

Obviating the Disjoint Reference Effect in French

Laurence B-Violette*

1 Introduction

In Western Romance as in English, control predicates embed complement clauses in the infinitive mood, as in (1a) and (2a). Certain control predicates (e.g. desideratives, directives) may also take complements in the subjunctive mood;¹ however, the coreference restriction known as “obviation” or the “subjunctive disjoint reference effect” (Farkas 1992) prevents an argument of a control predicate from corefering with the subject of its complement clause when that complement clause is in the subjunctive mood. This coreference restriction mainly arises between two subjects (see (1b)), but in French, it may also occur between a matrix object and an embedded subject, as in (2b) (B-Violette to appear). Henceforth, I will refer to the former phenomenon as “subject-subject obviation” (SSO), and the latter as “object-subject obviation” (OSO), following Costantini (2009).

- (1) a. Édouard veut sortir avec ses amis ce soir.
Édouard wants go out.INF with his friends this evening
‘Édouard wants to go out with his friends this evening.’
b. Édouard_i veut qu’ il_{*i/j} sorte avec ses amis ce soir.
Édouard wants that he go out.SBJV with his friends this evening
Lit. ‘Édouard wants that he go out with his friends this evening.’
- (2) a. Ton père t’ a demandé de ranger ta chambre.
your father you.SG.CL AUX asked to tidy up.INF your.SG room
‘Your father asked you to tidy up your room.’
b. * Ton père t’ a demandé que tu ranges ta chambre.
your father you.SG.CL AUX asked that you.SG tidy up.SBJV your.SG room
Lit. ‘Your father asked you that you tidy up your room.’

Previous accounts of obviation have been used to explain different datasets. For example, in B-Violette (to appear), I employ an antilogophoricity effect, triggered by certain properties of the subjunctive mood and dative clitics, to obviate OSO, but do not attempt to account for SSO. The purpose of this paper is to build on this previous account to determine whether it may be used to explain the global phenomenon of the subjunctive disjoint reference effect. Therefore, I argue that obviation is best accounted for by competition theories and that SSO in directive constructions is not a real instance of obviation since the subject of an embedded infinitive clause, like the subject of a subjunctive clause, can be disjoint in reference from the superordinate subject.

*I would like to thank my advisor, Isabelle Charnavel, who has provided me with endless guidance and support. Sincere thanks to Gennaro Chierchia for sharing his insight and his time with me. Additional thanks to Philippe Schlenker, my fellow graduate students at Harvard, and my Québec French and European French informants. All errors and misrepresentations are my own. Standard abbreviations are used in the glosses: 3: third-person, ACC: accusative, AUX: auxiliary, CL: clitic, DAT: dative, FUT: future, IND: indicative, INF: infinitive, PASS: passive, REFL: reflexive, SG: singular, SBJV: subjunctive.

¹Not all control predicates are able to take the subjunctive, however. Verbs like *essayer* ‘try’ can only take the infinitive.

- (i) Jean essaie de dessiner / *qu’ il_{i/j} dessine un chat.
Jean tries to draw.INF / that he draw.SBJV a cat

Other verbs, like *espérer* ‘hope,’ can take the infinitive or the indicative, but not the subjunctive.

- (ii) Maxine_i espère devenir / qu’ elle_{i/j} deviendra / *qu’ elle_{i/j} devienne vétérinaire.
Maxine hopes become.INF / that she become.FUT.IND / that she become.SBJV veterinarian
‘Maxine hopes to become / that she will become / *that she become a veterinarian.’

2 Background

In this section, I present data on French obviation in argument clauses and I review previous accounts that strive to account for this data. I conclude that the competition theories can best explain obviation, although they cannot account for the NP-clitic asymmetry.

2.1 The Data

In French, those control verbs that may select either an infinitive or a subjunctive clause include desiderative predicates (e.g. ‘want,’ as in (1)), emotive-factives (e.g. ‘regret’), directives (e.g. ‘ask,’ as in (2)), and some impersonal verbs such as *il faut* ‘it is necessary.’² These verbs select the infinitive to express coreference, as in (3a). However, the subjunctive can normally only express disjoint reference; as in (3b), where the subject of the embedded clause does not refer to the same entity as the subject of the control predicate. In the complements to desideratives and emotive-factives, obviation may be weakened or even completely obviated in certain circumstances. One such example (from Schlenker 2005) is presented in Section 2.2.³

- (3) a. Jean_i veut PRO_i manger des gaufres ce matin.
 Jean wants eat.INF waffles this morning
 ‘Jean wants to eat waffles this morning.’
 b. Marie veut que son mari mange plus de fruits et de légumes.
 Marie wants her husband to eat more of fruits and of vegetables
 ‘Marie wants her husband to eat more fruits and vegetables.’

