

Subjunctives: How much left periphery do you need?

Manuela Ambar^a and Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández^b

^aFLUL-CLUL, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; ^bUniversity of

Seville, Seville, Spain

^amanuela.ambar.flul@gmail.com; ^bajimfer@us.es

Abstract: In this paper we explore the left periphery (LP) of subjunctive clauses selected by desideratives and psych-emotive verbs concentrating on the availability of contrastive focus in (European and Brazilian) Portuguese, Spanish and English. We claim that the composition of the LP correlates with the distinction between agreement-prominent languages and discourse-prominent languages in that the latter allow for a more flexible LP in subjunctives. Moreover, it also correlates with the specific type of matrix verbs which select the subjunctive clause. We argue that in E(uropean) P(ortuguese) and Spanish (discourse-prominent languages) CF is possible with desiderative and psych-emotive verbs, but the focused element occupies a postverbal position (V moves to a high position in the LP), whereas in English (agreement-prominent languages) CF is not allowed in subjunctives.

Keywords: subjunctive; left periphery; contrastive focus; V-movement

1. Introduction

In this paper we explore the left periphery of subjunctive clauses selected by desideratives and psych-emotive verbs concentrating on the availability of contrastive focus in Portuguese, Spanish and English.

1.1 Problems and Background

There has always been certain controversy with respect to the semantic and syntactic analysis of subjunctive clauses (Quer 2006. Properties which have been analyzed in the literature include the following:

- a) Obviation (impossibility of coreference of subjunctive subject and matrix subject; Picallo 1984.
- b) Defective tense (tense in subjunctives seems to be dependent on matrix tense; Picallo 1984 and Raposo 1985).
- c) The existence of an operator-like Comp in subjunctives (Kempchinsky 1986, 1990).
- d) Worlds, (non)veridicality and evaluation model shift (Giannakidou 1998, 2009, Quer 2005, 2009)

However, no full account can be found of the discourse properties of subjunctive clauses, which is the gap that we intend to fill in this paper.

Before we address the special status of the left periphery of subjunctive clauses, we have to discuss the issue that there is no consensus on contrastive focus fronting (CFF) in EP. Raposo (1998) claims that Portuguese is the only (major) Romance language with

English-style topicalization of a definite direct object. Hence, in contrast with Spanish and French (1b-c), Portuguese allows sentences such as (1a) similar to English (1d):

- (1) (a) Esse livro_i, o Luís comprou e_i para a Maria.
 that book the Louis buy-PAST.3SG for the Maria
 “Louis bought that book for Maria.”
 (b) *Ese libro_i, Luis ha comprado e_i para María.
 (c) *Ce livre_i, Louis a acheté e_i pour Marie.
 (d) That book, Louis bought e_i for Maria.

In addition to topicalization, Portuguese also has the so-called Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) where the DP topic is resumed by an accusative definite clitic pronoun (Duarte 1987, Cinque 1990), and this is common to the rest of Romance languages, as illustrated in (2):

- (2) (a) Esse livro, o Luís comprou-o para a Maria.
 that book the Louis buy-PAST.3SG-CL for the Maria
 (b) Ese libro, Luis lo ha comprado para María.
 (c) Ce livre, Louis l' a acheté pour Marie.
 “That book, Louis bought it for Maria.”

Sentences (1a) and (2a) are basically equivalent in Portuguese, semantically and discourse-wise. The initial DP corresponds to old, presupposed information. Raposo (1998, 197–198) argues that (1a) is not a case of Focus Fronting, where the initial DP conveys focal assertion, as is the case in the Spanish example (3).

- (3) ESOS LIBROS ha leído Juan.
 those books ha-PRES.3SG read John
 “Those books John has read.”

Here, the initial focus is necessarily associated with a gap in direct object position. In any case, Raposo (2000) maintains that Portuguese lacks the construction illustrated in (3) with a non-quantified DP, but claims that there is a FocP in EP, focus movement being restricted to quantified expressions:

- (4) Muito whisky bebeu o capitão.
 much whisky drank-PAST.3SG the captain
 “The captain drank much whisky.”

Costa (2002: 97-98) observes that these constructions “seem to be better described as instances of exclamative or evaluative sentences, as defended in Ambar (1999)” and suggests that “if there is FocusP, it will be relevant for exclamative or evaluative sentences, not for information focus”.

Ambar (1988) argues that in *information focus* (reinterpreting ‘free inversion’), the focused element is post-verbal (also Costa 1998), being introduced by a (null) topic-like element corresponding to old information - if a clitic occurs enclisis is chosen. Inversion is instantiated as V-to-C movement (5a). FF does not occur in this context, unless it is associated to a *non-exhaustive* reading (5b):

Informational focus (EP)

(5) Q: Quem comeu o bolo?
who eat-PAST.3SG the cake
“Who ate the cake?”

