

M. Rita Manzini

SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTATION: THE SUBJUNCTIVE¹

In this article, I shall address the problem of sentential complementation with respect to the selection of an embedded subjunctive by certain classes of matrix verbs. I shall argue that in general a subjunctive is an indefinite T bound by an intensional operator in a syntactic dependency; like other syntactic dependencies, this is sensitive to islands and to parasitic gap-like configurations. The fact that certain classes of lexical predicates trigger the subjunctive can then be imputed to the fact that such predicates embed intensional operators. What is more, I shall argue that the well-known interaction of subjunctives with polarity items, reflexives and disjoint reference follows from this model and from independently needed assumptions.

1. The syntax of the subjunctive

An often noted property of the subjunctive in Romance and other European languages is that it is selected in embedded sentences by certain classes of matrix predicates. Thus in Italian verbs such as to want systematically select the subjunctive; that the indicative is excluded with these verbs is shown in (1):

¹ My original presentation was concerned with temporal dependencies in general, and with the selectional relations that such dependencies presuppose. This article stems directly from that work. I am grateful to P. Coopmans and M. Everaert for their editing suggestions, and especially to M. Everaert for his comments on the second part of the article.

(1) Voglio che tu *vai/ vada

I want that you go/ go-S

By contrast, a verb such as to know quite generally selects the indicative and is incompatible with the subjunctive, as indicated in (2):

(2) So che tu sei/ *sia andato

I know that you have/ have-S gone

This property of embedded subjunctives of being selected by certain matrix predicates extends to adjunct sentences introduced by prepositions. Thus rationale perchè ("in order that") selects the subjunctive, while causal perchè ("because") selects the indicative, as shown in (3):

(3) a. Vado perchè tu vieni

I go because/ *in order that you come

b. Vado perchè tu venga

I go in order that/ *because you come-S

These facts are systematic enough, and constant enough across languages, to require some explanation. The explanation that I shall propose will be motivated however by another set of facts. Consider again a verb that selects the indicative, as in (2). If the verb is negated, then it is possible for the embedded sentence to be inflected in the subjunctive, as well as in the indicative, as in (4):

(4) Non sa che io sono/ sia andato

He doesn't know that I have/ have-S gone

We are therefore led to the conclusion that there are cases, like (4), in which it is not a lexical head that licences the presence of the subjunctive, but rather a negation, i.e. an operator head.

A parallel conclusion can be drawn by looking at cases in which verbs of the type in (2) are questioned. Again the embedded clause can be either in the indicative or in the subjunctive, as in (5):

(5) Sai che lui è/ sia andato?

Do you know that he has/ has-S gone

Thus, like the negation, the question operator, Q, licences the presence of the subjunctive. As may be expected, the Wh operator patterns with the Q operator, as in (6):

(6) Chi sai che è/ sia andato

Who do you know that has/ has-S gone

A third case in which the subjunctive is licenced by an operator is that of conditionals. Thus the subjunctive can appear in the complement of verbs of the type in (2) when these are embedded in an if clause, as in (7); as usual, the indicative also remains possible:

(7) Se sai che lui è/ sia andato, ...

If you know that he has/ has-S gone

If we designate the operator involved in (7) as the If operator, we can draw a provisional list of at least three sentential operators that licence the subjunctive, namely Neg, Q/Wh and If.

As the first step in accounting for subjunctives, we can then assume that the subjunctive morphology is the spell-out of a T dependent on a sentential operator O. Thus, given a dependency (O, ..., T), T is spelled out as a subjunctive. Such a dependency can of course be construed as a head dependency, on the assumption that T is represented by a head, as are the operators Neg, Q and If that licence it.

Since under the minimalist approach of Chomsky (1993) we do not expect optionality to exist in grammar, the question arises why the indicative remains possible in examples of the type in (4)-(7). The answer is simply that while the indicative and the subjunctive are admissible in the same context, they are not synonymous. It is therefore natural to assume that T is indeed spelled out as a subjunctive when it forms a dependency with an operator of the relevant kind; while in the same context T is spelled out as an indicative in the absence of such a dependency.

The two different interpretations of indicative and subjunctive are evident in the case of sentences embedded under to know, since in simple examples of the type in (2) these have the core property of factives of having their truth presupposed. Consider then (5). In the indicative version the truth of the embedded sentence is still presupposed, yielding an interpretation roughly equivalent to "He has gone. Do you know

this?". In the subjunctive version, this is no longer true; rather, the relevant interpretation is roughly equivalent to "Has he gone, as far as you know?". Similarly, the truth of the embedded sentence remains presupposed under negation in the indicative version of (4), but not in the subjunctive version. The indicative version is roughly equivalent to "I have gone. He doesn't know this"; the subjunctive version to "I haven't gone, as far as he knows". Much the same holds of sentences of the type in (7). The indicative version of (7) is interpreted roughly as "He has gone. If you know this, then ..."; the subjunctive version as "If he has gone, as far as you know, then ...".

The present idea that the subjunctive spells out an (O, ..., T) dependency is clearly supported by the fact that subjunctives are sensitive to islands, as other dependencies are. Consider the adjunct sentence in (3a), which ordinarily admits only of an indicative. Since an adjunct is an island, we predict that a subjunctive embedded in it cannot be licenced by an operator in the main sentence. This prediction appears to be incorrect in the case of negation, since a sentential negation appears to licence a subjunctive in the causal adjunct, as in (8):

(8) Non è andato perchè è/ sia stanco

He hasn't gone because he is/ is-S tired

Furthermore, it is well-known that the English counterpart of the sentence in (8) is ambiguous; the indicative/ subjunctive distinction contributes to disambiguate the sentence. Thus only the indicative can be associated with the interpretation roughly

paraphrased by "Because he is tired, he hasn't gone"; conversely, the subjunctive can be associated only with the interpretation roughly paraphrased by "He has gone not because he is tired".

Before drawing any conclusions from (8), it is worth checking whether the other sentential operators that licence the subjunctive, namely Q and If, also licence it inside an adjunct. In this case the prediction that they don't appears to be confirmed, as in (9)-(10):

(9) E' andato perchè è/ *sia stanco?

Has he gone because he is/ is-S tired

(10) Se è andato perchè è/ *sia stanco, ...

If he has gone because he is/ is-S tired

Thus the data appear to be contradictory, since the negation, but not the Q and If operators, appear to be able to licence a subjunctive inside an adjunct.

The apparent contradiction between (8) and (9)-(10) can however be solved in favor of (9)-(10), if we consider that, as I paraphrased it above, the interpretation of the subjunctive version of (8) effectively involves constituent negation of the adjunct. In cases of overt constituent negation, both indicative and subjunctive are again licenced, as in (11):

(11) E' andato non perchè è/ sia stanco

He has gone not because he is/ is-S tired

On the assumption that the constituent negation in (11) is a

sister of the adjunct, no island intervenes between it and the embedded T. Thus the licencing of the subjunctive is predicted. In order to explain the apparent anomaly of (8) with respect to (9)-(10), I suggest that the subjunctive version of (8) is possible to the extent that this represents an abstract case of constituent negation.

