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0.1. Scope of analysis:
- **subjective dependents**, not root subjective
- **subjective dependents in ‘control’ situations**, i.e., selected by control predicates, not by D(ual) M(ood) C(hoice) verbs
  ⇒ the **subjective/infinitive cut**, not the subjunctive/indicative divide

0.2. Main Aims:
1) challenge the view that Romanian is a control language, i.e., that it displays syntactic control (with subjective dependents) → show that in typical O(Bligatory) C(ontrol) situations (fewer than previously assumed), Romanian is a raising rather than a control language (cf. Alboiu’s (2007) parameter)
2) refine the current binary classification (cf. Landau 2004) and propose a tripartite classification of subjective complements into a) Independent, b) Restricted and c) Anaphoric Subjunctives
3) show that in spite of the lack of (syntactic) obviation (at work in Romance), obviation effects can be obtained in Romanian independent subjunctives

0.3. Structure:
1. Setting the stage. The Ingredients of Control: The View from English and perspectives on Romanian
2. Romanian Subjunctive Complements Out of Control
3. On Obviative Effects in Romanian Independent Subjunctives
4. Concluding Remarks

1. Setting the stage. The Ingredients of Control: The View from English and perspectives on Romanian

1.1 Control (& Binding) in GB:
- **Binding Theory** (cf. Chomsky 1981: 188)
  - Principle A: An anaphor is bound in its governing category/ local domain.
  - Principle B: A pronominal if free in its local domain.
  - Principle C: An R-expression is free.

- **Control** in GB:
  - Control = relation between an antecedent DP in the matrix clause (the subject (2a) or the direct/prepositional object (2b, c)) and the empty subject of the infinitival complement (labeled PRO ≠ pro of pro-drop languages)
    1. a. John, wants/managed [PRO, to open the box by himself]
    2. b. I asked John, [PRO, to open the box]
    3. c. I rely on John, [PRO, to open the box by himself]

Control Theory mainly deals with issues such as:
- a) what elements can control (i.e., count as antecedents) and from what positions
- b) the nature of the relation established between PRO and its antecedent (i.e., obligatory / optional) and
- c) the formal mechanism whereby PRO can pick up its antecedent

- Licensing & interpretation of PRO (The Theta Criterion; The Empty Category Principle)
- Obligatory Control vs. Non-Obligatory Control
  a. OC: constructions that become illicit in the absence of an overt controller:
    (3) a. I forced them [PRO to leave] / * I forced [PRO to leave] (object control)
    b. I promised him [PRO not to perjure myself] (subject control)
    c. I tried [PRO to give up smoking] (idem b)

  - V's of obligatory control always select PRO-TO complements and disallow FOR-TO infinitives; in OC, the controller DP and the infinitive clause are always co-arguments of the matrix verb. (PRO ≠ anaphor)

  b. NOC: PRO need not be controlled by a clause-mate DP – it can either be absent (arbitrary control (4)) or may be in a higher clause (long-distance control – (5)):
    (4) a. John, wants/managed [PRO for Tom to leave]
    b. I tried [PRO for Bill to perjure himself/herself,]

  - significant empirical evidence distinguishing OC & NOC:
    a. Long distance control is only possible with NOC, not with OC.
    b. Arbitrary Control is only possible with NOC, not with OC.
    c. Strict Reading of PRO is only possible with NOC, not with OC.

  (6) a. Tom, tried [PRO to leave] and Bill, did, too
     …and Bill, tried [PRO to leave] NOT and Bill tried for Tom to leave
     b. Tom, wanted [PRO to leave] and so did Bill,
     ….. and Bill, wanted [PRO to leave] sloppily identity, OC
     AND ….and Bill, wanted Tom, to leave
Control vs. Raising

a. Control: - the result of a process of deletion (under identity): PRO is a base-generated empty category which obtains via deletion under identity and whose antecedent is established (at LF) under the control module  
- a relation between two chains (each with its own theta role)

b. Raising: - obtains via movement; the NP-trace is not base-generated, but the product of a transformational rule following the application of Move.  
- involves a single chain, since the binder (antecedent) of the NP-trace is not independently theta-marked

(7)  

a. John, seemed [t, to kiss a koala]. (raising)  
b. John, hoped [PRO, to kiss a koala]. (control)

1.2. Control in Minimalism:

- Early Minimalism: PRO bears null case (cf. Chomsky & Lasnik 1993)
- The Movement Theory of Control:  
  ➢ OC is treated as an instance of Raising = PRO is actually an NP-trace  
  ➢ the controller which at PF surfaces in the matrix clause has moved from the lower infinitival clause where it was originally projected  
  ➢ the only difference between Control and Raising that still holds is the number of theta roles: two in control (7b), but only one in raising (7a).
  ➢ Basic assumptions:
    a. theta roles are features on verbs (also Manzini & Roussou (1998))  
    b. a DP gets theta role by checking a theta feature of a verbal or predicate phrase it merges with  
    c. a chain can have more than one theta roles

adopted framework: the Agree model: (Landau 1999)

- Main idea: α and β are in an Agree relation if α is the probe (i.e. the attractor) and β the goal (i.e. the attractee) in the domain of θ.
- Agree holds in virtue of an uninterpretable feature ([u]) of α and a matching feature of β that makes the latter visible or active
- PRO does not raise; the θ - features of the controller are transmitted to PRO via Agree relations allowed in the derivation; the link between PRO and its antecedent is actually mediated by the Agreement features of the infinitive clause, which are anaphoric in nature as well (i.e. they need to be checked against the matrix T)

→ for control cases: the matrix DP (antecedent) is the probe and PRO is the goal, agreeing with its controller in φ - features and acquiring reference from it: the φ - features of the DP are transmitted to PRO via Agree

