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Abstract

The aim of this research is to further our knowledge of the syntax of postverbal subjects and focalization in Romance. Particular attention is paid to corrective focus at the right edge of the sentence in subject control structures without restructuring in Spanish. It is shown that the features of this syntactic context provide a testing ground for competing theories on the syntax of postverbal subjects. Evidence is provided for the view that (i) an overt subject at the right edge in this syntactic context is the subject of the main clause, not the infinitival clause; (ii) to explain the properties of the data a two-step process is needed, where movement of the subject out of the finite TP is followed by remnant movement of that TP past the landing position of the subject (Ordóñez 2000, a.o.). The result is relevant for our understanding of the mapping between syntax and semantics and the licensing of overt subjects by infinitivals. Furthermore, evidence is provided for the availability of remnant TP movement in the grammar.
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1. Introduction

This research focuses on the syntax of postverbal subjects and focalization in Romance. In contrast to previous discussions, particular emphasis will be put on i. corrective focus at the right edge of the sentence and on ii. non-restructuring control structures (focused elements are indicated by the use of capital letters hereafter):

(1) A: He oído que ayer Juan lamentó haber comenzado el doctorado.
     Have-1st.SG heard that yesterday Juan regretted to-have started the PhD.
     ‘I have heard that yesterday Juan regretted having started the PhD.’

B: Pero ¿qué dices? Ayer lamentó haber comenzado el doctorado PEDRO,
     But what say-2SG yesterday regretted to-have begun the PhD Pedro,
     (y no Juan).
     (and not Juan)
     ‘What? Yesterday, it was Pedro, not Juan, who regretted having started the PhD.’
B does not merely exemplify contrastive focus, but rather it assumes that a previous proposition is being negated; hence the label corrective focus. Crucially, the features of this specific syntactic context provide a testing ground for competing theories on the syntax of postverbal subjects. In particular, evidence is provided for the view that the rightmost subject in this structure is the subject of the main clause, not the infinitival clause, and that its rightmost position is the outcome of a two-step process: (i) movement of the subject out of the TP and (ii) movement of the TP past the subject (Ordóñez 2000, a.o.). This result is relevant for the debate on the relationship between syntax and semantics, as it argues for a systematic mapping via Chomsky’s (2001) Duality of Merge (Internal Merge vs. External Merge), where complex syntax is mapped to complex semantics (Uriagereka 2008). Furthermore, this analysis is also important for a number of approaches dealing with the licensing of overt subjects in infinitival clauses in Romance (e.g., Ortega-Santos 2003, Fernández Lagunilla 1987, Sitaridou 2002 and Solà 1992, a.o.). Specifically, these proposals assume that, from a descriptive point of view, overt subjects of infinitives are licensed in contexts other than infinitival complement clauses, in spite of what these rightmost subjects in non-restructuring control structures might suggest. The current proposal lends support for the existence of this asymmetry. Finally, this research provides evidence for the availability or remnant TP movement in spite of claims that this is a fairly restricted operation (see Abels 2003 and references therein). If true, this view supports an approach where syntactic movement is driven by the need to satisfy and EPP-feature (Chomsky 2008), against Abels (2003) and Branigan (2011).

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 briefly summarizes previous approaches to the syntax of postverbal subjects. Section 3 provides some background on the syntax of infinitives and overt subject licensing in Spanish. Section 4 deals with the issue of where in the structure the subject originates, arguing that it is the main clause subject. Section 5 discusses how high the subject is in the structure. Evidence is provided that it is hosted in the left-periphery of the clause in spite of what the linear order relations may suggest. Section 6 argues that the overt subject is indeed a contrastively focused subject as opposed to an instance of Clitic Right Dislocation (CLRD), apposition or a clause-external fragment. Section 7 uses the data unveiled throughout the discussion as a benchmark for alternative approaches to postverbal subjects. That section also discusses briefly the availability of alternative derivations of sentence-final subjects in other syntactic contexts. Section 8

---

1 Repeating the whole sentence as in B’s utterance might be slightly unnatural for some speakers unless there is a preverbal element, e.g., ayer. The data reported in this article are representative of both Iberian and Chilean Spanish. A minimum of three speakers (2 linguists and one naïve informant) were tested for each sentence. Variation among speakers is noted in the text, when attested.
discusses the advantages of the current approach and the relevance of this research for the debate on whether remnant TP movement is available in the grammar.

2. Previous approaches to focused-related word order variation

For the purpose of this discussion, focus refers to the new information that is being asserted in any given proposition. (e.g., Chomsky 1971). Strictly speaking, word order variation caused by focalization processes affects not only subjects but also other elements of the sentence. However, it is subjects that have captured more attention in the literature and, therefore, I concentrate on them. The following approaches to focused-related word order variation illustrated with the VOS order, where the subject is focused, are representative of the ongoing debate found in the literature on Romance languages:

(i) Right adjunction of the subject to some projection (Torrego 1984)
(ii) P(rosodic)-movement of presupposed phrases past the in situ subject (Zubizarreta 1998)
(iii) Object scrambling past the (in situ) subject (Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2008, López 2009 and Ordóñez 2000; cf. also Gallego 2007), which some authors take to be licensed prosodically (e.g., Domínguez 2004, following work by Cheng and Rooryck 2000)
(iv) Movement of the subject to a Focus projection at the VP periphery and movement of the presupposed material to a clause internal Topic projection higher than this Focus projection (Belletti 1999 and Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2008)
(v) Rightward movement of the subject at PF (Parafita Couto 2005)
(vi) Pronunciation of the low copy of the subject to meet Sentence Stress Assignment conditions, under the assumption that the verb moves to TP (Emonds 1978 and Pollock 1989) and that all arguments, including the subject, vacate vP / VP, arguably for Case checking purposes à la Chomsky (1995) (Author 2006a, 2006b, following Stjepanović’s 1999 analysis of Serbo-Croatian)

In this paper I will present evidence in favor of a theory as in (vii) to explain the data in (1)B. Within this view both leftmost and rightmost focus are implemented via movement to a Focus
Projection in the left-periphery, while the final word order is contingent on the topicalization of TP.\(^2\)\(^3\)

3. Background on the distribution of infinitives with overt subjects in Spanish

In Spanish, infinitives show no tense and agreement and, therefore, are predicted not to license overt subjects. Complement infinitival clauses have been claimed to be well-behaved in this respect, e.g., unaccusatives are known to license postverbal subjects without these being focused (Contreras 1976; see Ortega-Santos 2008 for a recent analysis of VS structures with unaccusative verbs), (2), but not when embedded in a control structure, (3):

\textit{(2)} \begin{center}
A: ¿Qué ocurrió?\(^4\)\text{\small \textit{\textit{'What happened'}}}\\
B1: Viene Porfirio.\text{\small \textit{\textit{comes Porfirio}}}\\
B2: *?Pofirio viene.\text{\small \textit{\textit{Porfirio is coming.}}}
\end{center}

\(^2\) There seems to be some dialectal variation in the availability of focus fronting, that is to say, left-periphery focus in Spanish. E.g., Gutiérrez-Bravo (2002: 171) shows tentatively that focus fronting does not apply to objects in Mexican Spanish, though preverbal subjects can be focused. The syntax of corrective focus in that variety is left for future research.

\(^3\) Focalization processes have also relevant PF properties which have inspired a number of alternatives to the syntactocentric T-model approach, e.g., Zubizarreta (1998). Still, as Irurtzun (2007) discusses, a syntactocentric approach of the kind defended in this research can capture the semantic, syntactic and PF properties of focus. According to Irurtzun (2007), the F-Structure of a sentence is built up derivationally from the elements that are assigned a [+F] formal feature as they enter the numeration. Within this view, narrow syntax creates a well specified F-Structure and the interface components can ‘read’ it and apply some operations upon it. E.g., nuclear stress is assigned to the most embedded element within the F-Structure in the case of both new information and contrastive focus regardless of the position of the [+F] elements in the clause. See Kahnemuyipour (2009) for a recent review of PF-centric approaches and a syntactocentric phase-based proposal.

\(^4\) \textit{What happened} questions are used to indicate that a neutral information context is being assumed. I leave aside the debate as to whether these questions actually provide a test for this kind of context (see Kahnemuyipour 2009:136-139 for recent discussion), as I take the data to be realistic irrespective of whether the \textit{what happened} test is valid. In particular, the same word order facts can be found in adverbial clauses, where ‘discourse factors motivating marked orders are weak’ (Belletti and Rizzi 1988: 337).
Porfírio comes

(3) A: ¿Qué ocurre?
   B1: Pedro lamenta haber venido.
       'Pedro regrets having come here.'
       Regrets to-have come Pedro

In contrast, infinitival clauses in other syntactic contexts license overt subjects (Fernández Lagunilla 1987, a.o.). Specifically, overt subjects have been argued to be licensed in infinitival clauses in subject and adjunct position, as exemplified below, exclamatives and (rhetorical) interrogatives:

(4) a. prepositional clauses
   Al entrar yo / Juan por la puerta, todos se callaron.
   'When I / Juan entered through the door, everybody stopped talking'

   b. infinitival subject clauses
   [Presentarse Julia a las elecciones] fue un error (Piera 1987: 164)
   'It was a mistake for Julia to be a candidate in the elections.'