In short, I have argued that sentential operators, while able to licence a subjunctive inside a complement sentence, cannot do so inside an adjunct. This in turn provides evidence that a syntactic dependency between the operator and the subjunctive T is created, which is sensitive to islands. This evidence, already discussed by Barbaud (1991), is also strengthened by another set of facts.

Suppose that a sentence associated with an operator of the Neg, Q, If class embeds a complement sentence and that the latter embeds an adjunct. The complement sentence can be either in the indicative or in the subjunctive. If the complement sentence is in the indicative, the adjunct sentence can only be in the indicative, as shown in (12) and (13) with the Q and If operator respectively:

(12) Sai che vuole andare perchè è/ *sia interessato?

Do you say that he wants to go because he is/ is-S
interested

(13) Se sai che vuole andare perchè è/ *sia interessato, ...

If you say that he wants to go because he is/ is-S
interested

However if the complement is in the subjunctive, the adjunct can itself be in the subjunctive, as in (14) and (15):

(14) Sai che voglia andare perchè è/ sia interessato?

Do you say that he wants-S to go because he is/ is-S
interested

(15) Se sai che voglia andare perchè è/ sia interessato, ...

If you say that he wants-S to go because he is/ is-S
interested

The impossibility of the subjunctive in (12)-(13) is straightforwardly explained by the presence of an adjunct island between the embedded T and the matrix operator. As for (14)-(15), I propose that the licencing of the subjunctive within the adjunct involves the creation of a branching dependency, of the same abstract kind as those involved in parasitic gaps phenomena, according to Brody (to appear), Manzini (1994a).

Both (14) and (15) obviously embed a wellformed dependency between the operator in the matrix sentence and the subjunctive T in the complement sentence. This dependency is roughly of the form (C, I, V, C, I), if we take the higher C to represent the position of the matrix operator and the lower I the position of the embedded subjunctive. Suppose then that this same dependency branches at the complement C, so that one branch reaches the I of the complement IP, as before, and the other branch the I of the adjunct, as in (16), where the adjunct CP and the complement IP are taken to be sisters by adjunction:

(16) C, I, V, C, $\begin{array}{l} \text{---I} \\ \diagdown \\ \text{C, I} \end{array}$

Branching dependencies of this kind, with one branch reaching into a complement sentence and one into an adjunct sentence, are independently argued to licence parasitic gaps by Brody (forthcoming), Manzini (1994a). What I propose is that this kind of branching dependency also licences multiple subjunctives within the complement and the adjunct clause in sentences of the type of (14)-(15).

Notice that the negation, which apparently patterns against other sentential operators in (8) vs. (9)-(10), follows the pattern in (12)-(13) and (14)-(15), as shown in (17)-(18):

(17) Non sapevo [che voleva andare perchè era/ *fosse stanco]

I didn't know that he wanted to go because he was/ was-S
tired

(18) Non sapevo [che volesse andare perchè era/ fosse stanco]

I didn't know that he wanted-S to go because he was/ was-S
tired

In (17)-(18), however, some care must be put in distinguishing the embedded construal of the adjunct from the matrix construal. It is only under the former construal, as indicated by the bracketing, that the judgements in (17)-(18) hold. Under the matrix construal, the subjunctive is always licenced in the adjunct, presumably as a case of constituent negation, as already argued, and hence irrelevantly.

→ I suppose in a minimalist grammar this would be rendered by saying that an abstract $+T$ feature in an embedded sentence moves to satisfy an internal feature associated with a $-T$ feature in the matrix sentence.

In short, if what precedes is on the right track, the existence of syntactic dependencies relating a sentential operator and a subjunctive T is confirmed not only by their sensitivity to adjunct islands but also by the fact that adjunct islands can be circumvented by a branching dependency, giving rise to phenomena formally indistinguishable from parasitic gaps.

Notice that the operators that licence the subjunctive are independently known to form a natural class. In particular, it is wellknown that the Neg, Q and If operators licence (negative) polarity items, which are not licenced in their absence. This is illustrated in Italian by the contrast between (19) and (20)-(22):

(19) *Vedo nessuno

I see anyone

(20) Non vedo nessuno

I don't see anyone

(21) Vedi nessuno?

Do you see anyone

(22) Se vedi nessuno, ...

If you see anyone

What is more, polarity items contrast with non-polarity items very much in the same way as subjunctives contrast with indicatives. In particular, true non-polarity existentials can occur without licencing by an operator, as in (23):

(23) Vedo qualcuno

Note however something ^{interesting} ~~and~~ ^{we} object to other type of (abstract) movement. The matrix $+N$ feature can or not be by an embedded one; only the interpretation differs. This is presumably due in fact to the + interpretable nature of $+N$.
I see someone

It is true that existentials can also occur in the presence of a sentential operator, as in (24)-(26):

(24) Non vedo qualcuno

I don't see someone

(25) Vedi qualcuno?

Do you see someone

(26) Se vedi qualcuno, ...

If you see someone, ...

→ In fact it is ^{tricky} to say that what we are intuiting is not at all movement, but binding of a free variable by an intensional operator. But this intuition binding would not predict islands under the current model.

However, exactly as I argued that the alternation of subjunctives and indicatives in the same contexts corresponds to a difference in interpretation, so it can be shown that different interpretations are attached to the polarity item and the existential when they alternate in the same context. In particular, the two different meanings of (20) and (24) are traditionally captured by saying that the polarity item in (20) has the force of an existential inside the scope of the negation, while the true existential in (24) is outside the scope of the negation. Similarly, a scope construal of the interpretation of subjunctives and indicatives, as polarity and anti-polarity items respectively, is presented by Brugger and D'Angelo (1994). Given a reconstruction of the scope terminology in terms of dependencies, however, we can say that in (20) the negative operator forms a dependency with the polarity item; on the other hand no such dependency exists in (24). This yields the two

different readings of (20) and (24). The data in (21)-(22) and (25)-(26) can of course be similarly construed.

The present view is consistent with the theory of indefinites of Heim (1982), and with its extensions to Wh and polarity items by Nishigauchi (1990) for Japanese, Cheng (1991) for Chinese, and others. In particular, we can assume that a polarity item like Italian nessuno is an indefinite that can and must be bound by a sentential operator. Reinterpreting then subjunctives in the light of these conclusions, it appears that T can also be construed as an indefinite that must be bound by a sentential operator. A parallelism between T and D is specifically predicted by a framework of the type of Higginbotham (1985); and the nominal-like nature of T is independently argued for in the treatment of temporal interpretation of Enç (1987). Conversely, if my characterization of the subjunctive is on the right track, it provides a very strong argument in favor of these theories of T.

Summing up, a subjunctive is an indefinite T bound by a sentential operator such as Neg, Q and If. In this respect a subjunctive is exactly parallel to a polarity item. Though based on data from one language, Italian, I take this characterization to hold universally.