➢ the OC class is not homogeneous > certain ‘irregularities’ as far as the identity relation between PRO and its antecedent/controller is concerned:  
  → 2 types of Obligatory Control:

a. Exhaustive Control – the relation btw. PRO and its antecedent is one of strict identity: PRO ≃ its antecedent;  
  ➢ SG antecedent >> PROSG  
  PL antecedent >> PROPL

b. Partial Control – the relation PRO-antecedent is one of subset-superset, i.e. the antecedent need not be strictly identical to PRO, but merely included in its reference:  
  PRO ⊆ its antecedent  
  ➢ SG antecedent >> PRO (can be interpreted as) PL (! The PC effect)
  PL antecedent >> PRO PL

➢ The domain of control → 7 classes of verbs:

a) aspcetual (begin, continue, start)  
b) modal (need, have to, be able, etc.)  
c) implicative (manage, dare, etc.)  
d) desiderative (want, prefer)  
e) factive (regret, hate)  
f) propositional (claim, maintain, believe)  
g) interrogative (ask, wonder)  

➢ EC predicates differ from PC predicates in two relevant respects:

  A) the (im)possibility of a collective predicate in the infinitival complement (with SG antecedent)  
  B) the (im)possibility of independent temporal specification in the complement

A) EC verbs disallow collective predicates in their infinitival complement (with Sg antecedents); PC verbs allow them with Sg antecedents (syntactic plurality is disallowed with sg antecedents (10)):

(8)  
a. *The chair was able [PRO to convene during the strike]  
b. The chair wanted [PRO to convene during the strike]

(9)  
a. *John, told Mary, he, managed [PROj to meet at 6]  
b. John, told Mary, he, preferred [PROj to meet at 6]

(10)  
a. John, told Mary he, preferred [PROj to meet (*each other) at 6]  
b. John told Mary that he, knew which club [PROj to join together]

[*PRO to become members of]
B) EC complements are untensed [−T] (anaphoric, cannot establish temporal independence (11); PC complements are tensed [+T] (they can refer to a time different from that of the matrix tense)(12)

(11) a. *Yesterday, John began to solve the problem tomorrow.
b. *Yesterday, John had to solve the problem tomorrow
c. *John managed (yesterday) to solve the problem next Monday.

(12) a. Yesterday, John hoped to solve the problem tomorrow.
b. Yesterday, John wondered how to solve the problem tomorrow.
c. Today, John regretted having kissed/kissing Mary last week.
d. Today, John claimed to have lost his car keys last week.

➢ the necessity to tease PRO apart from Condition A of BT (there are potential binders that cannot control / controllers that cannot bind)
➢ the new relevant criterion: the temporal specification of the complement, encoded in its C head

➢ Types of NOC: Long Distance, Arbitrary, Split, Implicit Control, Control Shift
Split: two antecedent NPs occupying distinct synt. positions in MC serve as antecedents of PRO, marking it (syntactically) for [pl]

(13) Mary, warned John, that [PRO_{ij}] to become members of the new club] is...

➢ Later amendments to the Agree theory of Control

➢ Landau 2006, 2013: PRO can bear its own case (quirky or structural)
➢ Landau 2013: finite control – robust phenomenon cross-linguistically

The ‘calculus of control’
→ the key ingredients of ‘finite control’:
a) semantic tense (the possibility of tense mismatch) &
b) agreement morphemes (specific phi-features)

→ The finiteness rule for OC

In a fully specified complement clause (I° carries slots for [T] and [Agr]):
a. If I° carries both semantic tense and agreement ([+T, +Agr]), No Control obtains
b. Elsewhere, OC obtains ⇒ OC as an ‘elsewhere case’ (2013: 103)

→ OC instances cross-linguistically:
1. OC in [−T, −Agr] complements (English EC infinitives)
2. OC in [−T, +Agr] complements (subjunctives in Greek (& Romanian); inflected infinitives in Hungarian, European Portuguese)
3. OC in [+T, −Agr] complements (PC infinitives in English, uninflected infinitives in Welsh, European Portuguese)

1.3. Perspective on the Romanian data

➢ all Romanian subjunctive dependents: [+ Agr] ⇒ [−T] – the key factor in establishing OC; [+T] will ensure NC

➢ Nominative – assigned in the same manner1 in all phasal domains, i.e., domains which allow the merger of disjoint DP subjects and which have contentful tense (i.e., [IT], selected by phasal/non-defective C)

➢ if we analyze the Romanian data in a comparative typological perspective, Romanian (a Romance language) patterns with Balkan languages w.r.t. subjunctive marking & control properties:

- Romanian (and Balkan languages (Greek, Albanian, etc.) use the subjunctive in all the contexts where English uses the infinitive (OC and NOC)
- Romance languages use the infinitive in OC and the subjunctive in NOC (obviation) ⇒ an East-West continuum, fc. of the type of complement:

(14) | Class A (Romanian/Balkan) | >> | Class B (Romance) | >> | Class C (English, German) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC/ NOC subjunctive</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+ finite]</td>
<td>[+/- Agr]</td>
<td>[+/- Agr]</td>
<td>[+/- Agr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+/-T]</td>
<td>[+/-T]</td>
<td>[+/-T]</td>
<td>[+/-T]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ selection of [+ finite] dependents in control contexts weakens the postulation of standard control (as a relation of a special category PRO)

➢ OC in English – sensitive to finiteness features ([−Agr]), whereas in Romanian (and Balkan languages) it is sensitive to temporal specification, such that only [−T] dependents induce OC +

➢ some (collateral) observations concerning clausal make-up:

➢ the currently-accepted view that șă heads its own projection MP, at the borderline between the IP and the CP
➢ given the place of Neg w.r.t. the subjunctive particle and the other ’modal’ auxiliaries, a re-enforcement of the existence of two mood positions

(15) M₂ > Neg > M₁ (Agr) > T (Agr) > Asp > V......

