Obviation as anti-control*

Norbert Hornstein
(University of Maryland)

Itziar San Martin
(University of Maryland, EHU-Gasteiz)

Abstract

This paper proposes a solution to the problem of Obviation in terms of the theory of Movement (Hornstein 1999). It suggests that Obviation is closely related to Control, specifically, it is the Anti-Control effect. It assumes a framework that favors derivations exploiting Move to those requiring Construal when establishing anaphoric relations. Evidence for the anti-control approach to Obviation comes from infinitival clauses in Basque. Sentences displaying Obviation effects induce no island effects, but the referential indices suggest that Movement did not take place. Violation of Move First allows the insertion of a pronoun (Construal) with the cost that it has to Obviate. By assuming that arrays do not contain morphological material, OC and Obviative structures compete for derivational economy. The proposal extends logically to crosslinguistic data on Obviation such as in Romance and English clausal gerunds. It also accounts for the presence and lack of Obviation across languages both synchronic and diachronically.

Introduction

Since Chomsky presented his Binding theory in *Lectures on Government and Binding* (1981), the phenomenon of pronominal Obviation has remained rather obscure. It is a well-known fact about natural languages that they display obviation effects in diverse environments. For instance, in Romance languages, it is subjunctive complements of volitional predicates that require their pronominal subjects to be disjoint in reference to the matrix subjects, as in (1). In Basque, obviation arises in infinitival complements of certain predicates (2), and in English, clausal gerunds display this effect (3).

* This research was funded by a grant from the Department of Education, Universities and Research of the Government of the Basque Country, as well as the NSF grant SBR 9817569.

(1) El_i quiere que [el/$pro_{*i/k}$ vaya de vacaciones][1]
He wants that he go-Subj on holiday
'He wants him to go on holiday'

(2) $Hark_i$ [$Ø_{*i/k}$/$hura_{*i/k}$ joatea] nahi du.[2]
3.s.E 3.s.A go-Nomin-Det-A want 3.A-3.E
'He/She wants somebody else/he-she to go'

(3) He_i would much prefer [him_k going to a movie]

By adopting Chomsky's LGB and subsequent extensive work along this line, the behavior of pronouns should fall under Principle B of the Binding Theory, which requires pronouns to be free in their Domain. The problem with structures containing Obviative subjects is the following: the binding restrictions on these pronouns appear to be stricter than the ones imposed on pronouns in other structures: they must not only obey Principle B of the Binding Theory, but they must also be free of a subject in a higher clause. This difference has led some to conclude that Obviation should be considered separately from Binding Theory (Bouchard 1982, Suñer 1986, Everaert 1986).

Despite the difficulties, there have been several syntactic proposals attempting to explain the facts along the lines of GB. These analyses include an extension of the Binding Domain of the obviative pronominal subject in order to include the matrix clause. This suffices to rule out coreference between the two subject positions. Jakubowicz (1985), Kempchinsky (1985), and Picallo (1985) follow the idea that the subjunctive complement of predicates displaying obviation effects are not independent from the matrix clauses they are embedded in, and it is precisely this dependency that makes the matrix clauses count as the relevant Governing Category.

From a Minimalist perspective the existence of a Binding Module has fallen under suspicion. Hornstein (1999) argues that the existence of Principle A is inadequate both on methodological and empirical grounds. The crucial definition of Domain is minimalistically problematic for several reasons: first, it uses the notion Government. Second, Minimalism already has a notion of local Domain that is central to Movement and instead, GB utilizes two types of Domains: one for Binding and one for movement. On methodological grounds it is preferable to have one. Hornstein proposes that Principle A and B fall under the general theory of Movement. To implement this idea it is proposed that Anaphors and Pronouns are grammatical formatives introduced by the computational system.

In this article we will argue that an extension of Hornstein's Minimalist approach to Control provides a natural explanation to the puzzle of Obviation. Section 1 is a presentation of the problem from an LGB viewpoint. Section 2 reviews in a detailed manner the Basque case. Section 3 gathers the common characteristics of the various

[1] These are the relevant abbreviations used henceforth in the text: E = Ergative, A = Absolutive, D = Dative, Det = Determiner, Nom = Nominalizer, Subj = Subjunctive, s = singular, pl = plural.

[2] Basque is a morphologically Ergative language, i.e. the subject of transitive and unergative verbs is marked Ergative, distinct from the subject of unaccusative verbs and object of transitive verbs, which are marked Absolutive.

Obviation constructions. In section 4 we propose that Obviation is a logical consequence of an extension of the Minimalist theory of Control as Movement. Section 5 shows that certain synchronic facts and diachronic changes support the line of inquiry presented in this article. Section 6 is a wrap up and conclusion.

1 Obviation: all problems

1.1. Domain According to the Binding Theory presented in the GB tradition (Chomsky 1981, 1986), Anaphors and Pronouns must satisfy certain locality conditions in order to be licensed. The reason why they appear in complementary distribution is derived from the fact that they must meet contradictory requirements within identical Domains. Anaphors must be bound in their Domain and Pronouns must be free. Construal operations are relevant only within the definition of Domain given in (4).

(4) (i) α is a Domain for B iff α is the smallest complete functional complex in which B is governed.

(ii) a Complete Functional complex of B is the minimal domain containing it, its governor and an accessible subject/SUBJECT.

As was noted in the Introduction, the big puzzle about constructions involving Obviation comes from binding theoretic facts. In (5) the subject in the lower clause must be free not only inside but also outside its regular Domain of application of the Binding Theory. More specifically, it must be disjoint in reference with respect to the matrix subject as the following French sentence shows.