2. Lexical selection of the subjunctive

Neg, Q, and If semantically appear to belong to a larger class of intensional operators, which also includes at least the necessity and possibility operators. These latter operators can

be expressed by lexical predicates in Italian, which indeed select the subjunctive, and are incompatible with the indicative, as in (27)-(28):

(27) E' necessario che tu *vieni/ venga

It is necessary that you come/ come-S

(28) E' possibile che io *vengo/ venga

It is possible that I come/ come-S

The parallel between subjunctives and polarity items appears then to break up at this point, since polarity items are not licenced in necessity/ possibility contexts in Italian. Crucially, however, polarity items are licenced by modals in other languages. Thus for instance the Greek data in (29)-(30), from Agouraki (1993), contrast with the Italian data in (31)-(32); data similar to (29)-(30) are also found in Albanian, as discussed by Turano (1994b):

(29) Prepi na dhis kanena apopse

It is necessary that you see-S anyone tonight

(30) Bori na dhis kanena apopse

It is possible that you see-S anyone tonight

(31) *E' necessario che tu veda nessuno stasera

It is necessary that you see-S anyone tonight

(32) *E' possibile che tu veda nessuno stasera

It is possible that you see-S anyone tonight

Given (29)-(30), we can tentatively conclude that it is the

entire range of intensional operators that can serve as licensors both for the subjunctive and for polarity items. A semantic characterization of the subjunctive in terms of intentionality is indeed proposed by Farkas (1992). Parametric choice determines which operators actually licence the subjunctive and which the polarity items in any given language. The question whether the sets of actual, as well as of potential, licensors can be characterized in a unitary manner, and how, is essentially semantic in nature and can only be left open here for future research.

(27)-(28) also reintroduce the question raised at the beginning, and then abandoned, concerning the licencing of the subjunctive (and of polarity items) by lexical predicates. The natural conclusion to be drawn from the discussion that precedes is that lexical predicates licence subjunctives (and polarity items) in their complements to the extent that they abstractly embed an intensional operator. In fact the necessity and possibility operators apparently contribute the entire content of the predicates in (27)-(28).

Other predicates like to doubt arguably embed the Neg operator. As expected, such predicates select the subjunctive in Italian, to the exclusion of the indicative, as shown in (33a); since they embed the negation, they also licence a polarity item, again as expected, as in (33b):

- (33) a. Dubito che *viene/ venga
 I doubt that he comes/ comes-S
 b. Dubito che abbia visto niente

I doubt that he has-S seen anything

On the other hand Laka (1990) and Progovac (1994) point out that predicates of the class of to doubt only licence a polarity item across sentence boundaries, and not within the same sentence, as in (34):

(34) *Dubito niente

I doubt anything

Laka (1990) and Progovac (1994) therefore conclude that the polarity item in (33b) is licenced by to doubt and the like through the C head of its sentential complement. Immediate support for this conclusion comes from the fact that there are languages in which the C selected by such predicates overtly bears Neg features. This is the case for instance with Basque enik.

Notice then that though a Neg head licences a polarity item within the same sentence, as in (20), it licences a subjunctive only across sentence boundaries, as in (4). This immediately suggests that the licencing of the subjunctive always is a two step process, whereby the operator in the matrix sentence binds the embedded C position, and the ordinary T-anchoring relation between C and I determines the presence of a subjunctive in the latter. Thus the fact that the Neg head in (4) determines the subjunctive in the embedded sentence and not in the matrix sentence is straightforwardly predicted on the basis of the fact that the embedded but not the matrix C is in the scope of Neg.

or perhaps
in
embedded
if positive
corresponding
to the
weak
features
of Neg,
etc.

C
therefore
is a
necessary
step
from

If it is indeed necessary for a C to be in the scope of an intensional operator in order for it to licence a subjunctive I, we can also exclude that an If or Q operator could licence a subjunctive within their sentence. Matrix subjunctives apparently do exist; arguably however some covert modal takes their C in its scope. It is significant that in Italian, leaving aside the suppletive forms of the imperative, the subjunctive only appears preceded by the complementizer che, even when it is apparently otherwise unembedded, as for instance in (35):

(35) a. Che sia malato?

That he is-S sick ("Could he be sick?")

b. *Sia malato?

He is-S sick

Returning then to predicates of the to doubt class, they of course licence the subjunctive through the embedded C, which eventually also licences polarity items.

As for the several classes of predicates that licence the subjunctive in Italian without licencing polarity items, they appear to involve in general modal properties, as for instance the verbs of the to want class exemplified in (1). Given the parallelism suggested here between the subjunctive and polarity items, we expect that all lexical predicates that licence subjunctives also licence polarity items at least in some languages. This prediction appears to be realized for instance in Chinese, as discussed in particular by Li (1992). Indeed polarity items appear to be licenced in Chinese even in contexts,

such as those embedded under to believe, where the subjunctive itself is a highly parametrized choice, being found for instance in Italian, but not in the other major Romance languages.

Similar problems are posed by the apparent selection of the subjunctive in adjuncts by certain prepositions. Here again the theory leads one to assume that the subjunctive is licenced to the extent that a preposition, like a verb, embeds one of the relevant operators. This is easily proven in some cases. Thus we can assume that the preposition without selects the subjunctive, to the exclusion of the indicative, as in (36a), in that it embeds a negation operator; this is confirmed by the fact that it licences polarity items, as in (36b):

- (36) a. Lo so senza che tu me lo *dici/ dica
 I know it without that you tell/ tell-S it to me
- b. Lo so senza che tu mi dica niente
 I know it without that you tell-S me anything

The decision as to what operators are involved in other cases is admittedly less straightforward; tentatively we can assume however that they are once again to be identified with modals.

Finally, it is easy to notice that in the discussion that precedes only complements, i.e. internal arguments of lexical predicates, have been taken into consideration; external arguments, i.e. subjects, have been left out. Similarly, the island behaviors of subjunctive dependencies have been illustrated only with adjunct islands; the behavior of subjunctives with respect to the other major class of strong

islands, namely subject islands, has not been discussed.

The facts turn out to be that at least in Italian subject sentences can apparently always be in the subjunctive. Thus, both the subjunctive and the indicative appear to be allowed by a predicate such as to be known in (37):

(37) Che Maria *è*/ *sia* infelice *è* noto

That Mary is/ is-S unhappy is known

However the possibility of having the subjunctive in (37) is restricted to the (apparent) subject position. In the post-verbal position only the indicative is allowed, as the similarity with (2) leads us to expect; this is shown in (38):

(38) E' noto che Maria *è*/ **sia* infelice

It is known that Mary is/ is-S unhappy

The phenomenon in (37) can then be related to a wider phenomenon. Topicalization of any sentence, including complements of to know, licences the subjunctive, as shown in (39):

(39) Che Maria *è*/ *sia* infelice lo so

That Mary is/ is-S unhappy I know it

If so, movement of a sentence to the apparent subject position can simply be equated to topicalization. A similar conclusion is reached by Koster (1978) on the basis of completely independent arguments.

Of course, the question that this description of the facts leaves open is how topicalization of a sentence triggers the subjunctive. Notice that in examples of the type in (40), even focussing the matrix verb is sufficient to licence the subjunctive in the embedded sentence:

(40) Gianni DICE che Maria è/ sia infelice (non lo sa)

John SAYS that Mary is/ is-S unhappy (he doesn't know it)

Whatever the solution to this problem turns out to be, what is crucial here is that at least the insensitivity of subjunctives to subject islands is only apparent.