A: (a) (O bolo) comeu a Joana.
eat-PAST.3SG the Jane
“Jane ate it.”

(b) A Joana comeu...
“Jane ate...” (*non-exhaustive*: I don’t know who else ate)

The cut between topicalization and CFF is an old controversial issue, not only in Portuguese (cf. (1) above¹). In both Spanish and Portuguese the CF phrase can be left in situ.

Sentences like (6) have been identified as instances of focus fronting (Benincà 1987, Cinque 1990, Jiménez-Fernández 2013 call it Resumptive Preposing; others, Uriagereka 1995, Leonetti & Escandell 2009 call it focus or *verum* focus; for Portuguese Rouveret 1992, Duarte 1997 –D-linked presentation, Barbosa 2009 – QP-fronting):

(6) Isso dizem eles.
that say-PRES.3SG they
“They say that.”

Ambar (1999) notes that in EP (6) covers different structures, as the different readings and positions of the clitic in (7b-c) suggest:

(7) Q: Quem (lhe) diz isso?
who him say-PRES.3SG that
“Who said that to him?”

A: (a) Isso dizem eles.
that say-PRES.3PL they
“They say that.”

(b) Isso dizem-lhe eles (informational focus – enclisis)

(c) *Isso lhe dizem eles (infelicitous as informational focus – proclisis)

But (7b) is well-formed as an *evaluative structure* expressing the speaker’s attitude on the facts described, with focus on the entire clause, thus contrasting with the information focus in (5), as illustrated in (8):

(8) Isso (lhe) dizem eles!
that him say-PRES.3PL they

These and other facts led to the proposal of EvaluativeP and AssertiveP as speaker’s projections of the left periphery (Ambar 1999, 2003): the latter encodes ‘what the

¹Torrego (1984:110, n.19) the Spanish equivalent of English topicalization requires inversion and “might be considered Wh-focus constructions”; Cinque (1985:4,n.6): it “should perhaps in Italian be named more accurately ‘Focus Movement’, owing to the heavy stress and pragmatic contrast falling on the topicalized phrase.” For discussion, see Duarte (1987).

speaker knows’, inspired in Searle’s (1970) definition of ‘assertive’, it is Common Ground-related; the former coins the speaker’s attitude (unexpected by the addressee), it extends the Common Ground. The label *Evaluative* was inspired in Barwise & Cooper’s (1981) distinction between pure and evaluative quantifiers: only the latter can enter evaluative structures:

- (9) (a) Muitos livros (o Pedro) comprou (o Pedro)!
 many books (the Peter) buy-PAST.3SG (the Peter)
 “Peter bought many books.”
 (b) *Todos os livros de Sintaxe comprou o Pedro!
 all the books of Syntax buy-PAST.3SG the Peter
 “Peter bought all the books of Syntax.”

The restriction does not hold for focus structures:

- (10) Q: Quem leu todos os livros de Sintaxe I?
 who read-PAST.3SG all the books of Syntax I?
 “Who read all the books of Syntax I?”
 A: Todos os livros leu o João.
 all the books read-PAST.3SG the John
 “John read all the books.”

Now the point is whether CFF is distinct from evaluative structures. In (11a) the speaker expresses her attitude of disagreement regarding A, it is evaluative in our terms. Clefts provide contrastive focus (Zubizarreta 1998, Costa 2002, a.o.), see (11b):

- (11) A Joana publicou o seu primeiro livro em Portugal.
 the Jane publish-PAST.3SG the her first book in Portugal
 “Jane published her first book in Portugal.”
 (a) Não, O SEGUNDO LIVRO publicou em Portugal, não o primeiro .
 “(No), the SECOND BOOK (she) published in Portugal (not the first one).”
 (b) (Não...) Foi o segundo livro que a Joana publicou em Portugal (não o primeiro)
 “It was the second book that Jane published in Portugal (not the first one).”

However, if (8) is inserted in a cleft part of its meaning is lost, as well as ‘focus’ (not the best label) on the entire clause, suggesting that (8) and (11b) are not fully equivalent:

- (12) É isso que eles dizem.
 be-PRES.3SG that that they say-PRES.3PL
 “It is that what they say.”

Other properties are involved (namely tense). Limitations of space preclude going through them here. For our purpose it is enough to hypothesize CFF structures do exist in EP and have an unvalued evaluative feature in need of valuation. As will be clearer in what follows, our proposal also sheds light on the distinction between topicalization and CFF.

1.2 Subjunctives and Information Structure

The second problem we have detected concerning subjunctive is that little attention has been paid to the information structure of subjunctive sentences. The exceptions have been Kempchinsky (2008) and Baunaz et al. (2013). For the former desiderative verbs are not compatible with contrastive focus in the subjunctive clause; for the latter directives and desideratives may have a full left periphery allowing CF (with other verbs the LP in the subjunctive clause is defective and ‘truncated’ à la Haegeman 2007).