---

1 We follow here assumptions in Pesetsky & Torrego (2004), as well as Alboiu (2007): case is formalized as [uT] on D, valued by Agree with the iT of a phi-complete T probe (u-ph).
in a Split CP analysis, the M\(_2\) head corresponds to C\(_{\text{fin}}\), whereas ca or că reside in C\(_{\text{force}}\):

\[(16)\hspace{1cm} C_{\text{force}} > (\text{Top} > \text{Foc}) > C_{\text{fin}}/M_2 > \text{Neg} > M_1/(Agr) > T/(Agr) > V \ldots.
\]

ca să nu vină t t

2. Romanian Subjunctive Complements Out of Control

Aims: 1) show that Romanian displays no syntactic (i.e., local) control with typical control predicates
2) show that the cut-off point for OC in Romanian is lower down Landau’s (1999–2013) scale of control predicates & OC instances are (long-distance) raising configurations
3) propose a tri-partite classification of subjunctive dependents (function of their temporal properties)

2.1. Previous analyses of OC in Romanian

- control as (modified) raising (Alboiu 2006, 2007)

2.1.1. PRO as the empty subject (Landau 2004, 2011; Jordan 2009)

  a. V selects a C-subjunctive in the Balkan languages if it selects an EC-infinite in other languages
  b. V selects an F-subjunctive in the Balkan languages if it selects a PC-infinite in other languages (Landau 2004: 837)

- C-subjunctives ≠ F-subjunctives from the pov of a) their temporal specification (T) & b) the type (interpretation) of the null subject (Agr)

- null & overt DPs bear a ‘referentiality feature’ ([R]) (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993): PRO = [+R]; DPs & pro = [+R]
- [+ T, + Agr] on I (i.e., NC) induce a [+ R] feature checkable only by a [+R] item ⇒ *PRO
- either of the three OC-yielding combinations (see above) induce [-R] ⇒ PRO
⇒ the R-feature, not case, is responsible for PRO\(_{[-R]}\) (OC) vs. DP/pro\(_{[-R]}\) (NC)

- null & overt DPs bear a ‘referentiality feature’ ([R]) (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993): PRO = [+R]; DPs & pro = [+R]
- [+ T, + Agr] on I (i.e., NC) induce a [+ R] feature checkable only by a [+R] item ⇒ *PRO
- either of the three OC-yielding combinations (see above) induce [-R] ⇒ PRO
⇒ the R-feature, not case, is responsible for PRO\(_{[-R]}\) (OC) vs. DP/pro\(_{[-R]}\) (NC)

- null & overt DPs bear a ‘referentiality feature’ ([R]) (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993): PRO = [+R]; DPs & pro = [+R]
- [+ T, + Agr] on I (i.e., NC) induce a [+ R] feature checkable only by a [+R] item ⇒ *PRO
- either of the three OC-yielding combinations (see above) induce [-R] ⇒ PRO
⇒ the R-feature, not case, is responsible for PRO\(_{[-R]}\) (OC) vs. DP/pro\(_{[-R]}\) (NC)

2.1.2. Why PRO & PC are not viable options (cf. Alboiu 2006, 2007)

- above: controller assumed to be merged in Spec, IP of matrix but the canonical subject position in Romanian is post-verbal:

\[(22)\hspace{1cm} \text{încearcă [să cânte Victor la trombon] (2007: 192)}
\]

\[\text{try-3sg sbj sing-3sg Victor at trombone}\]

⇒ since lexical subjects are available in the complement and PRO cannot alternate with lexical DPs/pro, the empty subject cannot be PRO

- unlike En., Rom. requires syntactic plurality of semantically plural predicates (23a, b): eu cannot control the embedded subject, which is closer to a referential pro than PRO

\[(23)\hspace{1cm} \text{a. * Eu, vreau [să plec x, împleună]/ * Vreau [să plec eu împleună}}
\]
2.2. Romanian Subjunctive Complements out of Control

Claim: typical OC/EC verbs (implicative, aspectual, modal) do not instantiate control in Romanian:

a) subject implicative resist both the standard (PRO) and the control-as-raising analysis; object control Vs can obviate OC (2.2.1)

b) aspectuals (& modals) evince (standard) raising behaviour, in accord with current claims in the literature (the dual nature of aspectuals, cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1999), Alexiadou et al. (2010); modals as raising verbs, cf. Wurmbrand 1999) (2.2.2) ⇒

c) this feeds the tripartite classification of subjunctive dependents (2.2.3)

2.2.1. The case of implicative verbs: subject & object implicative: The Data

2.2.1.1. Subject control implicative Vs (a încercă ‘try’, a reuși ‘manage’, a căuta (să) ‘endeavour’, a se strădui ‘try/do your best’, a îzbati ‘succeed’, a risca ‘risk’)

a) freely allow the overt complementizer ⇒ CPs

(26) a. Încercă ca in fiecare zi să fiu util

‘I am trying that every day I should be useful’

b. Jojo a reușit ca la doar o lună după naștere să revină la greutatea inițială

‘Jojo managed that only one month after birth she regain her initial weight’

c. Kenyon a îzbătut ca, prin influențarea unor gene, să le prelungească viața

‘Kenyon managed that by influencing genes he could prolong their lifespan’

b) disjoint, theta-free embedded subjects are avaialble (overt or pro) ⇒ evidence against PRO & NP-trace/copy (against any construal of obligatory control) and in favour of independent nominative case assignment

(27) a. Am încercat să nu afle prea multa lume că plec...