With the exception of impersonal verbs, all control predicates that exhibit the subjunctive disjoint reference effect also exhibit SSO; conversely, only a portion of those verbs (seem to) really exhibit OSO (i.e. directive predicates taking dative clitic objects). In addition, in B-Violette (to appear), I observe that, depending on the nature of the superordinate object, OSO may be obviated. Specifically, when the object of the directive is a dative clitic pronoun, OSO is observed as expected, but when the object is a full DP, coreference is perfectly acceptable, as shown in (4).

- (4) a. Tom_i lui_j a demandé qu’ il_{*i/??j} s’assoie.
 Tom him.dat.cl AUX asked that he sit.SBJV
 ‘Tom asked him to sit down.’
 b. Tom_i a demandé à Arthur_j qu’ il_{*i/j} s’assoie.
 Tom AUX asked to Arthur that he sit.SBJV
 ‘Tom asked Arthur to sit down.’

Other directives that take an accusative clitic pronoun as their object (e.g. *implorer* ‘implore,’ *persuader* ‘persuade’) do not exhibit this asymmetry, which I will henceforth refer to as the “NP-clitic asymmetry.” We will see in Section 3.1 that this asymmetry can be accounted for via an

²The subjunctive disjoint reference effect also occurs in purpose clauses (e.g. those introduced by *afin que*), and other adjunct clauses introduced by *avant que* ‘before that’, which seem to also express purpose. The examples below show that, like subjunctive argument clauses, subjunctive adjunct clauses only express disjoint reference, while infinitive adjunct clauses must express coreference.

- (i) a. Karine_i est allée dans une pâtisserie afin PRO_i d’ acheter un gâteau.
 Karine AUX gone in a bakery so to buy.INF a cake
 ‘Karine went to the bakery to buy a cake.’
 b. *Karine_i est allée dans une pâtisserie afin qu’ elle_i achète un gâteau.
 Karine AUX gone in a bakery so that she buy.SBJV a cake
 ‘Karine went to the bakery so that she may buy a cake.’

³Note, however, that I will not adopt the criteria for the weakening of obviation presented in Ruwet (1984) and Costantini (2009), since my informants and myself do not agree with most of the examples of weakening offered in these two works.

antilogophoricity effect, created by the properties of dative clitics and subjunctive clauses embedded under directive predicates.

Native speakers expect to be able to embed subjunctive clauses under a wide range of control predicates. Yet, some control predicates that always exhibit obviation in their subjunctive complement clauses may not even be allowed to embed the subjunctive mood. For instance, all directives taking an accusative clitic pronoun as their object do not even allow embedded subjunctive clauses expressing reference to a third party (i.e. an argument that has not been previously introduced in the superordinate clause), as shown below. Therefore, we may conclude that such verbs cannot take a subjunctive complement clause, and thus will not be involved in obviation.

- (5) *Élisabeth a persuadé Arthur que Tom parte.
 Elisabeth AUX persuaded Arthur that Tom leave.SBJV
 Intended: ‘Elisabeth persuaded Arthur to make it so that Tom would leave.’

Only permissives that take a dative clitic object consistently show obviation—no matter the nature of their object—and these verbs also allow reference to a third party.⁴

- (6) a. *Le médecin a permis à Jean_i qu’ il_i se déplace dans l’ hôpital.
 the doctor AUX permitted to Jean that he REFL move.SBJV in the hospital
 ‘The doctor allowed Jean to walk in the hospital.’
 b. On a permis à Jean que ses parents lui rendent visite.
 one AUX permitted to Jean that his parents him.DAT.CL visit.SBJV
 ‘Someone allowed Jean for his parents to visit him.’

Finally, directive predicates that take a dative object may have an impersonal subject if they are “passivized.”

- (7) Il lui a été permis de partir.
 it 3.SG.DAT.CL AUX PASS.AUX permitted to leave.INF
 ‘It was permitted to him to leave.’

⁴Another set of candidates for involvement in OSO is the impersonal verbs. These verbs behave similarly to permissives in that they always show obviation: no coreference between the superordinate object and the subordinate subject is possible, whether the superordinate object is a dative clitic or a full DP. Not even disjoint reference is permitted, as (ib) shows. Therefore, an impersonal verb may only take a subjunctive complement clause if the superordinate clause does not contain an object.