(5) * Je veux que je connaise la verite.
'I want that I know the truth'

According to (4) the relevant domain to be considered for the embedded subject is the lower clause. It contains the pronoun itself, Governor INFL and an accessible SUBJECT, which is the finite AGR. Obviation is unexpected, if we consider that the subordinate clause is the relevant Domain for the application of Binding Theory. In fact, indicative complements show no restrictions of this sort:

(6) Je pense que je connais la verite
'I think that I know the truth'

1.2. Typological distinction Although Obviation is typically found in most Romance languages not all Romance languages display Obviation effects with subjunctive complements of volitional predicates. Rumanian (7) and Salentino (8) are among these.

(7) Maria$_i$ vrea ea$_{i/k}$/∅$_{i/k}$ _a ramina
Maria wants she Subj. stay
'Maria wants to stay/somebody else to stay'

(8) Lu Karlu$_i$ ole ku ∅$_{i/k}$ bbene krai
The Karlu wants Subj comes(3p-sg) tomorrow
'Karlu wants to come /that somebody else comes'

In (7-8) the subject of the subordinate clause is free to refer to the subject outside its Domain defined as in (4). Interestingly enough, the subjunctive complements in the languages that lack Obviation seem to be regular subjunctive complements in the sense that they contain the agreement markers that appear in other Romance languages that display Obviation effects. This implies that they all have a governor in the lower clause and that in all of them the lower clause should be the relevant Binding Domain. In short, with respect to Binding theory there should be no difference between Romanian and Salentino (where Obviation is absent) on the one hand and Spanish and French on the other (where Obviation is found). Any theory on this issue should deal with this typological difference between the existence and nonexistence of Obviation.

1.3. Complementary Distribution? Another big puzzle about Obviation structures is the fact that where Obviation arises Controlled gaps are also licensed. Sometimes the structures in which Control and Obviation take place look identical, as in English verbal gerunds (9) and sometimes they differ minimally as in Basque (10a-b):

(9) He_i would much prefer [$PRO_{*k/i}$/$him_{k/*i}$ going to a movie]

(10) (a) Nik_i [$Ø_{*i/k}$/$hura_{*i/k}$ joatea] nahi dut.
I.E 3.s.A go-Nomin-Det-A want 3.A-1.E
'I want somebody else/he-she to go'

(b) Nik_i [$Ø_{i/*k}$/*John joan] nahi dut.
I.E go want 3.A-1.E
'I want to go'

In (9) the subject position of the lower clause can either be either be a gap/PRO or a DP. If it is filled with a pronominal DP it must Obviate with respect to the matrix subject. On the contrary, when PRO appears it must be controlled by the matrix subject. These facts are unaccounted for by the Binding, Control and Case Theory presented in GB Theory. First, PRO and DPs are not in complementary distribution. If DPs are allowed it must be a case position, exactly where PRO should be disallowed. Second, we must explain from where the lower subject gets case when overtly realized. Finally, we should account for the core fact, namely under what structural conditions Obviation arises. In other words, what triggers Obviation?

1.4. The Avoid Pronoun Principle: an attempt Let us revise Chomsky's argument about Clausal gerunds in *LGB*. Chomsky points out that PRO is permissible in (11) below because it is an ungoverned position, but not obligatory because genitive case can be assigned to a phonetically realized NP in that position, as in (12).

(11) He_i would much prefer [PRO_i /$him_{k/*i}$ going to a movie]

(12) $John_i$ would much prefer [*PRO/$his_{i/k}$ own book]

He further raises the observation that the lower subject position is not "a position of disjoint reference" because it can be occupied by a free referring pronoun as in (12): Chomsky concludes that the referential constraint on (11) is dictated by the "Avoid Pronoun Principle" (A.P.P), which states: "impose a choice of PRO over a pronoun where possible".

About the Obviation effect in (11) Chomsky mentions: "...where PRO may appear, the overt pronoun is taken as distinct in reference from *John*" and conversely, "...where PRO may not appear the overt pronoun is free in reference", referring to (12).

Several comments deserve mention: First, thanks to the advances in linguistics of the last two decades we know that it is not legitimate to consider the subject in specifier of NPs and Verbal gerund clauses as equivalent in any relevant sense. Hence, the comparison between (11) and (12) is not valid and it does not seem plausible to conclude that the subject position in (11) is not a position of disjoint reference.

Second, the Avoid Pronoun Principle was to apply to pro-drop languages too. Where pro is possible DPs where omitted (but not prohibited). This is why this Principle was considered as: "... a sub-case of a conversational principle of not saying more than is required". This makes sense for the pro-drop languages like Spanish, where (13) is conversationally better than (14):

(13) pro vienes?
__ come-2p-sg
'Are you coming'

(14) Tu vienes?
2p-sg come-2p-sg
'Are you coming?'

However, it is hard to accommodate this principle to Obviation cases such as (11). If, by following the A.P.P. we impose the choice of PRO over a pronoun where possible, then we would have to conclude that the difference between sentences with PRO and with a Obviative overt subject is a difference of conversational preference too. However, they are not only equally acceptable but they also have very different semantic interpretations. For this matter, it seems that the A.P.P. can be a plausible principle regarding the choice of pro over pronouns in pro-drop languages, but should not be extended to Obviation structures such as verbal gerunds in English.

However, despite these problems, the Avoid Pronoun Principle remains interesting due to two observations made by Chomsky. First, that "where PRO may appear, the overt pronoun is taken as distinct in reference from *John* (referring to example (11))". Second: "..impose a choice of PRO over a pronoun where possible". Let us postpone these observations until Section 5 where they will become relevant.