‘I have tried that not too many people should find out I was leaving.’

b. [...] am pro, o bunică paralizată [...]. [A]m încercat pro să primească pro indemnizația lunară de handicap de la primărie

‘I have a paralyzed grandmother. I have tried that she receive(s) her monthly benefit from the city hall.’

c. Am reușit ca în 25 septembrie, 11.500 de voluntari să strângă peste 25.000 de saci de gunoi.

‘I/we have succeeded that on September 25th, 11,500 volunteers should collect...’

d. Sper că am îzbătut ca expozitia să fie o reușită

‘I hope I have managed that the exhibition should be a hit.’

c) Partial Control effects, read as Split Control (the reference of the antecedent (singular) is included in the reference of the null embedded subject, which is syntactically plural:

2 http://www.agentudepresamondena.com/ata-com-a-slăbit-jojo-dupa-naste/er
5 http://www.9am.ro/comunitate/forum/view_topic/24460/indemnizatia-persoanelor-cu-handicap-de-gradul-1.html
6 http://www.maramures.ro/maramures让人们做它-romania-2011/video
d) LDC possible

(29) Musafiri, știu prea bine [că Ionă încearcă] mereu [să se simță prok cât mai bine] [când îl vizitează prok]]

well [when him.cl.Acc visit guests] very well 

‘The guests know that John is always trying that they have a good time whenever they pay him a visit’ or ‘The guests know John is always trying to have a good time ….’

2.2.1.2. (Direct or indirect) object control Vs (directive/executive: a ruga/cere ‘ask’, a convinge ‘convince’, a încuraja ‘encourage’, a ordona ‘order’; implicative a obliga ‘oblige’)

a) lexical disjoint subjects & free-referring pro are allowed

(30) a. Mama copilului s-a rugat de profesori să nu afle tatăl lui …..

‘The child’s mother begged the teachers that his father not be told …’

b. colegii mi-a încurajat să fie și un român la concurs

‘My colleagues encouraged me that there be a Romanian at contest’

c. Colonelul Kemenici mi-a ordonat ca nimeni să nu intre în birou ...

Col. Kemenici me Acc ordered that nobody sbj not enter-3sg in office

b) Split Control effects (the syntactically plural null embedded subject retrieves the reference of both the matrix Su & d/i/o)

(31) a. abia îk am convis prok [să nu plecăm prok] în ziua când avem cazare

‘I barely managed to convince them [we] not leave on the very day

that our accommodation started’

b. îk am convis prok [să facem prok] bebel puluu

‘I convinced him that we should have a baby.’

c. [Generalul Nuțiu mânc-are cerut [să organizăm prok] impresnu primirea ..]

‘General N. asked me that we organize the welcoming ceremony together.’

d. când a aflat prok că-s însarcinată mânc a obligat să ne casătorim prok]

‘When he found out I was pregnant, he forced me that we should get married.’

e. îk am încurajat prok să facă curat prok cu mine, să vorbim prok la telefon

‘I encouraged him to tidy up with me, that we should talk on the phone …’

f. Mi-a ordonat prok să așteptăm în ordine ulterioră

‘He ordered me that we should wait for further instructions’

c) possibility of Control Shift

(32) Maria i am a convis pe părinții să se ducă (singură/și ea) la concert.

Maria them.Acc convinced pe parents sbj go-3sg (alone/and she) at concert ‘Maria convinced her parents that she should go (alone/too) to the concert.’

• Further proof: results of (two) questionnaires

☑ Questionnaire 1

Aim: test whether disjoint lexical subjects are accepted by speakers in the complements of subject implicatives and object control verbs

Expectation: - given (26)-(32), disjoint subjects should be allowed

Method:

- 12 Vs tested (five subject implicatives (a încerca, a câștă să), a reuși, a izbuti, a risca), five object control Vs (executive: a ceră/ruga, a încuraja, a ordona, a convinge, implicative a obliga + 2 ‘distractors’ (a-și aminti & a putea)

- 24 sentences, all with disjoint lexical subjects in the complement; 24 (jumbled) sentences because each verb appears twice, selecting either a să- or a ca-subjunctive:

(33) a. matrix V [să + verb[subj] + disjoint subject + ……]

b. matrix V [ca (adv)/disjoint subject + să + verb[subj] + (adv) …]
40 respondents (age 22-60) asked to pass grammaticality judgements (‘Yes’ vs. ‘No’) & score sentences from 1-5 (Yes = 5 (perfectly grammatical), No = 1-4 (1= ungrammatical))

(34) Results of grammaticality judgements for the five subject implicative Vs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>YES (score 5)</th>
<th>NO (score 1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a încerca ‘try’</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a căuta (să) ‘try/endavour’</td>
<td>98.75%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a reuşi ‘manage’</td>
<td>76.25%</td>
<td>23.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a îzbuti ‘manage/succeed’</td>
<td>78.75%</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a riscă ‘risk’</td>
<td>98.75%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>350 (87.5%)</td>
<td>50 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(35) Results of grammaticality judgements for object control Vs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>YES (score 5)</th>
<th>NO (score 1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a rugă 'ask/beg'</td>
<td>91.25%</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ordona 'order'</td>
<td>88.75%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a convin‍ge 'convice'</td>
<td>71.25%</td>
<td>28.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a încuraja 'encourage'</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a obliga 'oblige'</td>
<td>48.75%</td>
<td>51.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>290 (72.5%)</td>
<td>110 (27.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ - expectations are borne out
- though all Vs induce NOC/NC, semantics affects their greater or more limited propensity towards control suspension (the more irrealis, the freer – see also Landau 2012 for the difference btw. reals/irreals selectors)
- no difference in the behaviour of sǎ- vs. ca-subjunctives > ca-subjunctives with disjoint subjects in the complement’s LP were easier to parse

Questionnaire 2

Aim: putting the raising hypothesis to the test → test whether a (unique) embedded DP subject is able or not to target the empty matrix subject position:

(36) A încercat cu orice preţ să obţină Ion postul. has tried-3sg with any price sbj obtain-3sg Ion job-the
A. ‘Ion has tried to get the job at all costs’ OR
B. ‘S/he tried for Ion to ….’?