This distribution of overt subjects of infinitives in Spanish has been captured by making use of licensing mechanisms where government (Fernández Lagunilla 1987), binding-theoretic properties (Solà 1992), L-marking (Ortega-Santos 2003) or phases (Sitaridou 2002) play a crucial role so as to single out infinitivals in complement position from the rest of the contexts (see Pöl 2007 for a recent review of these proposals).

Still, none of these works

---

Note that the present research bears on the accuracy of the generalization concerning the distribution of overt subjects of infinitives as opposed to the exact mechanism underlying this distribution. To the best of my knowledge, Mensching (2000: 151) is the only researcher who claims that in Modern Spanish overt subjects are licensed in complement clauses. He illustrates his claim with the following sentence:

i. Encontramos [ser el poema austriaco del siglo XIII, Kudrum, fuente de baladas...]
   (we) find to-be the poem Austrian from-the century 13th Kudrum source of ballads
   'We find that the Austrian poem from the thirteenth century, K., is the source of ballads...'

Still, according to my informants this sentence is ungrammatical. Furthermore, complement infinitival clauses are compatible with an overt subject as long as there is an outside source for Case as in
deal with the data in (1) (repeated here as (5)), where a focused subject appears at the right edge of the sentence. These kinds of cases raise a number of questions as to the exact origin of this subject and its location in the structure, given that, a priori, the subject could be within the complement infinitival clause. While the information structural properties of the overt subject in (5) differ from those of the subjects in (4), the questions still arise:⁶

(5) A: He oído que ayer Juan lamentó haber comenzado el doctorado.
   'I have heard that yesterday Juan regretted to-have started the PhD.'

   B: Pero ¿qué dices? Ayer lamentó haber comenzado el doctorado PEDRO,
   'What? Yesterday, it was Pedro, not Juan, who regretted having started the PhD.'

Crucially, this construction presents the typical properties of obligatory control predicates, e.g., it does not allow two referentially disjoint subjects. Below, it will be shown that the rightmost position of the subject is the outcome of a two-step process: (i) movement of the subject out of the TP and (ii) remnant movement of the TP. The subject moves into the specifier of a focus phrase (FocP), whereas the TP moves into the specifier of a topic phrase (TopP), as suggested by the information structural properties of the subject and TP, respectively. This derivation is exemplified in (6): ⁷,⁸

---

⁶ Complement infinitival clauses may contain other subject-like elements, such as floating quantifiers and so-called floating NPs (Torrego 1996), emphatic pronouns (Belletti 2005, Piera 1987 and Solà 1992), wh-operators (Bosque and Moreno 1984), and pronouns modified by scope taking particles like 'too' and 'only' (Barbosa 2010 and Szabolcsi 2009). Inasmuch as such cases do not include full-fledged regular subjects, I abstract away from these constructions, unless relevant to the argumentation.

⁷ There is no intonational break between the focused subject and rest of the sentence, unless the contrasting XP, e.g., y no Juan in (5), is added (M. Rodríguez Mondoñedo, p.c.). This state of affairs is not incompatible with the present analysis, but rather it is consistent with the observation that topics, e.g., the remnant TP, might be separated from the rest of the sentence by a pause (see Domínguez 2004: 151 for discussion; see Ortiz de Urbina 2002 for Basque).

⁸ Left-periphery focus triggers SV inversion, in contrast to right-periphery focus. Irurtzun (2005) notes that, under the view that head-movement is PF-movement and that SV inversion is caused by V-to-C-
The discussion is exemplified mostly with Spanish, though other languages will be included where relevant. Furthermore, throughout the exposition I use main verbs whose incompatibility with clitic climbing provides evidence for the biclausal structure of the sentence (Gómez Torrego 1999), e.g., *lamentar* 'regret', a factive verb:

(7) a. Pedro lamentó haber comprado.
   Pedro regretted to-have-it bought
   'Pedro regretted having bought it.'

b. *Pedro lo lamentó haber comprado.
   Pedro it regretted to-have bought.

Next, the following properties of the structures at hand are discussed: where does the subject originate (section 4), how high is the subject in the structure (section 5) and whether these are contrastively focused subjects as opposed to instances of CLRD, apposition or clause-external fragments (section 6).

4. *Where in the structure does the subject originate?*  

The goal of this section is to provide evidence that the overt subject is the main clause subject. Evidence is provided by (i) the interaction between the object of the infinitive and the rightmost subject, specifically, the c-command relationships between the overt subject and the object of the infinitive (section 4.1.1) and restrictions on the \( V_1 \) [\( V_2 \)-INF \( S_1 \) \( O_2 \)] order (section 4.1.2); and (ii) the syntax of Negative Polarity Items (section 4.2). Part of the discussion will focus on how the analysis in (6) can account for the data. A comparison with previous proposals is included in section 7.

movement, the verb in \( T \) and FocP would not be adjacent at PF at the end of the derivation in (6), a fact that prevents head-movement from applying. Thus, the lack of SV inversion does not constitute evidence against the present approach.
4.1. On the interaction between the object of the infinitive and the rightmost subject

It has been claimed that in Spanish VOS clauses, the object c-commands the subject (Ordóñez 2000). This c-command relationship is shown to hold also for the structures at hand, where the object is an argument of the infinitive. Furthermore, under certain circumstances, the overt subject may surface between the infinitive and its object. A priori, these facts seem to be at odds with the claim that the overt subject is the main clause subject. Detailed syntactic discussion shows that this kind of data not only does not constitute a counterargument to this view but rather provides an argument in favor of it.

4.1.1. On the c-command relationship between the overt subject and the object of the infinitive

Ordóñez (2000) demonstrated that Spanish allows the object to c-command the subject in the VOS order. Following Ortega-Santos (2003), evidence is provided that those c-command relationships also hold in the structures under consideration. In spite of what a naive look may suggest, an argument for the main clause subject analysis and for the account in (6) can be built on the basis of this observation.

In particular, the object of the infinitive may c-command the overt subject in sentence final position, as shown by PPLE C Effects and scope facts, by virtue of its capacity to undergo scrambling (see Ordóñez’s 2000 discussion on the syntax of simple clauses). With regard to PPLE C effects, the DP object cannot be co-referent with the postverbal subject at the right edge of the sentence in simple clauses (Ordóñez 2000) and in control contexts, (8) and (9), respectively.

(8) El libro, se lo compraron a ella_x/1 LOS PADRES DE EVA_i.
the book, her it bought to her the parents of Eva
‘Eva’s parents bought the book for her.’

(9) El libro, lamentaron haberse(a) _ comprado a ella_x/1 LOS PADRES DE EVA_i.
the book, regretted to-have-her-it bought to her the parents of Eva
‘Eva’s parents regretted having bought a book for her.’

Pronoun scrambling is also attested in Scandinavian languages, whereas quantifiers show closely-related properties in French (see Ordóñez 2000: 50-51 and Ordóñez 2007: 262 and references therein, respectively).
This is interpreted as evidence that the object c-commands the subject (see also the scope facts discussed in this section). These c-command relationships and the evidence that the overt subject originates as an argument of the main verb can be reconciled by having the object move past the focused subject and, then, having the TP move past the subject and the object, as exemplified below (see Ordóñez’s 2000 closely-related approach to simple clauses; I abstract away from irrelevant details in the derivation below):

\[(10) \quad [TP [los padres de Eva]_k \text{ lamentaron PRO habérselo comprado [a ella]_n}] \to (\text{movement of [los padres de Eva]_k to FocP})
\[\quad [FocP [los padres de Eva]_k, F [TP t_k \text{ lamentaron PRO habérselo comprado [a ella]_n}] \to (\text{movement of [a ella]_n to TopP_1})
\[\quad [\text{TopP}_1 [a ella]_n, \text{Top} [FocP [los padres de Eva]_k, F [TP t_k \text{ lamentaron PRO habérselo comprado } t_n]]] \to (\text{movement of [TP t_k \text{ lamentaron PRO habérselo comprado } t_n] to TopP_2})
\[\quad [\text{TopP}_2 [TP t_k \text{ lamentaron PRO habérselo comprado } t_n], \text{TopP}_2 [\text{TopP}_1 [a ella]_n, \text{Top}_1 [\text{TopP} [\text{los padres de Eva]_k, F t_n]]]]^{10}\]

This analysis takes for granted that the object may leave its clause in the spirit of Ordóñez (2009) for Spanish; see also references therein for discussion from other languages. As is well-known, infinitival clauses are fairly porous to extraction when compared to finite clauses, an observation that makes the present analysis plausible.