3. The interaction between subjunctives and (negative) polarity items

Let us assume that what precedes is on the right track and that subjunctives and polarity items are both the spell-out of indefinites bound by certain operators. As we shall now see it follows from the theory that, given the relevant environment, one cannot occur without the other.

The first context in which the interaction of subjunctives and polarity items can be seen is relative clauses. These can in principle be headed by a polarity item and be inflected in the subjunctive. Consider then (41)-(42). The existential in (41) remains unbound by the negation, while the polarity item in (42) is bound by it. In (41) a relative clause modifying the existential can be in the indicative but not in the subjunctive;

in (42) a relative clause modifying the polarity item can be both in the indicative and in the subjunctive:

(41) Non vedo alcuni oggetti che mi piacciono/ *piacciano

I don't see some objects that I like/ like-S

(42) Non vedo nessun oggetto che mi piace/ piaccia

I don't see any object that I like/ like-S

Before proceeding to the analysis of the facts in (41)-(42), it is necessary to introduce less vague assumptions on the nature of the dependencies formed by polarity items. Two models are in principle available. One model conceives of the relevant dependencies as formed by abstract phrasal movement to the Spec position of an operator head. The other model thinks of the relevant dependencies as formed by binding by the operator head; it is this latter model that I shall adopt here. For present purposes, in particular, we can assume that it is the D/N head of the polarity item itself that is bound by the operator head, thus creating a head to head dependency, as detailed by Manzini (1994b).

Consider then (41)-(42) again. I assume that head dependencies in general must satisfy (some appropriate version of) the Head Movement Constraint of Travis (1984). If so, the subjunctive dependency in (41)-(42) cannot reach from the operator position in the matrix sentence to the T position in the relative clause without passing through the D/N head of the relative. We can then assume that if D/ N is part of the dependency, it is itself bound by the negation, and must

therefore be spelled out as a polarity item. If D/N is not spelled out as a polarity item, this can only mean that it is not part of the dependency; but if so, (the relevant version of) the Head Movement Constraint is violated. Thus the combination of existential + subjunctive in (41) is predicted to be illformed. Viceversa, the other three possible combinations are predicted to be wellformed. These include existential + indicative in (41), where no dependency is formed, and polarity item + subjunctive in (42), where a dependency is formed including the subjunctive and the polarity item on its path. The combination polarity item + indicative is also wellformed, since in this last case the dependency can simply stop at the polarity item.

Another often noted fact is also automatically explained by the present theory, namely that subjunctive relative clauses cannot modify definite heads, or specific heads in the sense of Enç (1991), as seen for instance in (43):

- (43) Non vedo nessuno degli oggetti che mi piacciono/ *piacciano
I don't see any of the objects that I like/ like-S

If the licencing of the subjunctive corresponds to the formation of a syntactic dependency, then we can take the ungrammaticality of the subjunctive version of (43) to be due to a definiteness/specificity island. On the conclusion that this is a syntactic island there is agreement notably between Manzini (1992; 1994a) and Diesing (1992), though the explanations provided for it differ.

It is also worth considering what the behavior of relative

what happens here is that it is not a like element that blocks the path of not (what we have concluded about) but an unlike element. So a specific D head blocks the relation between the universal operator and the subjunctive. he has paper

clauses and their heads is with respect to the other operators that trigger polarity items and the subjunctive. The parallelism with the negation appears to hold, though the judgements are somewhat more delicate than in (41)-(42), as shown with the Q operator in (44)-(45):

(44) Vedi alcuni oggetti che ti piacciono/ *piacciono?

Do you see some objects that you like/ like-S

(45) Vedi nessun oggetto che ti piace/ piaccia?

Do you see any objects that you like/ like-S

In short, an operator can bind a subjunctive in a relative clause if the head of the relative clause is a polarity item, as in (42) or (45).

The reverse situation, in which a dependency licences a polarity item across a subjunctive T, is also found, and gives rise to well-known patterns of the type in (46)-(47):

(46) Non dico che è/ sia qualcosa *(di qualcosa)*

I don't say that it is/ is-S something

(47) Non dico che *è/ sia niente *(di qualcosa)*

I don't say that it is/ is-S anything

In (46) it is clear that the existential is insensitive to whether the embedded T is spelled out as an indicative or as a subjunctive. On the other hand in (47), though judgements can be delicate, it appears that the polarity item is licenced by the presence of an embedded subjunctive, but not of an indicative.

I propose a model based on the idea that Op... structures (what would be called unselector binding) ~~are represented by~~ are represented by a dependency connecting op and vbl ~~including all of~~ including all of intermediate heads. This is necessary to satisfy connectedness. No potential head can remain unmodulated under a modal dependency.

Thus indicatives apparently create islands for the licencing of polarity items, while subjunctives don't.

The same kind of pattern is found when polarity items are licenced by operators other than the negation, as shown with the Q operator in (48)-(49):

(48) Dici che è/ sia qualcosa?

Do you say that it is/ is-S something

(49) Dici che *è/ sia niente? *(the hypothesis)*

Do you say that it is/ is-S anything

The data in (46)-(49) are straightforwardly explained in terms of the present approach. Consider (47) or (49). A head dependency relating the matrix operator to the embedded polarity item must include the embedded T on grounds of locality. If so, the embedded T is also bound by the operator and hence must be spelled out as a subjunctive. In (46) and (48) the matrix operator may or may not bind the embedded T; whether it does or not is irrelevant to the embedded existential, which does not form a dependency with it.

Thus the often noted sensitivity of polarity items to the subjunctive/ indicative alternation is exactly predicted by the present theory. It is worth emphasizing that if we were to maintain a theory under which the dependencies that licence polarity items are formed by abstract phrasal movement, it would be difficult to provide an explanation for their sensitivity to intervening T heads.

On the other hand, we do expect polarity items to be

→ this explains the definiteness effect. The only alternative that I see is to state the definiteness/specificity effect as a general locality/ interface condition

sensitive to strong islands, exactly as discussed under the abstract movement approach by Longobardi (1990). In particular, a polarity item inside an adjunct cannot be licenced by a negation in the superordinate sentence. This is true even if the adjunct is in the subjunctive, when this is selected by the lexical head that introduces the adjunct, as in (50):

(50) Non vado purchè tu dica qualcosa/ *niente

I don't go provided you say-S something/ anything

Of course, if the subjunctive inside the adjunct is licenced by a constituent negation, then a polarity item inside it can also be licenced by the negation, as in (51):

(51) Vado non perche' succeda qualcosa/ niente

I go not because something/ anything happens-S

Similarly, we do expect a polarity item to be licenced inside an adjunct by a branching dependency whose main branch lies outside it, and whose other branch reaches into it, as in (52); thus we can account for the fact that (negative) polarity items create parasitic gap-like configurations, as first discussed by Kayne (1984):

(52) Non fai niente perchè qualcuno/ nessuno ti ami

You don't do anything in order that somebody/ anybody
loves-S you

As we have seen, subjunctive dependencies also are sensitive to strong islands and give rise to parasitic gaps-like effects.

4. The interaction between subjunctives and anaphors

Parallel facts to those observed for the interaction between T and polarity items have also been noted several times for the interaction of T and anaphors. In particular there are a number of languages in which an anaphor can refer to an antecedent across a subjunctive, but not across an indicative. Though Italian also is a representative of this type according to some speakers (Giorgi 1984), the best studied example of such a language is perhaps Icelandic.