- (i) a. Il lui faut partir.
 it 3.SG.DAT.CL is necessary leave.INF
 ‘It is necessary for him/her to leave.’
 b. Il (*lui_i) faut qu’ il_{i/j} parte.
 it (him.DAT.CL) is necessary that he leave.SBJV
 Lit. ‘It is necessary (*for him) that he leave.’
 c. Il faut (*à Arthur_i) qu’ il_{i/j} parte.
 it is necessary (to Arthur) that he leave.SBJV
 Lit. ‘It is necessary (*for Arthur) that he leave.’

With all impersonals, however, it is unacceptable to have both a superordinate object and an embedded clause in the subjunctive, even if the subject is a third party (see (ib), (ii) and (iii), below). Therefore, I assume the coreference restriction found with these impersonals is not the subjunctive disjoint reference effect *per se*.

- (ii) Il (*lui_i) suffit, à Marie_i, que Jean s’excuse.
 it (her.DAT.CL) suffice, to Marie, that Jean apologize.SBJV
 ‘It suffices for her that Jean apologize.’
 (iii) Il (*lui) arrive que sa femme rentre du travail à minuit.
 it (him.DAT.CL) happen that his wife comes back from work at midnight
 ‘It happens (*to him) that his wife comes home from work at midnight.’

In that case, however, the status of the superordinate object as a full DP or a dative clitic does not affect the acceptability of the sentence. Passivized directives always show obviation.

- (8) * Il a été demandé à Jean_i qu’ il_i parte.
 it AUX PASS.AUX asked to Jean that he leave.SBJV
 ‘It was asked of him that he leave.’

We will see in Section 3.1 that data on impersonal passives can be accounted for by evoking the expressive nature of the subjunctive. Below is a summary of the properties of certain control predicates with respect to obviation. Table 1 lists the types of obviation corresponding to each verb type and indicates whether obviation may be weakened or even completely obviated.

Control predicate	Type of obviation	Weakening
Desideratives	SSO	yes (see Section 2.2)
Emotive-factives	SSO	yes (see Section 2.2)
All directives	not really SSO (see Section 3.2)	no
with accusative objects	not really OSO	no
permissives	OSO	no
other verbs with dative objects	OSO	yes: NP-clitic asymmetry

Table 1: Control predicates and the type of obviation they exhibit.

From this subsection, we must note the not-so-trivial information that obviation only occurs in the embedded clauses of attitude verbs that can select either an infinitive or a subjunctive complement clause. Below, I review previous accounts of the subjunctive disjoint reference effect that strive to account for some of the data just presented.

2.2 Previous Accounts

Previous accounts of obviation are divided into two main approaches: binding-theoretical approaches and “competition” theories. However, none of the proposals advanced in either approach is able to account for all examples of obviation (i.e. SSO and OSO), particularly the NP-clitic asymmetry. The binding-theoretical approach proposes a property particular to embedded subjunctive clauses: the extension of the binding domain of its subject to encompass both the subordinate and the superordinate clause. This proposal is based on the observation that subjunctive clauses are “special” in Italian and Icelandic (for example), because they allow long-distance anaphora (LDA). LDA only occurs in subjunctive clauses in those languages (cf. Manzini 2000). Because the subjunctive mood causes the extension of the binding domain of anaphors and pronouns, Binding Condition A is not violated in the case of LDA, but the violation of Binding Condition B results in obviation. Given this distribution, how can we account for a language like French, which does not allow LDA, especially in subjunctive clauses, but does exhibit obviation? Aside from causing such problems, the binding-theoretical approach does not provide an explanation for why OSO may occur between a superordinate dative clitic object and the subject of a subordinate subjunctive, but not between a superordinate DP object and its subordinate subject.