We claim that the composition of the LP correlates with the distinction between agreement-prominent languages and discourse-prominent languages in that the latter allow for a more flexible LP in subjunctives. Moreover, it also correlates with the specific type of matrix verbs which select the subjunctive clause. We argue that in Portuguese and Spanish (discourse-prominent languages) CF is possible with desiderative and psych-emotive verbs, but the focused element occupies a postverbal position (see the contrast in examples 13-14), whereas in English (agreement-prominent languages) CF is not allowed in subjunctives (examples 15), in line with Hooper and Thompson (1973) their distinction between emotive and assertive contexts:

- (13) (a) ??Quiero que LOS LIBROS coloques en la estantería
 want-PRES.1SG that THE BOOKS put-PRES.2SG on the shelf
 (no las revistas).
 (not the magazines)
 (b) ?? Quero que OS LIVROS coloques na estante (não as revistas) Portuguese
 “I want you to put THE BOOKS on the shelf, not the magazines.”
- (14) (a) Quiero que coloques LOS LIBROS en la estantería
 want-PRES.1SG that put-PRES.2SG the books on the shelf
 (no las revistas).
 (not the magazines)
 (b) Quero que coloques OS LIVROS na estante (não as revistas).
 “I want you to put THE BOOKS on the shelf, not the magazines.”
- (15) *The professor asked that HER RESEARCH PAPER Mary submit before the end of the month (not her dissertation).

In these examples the focused constituent is the object, but focusing the subject also yields a similar contrast in positional terms:

- (16) (a) ??Quiero que MARÍA coloque los libros en la estantería.
 want-PRES.1SG that Maria put-PRES.3SG the books on the shelf
 (no Juan).
 (not John)
 (b) ??Quero que A MARIA coloque os livros na estante (não o João).
- (17) (a) Quiero que coloque MARÍA los libros en la estantería (no Juan).
 (b) Quero que coloque A MARIA os livros na estante (não o João).
- (18) (a) Quiero que coloque los libros en la estantería MARÍA (no Juan).
 (b) Quero que coloque os livros na estante A MARIA (não o João).
 “I want MARY to put the books on the shelf (not John).

As we will see below, these contrasts do not arise in indicative clauses.

Our working hypothesis is that with desiderative and psych-emotive verbs Focus Fronting is available in Spanish and Portuguese but for independent reasons CF must occur following the subjunctive verb.

Within cartography, we propose that subjunctives in Portuguese and Spanish project Force, which is a syncretized head made up of two heads, Evaluative and Assertion (Ambar 1999, 2003), and any discourse-related categories below Force. Concentrating on desideratives and psych-emotives we explain the preference of the pattern V-CF over CF-V by proposing that V moves to Assert (for tense reasons, tense being seen as a *bundle of features*; also to value an [Evaluative] feature, connected with focus, which creates a relativized minimality effect). CF undergoes movement to spec-FocP but the V surpasses Foc since it targets a higher position.

As for English, we suggest that LP in subjunctives is impoverished and hence a truncation analysis will accommodate the relevant data.

2. A Critical View on Background and Data

In this section we discuss data connected with embedded subjunctives alongside the information structure-based proposals that we have found in the literature. Kempchinsky (2008) claims that there are language-particular distinctions between topic and focus.

For her, in Spanish indicative subordinate clauses both CLLD and CFF are possible. However, in subjunctive clauses, CLLD is possible, but CFF is not. The contrast is illustrated in (19-20):

- (19) (a) Ha dicho que a NADIE devolvieron su manuscrito.
 have-PRES.3SG said that to no one return-PAST.3PL their manuscript
 “S/he has said that to NO ONE they returned their manuscript.”
 (b) Ha dicho que su manuscrito se lo devolvieron ayer.
 have-PRES.3SG said that their manuscript CL CL return-PAST.3PL yesterday
 “S/he said that his manuscript they returned it to him yesterday.”
 (c) Ha dicho que su manuscrito a nadie se lo devolvieron.
 have-PRES.3SG said that their manuscript to no one CL CL return-PAST.3PL
 “S/he said that his manuscript to NO ONE they returned it.”
- (20) (a) *El editor quiere que a NADIE devuelvan su manuscrito.
 the editor want-PRES.3SG that to no one return-PRES.3PL self’s manuscript
 “The editor wants that to NO ONE they return (SUBJ) his manuscript.”
 (b) El editor quiere que su manuscrito se lo devuelvan ahora mismo.
 the editor want-PRES.3SG that self’s manuscript CL CL return-PRES.3PL
 now same
 “The editor wants that his manuscript they return (SUBJ) it to him right now.”
 (c) *El editor quiere que su manuscrito a NADIE se lo devuelvan.
 the editor want-PRES.3SG that self’s manuscript to no one CL CL
 return-PRES.3PL
 “The editor wants that his manuscript to NO ONE they return it.”

