (11), which Chomsky (2005) takes to apply ‘in parallel’, do not respect the Extension Condition (see Chomsky 1993), requiring some version of Richards’s (1997) tucking-in instead. This possibility is not forced upon us if all operations within a phase (in 11, the entire CP) take place at the same time, with no real step-by-step chronological ordering (see Chomsky 2006).

17 Due to space restrictions we cannot assess here the facts concerning sub-extraction from XPs moved to SPEC-C. See Gallego & Uriagereka (2006) for an analysis.

18 We limit the data to structures where the object is either not realized at all (incorporated, as in Hale & Keyser’s 2002 treatment of unergatives) or else realized as a clitic, concentrating on whether the verb is transitive or not, for this is the criterion that identifies strong phases.

19 It is perhaps worth emphasizing that the verb in (12) might be analyzed as a psychological predicate (see Pesetsky 1995 for discussion), favoring a post-verbal position for subjects, as M. Lluïsa Hernanz and Luisa Martí observe through personal communication. However, such a possibility should not force dramatic changes, as long as $v^*$ assigns accusative case; their observation does raise, though, the issue of whether being a psych-verb has some bearing on the base structure, somehow ameliorating sub-extraction (as pointed out by Chomsky himself;
bona fide strong edge. The prediction, under Chomsky’s (2005) phase system, is clear: (12a) should be out, contrary to fact. There may be different routes to overcome the puzzle this raises, but two particular possibilities rapidly come to mind: one, the subject has passed through a position analogous to φ-defective T, freeing sub-extraction; two, sub-extraction is possible due to the special interpretive (focal) properties of post-verbal subjects. The first possibility is tempting, but unfortunately unavailable within our restricted framework, where we assume just two subject positions: SPEC-v* and SPEC-T, for post-verbal and pre-verbal subjects. It is unlikely that SPEC-T has this freeing effect, since it always creates opacity (by any of the analyses we have seen so far), which leaves us with SPEC-v*, a strong edge, as the remaining possibility. In this respect, Belletti (2004) provides strong arguments in favor of taking post-verbal subjects to move to a left-peripheral functional projection above the v*P where a focal interpretation is assigned. That said, however, Belletti’s (2004) analysis does not help us either: if such a FocusP meets some criterion (as expected under Rizzi’s 2004 system), post-verbal subjects should directly undergo Criterial Freezing, thus becoming islands.

For the purposes of this section, we can stop here. Having noted a potential counterexample to Chomsky’s (2005) proposal, in the next section we pursue a phase-based account of (12), in the hope that it will prove to be consistent not only with Chomsky’s (2005) system, but also with the old intuition that Romance T (INFL) has a special status.

4. Phase Sliding

Before laying out our proposal, we must make sure that the system we are assuming makes the right predictions for Spanish. That is, we must make sure that, say, object positions always allow sub-extraction. As the data show, expectations are met with unaccusative (13) and passive (14) structures:

(13) [[De qué lingüista] han llegado ya [VP [muchos libros]]
 ‘Which linguist have many books by already arrived?’

(14) [DP cuat ro participantes] have-3PL danced four participants

see Chomsky 2005:14 fn. 39). Even so, note that (i), involving a non-psychological transitive verb, again allows the type of sub-extraction we are interested in:

(i) ¿De qué equipo dices que han bailado [DP cuatro participantes t_i]?
 ‘Which team do you say that four members of have danced?’

But see Cardinaletti (2004) for a different view.

For different implementations also involving a FocusP, see Irurtzn (2006) and Uriagereka (2004), which make assumptions different from the ones presupposed here.

As Luigi Rizzi observes through personal communication, ‘Criterial Freezing’ must therefore be weakened so that only a specific portion of the XP is frozen. See Rizzi (2006) for the details of this ‘Selective-Freezing’ account.
Consider next sub-extraction from strong (transitive) phase domains. In principle, we expect the same results, with object positions being transparent to EPP-Probes –this time, launched from $v^*$.  