To recapitulate, in this section we addressed some difficulties that the obviation structures present for the traditional Government and Binding Theory. The immediate problems include (i) the constraint that the lower pronoun subject be free across its Domain, (ii) the typological distinction of the existence/non existence of Obviation effects in some Romance languages, and (iii) the non complementary distribution of DP and PRO (most obviously attested in English Verbal gerunds).

2. Basque Control: basis for Obviation

Basque shows Obviation effects in subjunctive and infinitival complements of volitional predicates, as in (15) and (16) respectively.

(15) Hark$_i$ [Ø/hura$_{*i/k}$ joan dadin] nahi du.
3p.sig-E 3.s.A go aux-Subj. want 3.A-3.E
'He/she$_i$ wants him/her$_k$ to go go'

(16) Hark$_i$ [Ø/hura$_{*i/k}$ joatea] nahi du.
3p.sg-E 3.s.A go-Nomin-Det-A want aux
'He/she$_i$ wants him/her$_k$ to go'

In both (15) and (16) the subject of the infinitival clause must not corefer with the matrix subject. Let us briefly consider the subjunctive version first, example (15). By adopting the GB version of the Binding Theory, we would have to conclude that the Domain where the pronoun must be free is the lower subjunctive complement. It contains the pronoun itself, a governor (INFL) and an accessible SUBJECT, AGR. The puzzle is familiar by now: the subject pronoun meets Principle B but it can not refer freely outside its Domain: it must obviate with respect to the matrix subject.

The more interesting case is the one in (16): an infinitival complement to volitional predicate shows Obviation effects in the lower subject position. Before considering the Obviation fact we should address certain issues concerning infinitival clauses in Basque and Control.

The first immediate problem in (16) is the fact that DPs are licensed in subject position of infinitival clauses. This is a puzzle for the long tradition that holds that Infinitival clauses lack AGR, and so cannot assign case. Moreover, gaps are allowed in this environment. If we strictly follow the GB approach to the distribution of empty categories, we are faced with a contradiction: on the one hand, this empty category must be PRO, since it is ungoverned and it is not case marked. On the other, the subject position of infinitival clauses seems to be a Case position because DPs are licensed in it. This indicates that the gap in the subject position is a pro. Thus, we would have to conclude that the subject position in the infinitival clause in (16) is at the same time a case and a caseless position (Governed and Ungoverned). The two logical questions to address at this point are:

(i) Are we facing an instance were DP and PRO are not in complementary distribution?

(ii) What licenses DPs in the subject of certain infinitival clauses?

2.1. An external or extra case assigner In the Basque literature it has been noted that there is a correlation between Infinitival clauses taking structural case (Absolutive, Ergative and Dative) and the licensing of DPs in their subject positions. (Ortiz de Urbina 1989). Consider (17-19):

(17) Ni$_i$ [aitak/Ø$_{i/k}$ semea lepoan eraman-AK] poztu nau
I-A father-E son-A shoulder-Loc carry-E gladden aux
'I'm glad of carrying/somebody having carried the son on his shoulder'

(18) Guk$_i$ ez dakigu [Ø$_i$/*Jon nora joan].
We-E Neg know John where go
'We do not know (*Jon) where to go'

(19) Peruk$_i$ [*bera/*John/Ø$_i$ etxera joan] nahi du.
Peru-E he-she/John home go want aux
'Peru wants to go home'

In (17) the infinitival clause is marked with Ergative case, which is marking the function of the lower clause required by the matrix predicate. DPs are licensed in their subject positions. On the contrary, in (18) and (19) the lower clauses are not marked with any case marking and subject DPs are banned. Ortiz de Urbina (1989) argues that in cases like (17) the ability to assign case percolates down to the infinitival Inflection from the case marking on the infinitival clause. The lower Inflection is licensed as a case assigner by this process. In other words, what is being percolated from the case marking found in the infinitival clause is the power to make Infinitival Inflection a case assigner.

Basque is not the only language that allows lexical subjects in certain infinitival clauses. Ortiz de Urbina (1989) mentions that other cases in the literature describing lexical subjects in what look like 'tenseless' clauses.[3] For instance, 'inflected infinitives' in European Portuguese (Raposo 1987) can only appear in those contexts where the infinitival clause is assigned case by an external case assigner. Tenseless INFL can assign case to its subject only if it is case marked itself.

(20) A Maria entrou en casa [sem [os meninos ouvir-em]
Maria entered the house without the children to hear-AGR
'Maria entered the house without the children hearing them'

In (20) IP is assigned case by the preposition *sem* licensing Infection as a case assigner for the embedded subject *os meninos*. Reuland argues for a similar proposal for English Verbal Gerunds, like in (3) repeated here as (21) (see also Pires 2000):

(21) He_i would much prefer [him_k going to a movie]

The three set of data presented in this section (Basque infinitival clauses marked with structural case, European Portuguese 'inflected' infinitives and English verbal gerunds) all seem to display some kind of Nominal character represented in AGR, even though the clause is Tenseless. The interesting fact for present purposes is that an External case marker seems to be licensing lower Inflection as a regular case assigner. In Basque it is the structural case marking on the infinitival clause; in European Portuguese it is a preposition, a verb or a matrix Inflection. In English, according to Reuland it is the presence of AGR *–ing*.

This section addressed the first puzzle posited by structures involving Obviation in Basque, namely the appearance of lexical subjects in infinitival clauses. We have concluded that, far from being a exception, we are facing an instance of 'Inflected Infinitivals'. In Basque Inflected Infinitivals are licensed when the lower clause is itself marked with Structural Case. Although the account given by Ortiz de Urbina relies on the problematic notion of Government, we consider the descriptive generalization to be correct and we will adopt it henceforth.