The explanation Kempchinsky gives for the unavailability of FF in subjunctives is that “Fin within the subjunctive clause is in the domain of the buletic model of the speaker (lexically entailed by the matrix predicate), hence can’t access discourse context.” However, this doesn’t account for our data in (13-14) and (16-17) from Spanish and Portuguese since the subordinate Fin falls within the domain of the matrix predicate.

Kempchinsky also offers the data in (21) with volitional verbs and argues that these verbs select a subjunctive clause which is incompatible with hanging topics (21d) and with CFF (21b-c), though not with CLLD (21a):

- (21) (a) Elena prefiere que el coche lo dejen con su hija
 Elena prefer-PRES.3SG that the car CL leave-PRES.3PL with their daughter
 los fines de semana.
 the weekends
 “Elena prefers that the car they leave(SUBJ) with their daughter on weekends.”
- (b) *Elena prefiere que el coche CON SU HIJA lo dejen los fines de semana.
 “Elena prefers that the car WITH THEIR DAUGHTER they leave(SUBJ) on weekends.”
- (c) *Elena prefiere que CON SU HIJA dejen el coche los fines de semana.
 “Elena prefers that WITH THEIR DAUGHTER they leave(SUBJ) the car on weekends.”
- (d) *Elena prefiere que en cuanto a Juan, el coche lo deje
 Elena prefer-PRES.3SG that in respect to Juan the car CL leave-PRES.3SG
 con su hija los fines de semana.
 with their daughter the weekends
 “Elena prefers that with respect to Juan, the car he leave(SUBJ) with their daughter on weekends.”

The incompatibility with hanging topics in (21d) is expected since they are root phenomena and apparently these embedded clauses are not even root-like (RIDEs in Emonds’ 2004, 2012 terminology). However, more difficult to explain are examples (21b-c) with CFF, given that Focus in Spanish seems to be compatible with all types of embedding (Camacho-Taboada & Jiménez-Fernández 2014).

The problem with desiderative verbs is not that embedded subjunctive is incompatible with FF. Actually, FF is possible in these contexts but the position of CF is lower than the verb, hence acceptability increases, as in (22). This is confirmed in Portuguese as well, as shown in (23).

- (22) Elena prefiere que dejen CON LA HIJA el coche
 Elena prefer-PRES.3SG that leave-PRES.3PL with the daughter the car
 los fines de semana (no con el hijo).
 the weekends (not with the son)
 “Elena prefers that they leave(SUBJ) WITH THE DAUGHTER the car on weekends (not with the son).”
- (23) (a) ??A Helena prefere que COM A FILHA deixem o carro
 the Helena prefer-PRES.3SG that with the daughter leave-PRES.3PL the car
 aos fins de semana (não com o filho).
 on.the weekends (not with the son)

- (b) A Helena prefere que deixem COM A FILHA o carro aos fins de semana (não com o filho).
 “Helena prefers that they leave(SUBJ) WITH THE DAUGHTER the car on weekends (not with their son).”

The position of the emphatic PP may be pre-verbal in both languages too, as illustrated in (24):

- (24) (a) Elena prefiere que con la hija dejen el coche
Elena prefer-PRES.3SG that with the daughter leave-PRES.3PL the car
los fines de semana, con el hijo la bicicleta.
the weekends, with the son the bicycle
(b) A Helena prefere que COM A FILHA deixem o carro aos fins de semana, com
o filho a bicicleta.
“Elena prefers that they leave(SUBJ) WITH THE DAUGHTER the car on
weekends, with the son the bicycle.”

However, the CF reading is lost here, and instead a pair-list reading obtains. This list-reading is possible with a preverbal constituent, but then the precise discourse category is that of a contrastive topic (Frascarelli 2007).

Kempchinsky (2008) claims that in general “the closer the identity between the default world of evaluation (the speaker’s epistemic model of the actual world, cf. Quer 2001) and the world of evaluation of the subordinate clause, the greater the range of left peripheral operations allowed.” And hence she argues that the use of CF is allowed in some subjunctive clauses that she considers problematic, as is the case of subordinate clauses to factive-emotives, where FF is allowed. Factive-emotive complements have a complex model of evaluation: a buletic intensional model anchored to the matrix subject (cf. Villalta 2001, Kempchinsky 2007) and the epistemic model of the matrix subject. This is illustrated in (25) from Zubizarreta (1998):

- (25) Lamento que LAS ESPINACAS no le gusten
 regret-PRES.1SG that the spinachs not CL like-PRES.3PL
 a Pedro (y no las papas).
 to Pedro (and not the potatoes)
 ‘‘I regret that SPINACH Pedro doesn’t like (and not potatoes).’’