The “competition”-type theories understand the subjunctive disjoint reference effect to result from the impossibility of the subjunctive to convey the same meaning as the infinitive; i.e., basically coreference. The crucial difference between the binding-theoretical approach and the competition theories is that the latter can evoke properties of the infinitive and subjunctive moods to account for cases where obviation is weakened or completely obviated. According to Farkas (1992), the infinitive proposition must be in a “responsibility relation” (RESP relation) with its controller—and with PRO, since they are coreferential. In other words, the controller is responsible for bringing about the action expressed by the proposition. Therefore, as the degree of agentivity or responsibility decreases—through the addition of a modal, like *puisse* ‘can’ in (9)—, obviation is weakened: the infinitive is used to express a higher degree of responsibility, while the subjunctive is used otherwise. Farkas can thus account for the examples discussed in Ruwet (1984), where obviation is weakened:

- (9) Je veux que je puisse partir dès demain.
 I want that I can.SBJV leave.INF as soon as tomorrow
 'I want to be able to leave tomorrow.' (Ruwet 1984:94)

Schlenker (2005) accounts for those same examples, as well as additional ones, by arguing that the subjunctive may be used when the event in question is non-*de se*—, whereas infinitive clauses must be *de se*. In (10a), for example, the event expressed by the subjunctive is non-*de se*; therefore it does not reflect the reality of Jean's leaving last, but rather the possibility that he might. In (10b), by contrast, the event expressed by the infinitive is *de se*: Jean agrees to the fact that he really will leave last.⁵ This explanation echoes Farkas' (1992) notion that (non-)RESP differentiates the subjunctive and the infinitive moods.⁶

- (10) [Talking about cyclists]⁷ (Schlenker 2005:293)
- a. Jean_i accepte qu' il_i parte en dernier.
 Jean accepts that he leave.SBJV last
- b. Jean_i accepte PRO_i de partir en dernier.
 Jean accepts PRO to leave.INF last

Nevertheless, competition theories sketched out here fail where the binding-theoretical approach failed: they cannot account for the NP-clitic asymmetry. If the subjunctive mood is to be used whenever the infinitive mood cannot, why can either mood be used when the object of the directive predicate is not a clitic, as in the example below?

- (11) a. Pierre a demandé à son fils de tondre le gazon.
 Pierre AUX asked to his son to mow.INF the lawn
 'Pierre asked his son to mow the lawn.'
- b. Pierre a demandé à son fils_i qu' il_i tonde le gazon.
 Pierre AUX asked to his son that he mow.SBJV the lawn
 Lit. 'Pierre asked his son that he mow the lawn.'

In this subsection, I outlined several previous accounts of the subjunctive disjoint reference effect, which mostly deal with SSO. Among the two main types of approaches, i.e. the binding-theoretical approaches and the competition theories, the latter offer wider empirical coverage, in

⁵Schlenker (2005) provides one example with a ditransitive control predicate, reproduced below. Note that I do not share the judgement for (ia).

- (i) a. J' ai forcé Jean à ce qu' il m' ouvre.
 I AUX forced Jean to it that he me.CL open.SBJV
 'I forced Jean so that he opened [the door] for me.'
- b. J' ai forcé Jean à m' ouvrir.
 I AUX forced Jean to me.CL open.INF
 'I forced Jean to open [the door] for me.'

The interpretation for (ib) is that the speaker applied physical pressure to either the door or to Jean in order for the event of the embedded proposition to occur. In (ia), the speaker indirectly caused the door to open by issuing threats, for example. Here again, Schlenker illustrates that the embedded subjunctive clause must be non-event *de se*. However, the fact that the complementizer introducing the subjunctive in (ia) is *à ce que* and not the usual *que* may contribute to this particular non-event *de se* interpretation.

⁶Ruwet (1984) accounts for obviation and its weakening in a similar way. He argues that there exists an iconic relation between the surface structure and the content of a sentence. Therefore, a relation of "self-to-self" between the subject of a control verb and the subject of its embedded clause is represented through an infinitive proposition, whereas a relation of "self-to-other" is represented through the subjunctive (where the embedded subject is overt, thus being a second, "another" subject). Costantini (2009) also argues that *de se* is crucial in determining when the subjunctive may be used to express coreference. Depending on whether the subjunctive morphology appears on a lexical verb or on an auxiliary or modal, a *de se* interpretation may obtain. Unfortunately, this latter account does not make the right predictions for cases where obviation is weakened and obviated; my French and Italian informants do not agree with all the judgments that follow from this proposal.

⁷Note that the majority of my informants report that they understand, but would never utter, (10a).

that they are able to explain some cases where obviation is weakened and to predict that obviation only occurs with verbs that can also take an infinitive complement clause. In the next section, I will introduce my own approach to obviation and show how it successfully explains some additional data, unaccounted for in the accounts presented so far.

3 Proposal

In this section, I summarize my own account of the NP-clitic asymmetry and OSO, developed further in B-Violette (to appear). I provide additional specifications pertaining to this analysis as well as evidence that directive constructions do not display real SSO.