[3] The parallelism between Basque nominalizations and sentences was already noted by Ortiz de Urbina (1989), Goenaga (1994), Zabala & Odriozola (1995) and Elordieta (1998). The striking similarities between Portuguese, English and Basque were noted by Ortiz de Urbina (1989), Pires (1999) and Pires & San Martin (in progress). See Reuland (1983) for a similar proposal for English *–ing* constructions.

2.2. Identification of Gaps in Infinitival clauses. In the previous subsection we concluded that the subject position in certain infinitival clauses is indeed a case position and therefore the fact that DPs appear in them ceases to be a puzzle. If we want to be consistent we would have to conclude that gaps appearing in instances like (17) are small pro-s. In principle, the fact that we find a small pro in this position in Basque should not be surprising, since it exhibits systematic pro-drop with the three main arguments in the auxiliary. However, the licensing conditions of this empty pronominal element are not met in the types of structures we are dealing with, namely infinitival clauses. Typically, it is the rich AGR in the verb that recovers the phi feature content. In Basque there is no auxiliary in infinitival clauses; the verb stands on its own, so pro should not be licensed in these structures. We could take a different approach, that of Jaeggli and Safir (1989), and say that it is not the richness of the inflectional paradigm but rather their morphological uniformity that explains the facts about pro. pro tends to occur with very rich Agreement or no Agreement at all, but not in languages with partial agreement paradigms. If we considered the fact that infinitival clauses lack AGR, then following Jaeggli and Safir we would have to conclude that pro is not licensed in Basque. This is in fact an undesirable conclusion considering the extensive literature that corroborates the existence of small pro in Basque.

There is a way to save this empty category from having its small pro status wiped out. San Martin (1999, 2000) argues that, unlike a GB approach, any current Minimalist approach to Control (Hornstein 1999, Martin 1996 and Manzini and Roussou 1998) can explain the basic facts about gaps in infinitival clause in Basque.

Specifically, Hornstein opts for a Movement approach to Control. Obligatory Control (henceforth OC) gaps are the result of the copy having moved to the matrix controller position for Case checking purposes, hence their anaphoric nature. Non Obligatory (NOC) gaps are the result of the copy not having been able to move to the relevant position because it is located within an island. Gaps in these cases are small pro, and they constitute the marked case, the costly option. All the Interpretive phenomena that OC an NOC structures display follow from this Movement approach to Control. For instance, OC gaps do not allow for split antecedents because it would imply that movement took place from/to two different positions. On the contrary, NOC allow for split antecedents, which is plausible given the assumption that there was no movement.

San Martin (1999, 2000) argues that the nature of gaps in Basque infinitival clauses can be successfully determined along the lines of Hornstein (1999). Specifically, Infinitival clauses taking structural case behave like NOC structures (they are islands, allow for split antecedents, etc.) and Infinitival clauses bearing no Case at all or a case other than structural behave like OC structures (they are not islands, etc). This correlates exactly with the conclusion in the previous section that Infinitival clauses taking structural case allow the lower Inflection to case mark the subject position. They are NOC structures. Hence, the copy already checks case in the relevant position and there is no greedy reason for further movement. Also, we would predict that gaps in this position are pro, even if it appears in a context of no visible agreement at all.

In this section we have answered the questions about the Case assignment and the identification of gaps in infinitival clauses in Basque. To recapitulate, the subject of infinitival clauses that are structurally case marked are NOC structures. In these instances, the subject gets its case through the Percolation process by an External Extra case assigner on the Infinitival clause. On the other hand, OC structures must have their lower subject position empty because they are the result of the copy having moved to the controller position. In the latter cases movement is driven for case checking purposes, since the subject of the infinitival clause is not a case position. Here is the schema of the two types of structures and what they license in Basque:[4]

(22) **OC:** DP_i....[$GAP_{i\ldots\ldots}$.....] + No case/inherent case
NOC: DP_i....[$pro_{i/k}$/$DP_{i/k}$.....] + structural Case.[5]

2.3. The problematic case: Obviation San Martin (1999, 2000) notes that the cases where Obviation arises in Basque posit problems for any Minimalist theory on Control. Consider (2) repeated here as (23):[6]

(23) Nik_i [$Ø_{*i/k}$/John joatea] nahi dut.
I.E go-Nomin-Det-A want 3.A-1.E
'I want somebody else/John to go'

[4] The generalization seems to hold except for the following predicates: on the one hand predicates 'ahaztu (forget) and 'kostatu' (have hard time in doing something). They take infinitival complements marked with Absolutive case. As such, we would expect them to allow for alternating DP and Gaps. However, they seem to be regular OC predicates, i.e, they only allow for a Controlled gap in the lower subject position.

(1) $Niri_i$ [$Ø_i$ erosketak egitea] ahaztu zait
1D shopping-pl do-Nom-Det-A forget 3A-1D
'I forgot to do the shopping'

There are two issues that are worth mentioning: first, these predicates only allow for Quirky subjects in dative case. Second, these predicates also select for complements marked with innesive case, but the meaning is different from the one stated for (1).

(2) $Niri_i$ [$Ø_i$ erosketak egite]-n ahaztu zait
1D shopping do-Nom-Inn forget 3A-1D
'I forgot how to do the shopping'

The second set of data comes from predicates that are highly aspectually marked such as 'ekin' (start in the task of), 'eutsi' (continue the task of) and 'utzi' (stop the task of). These predicates take Dative case in the infinitival clause but surprisingly enough, do not allow for lexical DPs in their subject position.

