

## Temporal Features, Referential Features and Feature Sharing with Subjunctive Clauses

Luka Szucsich, Ludwig Maximilian University Munich

Slavic and Romance languages exhibit so-called 'obviation' with subjunctive clauses: The pronominal subject of the embedded clause cannot be coindexed with the subject of the matrix clause containing a volitional verb, cf. Russian (1a) and Polish (2a). This phenomenon sharply contrasts with infinitival embeddings with obligatory coindexation (subject control), cf. (1b), (2b).

In the GB tradition and in early minimalism, a prominent line of explanation for this phenomenon was the assumption of binding domain extension. This analysis amounts to assuming that coindexation of the subject pronoun violates Principle B with subjunctive clauses, because the binding domain is extended to the matrix clause containing the illicit antecedent of the subject pronoun within the subordinate clause. This forces disjoint reference. In most cases, defectiveness/deficiency of temporal features have been taken to be the source for this domain extension (cf. Picallo for Romance and Progovac 1993a, 1993b for Slavic among many others).

Avrutin & Babyonyshev (1997) rightly point out that these analyses run into various empirical problems. Among others, binding domain extension cannot account for the fact that embedded subjects may be coindexed with objects of the matrix clauses, cf. (3a), and that dative NPs occupying the highest position within the subordinate clause *can* be coindexed with the matrix subject, cf. (3b,c). Their alternative relies on LF movement of an operator linked to the subjunctive complementizer to the matrix clause to take scope over both events which are subsequently temporally ordered. The ungrammaticality is attributed to the fact that the whole complex of verbal functional categories has to move along and that, as a consequence, pronominal AGR<sub>S</sub> of the matrix clause illicitly c-commands pronominal AGR<sub>S</sub> of the subordinate clause. This analysis relies on two unmotivated stipulations: (i) verbal functional categories may be pronominal, e.g. AGR<sub>S</sub>, or not, e.g. AGR<sub>O</sub> (which is not independently motivated but which accounts for the grammaticality of (3a)); (ii) subjunctive C may be an operator or not depending on the matrix verb (epistemic verbs marginally occurring with subjunctives do not exhibit obviation, cf. (4)).

This paper reconciles both approaches by applying the idea of feature sharing (cf. Pesetsky & Torrego 2007a, 2007b). I take subjunctive C-T-complexes to contain deficient temporal features (in Slavic marked by the marker *by*) which, however, can value nominative case on the embedded subject. Additionally, volitional matrix verbs contain an open, unvalued T-feature slot which is subsequently identified with the deficient T-feature of the embedded, subjunctive C-T-complex. This accounts for the phenomenon of temporal ordering with volitional verbs and subjunctives observed by Avrutin & Babyonyshev (1997). Epistemic matrix verbs lack this T-feature slot and, hence, also do not exhibit temporal ordering (cf. Avrutin & Babyonyshev 1997). With non-volitional verbs, deficient T-features get an independent, but ambiguous interpretation, cf. Polish (5). With volitional verbs, the unvalued T-feature shared by matrix V and the subjunctive C-T-complex is ultimately valued by matrix T, which means that the matrix tense feature and the embedded tense feature constitute instances of one feature occurrence, cf. Pesetsky & Torrego (2007a,b). Since nominative and accusative are T-features of T and *v*, respectively, the matrix subject and the embedded subject also share T features. Once this relation is established, feature sharing is maximized and extended to referential indices violating Principle B. Crucially, embedded subjects do not share T-features with matrix objects whose case is licensed by *v* not by T (cf. (3a)). Dative pronouns within the subjunctive clause whose case is not valued by embedded T also do not share T features with matrix subjects, cf. (3b).

Thus, with subjunctive clauses selected by volitional verbs there is no operator movement out of the embedded clause. Rather instances of one T-feature are spread across two clauses yielding obviation in relevant contexts.

- (1) a. Volodja<sub>i</sub> xoč-et čto-by on<sub>\*i/j</sub> poceloval Nadju. [Ru]  
 Volodja wants that<sub>SBJV</sub> he kissed Nadja  
 'Volodja wants him to kiss Nadja.'  
 b. Volodja<sub>i</sub> xoč-et PRO<sub>i</sub> pocelovat' Nadju.  
 Volodja wants PRO kiss Nadja  
 'Volodja wants to kiss Nadja.'
- (2) a. Dudek<sub>i</sub> chc-e že-by pro<sub>\*i/j</sub> grał. [Po]  
 Dudek wants that<sub>SBJV</sub> he played  
 'Dudek wants him to play.'  
 b. Dudek<sub>i</sub> chc-e PRO<sub>i</sub> grać.  
 Dudek wants PRO play  
 'Dudek wants to play.'
- (3) a. Volodja ugovori-l Nadju<sub>i</sub> čto-by ona<sub>i</sub> poexa-l-a v Evropu. [Ru]  
 Volodja persuaded Nadja that<sub>SBJV</sub> she went to Europe  
 'Volodja persuaded Nadja to go to Europe.'  
 b. Volodja<sub>i</sub> xoč-et čto-by emu<sub>i</sub> by-l-o veselo.  
 Volodja wants that<sub>SBJV</sub> him<sub>DAT</sub> was<sub>SG:NTR</sub> fun  
 'Volodja wants to be having fun.'  
 c. Jarek<sub>i</sub> chc-e, že-by mu<sub>i</sub> by-l-o ciepł-o. [Po]  
 Jarek<sub>M:SG:N</sub> want<sub>PS:3:SG</sub> that<sub>SBJV</sub> CL<sub>M:SG:D</sub> COP<sub>LPT-N:SG</sub> warm<sub>ADV</sub>  
 'Jarek wants to be warm.'
- (4) Nadja<sub>i</sub> somneva-et-sja čto-by ona<sub>i</sub> vyš-l-a zamuž za Feliks-a. [Ru]  
 Nadja doubts that<sub>SBJV</sub> she married for Feliks  
 'Nadja doubts that she would marry Feliks.'
- (5) Adam<sub>i</sub> mów-i, że pro<sub>i</sub> pożycz-y-l-by ci książk-ę. [Po]  
 Adam says that pro lend<sub>LPT-3:SG-SBJV</sub> you book  
 'Adam says that he would lend you a book.'  
 'Adam says that he would have lent you a book.'

## References

- Avrutin, S. & M. Babyonyshev. 1997. Obviation in Subjunctive Clauses and AGR: Evidence from Russian. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 229-262.
- Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2007a. The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features. In: S. Karimi, V. Samiiian & W. Wilkins (eds.) *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation*. Amsterdam, 262–294.
- Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego. 2007b. Probes, Goals and Syntactic Categories. To appear in: Y. Otsu (ed.) *Proceedings of the Seventh Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*.
- Picallo, C. 1985. *Opaque Domains*, PhD diss. CUNY.
- Progovac Lj. 1993a. Locality and Subjunctivity-like Complements in Serbo-Croatian. In: *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1, 116-144.
- Progovac Lj. 1993b. Subjunctive: The 'Misbehaviour' of Anaphora and Negative Polarity. In: *Linguistic Review* 10, 37-59.