Expectation: given (26)-(32) above, speakers should allow for B ⇒ evidence against raising

Method:
- 5 sentences, all with (five) matrix subject implicative verbs (a încerca, a căuta (să), a reuşi, a îzbuti, a se strădui) and unique embedded DP subject, cf. (23):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Disjointedness reading</th>
<th>Co-valuation reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a reuşi ‘manage’</td>
<td>70.45%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a încerca ‘try’</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a căuta (să) ‘try/endavour’</td>
<td>90.24%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a îzbuti ‘manage/succeed’</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a se strădui ‘endeavour/strive’</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>174 (81.69%)</td>
<td>39 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ - the raising account of control cannot be maintained
- subject implicative Vs are binary predicates which resist both the raising (Quest. 2) and the standard control accounts (Quest. 1) - their subjunctive subordinates represent independent case domains (phrasal), which allow the merger of disjoint DPs/pro, which receive case clause-internally

2.2.2. Aspectsuals (and deontic modals) and their subjunctive complements
- select defective/non-phrasal (Alboiu 2007)’/degenerate’ CPs (Landau 2012), not TPs
- ban disjoint subjects ⇒ there is only one overt subject, shared between the two verbs (37a), flexible position in the structure (37b)

(37)  a. Maria a început să citească ziarele "fiul ei Maria has started-3sg sbj read-3sg newspaper-the son hers
b. (Ion) poate / trebuie / începe să deseneze (Ion) can / have to / begin-3sg sbj draw-3sg (Ion) very well (Ion)

- display backward control behaviour

(38)  a început proUx[să danseze tango Maria] has begun sbj dance-3sg tango Maria
• cf. Alboiu (2007), the complement can license pronominal copies which form a chain with the matrix DP ⇒ no independent nominative checking (they are not phasal domains20)

(39)  a. [Victor înşuşi] începe să facă 3sg pizza
     b. Victor, începe [să facă ([el, înşuşi],)] pizza ([el, înşuşi],
     *(Victor himself is beginning to bake a pizza."
     c. * Victor, începe [să facă Mihai, pizza el, înşuşi].
     Victor begins sbj make Mihai pizza himself

• Aspectual Vs in Rom. display unaccusative behaviour
  a) impossibility of passivization

(40)  * A fost început/S-a început de către Ion, [să citească e.]
     has begun /se has begun by Ion [sbj read animate]
  b) select [- animate] DPs, alongside subjunctive CPs

(41)  a. A început/continuat spectacolul/ploaia/ furtuna / vântul / filmul
     has started/continued show-the/rain-the /storm-the/ wind-the/ movie-the
     b. A început [să plouă]/ [să nină]/ [să se întuneece repede]
     has started sbj rain-3sg / sbj snow-3sg / sbj get dark-3sg quickly
  c) with (leftward) agentive arguments, the complement is needed for proper interpretation ⇒ the DP subject is actually the agent argument of the embedded predicate & the matrix verb merely contributes aspectual information

(42)  a. ?? Ion a început/?? Pisia a încetat.
     Ion has started / cat-the has ceased
     b. Maria a început /continuă să cânte
     Maria started/continues-3sg sbj sing-3sg
     c. A început [să le fie ruşine fetelor]
     has begun-3sg sbj them-Dat be shame girls-3pl-Dat

d) lower quirky case retained on the displaced DP

(43)  a. Lui Băsescu, a început să -i 3sg fi frică21
     Băsescu-3sg-Dat has begun-3sg sbj him-3sg-Dat be-3sg fear
     b. Dacă copilului, continuă să -ii 3sg fie frica de dentist, ...

20Thus, in accord with recent assumptions – case valuation is/ remains a property of phasal domains. A subjunctive T (always phi-complete) will be able to value case the moment it is saturated by a phasal C. (see Pesetsky & Torrego (2004), Alboiu (2006, 2007) and references therein).
22 http://www.sfatulparintilor.ro/articol/559/cum-ingrijesti-dintii-copilului-si-il-scapai-de-frica-de-dentist

if child-3sg-Dat continues-3sg sbj him-3sg-Dat be-3sg fear of dentist e) evidence from idiom chunks

(44)  Au început [să i se începe corăbiile]
     have begun-3pl sbj him-Dat cl drown-3pl ships-3pl-Nom
⇒ complements of aspectual Vs = not independent case-domains, unsaturated temporally (uT on embedded Tense)
⇒ nominative case of a DP subject merged in situ can only be checked against the matrix iT probe, by (long distance) Agree:

[CP [iT T[CP] [vCP începe [CP C_{iT}] [MP M s[mp T[iT]] [[vP Maria][j-iopl][j-iT] V [vP V scrie teza]]]]]]