3.1 Obviating Obviation in French Ditransitive Clauses

In B-Violette (to appear), I account for the NP-clitic asymmetry via an antilogophoricity effect. First, I observe that only directive predicates with a dative clitic object exhibit the NP-clitic asymmetry: a superordinate full DP object may be coreferential with the subject of the subjunctive, but a superordinate dative clitic object may not, as we have seen above (example reproduced below).

- (4') a. Tom_i lui_j a demandé qu' il_{*i/??j} s'assoie.
 Tom him.dat.cl AUX asked that he sit.SBJV
 'Tom asked him to sit down.'
 b. Tom_i a demandé à Arthur_j qu' il_{*i/j} s'assoie.
 Tom AUX asked to Arthur that he sit.SBJV
 'Tom asked Arthur to sit down.'

To explain this asymmetry, I pursue the idea, put forward in Charnavel and Mateu (2015), that dative clitics are a type of logophoric centre: empathy loci, event participants with which the speaker empathizes or identifies (cf. Kuno 1987). In effect, dative clitics display logophoric properties inasmuch as they encode point of view. This property can be witnessed in their ability to undergo possessor raising and to appear as experiencers (see Charnavel and Mateu 2015 for French and Spanish, specifically). As the objects of directive predicates, dative clitics must be animate and must denote the addressee of the reported discourse. In the framework of Charnavel and Mateu (2014) and (2015), a logophoric centre is licensed by an operator that encodes its point of perspective within a given domain. The dative clitic in (4), for instance, is licensed by a logophoric operator in the superordinate clause. The subject of the subjunctive, when coreferential with the clitic, also refers to a logophoric centre and must also be licensed by an operator within the embedded clause. What causes the unacceptability of OSO in this case is the conflict of perspective arising from the co-occurrence of this latter operator and another operator that licenses the subjunctive clause. In fact, I argue that the subjunctive complement to a directive predicate is an expressive proposition (B-Violette to appear). In such sentences, the subjunctive conveys the “emotional involvement” (e.g. insistence, a stronger directive/illocutionary force) of the speaker of the reported speech; this is similar to the emotional involvement expressed by English epithets and expressives like *idiot* and *stupid* in the examples below.

- (12) a. Mary said she was in love with that idiot John.
 b. That stupid book just fell and hit me. (B-Violette to appear:12)

Subjunctive clausal complements to directive predicates share many of the properties of expressives, including the fact that, whether the “expressive content” is true of the speaker of the reported speech or not, what is expressed by the proposition stays true. The idea that certain types of speech acts double as expressives is not new (cf. Grosz 2011 for German optatives; Giannakidou 2015 for Greek emotive subjunctives), and this particular view on subjunctives embedded under directives can explain why sentences that were acceptable in the active voice become unacceptable in the passive. We saw already above that the active counterpart of (8) is perfectly acceptable, while the passive sentence is not; this asymmetry follows from the fact that, if the subject of the control verb is

impersonal, the embedded subjunctive clause cannot convey its emotional involvement. Therefore, the subjunctive cannot bear an expressive interpretation distinct from the meaning of its infinitive counterpart. In this case, competition occurs, and the infinitive wins over the subjunctive since it is preferred to express coreference.⁸

- (8') * Il a été demandé à Jean_i qu' il_i parte.
 it AUX PASS.AUX asked to Jean that he leave.SBJV
 'It was asked of him that he leave.'

Since the use of the subjunctive expresses the emotional involvement of the superordinate subject (which, as the subject of an attitude verb, is necessarily an attitude holder), an operator must be present within the embedded clause to contribute to this interpretation. This operator encodes the point of view of the attitude holder, another type of logophoric centre. As occurs in examples of coreference restrictions in clitic clusters presented in Charnavel and Mateu (2014) and (2015), a conflict of perspective arises when the “expressivity” operator and the logophoric operator coindexed with the superordinate dative clitic are found within the same domain—i.e., the embedded clause. This antilogophoricity effect results in unacceptability. When the superordinate object is a full DP, however, no empathy-encoding logophoric operator is found within the embedded clause, no conflict in perspective arises. In addition, the subjunctive’s expressive interpretation differentiates it from the infinitive and no competition arises between the two moods.

Charnavel and Mateu note that only pairs of logophoric centres, such as a discourse participant (i.e. the speaker or addressee) and an empathy locus, or an empathy locus and an attitude holder, may enter in conflict; a discourse participant and an attitude holder may not, as shown below.