(3) Nik_i [$Ø_i$ porruak batze-ari] ekin diot.
1E leek.pl harvest-Det-D start 3A-3D-1E
' I have started harvesting the leeks'

Notice, however, that there are other three not so aspectually marked predicates in Basque that follow the generalization given above (i.e.: 'hasi' (start), 'segitu/jardun/ari' (continue), 'amaitu' (finish). The difference between the former (the aspectually marked predicates) and this group seems to be merely aspectual as the corresponding translations indicate, but it is hard to determine the exact difference. Also, the subject in the matrix clause is in Quirky dative case in instances like (3). I suspect this last issue might be related to the fact that that they fall out of the generalization proposed.

[5] Note that structural case is directly related to the appearance of a determiner, which indicates that the maximal projection of these structures is ultimately a DP (Odriozola & Zabala 1995).

[6] The Obviation facts are not attested in all Basque dialects, but speakers of some Gipuzkoan dialects get Obviation effects in this environment.

Following the reasoning displayed in the previous section, let us raise the following observations: The infinitival clause is structurally case marked and hence we expect that it is a NOC structure in two relevant senses:

(i) It is an island for extraction

(ii) The lower subject position is a case position.

(ii) sounds plausible enough, since we find alternating DP/gaps in this position. We expect the gap in (23) to be pro, the consequence of the copy not having moved. However, the puzzle of these structures lies in the fact that, surprisingly enough, they do not constitute islands of any kind. Consider (24-26):

(24) Zer nahi dut nik [Mariak ___ jate]-A?
What want aux 1.s.E Mary-E eat-Nom-Det-A?
'What do I want for Mary to eat?'

(25) Nor nahi dut nik [__ joate]-A?
Who-A want aux 1.s.E go-Nom-Det-A?
'Who do I want that goes'

(26) Zer nahi dut nik_i [$Ø_k$ ___ erostea]?
What want 3A-1E 1.s.E buy-Nom-Det-A
'What do I want (for somebody else) to buy?'

(24-26) exemplify extractions of object and subject. This, we will point out, is an important observation about Basque Obviation that will shed some light on the general phenomenon of Obviation.

3. Problems revisited and Observations

3.1. Problems Revisited. This section brings together and discusses the various problems about Obviation structures that have been raised above.

All problems remain unexplained except for the licensing of lexical DPs in subject position of certain Basque infinitival clauses. Infinitival clauses in Basque and clausal gerunds in English allow for DP subjects. In section 3 we argued that, parallel to European Portuguese, there is a case assigner external to the infinitival which licenses DPs in Infinitival clauses, namely Structural case marking on the Infinitival clause. (See Pires 1999 for a proposal for Clausal gerunds).

First, we concluded that Obviation structures look like NOC structures. As such, we would expect them to behave like islands in not allowing extractions out of them. However, facts seem to show quite the opposite (as in 24 to 26 above). This unexpected behavior needs explaining, and it will be crucial for our proposal in the next section.

Second, some Romance languages (Rumanian, Salentino) do not display Obviation effects in the same environments as their relative Romance languages. Any theory about Obviation should also explain this typological distinction.

Third, sometimes DPs and PRO do not seem to be in Complementary Distribution. English gerunds as in (27-28)) seem to be offering the clearest case:

(27) (a) He_i would much prefer [$Ø_i$ going to a movie]
(b) He_i would much prefer [him_k going to a movie]

(28) (a) [$Ø_i$ leaving early] bothered $John_i$
(b) [Him_k leaving early] bothered $John_i$

The generalization about these structures is that where there is a gap, it must be controlled with the matrix subject (OC). Instead a DP in that position must obviate with respect to the matrix subject (OBV). The problem from an LGB viewpoint is clear: how could DP and OC PRO-s be licensed in the same position?

3.2. Observations This section introduces further observations about Obviation cases that will ultimately converge on our proposal in section 5.

One key observation about predicates/structures displaying Obviation is that all predicates that take structures in which Obviation arises (30) also take OC complements (29).

(29) $[DP_i \ldots\ldots [Ø_{i/*k} \ldots\ldots\ldots]$

(30) $[\ DP_i \ldots\ldots [\ DP_{*i/k} \ldots\ldots\ldots]$

This is clearly the case for English gerunds, which presumably uses exactly the same structure in both instances, as in (27a-b) and (28a-b) above. It also applies to Spanish and French, which use infinitival complements for OC and subjunctive complements to display Obviation effects. Basque also uses infinitival complements in OC and either subjunctive or inflected infinitivals for Obviation.

Recall that the Avoid Pronoun Principle did not provide us with an answer to the puzzle of Obviation for English gerunds. However, when discussing these instances in *LGB*, Chomsky already noted some very intriguing aspects: specifically he notices that "where PRO may appear the Overt Pronoun is taken as Disjoint in reference". This is precisely the observation we are focussing on here.

The second interesting fact about structures displaying obviative subjects in Basque is that they involve an extra case marking that allows DPs to appear in otherwise exotic environments (infinitival clauses). DPs get case by virtue of the infinitival clause being structurally case marked. Unlike OC structures, the Obviative structures involve case marked complements. In English clausal gerunds, for instance, it is not at all clear how the DPs in the subjects position gets case. In (27b) or (28b) there is no obvious case assignor from outside (see Pires 2000 for a proposal). Let us assume Reuland's idea that *–ing* is licensed as a case assignor. This leads us to the next interesting generalization: in Obviative structures subjects are licensed internally by virtue of having some extra case assignor in Basque and English gerunds. In Romance languages it is the regular agreeing inflection in subjunctive clauses that licenses subjects.