Islandhood allows us to test whether the derivation in (10) is on the right track: It is predicted that if the embedded clause constitutes an island, e.g., an indirect question embedded under *preguntar* ‘to ask’, a context known to bar extraction (see Torrego 1984: 115), this derivation should be blocked. In particular, if the embedded clause constitutes an island in control contexts, the PPLE C effects triggered by the object of the infinitive are absent:

\[(11) \quad \text{(11) En cuanto al libro, ayer se preguntaron cuándo comprárselo a ella.}
\[\quad \text{In regard to-the book, yesterday themselves asked when to-buy-her-it to her}
\[\quad \text{LOS PADRES DE EVA, (y no los sobrinos de María).}
\[\quad \text{the parents of Eva, (and not the nephews of María)}
\]

---

10 Following Rizzi (1997), a.o., I assume that TopP is recursive, meaning that to a certain degree Minimality does not affect topicalization processes in Romance. See Müller (1996) for discussion on scrambling and Minimality and see Author (2011) for recent discussion of Minimality in Spanish.
‘With regard to the book, yesterday Eva’s parents asked themselves when to buy it for her’

This is precisely what the view that the subject is the main clause subject predicts: Irrespective of the exact mechanism responsible for the sentence-final position of the subject, the object cannot leave its clause and, therefore, the object cannot c-command the subject. This result is also consistent with the current approach given the way the word order in (11) is derived, without the object leaving its clause:

(12)\[[TP [los padres de Eva]_{k} preguntaron cuándo PRO comprárselo [a ella]_{x}].n\]
→ (movement of \[los padres de Eva\]_{k} to FocP)
\[FocP [los padres de Eva]_{k}, F [TP t_k preguntaron cuándo PRO comprárselo [a ella]_{x}].n\]
→ (movement of \[TP t_k preguntaron cuándo PRO comprárselo [a ella]_{x}.n to TopP)
\[TopP [TP t_k preguntaron cuándo PRO comprárselo [a ella]_{x}.n Top [FocP [los padres de Eva]_{k}, F t_k]]\]

Not all speakers accept backwards anaphora, irrespective of c-command relations (Ortega-Santos 2006a). As a consequence, the contrast between (9) and (11) is subtle, though real, as predicted by the present approach. Note that if both the overt subject and the object of the infinitive were to originate in the infinitival clause, the locality properties of that clause would be irrelevant, as clause-internal scrambling could apply freely, contrary to fact. In contrast, the current account predicts that the object may c-command the subject only if the embedded clause does not constitute an island.

A similar argument can be made on the basis of scope facts: Judgments are subtle, but the quantifier binds the pronoun in (13)a, in contrast to (13)b:

(13)a. A: He oído que ayer un profesor lamentó haberle dado un libro a cada niño.
   ‘I have heard that yesterday a teacher regretted having given a book to each child.’

(13)b. B: Pero ¿qué dices? El libro, lamentó haberse dado [a cada niño].
   ‘What say-2SG the book regretted to-have-him-it given to each child’
his father
‘What? In regard to the book, EACH FATHER regretted having given it to his child’

b. [Su padre]m*/x lamentó haberle dado el libro [a cada niño].x.
his father regretted to-have-him given the book to each child

The derivation in (14) (essentially the same kind of derivation as (10)) explains the data:

\[
(14) \quad [\text{TP} \text{[Su padre]} \text{lamentó PRO habérselo dado [a cada niño].}_x] \\
\rightarrow \text{(movement of [Su padre] to FocP)} \\
[FocP [Su padre]. F [TP ti lamentó PRO habérselo dado [a cada niño].}_x] \\
\rightarrow \text{(movement of [a cada niño] to TopP)} \\
[TopP₁ [a cada niño]. Top [FocP [Su padre] F [TP ti lamentó PRO habérselo dado ti].}_x] \\
\rightarrow \text{(movement of [TP ti lamentó [CP PRO habérselo dado ti] to TopP₂)\textsuperscript{12}} \\
[TopP₂ [TP ti lamentó PRO habérselo dado ti]. Top₂ [TopP₁ [a cada niño]. Top [FocP [Su padre] F ti]].]
\]

Again, islandhood allows us to test the predictions of the present proposal: In (15), where the object cannot leave its clause, we still find the linear order object >> subject, but the object does not c-command the subject:

(15)A: He oído que ayer un profesor se preguntó qué darle a cada niño.
Have.1.SG heard that yesterday a teacher cl. asked what to-give him to each child.

B: Pero ¿qué dices? Ayer preguntó qué darle a cada niño, su padre.
but what say-2SG yesterday asked what to-give-him to each child his PADRE.

---

\textsuperscript{11} In B’s utterance in (13)a el libro is CLLD-ed. As a consequence, the clitic lo is included in the structure and this affects the shape of the indirect object clitic (cf. A’s utterance in (13)a. This does not interfere with the argument developed in this section.

\textsuperscript{12} Following Rizzi (1997), a.o., I assume that TopP is recursive, meaning that to a certain degree Minimality does not affect topicalization processes in Romance. See Müller (1996) for discussion on scrambling and Minimality and see Author (2011) for recent discussion of Minimality in Spanish.

---
father

This suggests the following derivation (similar to one in (12):

\[(16) [TP [su padre] preguntó qué PRO darle [a cada niño].]_k \rightarrow (movement of [su padre] to FocP)\]

\[[FocP [su padre] F [TP t preguntó qué PRO darle [a cada niño].]_k \rightarrow (movement of [TP t preguntó qué PRO darle [a cada niño].]_k to TopP)\]

\[[TopP [TP t preguntó qué CP PRO darle [a cada niño].]_k Top [FocP [su padre] F tu]]\]

As stated before, if the subject and the object were clause-mates, the presence of islands would not prevent clause-internal scrambling, contrary to the fact. In contrast, the current account predicts that the object may c-command the subject only if the embedded clause does not constitute an island.

4.1.2. Restrictions on the V1 [V2-INF S1 O2] order

The goal of this section is to study the properties of the V1 [V2-INF S1 O2] order. Even though the subject in these structures is not focused, the very existence of this word sequence constitutes a potential counterexample to the view that the overt subject is the main clause subject. A detailed study of the structure, nonetheless, helps us confirm the idea that the overt subject linearly following the infinitive in control clauses is the main clause subject irrespective of its surface semantics.

As is well known, in Spanish, the VSO order is grammatical in finite clauses:

\[(17) Todos los días compra Cefe el pan.\]

all the days buys Cefe the bread

‘Cefe buys the bread everyday’

The same word order obtains in object infinitival clauses, corresponding to the sequence V1 [V2-INF S1 O2] (Ordóñez 2007, 2009; see Costa 2004 for Portuguese):

\[(18) Todos los días lamenta comprar Cefe el pan.\]

13 While the scope fact included in this section were tested with three speakers, subsequent research revealed a certain degree of interspeaker variation. At present, I do not have any explanation for this variation. I leave this issue for future research noting its relevance. Judgments throughout the paper reflect the linguistic variety of speakers whose scope facts fit the pattern described in this section.
all the days regrets to-buy Cefe the bread
‘Cefe regrets buying bread everyday’

Under the view that the subject is the main clause subject, the relevant word order can be achieved by having the object move to the left-periphery, having the subject move past the object and, finally, having the TP move past the subject and the object, as exemplified below. The derivation assumes that the object undergoes focus movement, as there is a tendency to focus the object in this word order: 14

(19) [TP Cefe lamenta comprar [el pan]x]k
  → (movement of [el pan]x to FocP)
  [FocP [el pan]x, Foc [TP Cefe lamenta comprar t]k]
  → (movement of Cefe to TopP1)
  [TopP1 Cefe Top1 [FocP [el pan]x, Foc [TP t lamenta comprar t]k]]
  → (movement of [TP t lamenta comprar t]k to TopP2)
  [TopP2 [TP t lamenta comprar t]k, Top2 [TopP1 Cefe Top1 [FocP [el pan]x, Foc t]k]]

If this derivation is on the right track, it predicts that the V1 [V2-INF S1 O2] order should be ungrammatical whenever the non-restructuring embedded clause is an island (Ortega-Santos 2003: 29-31; see also Ordóñez 2000: 8), or whenever the object cannot be scrambled, e.g., a bare NP, *pan* as opposed to *el pan*, or a Negative Polarity Item (see Etxepare and Uribe-

14 There are other options: e.g., the subject could be focused in the V1 [V2-INF S1 O2] order (see Ordóñez 2000 and Zubizarreta 1998 for discussion of the VSO order in simple sentences). In that case, the derivation would be very similar to the one in (19), but the object would be scrambled to the left-periphery and, afterwards, the subject would undergo focus movement past the object followed by remnant TP movement. Note that the VSO order has been argued to be compatible with an out-of-the-blue context in simple clauses under certain circumstances, e.g., if a preverbal adverb is present, (i)B1. Still, the V1 [V2-INF S1 O2] order is predicted to be incompatible with the out-of-the-blue context, (i)B2, given the kinds of movements necessary to generate that word order. The prediction is borne out:

i. A: Que pasó ayer?
   what happened yesterday
   ‘What happened yesterday?’
B1: Ayer ganó Juan la lotería. (Ordóñez 2000:27)
yesterday won Juan the lottery
   ‘Yesterday, Juan won the lottery.’
B2: Ayer lamentó (Juan) haber ganado (*Juan) la lotería.
yesterday regretted (Juan) to-have won (Juan) the lottery
   ‘Yesterday, Juan regretted having won the lottery.’
Etxebarria 2008 and Ordóñez 2007 for claims regarding the impossibility to scramble bare NPs and Negative Polarity Items in Spanish). The prediction is fulfilled, (20)-(22):

(20) (Cefe) preguntó cómo comprar (*?Cefe) el periódico. Island
   (Cefe) asked how to-buy (Cefe) the newspaper
   ‘Cefe asked how to buy the newspaper.’