(15) ¿$\xi_{\text{CP}}$ [De qué lingüista, vais a leer $[v^*\text{P} \text{muchos artículos t}]$]? (Spanish)  
Of what linguist go-2PL to to-read many papers  
‘Which linguist are you going to read many papers by?’

The only exception concerns direct objects introduced by the dative preposition $a$, as in (16). Happily, that (16) blocks sub-extraction is a welcome situation from Chomsky’s (2005) perspective, if, as argued by Torrego (1998), $a$-marked elements move to SPEC-$v^*$, a phase edge.

(16) *¿$\xi_{\text{CP}}$ [De qué estudiante, has criticado $[v^*\text{P} \text{a los padres t}]$]? (Spanish)  
Of what student have-2SG criticized to the parents  
‘Which student have you criticized the parents of?’

Consider, finally, the case of subjects. As noted above, only post-verbal ones allow sub-extraction:

(17) De qué conferenciantes, te parece que ... (Spanish)  
Of what speakers CL-to-you seem-3SG that...  

a. ... me$_z$ van a impresionar$_v$ $[v^*\text{P} \text{las propuestas t}]$? (Spanish)  
CL-to-me go-3SG to to-impress the proposals  
‘Which speakers does it seem to you that the proposals by will impress me?’  
[from Uriagereka 1988]

Descriptively speaking, it is easy to see what goes wrong in (17b): the subject is in SPEC-$T$, which blocks sub-extraction by means of any of the restrictions available to that effect: Chain Uniformity, Multiple Spell-out, Activity Condition, or Subject Criterion. An alternative route, in principle, would be to invoke phase edges once again. The issue is how: SPEC-$T$ does not qualify as a phase edge, at least in Chomsky’s (2000; 2001; 2005) system.

At this point, we want to make a short excursus into the nature of $T$ (or $S$/INFL). Ever since early GB times, $T$ has been argued to show special properties in Romance languages: clitic climbing (and clitic doubling), free subject inversion, rich agreement, lack of that-trace effects (and generalized that-deletion), $A'$ properties of preverbal subjects, etc. These (and more)
intriguing facts suggested that, broadly speaking, T behaved as C. Such was the gist of Rizzi’s (1982) insight that it is S (not S’) that counts as a bounding node in Romance.\(^{23}\) Kayne (1989) made essentially the same point when he argued for T being able to L-mark VP. Finally, many other scholars (see Barbosa 1995, Masullo 1992, Solà 1992, and Uribe-Etxebarria 1992, among several others) proposed that SPEC-T is an A’-position in Romance.

That Romance T is indeed special is supported by the following data. First, consider (18) and (19), where preverbal subjects display typical A-properties (binding and control, and also agreement\(^{24}\)). In this respect, Romance behaves like English.

\[(18)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Juan, se peina a si mismo,} \\
& \text{Juan CL-self comb-3SG to himself} \\
& \text{‘Juan combs himself’} \\
b. & \text{Juan, quiere [ PRO, salir con María]} \\
& \text{Juan want-3SG to-go-out with María} \\
& \text{‘Juan wants to go out with María’} \\
\end{align*}

\[(19)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ {Han/ha} llegado tu padre y tu hermano.} \\
& \text{Have{3PL/3SG} arrived your father and your brother} \\
& \text{‘Your father and your brother have arrived’} \\
b. & \text{Tu padre y tu hermano {han/*ha} llegado.} \\
& \text{Your father and your brother have{3PL/3SG} arrived} \\
& \text{‘Your father and your brother have arrived’} \\
\end{align*}

On the other hand, DPs in SPEC-T also behave as A’-moved constituents, showing interpretive effects that fall under what Chomsky (2004) calls edge-semantics.\(^{25}\)

\[(20)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{María canta.} \\
& \text{María sing-3SG} \\
& \text{‘María sings’ (=María is a singer)} \\
b. & \text{Mira: canta María, como cada vez que está contenta!} \\
& \text{Look: sing-3SG María, as every time that be-3SG happy} \\
& \text{‘Look: María is singing, as she always does when she is happy’} \\
\end{align*}

---

\(^{23}\) For a minimalist reformulation of TP/S as a bounding node due to early Spell-out, see Uriagereka (1999b).