2.2.3. A tripartite classification of subjunctives (function of their temporal specification)

Basic facts:
• the Romanian subjunctive: 2 forms/tenses:
  - present subjunctive - used to mark simultaneity or posteriority (i.e., future/non-past irrealis): să + verb_{subj}
  - perfect subjunctive – used to mark anteriority or counterfactuality (past irrealis):  să + aspectual marker  fi + past participle
  - two ways to encode temporal information (Comrie 1985):
    - via lexicalized (adverbial) expressions (listed in the Lexicon) ⇒ semantic tense
    - grammaticalized expression of location in time (intergrated into the functional system of a language ⇒ tense morphemes / other temporal functional items ⇒ fi ⇒ syntactic tense
⇒ subjunctive complements will differ w.r.t.
  a) their (in)ability to encode syntactic tense (i.e., allow the perfect subjunctive)
  b) their (in)ability to encode semantic tense (i.e., allow distinct time adverbials)… or c) neither
  • the current binary classification into [- tensed] vs. [+ tensed] complements is insufficient: it has no way of teasing apart complements of (exercitive) object control Vs & those of volitional/desiderative Vs ⇒ both would be described as [+ tensed]
  • ⇒ tri-partite classification: cf. (45) below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of selecting predicates</th>
<th>Independent subjunctives</th>
<th>Restricted Subjunctives</th>
<th>Anaphoric Subjunctives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>volitional/desiderative Vs</td>
<td>Subject implicative &amp; object control Vs</td>
<td>aspectual &amp; modal Vs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence (and type) of embedded tense</th>
<th>(background) interval of the matrix predicate different from that of the matrix verb: future (irrealis):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES -morphological/syntactic tense &amp; - semantic tense</td>
<td>YES - semantic tense only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Featural make-up on the C^0 and T^0 heads</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C^0: ( \emptyset ) T^0: [+T]/iT ( \implies ) phasal CPs with unselected/unconstrained C</td>
<td>C^0: [+]T T^0: [+T]/iT ( \implies ) phasal CPs with selected/constrained C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control properties</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Control</td>
<td>No Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(46) **Independent Subjunctives (ISs)**

a. *Acum vreau* să plec la Chicago pe 14 aprilie. (Farkas 1984: 362)

   ‘Now I want to leave for Chicago on April 14th’

b. *Sper să fi ajuns mai repede ieri.*

   ‘I hope I/you/he/she/they arrived sooner.’

c. *|CP C_{TAgr} Ion T/Agr speră \( \{v_p \rho \}_a V \ t\_{\{c_r \} opT C_{[CP_{Ag}] MP} M = \{t_7/Tagr Asp fi \} \} \rightarrow\) full T-chain (tense operator, (functional) tense position & V)

(47) **Restricted Subjunctives (RSs)**

- object control Vs (exercitive) disallow the perfect subjunctive, but encode future irrealis:

  a. *L-am convins/î-am ordonat să plece abia măine.*

     ‘I convinced/ordered him (to) (only) leave (only) tomorrow.’

  b. *T.A.T.A. a reușit ca discriminarea tatălui în Codul Familiei să fie dezbatută la Curtea Constitutională, chiar măine.*

(48) **Anaphoric Subjunctives (ASs)**

- non-phasal domains (temporally unsaturated) \( \rightarrow \) no independent T-chain; embedded event has to copy the time specification of the matrix \( \rightarrow \) ‘single event’ reading (both events bound by the matrix tense operator)

   a. *Am început să schiez anul trecut/*mâine/ *chiar acum.*

   ‘I started/began to ski last year/*tomorrow/*right now.

b. *O să înceapă să citească anul viit la școală/*anul trecut.*

   ‘She shall begin to read next year at school/*last year.

   - in accord with Landau (2004), ‘independent’ tense = unselected/unrestricted

     \( \Rightarrow \) ISs make use of the maximum range of temporal relations (simultaneity, posteriority and anteriority, i.e., display syntactic (temporal) independence, \( \approx \) indicatives); matrix V imposes no restrictions \( \Rightarrow \) unselected features = absence of [Tense] on the C node (\( \emptyset \))

     - selected dependents (RSs & ASs) = presence of a corresponding [T] on C: [+]T for RSs (semantic (temporal) independence); [-T] for ASs (anaphorically)

   - **Advantages of the new classification:**

     - better coverage of the empirical data \( \rightarrow \) the identification of a new type of subjunctive complement, the IS, closer in properties (i.e., lack of selection) to indicatives

     - nicely correlates the OC-suspending properties of subject implicatives to their ability to display semantic tense (non-past irrealis)

     - confirms that semantic tense (available in independent and in dependent/restricted complements) is enough for nominative case-checking

3. Subject Reference in independent subjunctives: (Lack of) Obviation

Aims: 1) focus on the interpretation of embedded null or overt matching relational subjects in Romance subjunctives selected by volitional verbs
2) refute the ‘lexical C’ hypothesis for obviation in Romance subjunctives
3) show that obviative effects can be obtained with embedded matching relational (overt) subjects (el/ea)

3.1. Obviation in Romance subjunctives

= obligatory disjoint reference between the matrix and embedded subject (37), on account of the anaphoric nature of the [subj] complement, i.e., its inability to encode [+Past] (see also Terzi 1992) (50)

(50) a. Jean, veux que tu mange le pizza. (Fr.)
   Jean want-3sg that he eat-3sg-subj-pres the pizza
b. Juan quiere que yo venga manyana. (Sp)
   Juan want-3sg that he come-3sg-subj-pres tomorrow
c. Gianni vuole che pro/ lui parta. (It.)
   Gianni want-3sg that he leave-3sg-subj-pres

3.1.1. Basic GB considerations

Premise: subjunctive tense in Romance is anaphoric >> it cannot define its own topical specification, being dependent on the tense of the matrix clause24:

→ [+Present] or [+Future] (i.e., [-Past]) volitional verbs do not allow [+Past] subjunctives in the complement clause:

(51) a. Gianni vuole che io lavori / #lavorassi con voi.
   Gianni want-pres-3sg che I work-*past-subj* with you
   ‘Gianni wants me to work/to have worked with you’
b. Juan quiere que yo trabaje / #trabajaras contigo
   Juan want-pres3sg que I work-*past-subj* / #past-subj with you
   ‘Gianni wants me to work/to have worked with you’. (Terzi 1992: 78)
c. *Jean veut que j’aie travaille avec lui
   Jean want-pres-3sg que I work-subj-perf with him.
   ‘Jean wants me to have worked with him’.