The hypothesis that the presence of a subjunctive (or an infinitival) somehow extends the domain for the binding of reflexives has been a constant in the treatment of Icelandic by Anderson (1986), Everaert (1986), Manzini and Wexler (1987), Koster (1987) and many others. Nevertheless the difficulty of dealing with some of the relevant data has also been taken to justify recourse to a discourse category of logophoricity, notably by Maling (1984) and most recently by Reinhart and Reuland (1993). Here I shall show that the present characterization of the subjunctive allows for a straightforward syntactic account of all the various phenomena. My analysis will be based on the data reported in particular by Thrainsson (1990) and Sigurdhsson (1990).

As a preliminary to the discussion, it is worth noticing that the subjunctive is normally found under verbs of saying in

Icelandic, as in (53):

(53) Jon segir adh tveir plus tveir *eru/ seu fjorir

John says that two plus two is/ is-S four

The use of the subjunctive in indirect speech, which is quite productive in Icelandic, as in (54), appears to be a related characteristic:

(54) (Formadthurinn varðh oskaplega reidhur.) Tillagan vaeri
svivirdhileg og ...

The chairman was furiously angry. The proposal was-S
outrageous and ...

Though data like (54) have been systematically used to justify recourse to discourse-based categories, they can of course be reduced to the ordinary sentence-based syntax by postulating embedding under an abstract predicate of saying or, better, under the operator/ modal structure that this must contain under the present approach.

In all other respects, it is easy to establish that the basic properties of the subjunctive are the same in Icelandic as in Italian. Thus a verb of direct evidence like to see is normally incompatible with the subjunctive, as in (55); however the subjunctive becomes possible if the matrix predicate is negated as in (56):

(55) Jon ser adh thu ert/ *sert bestur

John sees that you are/ are-S best

(56) Jon ser ekki adh thu ert/ sert bestur

John does not see that you are/ are-S best

Similarly, the subjunctive is normally selected in certain adjuncts, such as those introduced by unless, but not in others, such as those introduced by because, as illustrated in (57)-(58):

(57) Jon kemur ekki nema Maria komi

John will not come unless Mary comes

(58) Jon for af thvi adh hann var/ *vaeri reidhur

John left because he was/ was-S angry

However, a negation associated with a because adjunct licences the subjunctive inside it, as in (59); the difference in interpretation found between the indicative and the subjunctive version of (59) exactly parallels that discussed for analogous Italian examples:

(59) Jon for ekki af thvi adh var/ vaeri reidhur

John did not leave because he was/ was-S angry

As anticipated, Icelandic provides an uncontroversial example of a long-distance reflexive, sig. Suppose that, as first argued by Pica (1987) and Chomsky (1986), long-distance anaphora involves the abstract cliticization of reflexive heads on I. If we assume that subjunctive dependencies systematically relate an embedded I to a matrix I, we are led to expect that given

anaphoric features associated with the embedded I, dependency-internal binding of these features by a matrix I is possible. Provided then a language has the relevant type of reflexives, that abstractly cliticize on I, we expect the distribution of reflexives to essentially match that of subjunctives. To be more precise, we expect that long-distance binding always involves an antecedent in subject position, given that the reflexive abstractly cliticized in I is bound by another, superordinate I.

Proceeding to a systematic review of the data, we first find that sig can be bound by the subject of its sentence, as in (60):

- (60) Jon_i rakadhi sig_i
Jon shaved himself

Furthermore, sig can be bound by the subject of a higher sentence across a subjunctive, but not across an indicative, as in (61):

- (61) a. Jon_i segir adh Maria elski sig_i
John says that Mary loves-S himself
b. *Jon_i veit adh Maria elskar sig_i
John knows that Mary loves himself

These basic data receive an obvious explanation within the present theory. In (60) sig abstractly cliticizes to the nearest I and is bound by the subject in IP. In (61a), the same kind of abstract cliticization of sig to the nearest I takes place. Furthermore, a subjunctive dependency relates this embedded I to the matrix I. Thus a dependency (I, ..., I) is formed, which

have subjunctives have long-distance reflexives^(i.e. 'subjunctives') one possibility
is that of course in German Sich does not have to I.

Another possibility, perhaps more interesting, given the historical

licences binding of the reflexive in the embedded I by the matrix
I, and hence ultimately by the matrix subject. In (61b), no such
dependency is formed between the matrix I and the embedded
indicative I; thus the impossibility of reflexivization follows.

The question however can be raised whether a syntactic
characterization of the antecedents for long-distance
reflexivization is empirically adequate. Thus in an example like
(62), reported by Maling (1984), it appears that the subject of
the complex nominal serves as the antecedent for reflexivization:

(62) Tru Olafs, adh allar syndir sinar, verdhi ser, fyrirgefna,
er bjargfost

The belief of Olaf, that all sins of himself will be
himself forgiven, is rockfirm

Crucially, in examples of this type it is the nominalization
itself that triggers the embedded subjunctive, so that
intuitively speaking, the binding of the reflexive by the subject
of the nominalization is entirely as expected. This informal
result can straightforwardly be translated into the present
syntactic framework, if we remember that genitive, like
nominative, is a structural Case, which is checked against an
inflectional projection of the noun according to Abney (1987),
exactly as nominative is checked against I. Hence sig is indeed
bound within a head to head dependency in both cases.

Next, the present theory succeeds in explaining a pattern
which has long been problematic for syntactic approaches to
Icelandic-type reflexives. This pattern is illustrated in (63);

understanding of long-distance reflexivization, is that ni and
other elements are orientated to internal operators themselves.
i.e. they move for $\pm \Pi$ checking and that determines their
coreference possibilities.

in (63), though the adjunct embeds a subjunctive, the reflexive contained in the adjunct cannot be bound by the subject of the immediately superordinate sentence:

(63) *Jon_i kemur ekki nema Maria kyssi sig_i

John will not come unless Mary kisses-S himself

On the other hand if the sentence in (63) is itself embedded under some predicate triggering the subjunctive, coreference between the highest subject and the reflexive inside the adjunct becomes possible, as in (64); nothing of course happens if (63) is embedded under a predicate not triggering the subjunctive, as in (65):

(64) Jon_i segir adh hann komi ekki nema Maria kyssi sig_i

John says that he will not come-S unless Mary kisses-S himself

(65) *Jon_i veit adh hann kemur ekki nema Maria kyssi sig_i

John knows that he will not come unless Mary kisses-S himself

In (63) it is the preposition introducing the adjunct that triggers the subjunctive; the adjunct, being an island, blocks both licencing of the subjunctive from the matrix sentence and reflexivization across it. The reason why (64) is not equally excluded has been examined in detail with respect to subjunctives in Italian. Briefly, in (64), a well-formed dependency can be created between the matrix I and the I of the embedded

complement; this dependency can also branch so as to reach the adjunct I, essentially as in (16), without violating locality, for the same reasons for which parasitic gap dependencies don't. Obviously, (65) remains impossible, in that the embedded indicative does not licence the formation of a branching dependency, reaching from the matrix I to the adjunct I.