- (13) La petite fille_i espère qu' on va te la_i confier.
 the little girl hopes that someone will you.SG.DAT.CL her.ACC.CL entrust
 'The little girl hopes that someone will entrust her to you.' (Charnavel and Mateu 2015:5)

Yet, in the subjunctive clauses subordinated by a directive predicate, the subject—coindexed with a dative clitic—may be either an empathy locus or a discourse participant (if first or second person), and the expressivity operator—coindexed with the superordinate subject—may be either a discourse participant (if first or second person) or an attitude holder. Therefore, if the dative clitic is a first- or second-person pronoun and the superordinate subject is third person, there should not be any obviation. However, we do observe OSO in such cases, as we have seen above (example reproduced below).

- (2b') * Ton père t' a demandé que tu ranges ta chambre.
 your father you.SG.CL AUX asked that you.SG tidy up.SBJV your.SG room
 Lit. 'Your father asked you that you tidy up your room.'

To counter this problem, I argue in B-Violette (to appear) that it is the presence of two separate logophoric operators that causes the unacceptability in this case rather than the impossibility for a sole operator to license two distinct logophoric centres that share common features. I would like to add that this stipulation may be unnecessary if we assume that a logophoric centre that is ambiguous between two types of logophoric centres is provided with features from both types.⁹ For example, a second-person dative clitic may be both/either an empathy locus (by virtue of being dative) and/or a discourse participant (by virtue of being second person). A third-person dative clitic, on the other hand, may only be an empathy locus. As for the subject of a directive predicate that is second or first person, it may be both/either a discourse participant and/or an attitude holder (by virtue of

⁸The same cannot be said about other impersonals (see Footnote 4), since they are not attitude verbs. The restriction about there being both a superordinate object and a subject to the clause embedded under such impersonals is not due to obviation, but to another phenomenon.

⁹It is also possible that one type of logophoric centre always wins over the other. For example, perhaps a dative clitic is always an empathy locus and never a discourse participant, whether it is first-, second- or third-person. Perhaps the subject of an attitude verb is always an attitude holder and never a discourse participant, no matter its person features. This hypothesis, however, needs further investigation.

being the subject of an attitude verb). On the other hand, a third person may only be an attitude holder. Therefore, in (2b), there can only be one logophoric centre, and that logophoric centre will be conflicted between probing the expressivity operator (present in order to provide the subjunctive proposition with expressive content) or the subject of the subjunctive (coindexed with a logophoric centre in the superordinate clause), because both elements share certain features. The full complexity of this situation is illustrated in sentence (2b), in which the expressivity operator has an attitude holder feature (feature [c]), and an embedded subject from both discourse participants (e.g. [a,b]) and empathy loci (e.g. [b,c]). In this case, all types of logophoricity features are available for the logophoricity operator to probe, but only the [c] feature can be probed in either of two elements.

The account of OSO presented here is based on logophoricity and expressivity, two notions relating to the general concept of perspective. We will see in the next subsection how this concept can explain the phenomenon of the subjunctive disjoint reference effect.

3.2 Accounting for SSO

We have seen a few plausible accounts of the different types of obviation in argument clauses. However, no account presented so far has been able to accommodate both SSO and OSO, including the NP-clitic asymmetry. The account found in B-Violette (to appear), in particular, does not attempt to explain SSO. Therefore, in this section, I will build on this account and focus on the task of explaining SSO.

It is noted in B-Violette (to appear) that the notion of RESP, used by Farkas (1992) to account for the subjunctive disjoint reference effect in desiderative and emotive-factive constructions, does not apply to the subjunctive argument clauses of directive predicates. The superordinate object, like the PRO controller in an infinitive complement clause, must be in a relation of responsibility with respect to the embedded subjunctive proposition. In fact, the object must have some authority over the subject of the subjunctive clause and must “make it so” that the event expressed by this clause take place. In addition, the object of the superordinate cannot be made non-*de te*, so the notion of strict *de se/te* does not apply either. Finally, applying Schlenker’s (2005) non-event *de se* analysis to the OSO data results in a misinterpretation of the use of the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause in (14). In effect, the use of the subjunctive clause only serves to illustrate the heightened emotional involvement of Tom with respect to what is expressed in the embedded clause. It is thus not straightforward to apply previous accounts to explain OSO in directive constructions.