→ [+Past] volitionals in the MC do not allow [+Present] subjunctives:

(52) Gianni voleva che io lavorassi / #lavori con voi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Embedded Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Present</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rizzi (1989): ∃ a strong correlation between these time restrictions and the obligatory disjoint reference of the two subjects

⇒ proposal of domain extension for subjunctive dependents; (!the novelty: not only non-finite, but also [+finite] tenses can be anaphoric)
⇒ assuming domain extension, the embedded subject (null or overt) of subjunctive clauses in Romance has to be disjoint in reference from the MC subject (50), on account of Principle/Condition B of BT

3.1.2. Minimalist approaches to (Binding & Obviation)

• Gallego 2007: a reformulation of Binding within a Probe-Goal approach, doing away with the necessity for the binder to c-command the bindee (in root clauses):

- Condition A is abided by via an operation of Multiple Agree whereby the matrix Tense (Tₐ) probes (and agrees with) both binder & bindee:

  (54) \[ CP \mathcal{C}_T \mathcal{S}_T [v \mathcal{P}_T \mathcal{E}_A \mathcal{I}_A \mathcal{I}_A] \] \hspace{2em} Multiple Agree (Tₐ, EA, IA) \hspace{2em} (Gallego 2007: 198)

• ∃ a relation between Case & Binding (within the Probe-Goal frame):
  ⇒ if α & β are formally different (i.e., bear different case), α & β are also semantically different, i.e., obviative/disjoint in reference (Condition B):

  (55) John i (Nom) called him *i (Acc) (Gallego 2007:199)

⇒ for Condition A to obtain, anaphors (like the reflexive se) are phi-defective and cannot be distinguished from their antecedents in terms of case (i.e., the system takes them to be one and the same)

(56) German se, afeito (a si, mismo)  
German SE shave-PAST-3SG to self same  
‘German shaved himself’  
(Gallego 2007:199)

24 see Rizzi (1989) for more details on Italian, Picallo (1985) for Catalan
⇒ α binds β if they are both Goals of the same Probe (T₃) (Condition A); otherwise (i.e., when the subject & object have different Probes, T₂ for binder (the subject), T₂/V* for bindee (the object)), α & β are obviative (Condition B).

⇒ same reasoning applies to *subject dependents* (in Spanish) (Gallego 2007: 209); *main clause obviation* is accounted for by the assumption that the [T] feature (i.e., case) of the two DPs is valued by different matrix T heads: T₅ (Tᵣ) for the main clause subject DP and T₀ (Tᵢ)²⁵ for the embedded subject (null or overt):

(57)        `Juan want to admire Charlie Mingus'  (Gallego 2007: 209-210)

⇒ (Spanish) subjunctives are ECM at the relevant level of abstraction (there is morphological agreement with embedded T, but the subject gets abstract Acc but

⇒ this is *not* a viable scenario for Romanian ISs, which behave differently

### 3.2. Lack of obviation in Romanian

*•* Romanian ISs display no obviation effects: null subjects can be either co-referent with *(default reading)* or disjoint from matrix subject +

*•* Romanian ISs are different from Romance subjunctives (ISs are not selected; can establish their own T-chain (see Section 2 above):

(58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Clause</th>
<th>Embedded Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ difference btw. Romanian and Romance w.r.t. what element can function as anaphor:

*•* in Romance, both empty & overt pronounal subjects behave as pronouns (⇒ Pp B); PRO – (intrinsic) anaphor (used for co-reference)

*•* in Romanian, the empty subjects of ISs are more readily interpreted as anaphors than overt (matching) pronominal subjects

### 3.3. On the possibility of obviative effects in independent subjunctives

#### 3.3.1. Claims & Proposal

**• Claims:**

1) Romanian subjunctives can display obvation effects

2) these are not due to the presence of a lexical complementizer *(ca)*, as claimed by Terzi 1992, Landau 2004, Roussou 2001(59); in spite of an overt ca, the two subjects can still co-refer (60)

(59) a. Ion vrea ca el să mănânce. (Landau 2004: 857, from Terzi 92: 109)
   b. Ion vrea ca (pro) să mănânce (pro). (Roussou 2001: 92)
   ‘John wants him/her/them to eat.’ (intended reading)

(60) a. Ion vrea să cumpere tortul mâine.
   b. Ion vrea [ca mâine să cumpere pro el] tortul.
   c. Ion vrea [ca tortul să - l cumpere pro el mâine.]
   John wants that-subj the cake buy-subj. 3sg/pl tomorrow
   ‘John wants to buy the cake tomorrow’ (default) or
   ‘John wants him/her/them to buy the cake tomorrow.’

**• Proposal (to be (slightly) refined): obviative effects obtain with an overt matching 3rd person pronominal subject left-dislocated to the complement’s LP (61a); overt pronouns in situ are part of the focal domain ⇒ construed as variables bound by the local antecedent (61b)²⁶**

(61) a. Petru vrea ca el să plece.
   Petru wants that-subj he leave-subj.3sg
   ‘Petru wants him to leave’ (disjoint reference reading preferred)
   b. Petru vrea să plece el.
   ‘Petru wants that he should be the one to leave’
   c. Petru vrea [să plece pro]
   ‘Petru wants to leave.’