The problem is that with desideratives the world of evaluation in the subjunctive clause is also anchored by the matrix subject, so no distinction is detected between the world of evaluation in factive-emotives (our psych-emotives) and the one in desideratives. Another explanation should be found.

Haegeman (2007) discusses the incompatibility of argument fronting and subjunctive in English:

- (26) *It's important that the book he study carefully.
(Hooper&Thompson 1973: 485, (166))

Following Kempchinsky (1987), Haegeman assumes that subjunctive clauses contain an operator in spec-CP, and suggests an intervention effect for the ungrammaticality of (26).

Hooper & Thompson (1973) give additional examples with subjunctives:

- (27) (a) *The senator proposed that the troops, they be withdrawing immediately.
- (b) *This scene requires that up the street trot the dog.
- (c) *It's mandatory that in the halls stand the guards.

These sentences in English contain either topic preposing or locative inversion, and their ungrammaticality is accounted for in terms of intervention. All of them are fine in Spanish or Portuguese. This raises the question as to whether English subjunctive is compatible with FF. Our intuition again is 'No', which is borne out in (28).

- (28) (a) The professor asked that Mary submit her research paper before the end of the month (not her dissertation).
- (b) *The professor asked that HER RESEARCH PAPER Mary submit before the end of the month (not her dissertation).
- (c) *HER RESEARCH PAPER the professor asked that Mary submit before the end of the month (not her dissertation).

This can be explained by the relative poorness of the left periphery in English. This makes sense since English, as opposed to Spanish/Portuguese, is an agreement-oriented language, not a discourse-prominent language (Miyagawa 2010; Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa 2014).

Baunaz, Puskas & Socanac (2013) propose that the basic structure of subjunctive-type complements is as follows:

- (29) [(SubP)... JussiveP... W(world)P ...TopP....FocP... ModP ...TP... MoodP...AspP...VP

For them directives and desideratives allow a full left periphery with Top and Foc, but propose a truncated LP for the rest of predicates. Crucially, contrary to Kempchinsky (2008), Baunaz et al. entertain that desideratives allow FF in embedded subjunctives in at least languages such as Napolitan (30) and Hungarian (31):

- (30) Gianni vulesc ca UN libro purt addereto, e no DDUJE.
Gianni want-PRES.3SG that ONE BOOK turn back, and not two
"Gianni wants one book to be turned back, and not two."
- (31) János (azt) kívánja, hogy az újságokat CSAK A PINCÉBE
János Prt wish-PRES.3SG that the newspapers ONLY IN BASEMENT
tároljuk.
stores-PRES.1PL
"János wants us to store the newspapers only in the basement."

Other types of subjunctives do not allow FF because their LP is truncated. The main problem that we find with this proposal is that it does not account for the data in Spanish and Portuguese.

3. Our data: A puzzling challenge from embedded subjunctives with volitional and emotive predicates

In Portuguese and Spanish desideratives allow FF but the focused element most naturally follows the verb, as illustrated in (13-14), repeated here as (32-33), and (34):

- (32) (a) ??Quiero que LOS LIBROS coloques en la estantería
 want-PRES.1SG that the books put-PRES.2SG on the shelf
 (no las revistas).
 (not the magazines)
 (b) ??Quero que OS LIVROS coloques na estante (não as revistas) Portuguese
- (33) (a) Quiero que coloques LOS LIBROS en la estantería
 want-PRES.1SG that put-PRES.2SG the books on the shelf
 (no las revistas).
 (not the magazines)
 (b) Quero que coloques OS LIVROS na estante (não as revistas).
- (34) (a) Quiero que coloques en la estantería LOS LIBROS
 want-PRES.1SG that put-PRES.2SG on the shelf the books
 (no las revistas).
 (not the magazines)
 (b) Quero que coloques na estante OS LIVROS (não as revistas)
 “I want you to put THE BOOKS on the shelf, not the magazines.”

It can be objected that (33)-(34) are not instances of FF, and hence no movement is involved. However, evidence that in both sentences the DP object undergoes movement to the LP comes from the fact this object must be generated as complement of V. If the PP on the shelf is interpolated between V and the DP object, this means that rearrangement (via movement) has taken place. What is interesting is that in Portuguese and Spanish FF is compatible with desideratives but only if CF is postverbal. How about psych-emotive verbs? Similar data can be found which confirm the compatibility of this class of verbs and FF:

- (35) (a) ??Me sorprende que CON ÁNGELA te encontraras en la fiesta
 CL surprise-PRES.3SG that with Angela CL find-PAST.2SG in the party
 (y no con Ana).
 (and not with Ana)
 (b) ??Surpreende-me que COM A ÂNGELA te tenhas encontrado encontres na festa (e não com a Ana)
- (36) (a) Me sorprende que te encontraras CON ÁNGELA en la fiesta (y no con Ana).
 (b) Surpreende-me que te tenhas encontrado COM A ÂNGELA na festa (e não a com a Ana)
- (37) (a) Me sorprende que te encontraras en la fiesta CON ÁNGELA (y no con Ana).
 (b) Surpreende-me que te tenhas encontrado na festa COM A ÂNGELA (e não com a Ana)
 “It surprises me that you met ANGELA at the party (not Ana).”