In short, the contrast between sentences displaying OC and Obviation appears to be the following: OC involves complements where elements are not licensed internally. Let us call them the unmarked complements (in terms of Case). Obviation involves complements that are capable of licensing elements internally and involve some extra morphological weight (either in the shape of subjunctive finite inflection

or inflection in infinitival clauses yielding inflected infinitival clauses). Let us call them the Case Marked instances.

In this sense we could view Subjunctive complements to volitional predicates as the case marked counterparts to the OC structures, which involve a bare infinitival complement. The overt morphological material in Basque most clearly exemplifies this point, where Obviation arises in both subjunctive (31) and Inflected infinitival complements (32). The same way as (32) in Basque can be viewed as the counterpart to the Subjunctive version (31), the Romance subjunctive complement in (33) can be viewed as counterpart to the Basque inflected infinitival (32). They all constitute the case marked options where elements are licensed internally. In short, we find a dichotomy between OC (bare infinitivals) and Obviation (case marked counterparts).

(31) Hark_i [$\text{pro}_{*i/k}$ /$\text{hura}_{*i/k}$ joan dadin] nahi du.
3.s.E 3.s.A go aux-Subj want aux
'He/she$_i$ wants him/her$_k$ to go go'

(32) Hark_i [$\text{pro}_{*i/k}$ /$\text{hura}_{*i/k}$ joatea] nahi du.
3.s.E 3.s.A go-Nomin-Det-A want aux
'He/she$_i$ wants him/her$_k$ to go'

(33) El_i quiere que [el/$\text{pro}_{*i/k}$ vaya de vacaciones]
He wants that he go-Subj on holiday
'He wants him to go on holiday'

At this point we have two sets of things. On the one hand we have a number of problems that need to be solved and on the other a bunch of observations. Both sets will lead us to the next section: the proposal.

4. Obviation: the proposal

In this section we will argue that all observations addressed so far lead us to propose that Obviation is best accounted for within an extension of the theory of Control as movement as proposed by Hornstein. Specifically, we will argue that Obviation is a logical consequence of violating 'Move First'.

Hornstein proposes to eliminate the Control Module, the PRO-Theorem and the Biding Theory and to reduce them to the more general theory of Movement. The interpretive and distributional parallelisms between OC and Local Anaphora and between NOC and Pronouns suggest that they should be handled by the same mechanism. Consider briefly Hornstein's theory of Control and Binding as Movement. He argues that a distinction must be made between gaps appearing in OC and NOC structures. OC gaps are the result of having moved to the matrix controller position. Movement takes place for greedy purposes, such as case checking. NOC gaps are found in islands from which movement is prohibited. Local Anaphors in a sentence like *John loves himself* are the result of moving *John* successively to the [Spec, TP] to check Nominative case by checking the internal and external theta roles. With respect to Anaphors, morpheme *self* is not part of the array and it is only introduced in the derivation to save *John* from checking two cases. It checks Accusative Case at LF. In this sense, bound pronouns only arise when Movement is not an option. In

other words, the fact that *John$_i$ loves him$_i$* does not converge is because a more economical derivation converges by movement, namely *John$_i$ loves himself$_i$*. We expect OC and Bound pronouns to be in complementary distribution, because of a postulated preference for Move to establish anaphoric relations (Move First) when possible. This prevents bound Pronouns where Movement is possible.

It was noted above that in Basque, Inflected infinitival clauses do not induce island effects, exactly like the OC cases. In other words, movement was an option, but, contrary to the OC cases, did not take place. Had it taken place we would have found a gap that is coreferential to the matrix subject instead of an obviative DP/pro subject. Furthermore, the similarity between OC and Obviation structures is beyond coincidence: all predicates that display Obviation effects also allow for constructions involving OC.

Recall that the possibility of Moving or not is determined by whether the structure at hand was an OC or a NOC structure. Since both OC and Obvation structures allow for movement, we could argue that OC and Obviation structures are the same in this sense.

The proposal is the following: Obviation is a logical consequence of violating Move First where Movement is possible, i.e. attempting to establish an anaphoric relation without Movement. Put it in other words: violation of Move First allows for the insertion of a pronoun with the cost that it has to obviate.

To implement this economy approach to Obviation requires certain technical assumptions. If we assume that arrays do not contain morphological material, derivations that are morphologically distinct will compete. OC (the non case marked) and Obviative structures (the heavily case marked) will compete, because they form part of the same comparison class for purposes of evaluating derivational economy. In an economy framework which favors derivations exploiting Move to those requiring Construal we could argue that Obviative structures violate Move First. Failure to Move where it could have yields an anti-control effect.

Let us illustrate this with the Basque instances. (34) is a construction involving OC and (35) one displaying Obviation effects in the 'inflected infinitival' version.

(34) Nik$_i$ [$\emptyset_{i/*k}$/*John joan] nahi dut.
I.E go want 3.A-.3.E
'I want to go'

(35) Nik$_i$ [$\emptyset_{*i/k}$/hura$_{*i/k}$ joatea] nahi dut.
I.E 3.A go-Nomin-Det-A want 3.A-1.E
'I want somebody else to go'

Since no morphological material is included in the array, the array for both sentences is identical, the one given in (36).

(36) NUM={ni$_1$, joan$_1$, nahi$_1$}

(37) and (38) are the derivation for the two sentences: lower clauses are not islands and therefore, by obeying Move First we derive the OC sentence in (37). (38) represents the derivation for the Obviation case.