⇒ in Romanian ISs, pro behaves like a (semantic) anaphor, preferring to co-refer with a local antecedent (in the default reading (61c), whereas the overt pron. *el* induces obviation effects, preferring to (behave like a pronoun and) retrieve a more distant antecedent

²⁵ Gallego (2007) adopts a similar „clausal backbone” as that assumed in Pesetsky & Torrego (2004), where Tₖ is responsible for Nominative case assignment, whereas Tₖᵣ „sandwiched” between v*P and VP assignes Accusative case to the Internal Argument (the D.O. DP);

²⁶ see also Progovac 1993: 43 → Maria spera che vinca lei, vs. Maria spera che lei vinca.

‘Maria hopes that she herself will win’ vs. ‘Maria hopes that she will win’
• (Refined/Final) Proposal: **in ambiguous contexts** (where two available antecedents could each in principle be identified as the logical subject of the subjunctive verb), *the null subject will prefer to pick up the closest (and most prominent) antecedent, whereas the overt subject will retrieve the more remote (less prominent) DP antecedent*

→ the presence of the overt pronominal in an ISS contributes to disambiguate a potentially ambiguous sentence and make the reference relation clear(er) ⇒ *obviation effects*

![Image](example.png)

(62) a. \[DP_k \ldots [DP_1 \text{volitional } V [\text{CP(3)}, \text{vb}_{subj} \text{ pro}_{k}]] \] vs. b. \[DP_k \ldots [DP_1 \text{ volitional } V [\text{CP(3)}, \text{ca } el_k \text{ vb}_{subj}]] \]

(63) a. Pentru că Dragoş îi e prieten, Petru ar vrea \[\text{să -l viziteze la spital } pro_{k} \]
‘Because Dragoş is his friend, Petru would want to visit him in hospital.’
b. Pentru că Dragoş îi e prieten, Petru ar vrea \[\text{ca } el_k \text{ să -l viziteze la spital} \]
‘Because Dragoş is his friend, Petru would want him to come to the party.’

3.3.2. Supporting evidence:


- from Reinhart > null pronouns are interpreted via *binding*; the overt *el* gets the *co-valuation* interpretation (assigned a value from the discourse storage)

- Ariel’s Accessibility Theory → anaphora resolution within and across sentences

- **anaphoric expressions = “accessibility markers”** ranked according to *degrees of accessibility* determined by the *salience of the antecedents*:
  a) the more salient the antecedent, the higher the degree of accessibility encoded by the anaphoric expression meant to resume it
  b) the more distant/less salient the antecedent, the lower the degree of accessibility of the referring expression

- **degrees of accessibility** - influenced by 3 factors: informativity, rigidity (ability to refer to a unique antecedent) & attenuation (phonological size) →
  a) the more informative/rigid/stressed the anaphoric element is, the lower its degree of accessibility
  b) the less informative/rigid & more attenuated an anaphoric element is, the higher its degree of accessibility

- **ordering of accessibility markers** fc. of their degrees of accessibility:

- **3.3.2.3. Questionnaire (3)**

**Aim:** establish speakers’ preferences for the reference relations of null vs. overt subjects within independent subjunctives

**Expectation:** *pro* should pick up the most salient antecedent (the closest \(DP_2\)), ‘el’ should retrieve the less prominent antecedent, i.e., the more remote \(DP_1\), cf. (67):

(67) a. \([DP_1 \text{ + verb } and/but,} [DP_2 \text{ + volitional }] [\text{să + verb } pro] \]

b. \([DP_1 \text{ + verb } and/but,} [DP_2 \text{ + volitional }] [\text{ca } el \text{ să + verb}] \]

Method:
- 20 sentences of the type in (63)&(67); pragmatically + semantically, either antecedent could have been chosen as the agent of the embedded action; 40 respondents
- sentences divided in 10 pairs, each with a pro and overt el in the complement; the pairs pro-overt el - randomized (hence the 20 sentences)
- each sentence: two possible interpretations A & B, one identifying the closest DP as antecedent for the (null or overt) embedded subject, another the more remote DP
- respondents were allowed to choose A+ B (there were 7 such responses, all of them for contexts with embedded pro)

⇒ the prominence criterion distinguishing the two DPs > distance/proximity w.r.t. the subject of the subjunctive (pro or el)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-reference (with the closest DP)</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Null</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Disjoint reference (from the closest DP) | 93.75 | 11.46 |

⇒ expectations are borne out
- obviation effects in Romanian ISs are not triggered by an overt complementizer, but by the presence of a less attenuated pronominal element (the overt matching embedded subject) to the parameter proposed by Alboiu (2007)
- ca-subjunctives are no different from să-subjunctives as far as the interpretation of embedded subjects is concerned
- as a semantic anaphor/a logophor, pro retrieves an antecedent which need not occupy an argument position; the key criterion: (discursive) prominence

4. Concluding remarks
- we have provided (further) evidence for the classification into ‘infinitive’ and ‘subjunctive languages’ as far as control environments are concerned

- we have thus motivated an East-West continuum, with Romance languages in the middle, displaying both control (with OC verbs) and obviation (with volitionals, i.e., PC verbs). At the two extremes, there is English, with little (if any) obviation & a complex typology of (syntactic) control, and Balkan languages/ Romanian, with little control (parametrized as raising) and obviation effects induced by discourse factors (prominence)

- we have confirmed Romanian as a raising rather than a control language, a fact which might describe a more generalized situation across the Balkan area, according to the parameter proposed by Alboiu (2007).

- by ‘raising’ we refer to the standard raising relation, not to the (modified) ‘control-as-raising’ one.

- (based on roughly similar proposals for Greek (Spyropoulos 2007, Kapetangiani 2010), we have challenged the widely-accepted binary classification of subjunctive complements and proposed a more comprehensive tri-partite one, which better reflects the empirical data in the language.
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