(21) Todos los días (Cefe) lamenta comprar (? ?Cefe) pan. Bare NP
   All the days (Cefe) regrets to-buy (Cefe) bread

(22) Ayer (Cefe) no lamentó comprar (*?Cefe) nada. Negative Polarity Item
   Yesterday (Cefe) not regretted to-buy (Cefe) anything
   ‘Yesterday, Cefe did not regret the fact that he had not bought anything.’

In these contexts, one step of the derivation illustrated in (19) is not allowed. This is exemplified for (20), where the very first step (movement of [el periódico] to FopP) is not possible due to locality restrictions:

(23) [TP Cefe\textsubscript{m} preguntó cómo comprar [el periódico]\textsubscript{x}]\textsubscript{k}
    → (movement of [el periódico]\textsubscript{x} to FopP)
    [FopP [el periódico]\textsubscript{x} F [TP Cefe\textsubscript{m} preguntó cómo comprar t]\textsubscript{k}]
    → (movement of Cefe\textsubscript{m} to TopP\textsubscript{1})
    [TopP\textsubscript{1} Cefe\textsubscript{m} Top\textsubscript{1} [FocP [el periódico]\textsubscript{x} F [TP t preguntó cómo comprar t]\textsubscript{k}]]
    → (movement of [TP t preguntó cómo comprar t]\textsubscript{k} to TopP\textsubscript{2})
    [TopP\textsubscript{2} [TP t preguntó cómo comprar t]\textsubscript{k} Top\textsubscript{2} [TopP\textsubscript{1} Cefe\textsubscript{m} Top\textsubscript{1} [FopP [el periódico]\textsubscript{x} F t]]]

This state of affairs contrasts with the distribution of subjects in simple clauses and in restructuring contexts. Since the subject and the object are clause-mates, the VSO and the V\textsubscript{1} [V\textsubscript{2}-INF S\textsubscript{1} O\textsubscript{2}] order are grammatical irrespective of whether the object can be scrambled. see (24) and (25), respectively: 16

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item (21) is unacceptable irrespective of the tense or aspect chosen. E.g., even if the sentence refers to a specific event of buying bread, the same result is obtained:
   i. Ayer (Cefe) lamentó haber comprado (**Cefe) pan.
   ‘Yesterday (Cefe) regretted to-have bought (Cefe) bread’

\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}

15 Ordóñez (2007) shows that while Spanish allows for both the VSO and the V\textsubscript{1} [V\textsubscript{2}-INF S\textsubscript{1} O\textsubscript{2}] order, none of these options is attested in Catalan. According to this researcher, in the VSO order in Spanish, the subject has moved to SubjP, an inflectional projection above VP and below the final landing site of
Todos los días compra Cefe pan.
All the days buys Cefe bread
Cefe buys bread everyday'

Todos los días quiere comprar Cefe pan.
All the days want 3SG to-buy Cefe bread
Cefe wants to buy bread everyday'

Furthermore, if a restructuring verb as querer ‘to want’ is prevented from restructuring, the grammaticality of the $V_1 [V_2\text{-INF} S_1 O_2]$ order is predicted to be contingent on whether the object can be scrambled (M.C. Cuervo, p.c.). In particular, embedded negation has been claimed to prevent the restructuring process from taking place (Masullo 2004 and references therein, a.o.), as seen in the fact that, for instance, it is incompatible with clitic climbing – a standard diagnosis for restructuring: 17

(26)a. Pablo quisiera no verla.  
Pablo would-like not to-see.CL
‘Pablo would like not to see her.’

b. *Pablo la quisiera no ver.  
Pablo CL would-like not to-see

The prediction is borne out: When embedded negation is present, the $V_1 [V_2\text{-INF} S_1 O_2]$ order is grammatical only with DP objects that can be scrambled, that is to say, with full DPs, as

the verb in TP. The same is true for the $V_1 [V_2\text{-INF} S_1 O_2]$ order where restructuring has taken place in that the subject of the main clause is shown to be hosted in SubjP. Catalan, in contrast, does not have this SubjP projection available and, therefore, the VSO order in simple clauses and the $V_1 [V_2\text{-INF} S_1 O_2]$ order in restructuring contexts are ungrammatical. If true, this provides further evidence that the subject in the $V_1 [V_2\text{-INF} S_1 O_2]$ order is not in situ. Furthermore, Ordóñez provides evidence that the $V_1 [V_2\text{-INF} S_1 O_2]$ order is found in restructuring structures without control in Spanish, e.g., causatives and perception verbs, thus underscoring the validity of the restructuring approach for a subset of the $V_1 [V_2\text{-INF} S_1 O_2]$ structures.

17 See Kayne (1989) for an alternative to the restructuring approach to clitic climbing and to the negation facts across Romance. Kayne’s proposal is developed within the framework of Chomsky (1986) and as a consequence part of the mechanisms assumed (e.g., barrierhood) are at odds with current minimalist terms.
seen in (27)a, in contrast to bare NPs and Negative Polarity Items, (27)b and (27)c, respectively.\(^{18}\)

\[\text{(27)a. Hoy (Cefe) quisiera no comprar (Cefe) el pan.} \quad \text{Full DP}\]
'Today (Cefe) would-want:3SG not to-buy (Cefe) the bread'

\[\text{'Today, Cefe does not want to buy the bread'}\]

\[\text{(27)b. Hoy (Cefe) quisiera no comprar (*Cefe) pan.} \quad \text{Bare NP}\]
'Today (Cefe) would-want:3SG not to-buy (Cefe) bread'

\[\text{(27)c. Hoy (Cefe) quisiera no comprar (*Cefe) nada.} \quad \text{Negative Polarity Item}\]
'Today (Cefe) would-want:3SG not to-buy (Cefe) anything'

The derivation of (27)a would proceed as in (19) and the outcome would be grammatical. In turn, the derivation of (27)b and (27)c would be banned for the same reason (20)-(22) are ungrammatical: the derivation necessary to generate this word order cannot apply due to the properties of the object or due to constraints on movement (see (23)).

To sum up the discussion so far, the very existence of the V\(_1\) [V\(_2\)-INF S\(_1\) O\(_2\)] order seems to challenge the idea that the overt subject was the main clause subject and, therefore, this discussion was in order irrespective of the information structural properties of the subject in this sequence. This potential counterexample, however, has been explained away. In particular, it has been shown that the availability of the V\(_1\) [V\(_2\)-INF S\(_1\) O\(_2\)] order in non-restructuring contexts is contingent on the locality properties of the infinitival clause and on the properties of the object. Furthermore, when restructuring takes place, the V\(_1\) [V\(_2\)-INF S\(_1\) O\(_2\)] order is grammatical irrespective of those properties of the object and the infinitival clause. Again, this provides evidence in favor of an analysis where the subject is not in the infinitival clause or else the properties of the object and the locality properties of the infinitival clause would be irrelevant, contrary to the fact. Finally, it has been argued that the derivation in (19) is needed to capture the data. This derivation shares very important components with the analysis defended in this paper (see (6)), and thus, the discussion is relevant in that light, too.

\(^{18}\) Under this view, the V\(_1\) [V\(_2\)-INF S\(_1\) O\(_2\)] order can be the result of \textit{either} restructuring \textit{or}, in the case of verbal complexes which lack this option, a derivation in the spirit of (19). This contrasts with Ordóñez (2007) and Ordóñez (2009), where those approaches are considered to be mutually exclusive. In turn, Costa (2004: 97-9) argues that the V\(_1\) [V\(_2\)-INF S\(_1\) O\(_2\)] order is only possible under restructuring, which for him means that there is no embedded CP and, therefore, no strong phase that would prevent the subject from being licensed in situ. Still, the present data go beyond the interaction between subject licensing and restructuring by showing that the nature of the object of the infinitive matters as well.
4.2. The licensing of Negative Polarity Items

Under the view that the subject originates as an argument of the matrix verb, it is predicted that only matrix negation as opposed to embedded negation may license a Negative Polarity Item functioning as a subject at the right edge of the sentence in the non-restructuring control structures under discussion. This is the case because according to this analysis the Negative Polarity Item interacts with matrix negation at some point in the derivation, i.e., the Neg head in the left-periphery c-commands the subject in its base position and the Negative Polarity Item stands in a Spec-Head relation with Neg at some point in the derivation. Specifically, the subject Negative Polarity Item would move through the specifier position of NegP on its way to FocP, while its rightmost position would be the result of the movement of the TP past the subject. In contrast, embedded negation does not interact with the Negative Polarity Item: Neg does neither c-command the Negative Polarity Item in its base position nor stand in a Spec-Head configuration with it at any stage in the derivation. The prediction is fulfilled as the contrast in (28) shows (Ordóñez 2009: 2-3; see also Alexiadou et al. 2010 for discussion). (28)A illustrates embedded negation, whereas (28)B illustrates matrix negation:

(28)A: Ayer Pedro lamentó haber ido a la fiesta.
   ‘Yesterday, Pedro regretted to-have gone to the party’
B: Pero ¿qué dices? ‘Ayer’ lamentó no haber ido NINGUNA PERSONA.
   ‘What? Yesterday, NO ONE regretted having gone there’

Thus, the fact that only matrix negation licenses subject Negative Polarity Items in contrast to embedded negation provides still another argument in favor of the view that the subject at the right edge is the subject of the matrix clause. Further support for this view comes from the fact that embedded negation licenses a Negative Polarity Item when it is unambiguously part of the infinitival clause, e.g., a PP which is part of the semantics of the infinitival verb: 19

---

19 It is well-known that while postverbal Negative Polarity Items co-occur with the sentential negative marker no, preverbal Negative Polarity Items do not. Arguably, the Spec-Head relation between the Neg head and the Negative Polarity Item allows for the negative marker to be dropped in the latter
To sum up the discussion so far, two areas of the syntax of Spanish provide evidence that the subject sitting at the right edge is the main clause subject, namely, the interaction between the object of the infinitive and the rightmost subject (section 4.1) and the syntax of negation (section 4.2).

5. How high in the structure is the rightmost subject?

Syntactic facts concerning the scope of negation and the licensing of parasitic gaps provide evidence that the rightmost subject has moved to the A’ layer of the main clause, in spite of what its rightmost position would seem to suggest. Furthermore, it will be shown that the account in (6) explains the data.

5.1. A note on the scope of negation

case. A priori, the analysis in (6) would seem to predict that the subject at the right edge does not need to co-occur with the negative marker, as it goes through an intermediate stage where the Negative Polarity Item stands in a Spec-Head relation with Neg (see Belletti 1999, a.o.). The prediction is not borne out:

i. (Ayer) *(no) lamentó haber ido NINGUNA PERSONA

(“yesterday”)(not) regretted to-have gone any person

While a detailed discussion of the presence/absence of the negative marker is beyond the scope of this paper, this property suggests that the Neg head disappears only if (a.) it comes to be in a Spec-Head relation with Neg in the course of the derivation, and (b.) it is c-commanded by the Negative Polarity Item at the end of the derivation. This accounts for the observations in (i) and (28) while explaining the fact that focused Negative Polarity Items moved to a higher clause are not doubled by negation:

ii. (Ayer) NINGUNA PERSONA creo que lamentó haber venido

(“yesterday”)(any person) believe.1SG that regretted to-have come

‘I believe NO ONE regretted having come there’

See Author (2010) for further discussion on this issue. Additional discussion on other aspects of negation is found in section 5.1.
Clause internal elements, irrespective of their information structural properties, get a narrow-scope reading with respect to sentential negation. This can be seen in the compatibility of the data in (30) with a follow up stating that only some of the candidates received a positive evaluation (examples modeled after De Cat 2007: 498). This observation is illustrated for simple clauses and non-restructuring subject control structures ((30)a and (30)b, respectively):

(30)a. (Ayer) no recibieron todos estos candidatos una valoración baja. Sólo algunos de ellos.
(yesterday) not received.3PL all these candidates an assessment low only some of them
‘Yesterday, not all these candidates received a negative evaluation. Only some of them.’

a’. (Ayer) no recibieron TODOS ESTOS CANDIDATOS una valoración baja. Sólo algunos de ellos.

b. (Ayer) no lamentaron todos estos candidatos haber recibido una valoración baja. Sólo algunos de ellos.
(yesterday) not regretted.3PL all these candidates to-have received an assessment low only some of them
‘Yesterday, not all these candidates regretted having received a negative evaluation. Only some of them.’

b’. (Ayer) no lamentaron TODOS ESTOS CANDIDATOS haber recibido una valoración baja. Sólo algunos de ellos.

In contrast, the same DP focused at the left-periphery gets a broad scope reading with respect to sentential negation, as seen in the incompatibility with the follow up:

(31)A: Tenemos el resultado de las encuestas.
(we have the result of the surveys)
‘We have the results of the survey.’

B: Ah... ¿Y te sorprendió algo con respecto a las valoraciones bajas que recibieron los candidatos o sus reacciones?

---

20 Note that in (31) the subject is focused, not a non-contrastive preverbal subject or a contrastive topic. As a consequence, there is no pause or intonational break separating the focused subject and the rest of the sentence.
received the candidates or their reactions

‘I see. And did anything concerning the negative evaluations of the candidates or their reactions catch your attention?’

A: Mira, no te lo vas a creer...

‘Look, not reflexive it will to believe

‘Look, you will not believe this.’

a. Todos Estos Candidatos no recibieron una valoración baja. ??Solo all these candidates not received an assessment low only algunos de ellos. some of them

‘None of these candidates received a negative evaluation.’

b. Todos Estos Candidatos no lamentaron haber recibido una all these candidates not regretted to-have received an valoración baja. ??Solo algunos de ellos. assessment low only algunos de ellos

‘None of these candidates regretted having received a negative evaluation.’

If a focused subject at the right edge is indeed clause internal, we would predict it to get a narrow-scope reading. In contrast, if it has indeed moved to the left-periphery of the clause, the broad scope reading would be licensed. The latter prediction is fulfilled, as seen in the incompatibility with the follow up:

(32)A: Ayer no recibieron una valoración baja tres candidatos. yesterday not received a assessment low three candidates

‘Yesterday, three candidates did not receive a negative evaluation.’

B: Pero ¿qué dices? (Ayer) no recibieron una valoración baja Todos but what say-2SG (yesterday) not received 3PL an assessment low all Estos Candidatos. ??Solo algunos de ellos. these candidates only some of them

(33)A: Ayer no lamentaron haber recibido una valoración baja tres candidatos. yesterday not regretted 3PL to-have received an assessment low three candidates

‘Yesterday, three candidates did not regret having received a negative evaluation.’

B: Pero ¿qué dices? (Ayer) no lamentaron haber recibido una but what say-2SG (yesterday) not received 3PL to-have received an valoración baja Todos Estos Candidatos. ??Solo algunos de ellos. assessment low all these candidates only some of them
This indicates that the focused XP in the rightmost position in (32) is higher than the linear order suggests (see Ortiz de Urbina 2002 for Basque; see also Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2008 for closely-related discussion in Spanish). More specifically, the interpretation of (32) provides further evidence that the rightmost subject has moved to the A' layer of the main clause in keeping with the analysis in (6).21

5.2. Parasitic gaps

Parasitic gaps are known to be licensed by elements that have undergone A’ movement, (34), but not by in situ elements irrespective of their information structural properties, (35):

(34)
   a. ¿Qué facturas dijiste que fueron tiradas sin triturar?
      what bills said.2.SG that were thrown-away without to-shred
      ‘Which bills did you say were thrown away without having been shredded?’
   b. ESAS FACTURAS dijiste que fueron tiradas sin triturar.
      those bills said.2.SG that were thrown-away without to-shred
      ‘Those bills are the ones you said were thrown away without having been shredded.’

(35)
   a. *Dijiste que fueron tiradas ESAS FACTURAS sin triturar.
   b. *Dijiste que fueron tiradas esas facturas sin triturar.

The current approach predicts that the parasitic gap should be licensed by a subject sitting at the right edge of the clause, as by hypothesis, the (sentence final) subject would be the result of movement, going through an intermediate stage analogous to (34)b. This prediction is fulfilled, as (36) shows (compared to (35)a).22 23

21 An anonymous reviewer notes certain variability in the judgments. As noted in n. 1, the judgments reported throughout the paper were tested with three speakers (two linguists and one naive informant). While it is well-known that judgments concerning scope facts are fairly subtle (see also n. 13), a study of the grammar of speakers who show such variability is beyond the scope of the present research.

22 Subjects license parasitic gaps provided that the true gap does not c-command the parasitic gap (see Culicover 2001 for an overview of the syntax of parasitic gaps; I thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing this fact to my attention). To fulfill this requirement, passive structures are used throughout this section. Furthermore, there is some controversy in the literature regarding the validity of tests involving parasitic gaps. E.g., López (2009: 225) argues that the data used to exemplify these constructions involve verbs that can be used intransitively. To avoid this criticism, triturar ‘to shred’ is included in the data as it rarely allows for null objects.

23 While the subject at the right edge is adjacent to triturar in (36), this does not argue against the validity of this test. If adjacency was relevant, the in situ counterparts in (35) would be grammatical,
If this logic is on the right track, we have further evidence as to how high the rightmost subject is: It has moved to the A' layer of the main clause. Note that the current account predicts the licensing of parasitic gaps in (36), as the rightmost position is achieved by having the subject move to Foc,P in the left-periphery (thus licensing the parasitic gap) and, subsequently, having the whole TP move past the subject (see (6)).