It is worth emphasizing, then, that the data in (63)-(65), which have been taken to crucially justify theories of long-distance anaphora based on pragmatic notions such as logophoricity, provide perhaps the strongest evidence in favor of its syntactic nature. Quite simply, the syntactic approach succeeds in unifying data such as (63)-(65) with the completely independent phenomenon of parasitic gaps, the syntactic nature of which is generally agreed upon. Under a pragmatic approach to (63)-(65), this parallel remains purely coincidental. But the odds against this being a pure coincidence must be very high.

The same point as in (63)-(65) can be made with an adjunct normally associated with the indicative; in such an adjunct a long-distance reflexive is normally impossible, as indicated in (66):

(66) *Jon_i kemur fyrst Maria elskar sig_i

John comes since Mary loves himself

Embedding (66) under a matrix verb of saying licences both a subjunctive inside the adjunct and, in the presence of the subjunctive, a long-distance reflexive, as illustrated in (67); this is of course exactly what is predicted by the theory of

branching dependencies:

(67) Jon_i segir adh hann komi fyrst Maria elski sig_i

John says that he comes since Mary loves-S himself

Finally, the same theory also correctly predicts that in a sentence of the type in (67), or indeed (64), the reflexive cannot be bound by the intermediate subject, as in (68):

(68) *Jon segir adh Haraldur_i komi fyrst Maria elski sig_i

John says that Harald comes since Mary loves-S himself

The reason for this behavior is that the adjunct I_i, which is associated with the reflexive, and the complement I_j, which is associated with the embedded subject, sit on two separate branches of a dependency of the type in (16). Thus, binding fails essentially for lack of c-command, assuming crucially that the two branches of the dependency are unordered with respect to one another.

An apparent counterexample to this syntactic account of long-distance reflexivization in Icelandic is provided by the presence of sig in indirect speech examples of the type in (54). Thus (54) can be continued as in (69):

(69) ... og vaeri henni beint gegn ser_i personulega. Ser_i vaeri sama ...

... and it was-S aimed against himself personally. To himself it was-S indifferent

Given the previously stressed advantages of enforcing syntactic constraints on sig, the simplest analysis of this pattern involves postulating that all of the indirect discourse depends from some abstract verb of saying. Of course this is exactly how the passage is interpreted.

Another familiar problem that arises in connection with Icelandic anaphors is why they lack a nominative form. Following Chomsky (1986), however, we can assume that this problem receives an independent explanation. In particular, in a framework in which sig abstractly cliticizes to I, it is natural to assume that this cliticization is impossible essentially for the same reasons for which we exclude other extractions of a subject. If so, no long-anaphora dependency involving the subject can be established, and the impossibility of nominative anaphors is derived.

Interesting questions arise on the other hand in the case of subject positions from which extraction is possible, such as the inverted subject position of Italian. As noted by Rizzi (1990), nominative anaphors are still impossible in this position. Rizzi (1990) attributes this impossibility to the fact that I, that can be taken to be pronominal in Italian, has binding requirements incompatible with those of the anaphor. In any event, this confirms the conclusion that the anaphor-agreement effect, as Rizzi (1990) calls it, can be separately explained.

The final question to be considered here concerns patterns of a type exemplified by Italian (70)-(72):

(70) Non dico che sappia che io sono/ sia arrivato

I don't say that he knows-S that I have/ have-S arrived

(71) Dici che sappia che tu sei/ sia arrivato?

Do you say that he knows-S that you have/ have-S arrived

(72) Se dice ch'io sappia che è/ sia arrivato, ...

If he says that I know-S that he has/ has-S arrived

In (70)-(72) the Neg, Q and If operators in the matrix sentence obviously trigger the subjunctive in the intermediate sentence. As a consequence of this, the predicate in the intermediate sentence, which ordinarily requires the indicative in its complement, also admits of a subjunctive. This pattern is of course reminiscent of the branching dependency pattern last illustrated in (67). As in (67) and the like, we conclude that it is the matrix operator that ultimately induces the subjunctive in both embedded sentences. The difference between the two cases however is that, if in (67) the two embedded subjunctives correspond to two branches of a dependency, in (70)-(72) this is not the case.

Consider then Icelandic. The same kind of multiple licencing of subjunctives inside complements is clearly found, as in (73):

(73) Jon segir adh Haraldur viti adh Maria elskar/ elski Billa

John says that Harald knows-S that Mary loves/ loves-S Bill

The long dependency between the matrix operator and the most embedded subjunctive clearly licences reflexivization, as seen in (74), where a reflexive in the most embedded sentence is bound

by the matrix subject:

(74) Jon_i segir adh Haraldur viti adh Maria elski sig_i

John says that Harold knows that Mary loves-S himself

The question is whether the reflexive can also be bound by the intermediate subject, as in (75):

(75) *Jon segir adh Haraldur_i viti adh Maria elski sig_i

John says that Harold knows that Mary loves-S himself

In this case, the judgement of Sigurdhsson (1990) appears to be undecided between the full grammaticality of (74) or (67), and the full ungrammaticality of (68). Remember that in an example of the type in (68) we were able to predict the impossibility for sig to be bound by the intermediate subject on the ground that they lie on two different branches of a dependency and c-command does not hold between them. Since c-command orders the three I's in (75) with respect to one another, on this basis we predict on the contrary that binding of the reflexive by the intermediate subject is possible.

But suppose that the correct assessment of the facts is that the reflexive cannot be bound by the intermediate subject, as tentatively indicated in (75). In terms of the present theory this means that the only possible antecedent for the reflexive is the I associated with the intensional properties that licence the subjunctive. Thus it appears that a long reflexivization dependency must not simply be contained within a subjunctive

argument
in favor
of intensional
sig!

or alternatively - epiphenomenally - sig
is carried along by movement to +T
but it is only the landing site that counts for
coreference

dependency, but rather must coincide with it. In other words, the same I that licences the subjunctive properties on a given I, must also licence its reflexive properties, if present. Dissociation between the two is naturally enough barred.

Finally, we may ask why German does not have long-distance reflexivization, and Icelandic does. Though both languages have a morphological reflexive without complex internal structure, the relevant parameter can be stated simply by saying that Icelandic reflexives cliticize on I, while German reflexives do not. There is indeed no reason why the two elements should not have different abstract properties, despite their morphological similarity.

5. The interaction between subjunctives and pronominals

I shall conclude by considering the well-known fact that the subject of a subjunctive clause in Italian and other languages is disjoint in reference with the matrix subject, though this behavior appears to be parametrized once again.