- (14) Tom_a demandé à Arthur_i qu’ il_i déménage.
 Tom AUX asked to Arthur that he move out.SBJV
 Lit. ‘Tom asked Arthur that he leave.’ (B-Violette to appear:11)

Moreover, the previous accounts cannot accommodate SSO in such constructions either. When PRO cannot be coreferential with the superordinate subject in an embedded infinitive clause, the subject of its subjunctive counterpart will not be able to corefer either, regardless of the clause’s status as event *de se*. The explanation for this coreference restriction must be the same in both infinitive and subjunctive clauses, and it cannot be strictly due to the Minimal Distance Principle (Rosenbaum 1970) or the Minimal Link Condition (Hornstein 1999). In effect, Landau (2013) shows that the selection of the controller is affected by pragmatics; more specifically, by the authority relation between the arguments of the directive.

- (15) a. The pupil_i asked the teacher PRO_i to leave early.
 b. The guard asked the prisoner_i PRO_i to leave the room. (Landau 2013:137)

Given this reliance on context, it seems that SSO in directive constructions is not a real instance of the subjunctive disjoint reference effect (*contra* Costantini 2009). We saw in Section 2.1 that SSO is a characteristic of desiderative, emotive-factive, and—seemingly, but not really—directive predicates. OSO, on the other hand, only characterizes a certain subset of directive predicates: those that take dative objects. All these types of predicates comprise attitude verbs, a class of verbs known to be involved in logophoricity. Although permissives (e.g. *permettre* ‘permit’, *interdire* ‘forbid’) are

also directives, they are not involved in the NP–clitic asymmetry. To explain this, consider the jussive nature of the subjunctive mood selected by directive predicates (cf. Kempchinsky 2009). In effect, an embedded subjunctive clause is the indirect speech form of an imperative.¹⁰ The subjunctive also completes the paradigm of the imperative in Western Romance languages and is used as a third-person imperative. As such, it has been reported to contribute a stronger directive/illocutionary force than the imperative itself (B-Violette to appear), expressing a more intense involvement of the speaker with respect to the accomplishment of the action.¹¹ In directive constructions, the subject (or speaker of the reported speech) gives an order or a recommendation to the addressee (the object of the directive). This order or recommendation is given by the speaker because he somehow hopes for the task to be accomplished; orders and advice need not be solicited by the addressee. The subject of a permissive, on the other hand, is not necessarily in a position of desiring the accomplishment of an activity he grants permission for; instead, permission may have been solicited and hoped for by the addressee. Therefore, the structure of permissive constructions is different from that of other directive predicates: coreference in this case arises between the agent who will bring about the action expressed by the embedded proposition and the person who wants this action to be brought about (the addressee); conversely, in other directive constructions, it is the speaker who fulfills this latter role, and the same coreference relationship does not arise. A subjunctive embedded under a permissive predicate thus does not bear expressive content or express the “insistence” of the speaker.

This expressivity explanation can account for the characteristics of directive constructions, but can it account for SSO in desiderative and emotive-factive predicates? In order to find an answer to this question, I reproduce below the “cyclist” example from Schlenker (2005), in which SSO is obviated.

(10a') Jean_i accepte qu' il_i parte en dernier.

Jean accepts that he leave.SBJV last

(Schlenker 2005:293)

If the subjunctive bears expressive content, the emotion it expresses must pertain to the subject of the matrix clause. Since most of my informants do not accept (10a), we cannot detect any distinct expressive content for the subjunctive here. To provide a comprehensive theory of obviation in argument clauses, one must ideally take variation among native speakers into consideration. In the case of my informants and myself, obviation seems to occur with a wide range of attitude verbs, but it may only be obviated in the complement clauses of some directive predicates. Therefore, SSO may simply be the result of a competition between the infinitive and subjunctive moods.

In this section, I showed that the SSO in directive constructions is not a real case of obviation. In addition, I argued that permissives do not show the NP–clitic asymmetry because they do not embed an expressive subjunctive clause.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, I showed that obviation is best accounted for by a competition theory and that the SSO in directive constructions should not be considered as a real case of obviation. Some questions remain, however, such as “What determines which verbs are able to embed a subjunctive clause?” and “What would a comprehensive theory of obviation (involving subjunctive argument and adjunct clauses) look like if we assumed that Schlenker’s (2005) account of SSO is correct?”.