\(^{24}\) The agreement datum is a classical observation, first noted by Bello (1847). See Camacho (2003) for much updated discussion.

\(^{25}\) Gallego (2004/2006b) claims that subject movement as in (19b) is similar to Object Shift in Chomsky’s (2001) analysis, in that the operation invokes interpretations arising at phase edges. The important aspect of (20) is that when the subject DP María is in SPEC-T, an interpretive effect arises: a categorical reading (see Raposo & Uriagereka 2002).
More A’-properties of Spanish preverbal subjects are pointed out by Uribe-Etxebarria (1992), who notes that, contrary to post-verbal subjects, pre-verbal ones cannot undergo LF-raising, thus blocking pair-list answers to questions such as (22A):

(21)
A: A quién dices [CP que [TP amaba, [vₚ cada senador t₁ t₂]]]? (Spanish)
   ‘Who do you say that each senator loved?’
✓ B: Cada senador amaba a María. (Spanish)
   ‘Each senator loved María’
✓ B’: El senador Smith amaba a María, el senador Brown a Inés, etc. (Spanish)
   ‘Senator Smith loved María, senator Brown did Inés, etc.’
   [from Uribe-Etxebarria 1992]

B: Cada senador amaba a María. (Spanish)
   ‘Each senator loved María’
✓ B’: El senador Smith amaba a María, el senador Brown a Inés, etc. (Spanish)
   ‘Senator Smith loved María, senator Brown did Inés, etc.’
   [from Uribe-Etxebarria 1992]

(22)
A: ¿A quién dices [CP que [TP cada senador, amaba, [vₚ t₁ t₂]]]? (Spanish)
   ‘Who do you say that each senator loved?’
✓ B: Cada senador amaba a María. (Spanish)
   ‘Each senator loved María’
✓ B’: El senador Smith amaba a María, el senador Brown a Inés, etc. (Spanish)
   ‘Senator Smith loved María, senator Brown did Inés, etc.’
   [from Uribe-Etxebarria 1992]

A translation of all that pioneering work into the current system amounts to saying that TP behaves as a phase in Spanish. Although such an approach is consistent with the facts, it raises the odd possibility of phases (or, alternatively, barriers) being parametrizable, which departs from an optimal scenario. Ideally, phases should be just v*P and CP, cross-linguistically.

In this paper we want to argue for an alternative analysis that overcomes the conceptual problem just raised, while still accounting for the phase effects on T. In particular, we follow Gallego’s (2006a) suggestion that phase effects on T, although pervasive and robust, are derivative, a side effect of v*-to-T movement. The specific process responsible for such an upwards ‘percolation’ of phase properties will be called Phase Sliding.

26 For a proposal precisely in these terms, see Gallego (2004/2006b).
The process depicted in (23), and its consequences, are virtually equivalent to Chomsky’s (1986) idea that V-to-INFL movement frees VP from barrierhood (the matter also relates to an analysis in Chomsky 1993 whereby head movement was used as a domain-extension device).

A problem that immediately arises in the context of the present discussion is related to the status of head movement, which was cornered to the PHON component by Chomsky (2001): if Phase Sliding is parasitic on \( v^* \)-to-T movement, head movement must have bona fide syntactic effects. This said, notice that one of the problems of head movement (i.e., its violation of the Extension Condition) is avoided in (20), assuming that \( v^* \) directly targets T, forming a hybrid label, \( v^*/T \), from where all operations are triggered.