Consider Italian first. Disjoint reference is forced between the subject of a volition verb, as in (76a), and the subject of its subjunctive complement; coreference between the two subjects is possible only in the presence of an embedded infinitival, as in (76b):

- (76) a. *Voglio che io vada
 I want that I go-S
 b. Voglio andare

I want to go

However, the subject of a subjunctive complement need not be disjoint in reference from a non-subject in the matrix sentence. Thus the subject of the subjunctive in (77a-b) must be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, but not from the matrix object; (77c) shows that subject and object control are equally acceptable in the infinitival counterpart:

- (77) a. *Mi chiedono che vadano
 They ask me that they go-S
- b. Mi chiedono che io vada
 They ask me that I go-S
- c. Mi chiedono di andare
 They ask me to go

As for adjuncts, in general coreference of the embedded subject with the matrix subject remains possible. Thus (78), where the subjunctive is selected by the preposition before, is possible without disjoint reference:

- (78) a. Vado prima che mi arrabbi
 I go before I get-S angry
- b. Vado prima di arrabbiarmi
 I go before getting angry

Suppose that the discussion so far is correct and that licencing of a subjunctive depends on the formation of a

~~the simplest way to account for this within the minimalist framework~~ The simplest way to account for this within the minimalist framework is to say that the checking of the +N feature implies that 38 nominal Agr features are also carried along. Thus disjoint reference if such features are present

dependency connecting an embedded T to an operator in a higher sentence. If the subjunctive I also contains a pronominal Agr, we expect this pronominal Agr to be disjoint in reference from other Agr elements that c-command it locally, i.e. within the same dependency. This approach of course predicts that subjunctive-induced disjoint reference is restricted to subject antecedents, as in (76); no such effect holds with non-subjects, as in (77), which are effectively outside the relevant dependency. Within different conceptions of subjunctive dependencies, this proposal is indeed found in previous work, notably by Picallo (1985) and Kempchinsky (1986).

The absence of disjoint reference between the subject of the adjunct and the subject of the matrix sentence in (78) is of course unproblematical. Indeed the subjunctive is licenced by the preposition that introduces the adjunct; thus the matrix and embedded I do not form a dependency together.

To be more precise, there is one case in which disjoint reference obligatorily holds of the subject of an adjunct and the subject of the sentence under which it is embedded. This involves rationale clauses, as illustrated in (79):

- (79) a. *Vengo perchè ti aiuti
I come in order that I help-S you
b. Vengo per aiutarti
I come to help you

An intuitive explanation for the behavior in (79) is not difficult to find. In essence all sentences of the type in (79)

admit of a paraphrase of the type in (80):

(80) Vengo perchè voglio aiutarti/ *che ti aiuti

I come because I want to help you/ that I help-S you

If we assume that it is literally true that a rationale sentence embeds an abstract volitional predicate, then the disjoint reference pattern observed in (79) is just a reflex of the disjoint reference between the volitional predicate and its subjunctive complement, in case the volitional predicate corefers with the subject of the matrix sentence, as in (80). Remarkably, the match between Italian disjoint reference and Icelandic long reflexivaization extends to this *prima facie* exception. Thus long-distance reflexives appear to be exceptionally licenced in rationale clauses in Icelandic, as in (81):

(81) Jon, fer sennilega til adh thu gleymir ser,

John probably goes so that you forget-S himself

The same tentative explanation can of course be suggested for the Icelandic case as for the Italian one.

It remains for us to consider more complex cases where a subjunctive dependency does not relate a matrix sentence and its complement, but rather a matrix sentence, its complement and an adjunct embedded in it, through the formation of a branching dependency, as in (82)-(83):

(82) Vuole ch'io vada dopo che gli abbia parlato

*This again shows
that it's only
the original point that
matters.*

He wants that I go-S after I have-S talked to him

(83) *Vuole ch'io vada dopo che mi abbia parlato

He wants that I go-S after he has-S talked to me

In (82) we expect that disjoint reference does not hold between the subjects of the adjunct and of the intermediate sentence, since they are on parallel branches of a subjunctive dependency of the type in (16) and hence not ordered by c-command with respect to one another. Viceversa, on the basis of a dependency of the type in (16), we expect disjoint reference to hold between the subjects of the adjunct and of the matrix clause in (83). Though judgements are delicate, the comparison between (82) and (83) seems to produce the desired results.

We must then consider what the disjoint reference patterns are in case a matrix sentence triggers the subjunctive in two complements embedded one into the other. On the basis of reflexivization patterns in Icelandic, we expect disjoint reference to hold between the most embedded and the matrix subject, but not between the most embedded and the intermediate subject. Indeed, though judgements are again delicate on this point, there appears to be a contrast between the acceptability of (84) and the unacceptability of (85):

(84) Voglio che dica che si diverta

I want that he says-S that he has-S fun

(85) *Voglio che dica che mi diverta

I want that he says-S that I have-S fun

???

To the extent that disjoint reference mirrors long reflexivization, we can of course advance an explanation for (84)-(85) similar to the one proposed for the parallel data from Icelandic. Thus it appears that disjoint reference is obligatory only with respect to the I associated with the intensional properties that trigger the subjunctive dependency, and not with respect to intermediate I's.

???

A special note of caution is in order at this point. Studies on reflexivization patterns have long taken into account complex syntactic environments, and the data are clearly understood. Disjoint reference patterns have been less studied; correspondingly, the present conclusions concerning them are built on a more impressionistic foundation.

Furthermore, according to Ruwet (1991), even in the simplest syntactic environments complex disjoint reference effects are found depending on semantic factors. If correct, these data in themselves do not undermine the syntactic approach, which has been motivated here on a number of other grounds. Conversely, the role of operator and modal structures in triggering the subjunctive is explicitly recognized by the present theory. It is not to be excluded then that further study both confirms subtle semantic intuitions and shows their compatibility with a syntactic analysis. Like all questions crucially concerned with the semantics of subjunctives, however, this must be left for future work.

Again by analogy with the preceding discussion of long-distance reflexivization we can also ask why disjoint reference of the Italian type does not characterize other languages with

subjunctive dependencies. A rather obvious possibility is that the pronominal or non-pronominal nature of I itself is involved. This implies that French, which has the same disjoint reference effects as Italian, is a special kind of null subject language, having a pronominal I as Italian does. In turn, this is not implausible, given the role played in the language by subject clitics. Viceversa, the lack of disjoint reference effects in Germanic languages, including Icelandic itself (M. Everaert, p.c.) is correctly characterized by the parameter as due to the non-pronominal nature of I.

The lack of disjoint reference in languages like Greek and Albanian, as well as Romanian in the Romance family, appears to be a distinct phenomenon altogether. These languages are characterized by the use of a subjunctive particle, na in Greek, te in Albanian, sa in Romanian. This is in addition to the inflectional morphology of the verb; and, as discussed by Terzi (1992), Motapanyane (1991), Turano (1994a), at least in Albanian and Rumanian it is clearly not a complementizer, since it can cooccur with the complementizer proper, as in Albanian (86):

(86) Dua qe Maria te vije

I want that Mary comes-S

Incidentally, in some of these languages, namely Romanian and Albanian, the subjunctive alternates with a morphological infinitive. In Greek, on the other hand, where no such residual alternation is found, Roussou (1994) shows that the subjunctive form is truly such, in that it has the same properties noted for

the Italian subjunctive, which distinguish it from the infinitive.

Both in Albanian and in Romanian, if the complementizer is overtly present, the subject can be in pre-verbal position, as exemplified with Albanian (86). On the other hand, if the complementizer is not present, the subject must be inverted, as in Albanian (87):

- (87) a. *Dua Maria te vije
 I want Mary comes-S
 b. Dua te vije Maria
 I want comes-S Mary

The natural conclusion to be drawn from such data is that the inversion of the subject in (87) is due to movement of the subjunctive particle te to the empty C position, which implies movement of the inflected V as well.