Note that embedded indicatives do not display this positional constraint:

- (38) (a) Me dijeron que CON ÁNGELA te encontraste en la fiesta
 CL tell-PAST.3SG that with Angela CL find-PAST.2SG in the party

- (no con Ana).
(not with Ana)
- (b) Disseeram-me que COM A ÂNGELA te encontraste na festa (não com a Ana).
- (39) (a) Me dijeron que te encontraste CON ÂNGELA en la fiesta (no con Ana).
(b) Disseeram-me que te encontraste COM A ÂNGELA na festa (não com a Ana)
- (40) (a) Me dijeron que te encontraste en la fiesta CON ÂNGELA (no con Ana).
(b) Disseeram-me que te encontraste na festa COM A ÂNGELA (não com a Ana)
“Someone told me that you met ANGELA at the party (not Ana).”

The natural conclusion we draw from our data is that CFF is fully accepted in desiderative and emotive subjunctives, but this CF must be preverbal CF.

4. Our Proposal: V moves to Assert

In this section we present our analysis for embedded subjunctives in desiderative and psych-emotive contexts. Based on Ambar (2003), we propose the structure in (41):

- (41) XP [EvaluativeP [Evaluative [AssertiveP [Assertive [XP [FocusP [Focus [XP [IP I [vP v+V...
(based on Ambar 2003)

We claim that V moves to Assert for tense reasons, tense being seen as a *bundle of features* (Ambar forthcoming). This explains why T is defective in subjunctives. V also values an [Eval] feature, connected with focus, which creates a relativized minimality effect. This accounts for the high position of V in embedded clauses with desiderative and psych-emotive verbs.

On the other hand, CF undergoes movement to spec-FocP to value an unvalued [Foc] feature and check the corresponding [EPP] feature under Focus. This explains why CF is always post-verbal.

As argued by Ambar (2003), XP stands for any topic position. It can be subject to types of topics. This accounts for the different slots that CLLD can fill in the derivation. Finally, our analysis also accommodates data in (23) with Pair-List interpretation for which a Contrastive Topic occurs higher than the verb in that the verb does not move because focus is not activated. In other words, it is the [Eval] and [Foc] features that trigger V-movement. Thus, in (23) the PP *con la hija/com a filha* ‘with the daughter’ is in spec-TopP and the verb remains low because it has no [eval] feature.

Let’s illustrate our analysis. Consider (42) and the structure we propose in (43):

- (42) (a) Prefiero que prepare EL INFORME FINAL la secretaria
prefer-PRES.1SG that prepare-PRES.3SG the report final the secretary
(no la versión preliminar).
(not the version preliminary)
- (b) Prefiro que prepare O RELATÓRIO FINAL a secretária (não a versão preliminar).
“I prefer the secretary to prepare the final report, not the preliminary version.”
- (43) Prefiero [EvaluativeP [Evaluative’ que [AssertiveP [Assertive’ prepare [XP [FocusP EL INFORME FINAL [Focus’ prepare [XP la secretaria [IP la secretaria prepare el informe final]]]]]]]]

Note that we are presuming that the subject is a topic, which may occur either following or preceding the focused constituent. This is captured by optionally projecting XP

(TopP) immediately below or above FocP. The topic nature of subjects in this construction is supported by the impossibility of indefinite non-specific pronouns, which are never selected as topics:

- (44) (a) Prefiero que prepare EL INFORME FINAL la secretaria/*?él/*alguien (no la versión preliminar).
 (b) Prefiro que prepare O RELATÓRIO FINAL a secretária/*?ele/*alguém (não a versão preliminar).
 “I prefer the secretary/he/someone to prepare the final report (not the preliminary version).”

Now we have to account for the successive movement of the subjunctive. What are the features triggering movement in Evaluative, Assertive, and Focus?

Our intuition is that subjunctives are quasi-operators which carry interpretable [+evaluative] and [+assertive] features. The relevant functional categories in the Left Periphery will probe in search of a suitable goal to value their uninterpretable evaluative and assertive features. Both Eval and Assert have verb features (maybe TNS, in line with Ambar to appear) triggering movement of the relevant head.