To sum up, the scope relations found between focused subjects at the right edge and negation as well as the syntax of parasitic gaps provide evidence that the subject has undergone A’ movement to the left-periphery.

### 6. Evidence that these are contrastively focused subjects

So far, it has been argued that (a.) the subject sitting at the right edge is the main clause subject (section 4); (b.) the subject has moved to the left-periphery in spite of what the linear order relations seem to suggest (section 5); and (c.) our approach in (6) explains the full range of data (sections 4 and 5). The purpose of this section is to show that the subjects under discussion at the right edge are contrastively focused subjects as opposed to being an instance of CLRD, section 6.1, some sort of appositive, section 6.2, or a clause-external fragment, section 6.3.

contrary to the fact. Furthermore, as noted by G. Goodall (p.c.) and an anonymous reviewer, (36) bears some resemblance to a Right-Node Raising structure. Still, to our ear in the Right-Node Raising cases the element at the right edge needs to receive the same Case in both conjuncts. In contrast, this requirement is absent in the parasitic gap construction (see (36)). The requirement present in Right-Node Raising can be seen in the following examples, where (ia) mimics the parasitic gap case, whereas in (ib) the XP at the right edge receives the same Case in both conjuncts:

i. **Right-Node Raising**
   a. ¿Fueron tirados y alguien trituró esos documentos.  
      'Those documents were thrown away and somebody shredded them.'
   b. Yo tiré y alguien trituró esos documentos.  
      'I threw those documents away and somebody shredded them.'

Given that only (ib) is fully grammatical, one can conclude that (36) is not an instance of Right Node Raising.
6.1. Evidence against an analysis in terms of CLRD

The goal of this section is to rule out an analysis in terms of Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) or CLRD. Out of these construction types, CLRD would seem to be the most likely candidate, given its rightmost position. I will, therefore, concentrate on it. While a detailed discussion of CLLD and CLRD in Spanish is beyond the scope of the present research, the information-structural properties as well as the phonological features of contrastively focused subjects at the right edge rule out the CLRD analysis. This is the case because CLRD is known to be incompatible with contrastive stress and contrastive properties in general (see De Cat 2007, López 2009 or Villaalba 2000, a.o.). E.g., as shown by López (2009:44; examples modeled after his work), in the context of the question ‘did you take the pens to María?’ both (37)a, where María is CLLD-ed, and (37)b, where that same XP is CLRD-ed, are legitimate answers, but only the former implies that there is someone else who might have received the pens:

(37)a. No, a María creo que no se los he dado.  
    not to María think I that not her them have given  
    ‘No, I don’t think I have given them to María.’

b. No, creo que no se los he dado, a María. 
    not think I that not her them have given to María

That is to say, the contrastive interpretation that the focused subject at the right edge receives, e.g., see (5)B, is absent in CLRD-ed cases. Furthermore, there is evidence that CLRD-ed items are not hosted in the left-periphery, but rather they occupy a midfield position (see López 2009 or Villaalba 2000, a.o., for details), a fact at odds with the properties of the data at hand (see section 5).

6.2. Evidence against an analysis in terms of apposition

24 Elements undergoing focus movement in Spanish are not doubled by a clitic in contrast to CLLD-ed or CLRD-ed elements (see Bosque and Gutiérrez-Rexach 2008: 696, a.o.). Still, the presence or absence of a clitic is not sufficient evidence to rule out an analysis of subjects at the right edge in terms of CLRD, given that this absence can arguably be due to the absence of (overt) subject clitics in the lexicon (see De Cat 2007, Casielles-Suárez 2004 and Villaalba 2000 for relevant discussion). Nonetheless, as seen in this section, there are other compelling arguments against a CLRD analysis of the data under discussion.
If the rightmost subjects under consideration were appositives, it would be predicted that they can surface after question tags (Costa 2002: 53). However, this is not the case:

(38) A: He oído que ayer Juan lamentó haber comenzado el doctorado. 
    Have-1st.SG heard that yesterday Juan regretted to-have started the PhD. 
    'I have heard that yesterday Juan regretted having started the PhD.'

B: Pero ¿qué dices? Ayer lamentó haber comenzado el doctorado. (?*¿cierto? 
    but what say-2SG yesterday regretted to-have begun the PhD (right? 
    / ¿*¿no crees?), PEDRO, (y no Juan). 
    / not think.2SG?) Pedro (and not Juan) 
    'What? It was Pedro who regretted yesterday having started the PhD, not Juan.'

If this logic is on the right track, it means that we are not dealing with an instance of apposition, but rather a contrastively focused subject.

6.3. Evidence against an analysis in terms of an afterthought or clause-external fragment

These rightmost focused elements are subject to islands in the very contexts where left-periphery focus shows locality effects. For instance, as shown by Ortiz de Urbina (2002) for Basque, focalization out of an adjunct clause is not possible. The same restriction is found in Spanish. (39) illustrates a regular sentence with an adjunct clause and (40) and (41) illustrate the locality restrictions on leftmost and rightmost focalization, respectively:

(39) Cuando Pedro compró ese libro, nos fuimos. 
    when Pedro bought that book, we-reflexive left. 
    'Once Pedro bought that book, we left.'

(40)*PEDRO cuando compró ese libro, nos fuimos. 
    Pedro when bought that book, we-reflexive left

(41)*Cuando compró ese libro, nos fuimos PEDRO. 
    when bought that book, we-reflexive left Pedro

Note that if the subject at the right edge was just some sort of afterthought or a separate utterance, there would be no reason to expect locality restrictions to apply to it. This argues for a unified approach to both leftmost and rightmost contrastive focus as in (6). Under that analysis both leftmost and rightmost contrastive focus have the same syntax, that is to say, both involve movement of the focused XP to the left-periphery, whereas the rightmost position in the latter case follows from the topicalization of the TP past the subject.
7. Comparison with the alternative analyses

So far, evidence has been provided for the following claims regarding the structures under discussion: i. no clausal restructuring has taken place; ii. the subject does not originate in the infinitival clause or at the very least it behaves like it is licensed in the main clause; iii. the subject has moved to the left-periphery of the main clause; iv. the overt subject is indeed a contrastively focused subject as opposed to a CLRD-ed element, a case of apposition or a clause-external afterthought. Throughout the discussion it has been shown how the account in (6) can deal with those properties successfully. According to this account, the movement of the main clause subject to a left-peripheral FocP projection is followed by movement of the TP remnant past the subject. In this section, the properties unveiled so far are used as a benchmark to compare the current analysis to other proposals for the syntax of postverbal subjects. In turn, section 7.5 discusses the availability of other derivational options in syntactic contexts other than non-restructuring control clauses.

7.1. Alternative approaches where the subject of the main clause is in situ

With regard to analyses in terms of object-scrambling or p-movement of the object past an in situ subject (e.g., López 2009 and Zubizarreta 1998, respectively), these approaches can derive the right word order. Specifically, the complement clause could move past the in situ main clause subject (irrespective of the exact operation responsible for the movement of the object clause, e.g., object-shift, p-movement or movement to an AgrO projection to receive Case; see Plann 1986 for discussion on the relationship between Case and clauses in Spanish). This kind of derivation is illustrated in (43) for the data in (42) (I abstract away from irrelevant differences in the exact implementation of each approach, e.g., the landing site or the trigger of the movement of the object clause):

(42)Lamentó cobrar poco PEDRO.
regretted earning little Pedro
‘It was Pedro who regretted making little money.’
Within these approaches, the subject remains in situ. It is therefore predicted that the subject will not be able to license a parasitic gap and that it should remain within the scope of negation, (44) and (45), respectively, contrary to the fact (see section 5): 25

(44) Di jiste que fueron tiradas sin triturar ESAS FACTURAS. = (36)
  said 2.SG that were thrown-away without to-shredded those bills
(45) A: Ayer no lamentaron haber recibido una valoración baja tres candidatos.
    yesterday not regretted 3PL to-have received an assessment low three candidates
    'Yesterday, three candidates did not regret having received a negative evaluation.'
B: Pero ¿qué dices? (Ayer) no lamentaron haber recibido una

---

25 The same criticism applies to Domínguez’s (2004) approach to focused subjects at the right edge. Specifically, this researcher shows that contrastively focused phrases appearing in any position in the sentence other than the leftmost position must be realized with marked prosody which, in Spanish, is achieved by increasing the height of the pitch peak and aligning it with the stressed syllable. Domínguez, following work by Cheng and Rooryck (2000), takes this observation to constitute evidence in favor of a treatment of these rightmost subjects in terms of covert feature movement combined with the presence of an intonational morpheme which allows the focalized subject to be licensed in situ. Still, her approach cannot explain the parasitic gaps facts and the scope of negation. See n. 3 for discussion of the interaction between the syntactic and the phonetic properties of focus. Similarly, the same criticism would arise under a closely-related approach making use of clause-internal A'-projections à la Belletti (1999). Within her framework, the relevant word order can be derived by having the focused main clause subject move to a clause-internal Foc,P and the infinitival TP to a clause-internal Top,P above the Foc,P.
but what say-2SG (yesterday) not received 3PL to-have received an
valoración baja TODOS ESTOS CANDIDATOS. *(Sólo algunos de ellos. =) (33)
assessment low all these candidates only some of them