The lack of disjoint reference requirements in languages like Greek can be seen in simple examples of subjunctives subcategorized by volitional predicates, as in (88):

- (88) Thelo na fai
 I want I eat-S

Consider on the other hand languages like Albanian where the subjunctive particle can cooccur with a complementizer. As discussed by Terzi (1992), if the complementizer is missing, then it is possible for the embedded and matrix subjects to corefer,

as in Greek; however if the complementizer is present, disjoint reference is forced, as in Italian. The relevant Albanian examples are in (89):

- (89) a. Do te vije
 He wants he comes-S
- b. *Do qe te vije
 He wants that he comes-S

Given then a subjunctive structure with a complementizer, disjoint reference appears to hold in all languages. It is the complementizer-less construction with the subjunctive in C that removes disjoint reference, as indeed suggested by Terzi (1992).

Another remarkable property of the class of languages under consideration is that they allow not only what appears to be control, as in (89), but also what appears to be raising from the subject position of a subjunctive, provided the complementizer is absent. This is illustrated in Greek (90):

- (90) Ta pedia fenonte na fevghun
 The children seem they go-S

What is more, movement of the subjunctive to C appears to represent a first step toward incorporation in the relevant languages. Thus causative constructions involve subjunctive complements in a number of Albanian dialects discussed by Brandi and Savoia (1990) and Guasti (1993), always of course in the absence of complementizers.

We are then in the presence of a full spectrum of infinitival-like behaviors of subjunctives moved to C, from control to raising to incorporation. I tentatively impute all such behaviors to the complementizer-less construal of the subjunctive in C. Since there is no reason to believe that these data require the present theory of the subjunctive or of its interactions with other processes of dependency formation to be changed, I leave all further research in this domain for future work.

The subjunctive
being launched
from C, we
may expect it does
not take along
any personal
I features.

why control + raising is
possible. I can't say.

References

- Abney, Stephen. 1987. The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Agouraki, Yoria. 1993. Spec-Head Licencing. Doctoral Dissertation, University College London, London
- Anderson, Stephen. 1986. The typology of anaphoric dependencies: Icelandic (and other) reflexives. In Topics in Scandinavian syntax, eds. Lars Hellan and Kirsti Koch Christensen. Dordrecht: Reidel
- Barbaud, Philippe. 1991. Subjunctive and ECP. In New Analyses in Romance Linguistics, ed. Dieter Wanner and Douglas Kibbee. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Brandi, Luciana and Leonardo Savoia. 1990. Proprietà morfosintattiche e assegnazione di caso nel causativo Arberesh. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa 15:29-121
- Brody, Michael. To appear. Lexico-Logical Form. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press
- Brugger, Gerhard and Mario D'Angelo. 1994. Tempo, modo e la posizione di NegP. 20° Incontro di Grammatica Generativa
- Cheng, Lisa. 1991. On the Typology of Wh-Questions. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. Knowledge of Language. New York: Praeger
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In The View from Building 20, ed. Ken Hale and Samuel Keyser. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. Indefinites. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press
- Enç, Murvet. 1987. Anchoring conditions for Tense. Linguistic Inquiry 18:633-657.
- Enç, Murvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. Linguistic Inquiry 22:1-25
- Everaert, Martin. 1986. The syntax of reflexivization. Dordrecht: Foris
- Farkas, Donka. 1992. On the semantics of subjunctive complements. In Romance Languages and Modern Linguistics, ed. Paul Hirschbuhler and Konrad Koerner. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Giorgi, Alessandra. 1984. Toward a theory of long distance anaphors. The Linguistic Review 3:307-361
- Guasti, M. Teresa. 1993. Causative and Perception Verbs. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier

Heim, Irene. 1982. The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases. Doctoral Dissertation. GSLA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. Linguistic Inquiry 16:547-594.

Kayne, Richard. 1984. Connectedness and Binary Branching. Dordrecht: Foris

Kempchinsky, Paula. 1986. Romance Subjunctive Clauses and Logical Form. Doctoral Dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles

Koster, Jan. 1978. Why subject sentences don't exist. In Recent transformational studies in European languages. ed. Samuel J. Keyser. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press

Koster, Jan. 1987. Domains and dynasties. Dordrecht: Foris

Laka, Itziar. 1990. Negation in syntax. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Li, Audrey. 1992. Indefinite wh in Mandarin Chinese. Journal of East Asian Linguistics 1:125-155

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1990. On the correspondence hypothesis. In Logical Structure and Linguistic Structure, ed. James Huang and Robert May. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Maling, Joan. 1984. Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Modern Icelandic. Linguistics and Philosophy 7:211-241

Manzini, M. Rita. 1992. Locality: A Theory and Some of Its Empirical Consequences. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Manzini, M. Rita. 1994a. Locality, minimalism and parasitic gaps. Linguistic Inquiry 25

Manzini, M. Rita. 1994b. Syntactic dependencies and their properties: weak islands. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica dell'Università di Firenze 5

Manzini, M. Rita and Ken Wexler. 1987. Parameters, Binding Theory and learnability. Linguistic Inquiry 18:413-444

Motapanyane, Virginia. 1991. Theoretical implications of complementation. Doctoral Dissertation, Université de Genève

Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. Construing WH. In Logical Structure and Linguistic Structure, ed. James Huang and Robert May. Dordrecht: Kluwer

Pica, Pierre. 1987. On the nature of the reflexivization cycle. NELS 17:483-499

Picallo, Carmen. 1985. Opaque Domains. Doctoral Dissertation,

CUNY, New York

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. Negative and positive polarity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Reinhart, Tania and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. Linguistic Inquiry 24

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. On the anaphor-agreement effect. Rivista di Linguistica 2:27-42

Roussou, Anna. 1994. The Syntax of Complementizers. Doctoral Dissertation, University College London

Ruwet, Nicolas. 1991. Syntax and Human Experience. Chicago: Chicago University Press

Sigurdhsson, Halldor. 1990. Long-distance reflexives and moods in Icelandic. In Syntax and Semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax, ed. Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen. New York: Academic Press

Terzi, Arhonto. 1992. PRO in Finite Clauses. Doctoral Dissertation, CUNY, New York

Thrainsson, Hoskuldur. 1990. A semantic reflexive in Icelandic. In Syntax and Semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax, ed. Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen. New York: Academic Press

Travis, Lisa. 1984. Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Turano, Giuseppina. 1994a. Subjunctive constructions in Arberesh and Standard Albanian. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa 18

Turano, Giuseppina. 1994b. Dipendenze Sintattiche in Albanese. Doctoral Dissertation. Università della Calabria, Cosenza

Foreign Language Assistant
East Asian Department
(Japanese section)

Dr. H. S. E. Parker
Centre for Japanese Studies
University of Edinburgh
David Hume Tower

Edinburgh EH8 9JX

personnel @ uk.ac.ed



Universitat
de Girona



Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona



Generalitat de Catalunya
Departament de la Presidència
Comissionat per a Universitats i Recerca
CIRIT



Generalitat de Catalunya
Departament de la Presidència
Comissionat per a Universitats i Recerca
Direcció General de Recerca

*fundació
privada:
Girona,
Universitat
i futur*