On the other hand, the focus feature in Foc is valued via Agree with the DP ‘el informe final’, but Foc carries an EPP which drags the focused constituent along to spec-FocP. This will explain the word order attested in Spanish and Portuguese.

Our analysis also raises the question as to why the focused DP cannot move to a higher position. In other words, what is it that stops this DP from preceding V? The answer now is simple: Because it hasn’t got evaluative or assertive features, and because V needs to be in the search domain of the matrix verb to value tense-features. If CF intervenes it creates a relativized minimality effect.

As stated earlier, our analysis also accounts for higher occurrences of an emphatic DP in desideratives and psych-emotives, in which case the preposed DP is a Contrastive Topic. Hence, the examples in (45) are analyzed as in (46):

- (45) (a) Quiero que los libros coloques en la estantería, las revistas en el armario, los papeles en la caja.
 (b) Quero que os livros coloques na estante, as revistas no armário e os papéis na caixa.
 “I want the book you put on the shelf, the magazine in the board, the papers in the box.”

- (46) Quero [_{EvaluativeP} [_{Evaluative}’ que [_{AssertiveP} [_{Assertive}’ [XP OS LIVROS [IP pro coloques os ~~libros~~ na estante]]]]]] as revistas no armário e os papéis na caixa.

5. Some Parametric Variation

In some languages subjunctive classes are not distinguished in terms of V-movement to Assert. Our analysis poses questions about those languages in which desideratives and psych-emotives select subjunctive but then CF is high in the LP, and hence it is pre-verbal. Such was the case of Hungarian, Serbo-Croatian and Napolitan (see examples (30-31)). We surmise that this is the result of some parametric variation with respect to the nature of Assert and Eval in different languages. In these languages the heads Assert and Eval establish a long-distance agree relation with their goal, and

because they have no EPP feature V raises as high as is independently required by other categories.

Let's see the case of Napolitan example (30), repeated as (47):

- (47) Gianni vulesc ca UN libro purt addereto, e no DDUJE.
 Gianni want-PRES.3SG that ONE BOOK turn back, and not two
 "Gianni wants one book to be turned back, and not two."

As is clear, the focused constituent *un libro* precedes the subjunctive V, in contrast with Spanish and Portuguese. Napolitan, thus, is a language whose subjunctive clauses project Assert and Eval. However, these categories do not attract the verb simply because they carry no EPP. Hence, V remains lower (maybe in T or Finiteness in the LP).

BP is particularly revealing. Observe the following contrasts²:

- (48) a. *Quero que O LIVRO a Maria coloque na estante, não a revista .
 I want that THE BOOK Mary put-SUBJ on the shelf, not the magazine.
 b. *Quero que coloque O LIVRO na estante (a Maria), não a revista
 c. O LIVRO quero que a Maria coloque na estante, não a revista.
- (49) a. O João disse que O LIVRO a Maria colocou na estante, não a revista.
 John said that THE BOOK Mary put-IND on the shelf, not the magazine.
 b. *O João disse que colocou O LIVRO na estante (a Maria), não a revista.
- (50) a. Quero que a Maria coloca o livro na estante (some dialects)
 I want that Mary put-IND the book on the shelf
 b. Quero que O LIVRO a Maria coloca na estante, não a revista.

(i)-(iii) follow from (48)-(50):

- (i) no periphery in embedded subjunctives – focus in the matrix (48)
 (ii) periphery in indicative (49)-(50)
 (iii) no verb movement (generally) (48)-(50)

The contrasts and conclusions above are predicted by our system and find support in other facts described in the literature: (i) BP lacks V-movement to the left periphery generally (Ambar 2003, Kato 2013, a.o.); (ii) BP is losing indicative-subjunctive oppositions in given contexts (Marques 2012); (iii) the root-embedded divide regarding information structure is dependent on (speaker) assertive features (H&T 1973), in turn dependent on tense, evoking Emonds's (2004, 2012) insight.

6. Conclusions

Our data have shown that in discourse-prominent languages such as Spanish and Portuguese in desiderative and psych-emotive subjunctives the V moves to Assert in order to be close enough to the matrix V and values its relevant features there. On its way to Assert, V passes through Foc. This explains why CF is most naturally place in

² We thank Maria José Foltran, Patrícia Rodrigues, Gustavo Freire for the BP data.

postverbal position. On the other hand, BP has no CF in embedded subjunctives because there is no V-movement to the LP. In agreement-prominent languages such as English, CF is not allowed in subjunctives because its LP is too poor to project Foc.