7.2. The backwards control approach

Within the movement theory of control (Hornstein 1999, 2003; see Boeckx, Hornstein and Nunes 2010 for recent discussion), it is claimed that PRO is not part of the grammar and that the subject of the infinitive undergoes A-movement to the main clause subject position in control structures. Both approaches, the movement theory of control and the PRO-based approach (see Chomsky’s 1981 PRO-theorem and Chomsky and Lasnik’s 1993 null case analysis, a.o.; see also Landau 2000, 2003 for a recent version of this approach) are illustrated below, respectively:

(46)a. [John tried [to t.kiss Mary]]. Movement theory of control
   b. [John tried [to PRO t.kiss Mary]]. PRO-based approach

As seen in section 2, it has been claimed in the literature that the VOS order results from the pronunciation of the low copy of the subject to meet Sentence Stress Assignment conditions, under the assumption that the verb moves to TP (Emonds 1978 and Pollock 1989) and that all arguments, including the subject, vacate vP / VP, arguably for Case checking purposes à la Chomsky (1995) (Ortega-Santos 2006a and 2006b, following Stjepanović’s 1999 analysis of Serbo-Croatian).26 Once this approach is put together with Hornstein’s theory, it is possible to entertain an analysis where the subject in (1)B/(5)B is a low copy pronounced in the infinitival clause to meet PF requirements on focused items.

(47)[TP Pedro, lamentó [Pedro, no trabajar [VP Pedro, trabajar]]]

This kind of control structure where two subject arguments are coindexed but it is the higher subject that is unpronounced is known as backwards control. Analyses where the overt subject in this configuration is a low copy of a non-trivial chain under the movement theory of control have been put forward, for instance, in Polinsky and Potsdam (2002) for Tsez, a language of the Caucasus, and in Monahan (2003) for Korean (see Boeckx, Hornstein and Nunes 2010:106-114 for a summary of the arguments). Note that such an account would be

---

able to generate the right word order while having the subject move up to the left-periphery, (48), thus capturing the evidence that the subject has undergone A-bar movement to a left-peripheric position, e.g., the parasitic gap facts:

\[(48)\text{[FocP Pedro [TP Pedro lamentó [Pedro no trabajan [VP Pedro trabajan]]]]}\]

Still, within the analysis in (48), the overt subject is within the infinitival clause. As a consequence, the infinitival clause and the subject should pass constituency tests, e.g., the movement test, as pointed out by Polinsky and Potsdam (2002) and Monahan (2003). Specifically, the infinitival clause should be able to move together with the subject as a constituent. In contrast to Tsez or Korean, the prediction is not fulfilled for the cases under consideration. This is illustrated in (49)-(50), where the infinitival clause undergoes focus fronting:

\[(49)\text{HABERIDO lamentó Pedro con amargura, no haber comprado un coche.} \quad \text{to-have gone regretted.3SG Pedro with bitterness not to-have bought a car} \]

‘Pedro regretted bitterly HAVING GONE THERE, not having bought a car.’

\[(50)\text{HABERIDO (*PEDRO) lamentó con amargura, no haber comprado un coche.} \quad \text{to-have gone Pedro regretted.3SG with bitterness not to-have bought a car}^{27}\]

One could argue that maybe this context does not license the pronunciation of a low copy of the subject in Spanish. Still, the licensing of Negative Polarity Items (section 4.2) poses a stronger problem for this approach. Specifically, if (48) is really the structure underlying corrective focus at the right edge, not only matrix negation but also embedded negation would be expected to license a Negative Polarity Item functioning as the subject (Ordóñez 2009), contrary to the fact (see (28)a and (28)b, respectively, repeated here):

\[27\text{Note that there is no ban on overt subject-like material in the infinitival clause in this syntactic context. E.g., floating quantifiers are licensed:} \]

\[\quad i. \text{HABERIDO TODOS lamentaron los taxistas con amargura.} \quad \text{to-have gone all regretted.3PL the taxi drivers with bitterness} \]

‘The taxi drivers regretted bitterly HAVING ALL GONE THERE.’

Floating quantifiers are traditionally analyzed as (a.) modifiers of a DP which are left behind after movement of that DP or (b.) as some sort of adverbial (e.g., Sportiche 1988 and Bowers 1993, respectively, a.o.; see Cirillo 2009 for recent discussion). Within the former view, in control clauses PRO would be the DP that the floating quantifier modifies (unless the Movement Theory of Control is adopted). Within that view, floating quantifiers are related to the subject and, therefore, the argument that the moved infinitival clause is compatible with overt subject-oriented material holds.
Furthermore, while this mechanism captures naturally the fact that the object of the infinitival c-commands the subject, (9), repeated here as (52), (see section 4.1.1), nonetheless, the backwards control approach does not predict that such a c-command relation should be prevented by the presence of islands, (11), repeated here as (53). This is the case because subject control is attested irrespective of the locality properties of the infinitival clause. Therefore, even if the infinitival clause is an island, the subject and the object can remain clause internal and the object should be able to c-command the subject after undergoing clause-internal scrambling, contrary to the fact.28

(52)*El libro, lamentaron habérselo comprado a ella; LOS PADRES DE EVA,
the book, regretted to-have-her-it bought to her the parents of Eva
‘Eva’s parents regretted having bought a book for her.’

(53)(?)En cuanto al libro, ayer se preguntaron cuándo compraráselo a ella.
In regard to-the book, yesterday themselves asked when to-buy-her-it to her
LOS PADRES DE EVAi, (y no los sobrinos de María),
the parents of Eva, (and not the nephews of María)
‘With regard to the book, yesterday Eva’s parents asked themselves when to buy it for her’

In contrast, the remnant movement approach indeed predicts that islands should prevent the object from c-commanding the subject at the right edge as discussed in section 4.1.1.

28 Similarly, the backwards control approach does not predict that the V1 [V2-INF S1 O2] order should be affected by the presence of islands or the properties of the object of the infinitive –whether it can undergo scrambling or not-, either (see section 4.2.2). For further discussion of the backwards control analysis to Spanish and Romance infinitival clauses, see Albiou (2009), Alexiadou et al. (2010), Barbosa (2009), Ordóñez (2009) and Rodrígues (2007).
7.3. Rightward movement, right-adjunction or rightward linearization of the subject

Approaches in terms of right adjunction or rightward PF movement of the subject (Torrego 1984 and Parafita Couto 2005, respectively) or rightward linearization of the subject specifier (see López’s 2009 treatment of CLRD\textsuperscript{29}) look promising, as long as these accounts are put together with the movement of the focused XP to the left-periphery. (54) illustrates this kind of derivation for (42) (I abstract away from irrelevant differences in the implementation of each approach):

\begin{center}
(54) Rightward PF movement or rightward linearization of the subject
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (foc) at (0,0) {$\text{FocP}$};
\node (focp) at (-1,1) {$\text{Foc}'$};
\node (dp) at (-1.5,1.5) {$[\text{DP Pedro}]_x$};
\node (f) at (-2,2) {$F$};
\node (tp) at (0,2) {$TP$};
\draw (foc) -- (f); \draw (foc) -- (tp); \draw (focp) -- (dp); \draw (focp) -- (tp); \draw (f) -- (dp); \draw (tp) -- (dp);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
[\text{at lamento cobar poco}]
\end{center}

This would capture the scope and parasitic gap facts (section 5) as well as generate the right word order without having to posit the topicalization of the remnant TP past the subject in the left-periphery. Thus, the main difference between the current approach and rightward linearization or rightward extraposition of a main clause subject hosted in Foc, P lies in the c-command relations between the subject and the TP. In particular, given the sentence in (55), our current approach predicts that the sentence final subject \textit{el pedazo bastard ese} ‘that big bastard’ does not c-command the R-expression \textit{Pedro} and therefore, no PPLE C violation should be attested. In contrast, within these alternative approaches the R-expression is c-commanded by the subject at the right edge, thus predicting that a PPLE C violation should be attested, contrary to the fact.

\begin{center}
(55) Ayer lamento haber visto la foto de Pedro\textsubscript{x} EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE\textsubscript{x}, yesterday regretted to-have seen the picture of Pedro the big bastard that
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{29} According to López (2009) the Linear Correspondence Axiom (Kayne 1994) is a soft constraint which can be overruled by a constraint of the WRAP family that seeks to combine a verb and its extended projection in one intonational phrase. As a result, CLLR-ed items are linearized to the right (see López 2009 for details).
no...
nct...
‘Yesterday, Pedro, the big bastard, was the one who regretted having seen his picture.’