Recall that the previous accounts of obviation, presented above, based their theories on related notions. The restriction that some logophors must be *de se* is well known.¹² In addition, many proponents of the binding-theoretical approach, as well as Bianchi (2001) and Kempchinsky (2009),

¹⁰In Western Romance, the subjunctive may be used to change verbs of communication like *dire* ‘say’ into directives (e.g. ‘tell’). In French, however, *de*+infinitive seems to be used instead, as if the subjunctive were not allowed with this verb. The addition of *de* may contribute to a strong directive force in the infinitive.

¹¹The kind of emotional involvement reported for directive constructions or third-person imperatives is mostly insistence—almost like a more intense desire that the action expressed in the embedded proposition be accomplished—but exasperation, frustration, anger, etc. may also be expressed.

¹²However, Pearson (2013) shows that logophors need not be *de se* in Ewe.

argue for anaphoric, and even logophoric, properties of subjunctive argument clauses, such as the ability to allow LDA. Therefore, one could suggest that a comprehensive theory of obviation could be based on the central notion of “perspective.” The fact that the subjunctive clause bears expressive content at all may not be important, but only the fact that it is read under the perspective of the superordinate subject (since the expressivity operator is a logophoric centre)—that it is subject-oriented. My account of OSO does not preclude adopting Schlenker’s (2005) analysis for SSO, for example. I simply contend that OSO results from a conflict of perspective, arising because the subjunctive has a meaning distinct from that contributed by the infinitive. Obviation in argument clauses arises because the infinitive and subjunctive moods compete to express the same meaning. SSO can be obviated when the embedded clause is not read as first person, that is, non-event *de se* (Schlenker 2005); OSO can be obviated when the subjunctive is not subject-oriented. In each case, obviation is obviated whenever the controller—i.e. the antecedent of the subject of the subjunctive—is not the centre of perspective of the subjunctive clause. This hypothesis also ties back to the attempts of the binding-theoretical approaches to explain obviation; if weakening occurs when perspective is disjoint, obviation occurs when it is *not*: when Condition B is violated. Such an hypothesis requires further investigation.

References

- B-Violette, Laurence. to appear. Obviating obviation in French ditransitive clauses. In *Proceedings of the Poster Session of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 8–17.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2001. On person agreement. Ms., Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, and Victoria Mateu. 2014. The clitic binding restriction revisited: evidence for antilogophoricity. Ms., presented at GLOW 37.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, and Victoria Mateu. 2015. Antilogophoricity in clitic clusters. In *Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. U. Steindl, T. Borer, H. Fang, A. García Pardo, P. Guekguezian, B. Hsu, C. O’Hara, and I.C. Ouyang, 1–10.
- Costantini, Francesco. 2009. *Interface perspectives on clausal complementation: the case of subjunctive obviation*. Venice: Università Ca’ Foscari, Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina.
- Farkas, Donka. 1992. On obviation. In *Lexical Matters*, ed. I.A. Sag and A. Szabolcsi, 85–109. Stanford University: CLSI.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2015. Evaluative subjunctive and veridicality. Ms. for *Mood, Aspect and Modality: What is a linguistic category?*, ed. J. Blaszcak, A. Giannakidou, D. Klimek-Jankowska and K. Mygdalski.
- Grosz, Patrick Georg. 2011. On the grammar of optative constructions. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69–96.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 2009. What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive? *Lingua* 119:1788–1810.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1987. *Functional Syntax*. Chicago–London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar a research companion*. Cambridge University Press.
- Manzini, Maria Rita. 2000. Sentential complementation. The subjunctive. In *Lexical Specification and Insertion*, ed. Peter Coopmans, Martin Everaert, and Jane Grimshaw. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pearson, Hazel. 2013. The sense of self: topics in the semantics of *de se* expressions. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Rosenbaum, Peter. 1970. A principle governing deletion in English sentential complementation. In *Readings in English transformational grammar*, ed. R. Jacobs and P. Rosenbaum, 20–29. Waltham, MA: Ginn.
- Ruwet, Nicolas. 1984. *Je veux partir/*Je veux que je parte*: on the distribution of finite complements and infinitival complements in French. *Cahiers de Grammaire* 7:75–138.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2005. The lazy Frenchman’s approach to the subjunctive (speculations on reference to worlds, presuppositions, and semantic defaults in the analysis of mood). In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory: Selected Papers from “Going Romance XVII” Nijmegen, 20–22 November 2003*, ed. T. Geerts, I. van Ginneken, and H. Jacobs, 269–310.

Department of Linguistics
Harvard University
Boylston Hall, third floor
Cambridge, MA 02138–3654
lbviolette@fas.harvard.edu