WORKS CITED

- Ambar, Manuela. 1988. Para uma sintaxe da inversão sujeito verbo em Português. PhD dissertation. University of Lisbon.
- Ambar, Manuela. 1999. "Aspects of the syntax of Focus in Portuguese." In *The Grammar of Focus*, edited by Georges Rebuschi & Laurice Tuller, 23–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ambar, Manuela. 2003. "Wh-asymmetries." In *Asymmetry in Grammar*, edited by Anna Maria di Sciullo, 209–251. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ambar, Manuela. Forthcoming. "Finiteness and left periphery: focusing on subjunctive." *Tense, Mood, and Modality: New Perspectives on Old Questions*, edited by Blaszack, J., D. Klimek-Jankowska, Kryzstof Mygdalski, and Anastasia Giannakidou. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Barbosa, Pilar. 2009. "Two kinds of subject pro". *Studia Linguistica* 63 (1): 2–58.
- Barwise, Jon and Robin Cooper. 1981. "Generalized Quantifiers and Natural Language." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4 (2): 159-219.
- Baunaz, Lena, Genoveva Puskas and Tomislav Socanac. 2013. "Control your mood! A cross-linguistic study of subjunctive clauses." Paper presented at *Balkan Syntax Workshop of the SLE*, University of Split.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of \bar{A} -Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Costa, João 1998. *Word Order Variation: A constraint-based approach*. Leiden: HIL/Leiden University dissertation.
- Costa, João. 2002. "Multiple focus in European Portuguese: Apparent optionality and subject positions." In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, edited by Claire Beyssade et al., 93–108. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Duarte, Inês 1987. A Construção de Topicalização na Gramática do Português. PhD diss., FLUL, University of Lisbon.
- Duarte, Inês 1997. Ordem de palavras: sintaxe e estrutura discursiva. In *Sentido que a Vida Faz. Estudos para Óscar Lopes*, edited by A. M. Brito, F. Oliveira, I. Pires de Lima, 581-592. Porto: Campo das Letras.
- Emonds, Joseph. Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions. In *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and their Effects*, edited by David Adger, Cécile De Cat & Georges Tsoulas, 75-120. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Emonds, Joseph. 2012. "Augmented Structure Preservation and the Tensed S Constraint." In *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*, edited by Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman, and Rachel Nye, 23–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2007. "Subjects, topics and the interpretation of referential *pro*: an interface approach to the linking of (null) pronouns." *Natural Language and Linguistics* 25: 691–734.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2009. The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: temporal semantics and polarity. *Lingua* 120: 1883-1908.

- Haegeman, Liliane. 2007. "Operator movement and topicalization in adverbial clauses." *Folia Linguistica* 18: 485-502.
- Hill, Virginia and Olga Mišeska-Tomić. 2009. "A typology of subjunctive complements in Balkan languages". *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 9 (1): 197-208.
- Hooper, Paul J. and Sandra Thompson. 1973. "On the applicability of root transformations." *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465-497.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel. 2013. "Towards a typology of focus: Microvariation at the discourse-syntax interface". Paper presented at the LAGB meeting, SOAS, London.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel and Shigeru Miyagawa. 2014. "A feature-inheritance approach to root phenomena and parametric variation". *Lingua* 145: 276-302.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 1986. Romance subjunctive clauses and logical form. PhD diss., UCLA.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 1990. "Más sobre el efecto de referencia disjunta del subjuntivo". In *Indicativo y Subjuntivo*, edited by Ignacio Bosque, 234-258. Madrid: Taurus.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 2008. How much structure does the left periphery need?. Paper presented at the *Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* 38, University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign.
- Koopman, Hilda and Dominique Sportiche. 1989. "Pronouns, logical variables, and logophoricity in Abe". *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 555-888.
- Leonetti, Manuel and Escandell, Victoria. 2009. "Fronting and verum-focus in Spanish." In *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*, edited by Andreas Dufter and Daniel Jacob, 155-204. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-Based and Discourse Configurational Languages*. LI Monograph 54. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Picallo, Carme. 1984. "The Infl node and the null subject parameter". *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 75-101.
- Quer, Josep. 2005. "Subjunctives." In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. IV, edited by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 660-684. Blackwell Reference Online.
- Quer, Josep. 2009. "Twists of mood: the distribution and interpretation of the indicative and the subjunctive." *Lingua* 119: 1779-1787.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1985. "Some Asymmetries in the Binding Theory in Romance." *The Linguistic Review* 5: 75-110.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1998. "Definite/Zero Alternations in Portuguese: Towards a Unification of Topic Constructions". In *Romance Linguistics: Theoretical Perspectives*, edited by A. Schwegler, B. Tranel and M. Uribe-Etxebarria, 197-212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 2000. "Clitic Positions and Verb Movement." In *Portuguese Syntax. New Comparative Studies*, edited by João Costa, 266-297. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rouveret, Alain. 1992. "Clitic Placement, Focus and the Wackernagel Position in European Portuguese. *Eurotyp Working Papers* [Theme Group 8: Clitics], Volume 3:103-139.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. "Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance." *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79-123.
- Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1998. *Word Order, Prosody and Focus*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