Let us now go back to the Subject Condition. Given (23), phase domains are removed: the complement domain is \( v^*/P \) (not VP) and the edge domain is \( v^*/T \), plus all its SPECs. Especially important is the fact that SPEC-\( v^* \), where –we assume– post-verbal subjects stand in Spanish, is no longer a phase edge, it simply is a SPEC within the complement domain. Sub-extraction should then be possible, and it is, as we saw before. Things would proceed as indicated in (24), where \( v^* \), once amalgamated with T, targets SPEC-\( v^* \) and sub-extracts the wh-phrase de qué conferenciantes (Eng. of what speakers):

\[
(24) \ [v^*/TP \ v^*/T \ [v^*P \ [DP \ las \ propuestas \ [de \ qué \ conf.]] \ [VP \ me \ impresionan]]
\]

\[27\] The debate is far from settle; see Boeckx & Stepanovic (2001), Matushansky (2006), and references therein.
Technically speaking, (23) provides an account of why Romance languages such as Spanish can circumvent the Probe-proof status of subjects: as phase domains are redefined due to $v^*\text{-to-} T$ movement, locality conditions run the same fate.

5. Final remarks

In this paper we have investigated one of Huang’s (1982) CED phenomena, focusing on Chomsky’s (2005) recent analysis, which points that it is $\text{SPEC-}v^*$, and not $\text{SPEC-T}$, the critical position rendering subjects opaque. The crucial aspect for Chomsky (2005), therefore, lies in the fact that subjects occupy the edge of the $v^*$P phase, a position that imposes locality restrictions.

We have noted that Romance languages pose a potential difficulty to Chomsky’s (2005) analysis, given that post-verbal subjects (which we take to occupy, precisely, $\text{SPEC-}v^*$) do allow sub-extraction. In order to overcome this apparent counterexample, we have related this fact to a large series of properties that point to T as being different in (some) Romance languages. With Gallego (2006a) we have related the special status of T to phase theory, arguing that T may inherit phasehood by $v^*$-to-T movement, a process dubbed Phase Sliding: literally, verb movement pied-pipes all its properties up to the TP level. This allows us to account for the facts in a way that is compatible with Chomsky’s (2005) phase account.

That said, we must also point out (and eventually address) the flaws our proposal presents. First of all, it is not clear to us how, precisely, this species of $v^*$P extension we have argued for takes place, in the first place: if T is not present in the derivational workspace of $v^*$P, how can $v^*$ amalgamate with it? This is particularly intricate if Numerations are assumed; intuitively, it is as if T were able to ‘sideward move’ to $v^*$P’s workspace. Also problematic is the idea that both T and $v^*$ belong to the same phase domain, for it predicts that Romance languages present a case imbalance: both nominative and accusative are assigned within $v^*/TP$. Ordóñez’s (1998) analysis of VOS structures, which involve object scrambling (and not, say, a $v^*$P remnant movement), suggests that the idea is actually on track. Finally, note that the entire proposal crucially depends on the existence of full-fledged syntactic head movement: that is what slides the $v^*$P phase. This nicely fits with the properties of most Romance languages we are familiar with; except, of course, French: if this language does have $v^*$-to-T movement (as widely assumed in the literature), it remains to be understood why such an operation fails to trigger the effects it does in Null Subject Romance languages.

It is worth remarking, also, that the analysis just sketched, though proposed merely in order to address a particular locality phenomenon (Huang’s

---

28 The same problem is at stake if one endorses Belletti’s (2004) analysis of post-verbal subjects, because of ‘Criterial Freezing’. See fn. 19.

29 Things become more complex if not only T but also C must be active, because of $\varphi$-feature inheritance, as in Chomsky (2005).
1982 Subject Condition), is promising in its unifying nature: it allows us to put together a list of apparently unrelated properties of languages within the Romance family, reconciling current minimalist theorizing with traditional GB intuitions about parameters.
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