(37) **OC:**

(EPP,Erg)	θ				EPP	θ	
[nik_i	[ni	[nahi	[nahi		[ni	[ni	joan]]]]]]]]]
TP1	*vP*	*v'*	*VP*	***TP2***	*VP*		
				<def+ Not island>			

(38) **OBV:**

(EPP,Erg)	θ				EPP	θ	
[nik_i	[ni	[nahi	[nahi		[pro_K	[pro	joan]]]]]]]]]
TP1	*vP*	*v'*	*VP*	***TP2***	*VP*		
<def+ Not island>							

We argued that the Subjunctive version displaying obviation effects is equivalent to the inflected infinitival in the sense that they both represent the heavily case marked options. Thus, for these cases we would have the same numeration as in (36) and the same derivation as in (38).

The following logical question arises: where does the extra morphological material come from in the Obviation cases? After the competition of derivations takes place (recall that this morphological material does not count in assessing comparison classes for purposes of derivational economy) the grammar adds as much morphological material as needed. In the subjunctive instances (Basque, Spanish and French) it is the subjunctive finite agreement. In the case of inflected infinitivals in Basque it is the Structural case marking on the infinitival, which, we argued, was precisely the licenser of lexical DPs in their subject position. The idea is that comparison of structures is independent of their feature specification. This is precisely the intuition behind the existence of anaphors as presented above, where the bound morpheme *self* is added in order to save the derivation from crashing. Notice that it is not costly to have extra morphological material added if this helps prevent derivations from crashing.

This proposal can be easily extended to English clausal gerunds. Although these structures show the same surface form in both OC and Obviation instances, one would still have to account for the fact that pronouns are licensed in Obviative structures. This suggests that the characterization that we held so far between OC as non case marked and Obviative structures as heavily case marked environments is plausible, even if it is not visible in the morphology of English.

In this section we laid out the proposal that Obviation and OC structures are tightly related. They are the two sides of the same coin: where movement was possible OC obeys Move First and Obviation does not. The next section presents some interesting evidence in favor of this proposal.

5. Predictions: synchrony/diachrony

The proposal that has been laid out in section 4 makes various predictions. First, we expect deictic and bound pronouns to behave differently. Unlike bound pronouns, deictic pronouns are part of the Numeration. Bound pronouns are inserted in order to prevent the derivation from crashing when Movement did not take place. The subjects that results from violating Move First (obviative subjects) are of this sort. However, we expect deictic pronouns to behave differently because they are part of the

Numeration. The fact that they are part of the Numeration makes the derivation they are part of non competitive with the derivations that will result in OC. For this reason we expect to find no Obviation in these instances, as example (39) shows in Basque.

(39) Hark$_i$ [bera$_i$ joatea] nahi du
3.s.E 3.s.A go-Nom-Det-A want aux (3.A-3.E)
'He wants himself to go'

Second, since the competition between derivations is the key ingredient for Obviation to emerge, then it is a necessary condition that Control structures be convergent too. In other words, all predicates that display Obviation must also allow for OC structures. This prediction is born out for all the cases we have considered: English Gerunds, Basque Infinitival/subjunctive complements to volitional predicates and most Romance complements to volitional predicates.

English: (gerunds)

(40) (a) He$_i$ would much prefer [Ø$_i$ going to a movie]
(b) He$_i$ would much prefer [him$_k$ going to a movie]

(41) (a) [Ø$_i$ leaving early] bothered John$_i$
(b) [Him$_k$ leaving early] bothered John$_i$

Basque

(42) (a) Nik$_i$ [Ø$_{i/*k}$/*John joan] nahi dut.
1.E go want 3.A-1.E
'I want to go'
(b) Nik$_i$ [Ø$_{*i/k}$/John joatea] nahi dut.
1.E go-Nomin-Det-A want 3.A-1.E
'I want somebody else to go'

Spanish

(43) (a) El$_i$ quiere [Ø$_{i/*k}$ ir de vacaciones al monte]
He wants go on holiday to-the mountain
'He wants to go on holiday to the mountain'
(b) El$_i$ quiere que [el/pro$_{*i/k}$ vaya de vacaciones]
He wants that he go-Subj on holiday
'He wants him to go on holiday'

French

(44) (a) Il$_i$ veut [Ø$_i$ aller au cinéma]
He wants go to the cinema
'He wants to go to the cinema'
(b) Il$_i$ veut [qu'il$_{*i/k}$ aille au cinéma]
He wants that he go-Subj to the cinema
'He wants him to got he cinema'

Third, as OC structures always come in the shape of Infinitival clauses, we expect that languages that do not have Infinitival clause should not display Obviation effects. Synchronically this prediction is born out by the following languages: Romanian, Salentino and Modern Greek.

Rumanian

(45) Maria$_i$ vrea [ea$_{i/k}$/Ø$_{i/k}$ _a ramina]
Maria wants sheq Subj stay
'Maria wants to stay/somebody else to stay'

Salentino

(46) Lu Karlu$_i$ ole ku [Ø$_{i/k}$ bbene krai]
The Karlu wants Subj comes(3.sg) tomorrow
'Karlu wants to come / that somebody else comes'

Fourth, we also expect that, within a particular language, predicates that allow for both infinitival and subjunctive complements, the subjunctive (case marked) option should always Obviate with respect to the matrix subject position. This is born out by the predicate 'querer' (want) as in (47-48) and 'preferir' (prefer) as in (49-50) in Spanish. With predicates that only allow for subjunctive complements 'dudar' (doubt) no competition arises and the pronoun in the lower clause is free to refer, as in (52) below:

(47) El$_i$ quiere pro$_i$ ir
He wants pro to go
'He wants to go'

(48) El$_i$ quiere que pro$_k$ vaya
He$_i$ wants that pro go-subjun
'He$_i$ wants that he$_k$/she goes'

(49) El$_i$ prefiere pro$_i$ ir
He prefers pro to go
'He prefers to go'

(50) El$_i$ prefiere que pro$_k$ vaya
He prefers that pro go-subjunct
'He$_i$ prefers him$_k$/her to go'

(50) *El duda pro ir
He doubt pro to go
'He doubts to go'

(51) El$_i$ duda pro$_{i/k}$ que vaya
He doubts pro that go-subjunc
'He$_i$ doubts that he$_{i/k}$ will go'

Finally, there is some interesting diachronic data that supports the hypothesis pursued in this paper. It is a well-known fact that Modern French Displays Obviation effects as most Romance languages do. However, this was not always the case. In Old French no Obviation existed. Most interestingly, Old French did not have infinitival clauses either (of the OC type, we presume). It is only in the Middle French period when Infinitival clauses came into existence together with the emergence of Obviation effects (Arteaga 1990), suggesting that that the existence of OC is a necessary condition for Obviation to arise.

6. Conclusion

In this paper we have argued that Obviation is a phenomenon tightly related to Control. It is the anti-Control effect that results from violating Move First. As early as Lectures of Government and Binding Theory, Chomsky had already noted that

'where PRO may appear, the overt pronoun is taken as distinct in reference'. We have attempted to implement this insight within an economy framework which favors derivations exploiting Move to those requiring Construal.

References

Arteaga, D., 1990, *The Disjoint Reference Requirement in Subjunctive clauses: Diachronic evidence from Romance*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Washington.

___, 1991, «Old French and the Disjointness Reference Requirement». Paper presented at the *Twenty-first Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Bouchard, D., 1982, *On the Content of Empty categories*. Dordrecht, Foris.

Calabrese, A., 1989, «The lack of infinitival clauses in Salentino: A synchronic analysis». Paper presented at the *19th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Linguistics*, Ohio State University.

Chomsky, N., 1981, *Lectures in Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Foris.

___, 1995, *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Eguzkitza, A., 1986, *Topics in the Syntax of Basque and Romance*. Indiana University Club, Bloomington, IN.

Everaert, M., 1986, «Long Reflexivization and Obviation in Romance Languages». In *Formal Parameters of Generative Grammar II*: Going Romance, ed. By Peter Coopman, et al.

Finer, D., 1984, *The Formal Grammar of Switch Reference*. PhD Thesis, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Franco, J., 1993, *On Object Agreement in Spanish*, PhD Thesis, USC.

Goenaga, F., 1984, *Euskal Sintaxia. Konplementazioa eta Nominalizazioa*. PhD Thesis, Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea

Hale, K., and S. J. Keyser, 1993a, «On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations». In Hale and Keyser, 1993b.

___ and ___, eds., 1993b, *The view from Building 20*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

Hornstein, N., 1997, «Control in GB and Minimalism», *Glot* 2.8, 3-7.

___, 1999, «Movement and Control», *LI* 30.1, 69-96.

Jaeggli, O. and K. Safir, 1989, «The Null Subject Parameter and Parametric theory». In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.) *Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Jakubowicz, C., 1984, «Do Binding Principles apply to INFL?», *NELS* 15.

Kempchinsky, P., 1987, «The Subjunctive Disjoint Reference Effect». In Neidle, C. and Nuñez-Cedeño, R. *Studies in Romance Languages*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Manzini, M. R. and A. Roussou, 1998, «A Minimalist Theory of A-Movement and Control». Firenze/UCL-Bangor.

Martin, R., 1996, «A Minimalist Theory of PRO and Control». MA. University of Connecticut.

Ormazabal, J., 1995, *The syntax of complementation: On the connection between syntactic structure and selection*. Doctoral Dissertation, Storrs, University of Connecticut.

Ortiz de Urbina, J., 1989, *Some Parameters in the grammar of Basque*, PhD, Foris: Dotrecht.

Picallo, C., 1985, *Opaque Domains*. Doctoral Dissertation, CUNY.

Pires, A., 1999a, «Infinitives, Control and Binding in Portuguese». Paper presented in the *Student Conference in Linguistics*, Univ. of Maryland, College Park.

___, 1999b, «A Minimalist Approach to Clausal Gerunds». Doctoral research Paper. University of Maryland.

Raposo, E., 1987, «Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: the Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese», *LI* 18.

Reuland, E., 1983, «Governing *-ing*», *LI* 14, 101-136.

San Martin, I., 2000a, «Control in Basque». *Proceedings to West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, XIX*. Cascadilla Press.

___, 2000b, «The Control Basis of Obviation». *Upenn Working Papers in Ling*uistics. University of Pennsylvania.

Stowell, T., 1982, «The Tense in infinitives», *LI* 13, 561-70.

Suñer, M. and J. Padilla-Rivera, 1985, «On Obviation and Subjunctive clauses», *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 7, 196-207.

Uriagereka, J., 1995, «An F position in Western Romance». *In Discourse Configurational Languages*. K. Kiss (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press.

___, Forthcomming , «Formal and Substantive Elegance in the Minimalist Program». In *The role of Economy Principles in Linguistic theory*, edited by C. Wilder, H. M. Gärtner, and M. Bierwish. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Zabala, I. and J. C. Odriozola, 1995, «On the Relation between DP and TP in Basque infinitival clauses»; ms. EHU-UPV, Leioa.