The respective derivations are illustrated below (where I abstract away from irrelevant details):

(56) *Derivation of (55) according to the present proposal*

\[ TP [el pedazo bastardo ese]\_lamentó haber visto la foto de Pedro] \to \text{(movement of } \text{el pedazo bastardo ese to FocP)} \]

\[ \text{FocP } [el pedazo bastardo ese]\_F [TP } l_lamentó haber visto la foto de Pedro]] \to \text{(movement of TP to TopP)} \]

\[ \text{TopP } [l_lamentó haber visto la foto de Pedro] \text{ Top } [\text{FocP } [el pedazo bastardo ese]} \_F \text{ } t] \]

(57) *Derivation of (55) - rightward PF movement or rightward linearization of the subject*

\[ \text{FocP} \]
\[ \text{Foc'} \left[ DP \text{ el pedazo bastardo ese} \right] \]
\[ \text{F } \text{TP} \]

\[ [l_lamentó haber visto la foto de Pedro] \]

The fact that Pedro may corefer with \[el pedazo bastardo ese]\_x, therefore, provides evidence for the remnant movement approach and against the rightward movement/rightward Spec approach. Though judgments are subtle, the predictions of the analysis in (56) are fulfilled, in contrast to the alternative approaches illustrated in (57).

This contrasts with what we have seen for (9)/(52), repeated here as (58). It was argued that the object of the infinitive may c-command the overt subject in sentence final position by virtue of its capacity to undergo scrambling.

(58)*El libro, lamentaron habérselo comprado a ella LOS PADRES DE EVA.

---

30 The c-command relations are the ones illustrated in (57) irrespective of the exact implementation of the analysis, e.g., syntactic movement of the subject to Foc.P or base-generation in Foc.P, combined with rightward linearization or rightward PF movement of the Spec of Foc.P. Within a right-adjunction approach, if indeed such operation is part of the grammar (cf. Kayne 1994), the same c-command relationship is established.
the book, regretted to-have-her-it bought to her the parents of Eva
‘Eva’s parents regretted having bought a book for her.’

Again, evidence in favor of that view came from the fact that, if the embedded clause constitutes an island in control contexts, the PPLE C effects triggered by the object of the infinitive are absent, (see (11)/(53)). So why are PPLE C effects absent in (55) as opposed to (58)? Even if the object of the infinitive, la foto de Pedro, undergoes object-scrambling, Pedro would not be able to c-command the subject – it is deeply embedded within the object- and, therefore, no PPLE C effects would be present.

In contrast, the current approach predicts that if Pedro is the object (as opposed to being deeply embedded inside the object as in (55)), it will be able c-command the subject after being scrambled as suggested by (58). Under this view, it is predicted that the DP object cannot be co-referent with the postverbal subject at the right edge. The prediction is fulfilled in that PPLE C effects are present in (59) when compared to (55) (see section 4.1.2 for detailed discussion on PPLE C effects):

(59) Ayer lamentó haber visto a Pedro, [EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE], no...
yesterday regretted to-have seen to Pedro [the big bastard that] not...
‘Yesterday, Pedro, the big bastard, was the one who regretted having seen himself.’

As argued in section 4.1.2, these c-command relations suggest the following derivation for (59):

(60) Derivation of (59) according to the present proposal

\[\text{TP [EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE]}_{k} \text{lamentó PRO haber visto [a Pedro]}_{x} \rightarrow (\text{movement of [EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE]}_{k} \text{to FocP}) \]

\[\text{FocP [EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE]}_{k} F [TP t_{i} \text{lamentó PRO haber visto [a Pedro]}_{x}] \rightarrow (\text{movement of [a Pedro]}_{x} \text{to TopP}_{1}) \]

\[\text{TopP}_{1} [a \text{Pedro]}_{x} \text{Top}_{1} [\text{FocP [EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE]}_{k} F [TP t_{i} \text{lamentó PRO haber visto t}_{i}]] \rightarrow (\text{movement of [TP t}_{i} \text{lamentó PRO haber visto t}_{i} \text{to TopP}_{2}) \]

\[\text{TopP}_{2} [TP t_{i} \text{lamentó PRO haber visto t}_{i}] \text{Top}_{2} [\text{TopP}_{1} [a \text{Pedro]}_{x} \text{Top}_{1} [\text{FocP [EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE]}_{k} F t]} \]

As seen in this derivation, the current proposal can explain the data if combined with certain assumptions about object-scrambling. In contrast, the approaches in terms of rightward movement, rightward linearization or right-adjunction cannot predict the full range of data.
(59), a priori, is not a problem: the subject binds the object, thus, triggering a PPLE C violation.

\textit{Derivation of (59) - rightward PF movement or rightward linearization of the subject}

\begin{align*}
\text{FocP} & \\
\quad & / \quad \\
\text{Foc'} & [\text{DP el pedazo bastardo ese}]_x \\
\quad & / \quad \\
\text{F} & \quad \text{TP} \\
\end{align*}

[\text{t. lamentó haber visto a Pedro}]

Still, leaving the object of the infinitive in situ does not draw the line between (55) and (59). That contrast suggests that the PPLE C violation in (59) is not explained by \textit{Pedro} being c-commanded and bound by the subject, but rather by \textit{Pedro} being able to c-command and bind the subject. Unfortunately, a hybrid approach combining these analyses with object-scrambling does not help either. This is the case because even if these approaches are put together with movement of the object of the infinitive to a position where it c-commands the subject, this would fail to generate the right word order. This situation is illustrated for (59), where the subject is hosted in Foc.P as discussed previously:

\textit{(Partial) derivation for (59) with rightward linearization of the subject and movement of the object}

\begin{align*}
\text{TopP} & \\
\quad & / \quad \\
\text{Top'} & \\
\quad & / \quad \\
\text{Top} & \quad \text{FocP} \\
\quad & / \quad \\
\text{Foc'} & [\text{DP EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE}]_x \\
\quad & / \quad \\
\text{F} & \quad \text{TP} \\
\end{align*}

[\text{t. t. lamentó haber visto a Pedro}]
This derivation does not generate the word order in (59), but rather it generates the following sequence:

(63) [A Pedro]x lamentó haber visto [EL PEDAZO BASTARDO ESE]x

One step would be missing, namely, the topicalization of the TP, this time put together with a Spec linearized to the right or rightward movement. Still, this family of approaches was supposed to be an alternative to this movement of the TP remnant. In fact, if the topicalization of the TP is needed anyway, then it is not clear why the rightward Spec or rightward movement is needed. In particular, if the derivation includes the topicalization of the TP, a leftward Spec of Foc,P generates the right word order. Thus, the current approach seems more parsimonious than the rightward movement, rightward linearization or right-adjunction accounts as the former has fewer operations or assumptions (there is no rightward movement or linearization to the right on top of the topicalization of TP and the movement of the subject and the object). Therefore, the current analysis is to be preferred according to Occam’s razor. 31

7.4. Interim summary

To sum up, approaches that derive the rightmost position of the subject by leaving it in situ and moving the object clause past the subject (e.g., the object clause undergoes objects-shift, López 2009, a.o., or p-movement, Zubizarreta 1998) are incompatible with the evidence that the subject has undergone A’ movement to the left-periphery (see section 5). In turn, an analysis of the overt subject in (5)B as a low copy of a non-trivial chain under the movement theory of control (Hornstein 1999) would have problems to explain the evidence that the subject originates or at the very least is licensed in the main clause. Finally, accounts in terms of right-adjunction (Torrego 1984), rightward movement (Parafita Couto 2005) or rightward linearization of the A’-moved subject predict that it should c-command the TP, contrary to the fact. In contrast, the proposal in (6) is the only one that can predict the whole range of data as seen throughout the discussion. This result is consistent with previous evidence pointing in the same direction for other kinds of focalized subjects in Romance, e.g.,

31 In turn, in cases where the object of the infinitive does not c-command the subject (see (11)/(53) and (15)B), the current approach and the rightward movement, rightward linearization and right-adjunction accounts involve the same number of steps: movement of the subject to Foc,P and an additional mechanism, topicalization of the TP vs. rightward movement, rightward linearization or right-adjunction of the subject. Thus, these approaches are just as parsimonious in those simpler contexts.
subjects constituting new information or non-corrective contrastive focus. (Ortega-Santos 2008, 2010, Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2008, Longobardi 2000 and Ordóñez 2000, 2009. Furthermore, this conclusion is also relevant in that it provides support for the traditional description of the distribution of overt subjects of infinitives in Spanish (see section 3), a non-trivial result for a number of approaches found in the literature (Ortega-Santos 2003, Fernández Lagunilla 1987, Sitaridou 2002 or Solà 1992).

7.5. On the availability of other derivational options in other syntactic contexts

In spite of the fact that the approaches to postverbal subjects found in the literature are frequently presented as mutually exclusive, the same language may make use of more than one mechanism (e.g., see Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2008 for relevant discussion on Spanish). In particular, recent research has shown the validity of Long Distance Agree (Chomsky 2005) as a licensing mechanism for in situ elements as well as the lack of an across-the-board subject-oriented EPP requirement in Romance Null Subject Languages (see Ortega-Santos 2008 for recent discussion). Moreover, some of the derivations put forward in this research include object scrambling, e.g., (60). Taken together, these properties of the syntax of Spanish and the framework open the door to derivations where the sentence final subject in a transitive sentence remains in situ and the object is moved past it (Ordóñez 2000, a.o.) in contexts other than the data at hand, where object scrambling alone cannot explain the features of the construction. An instance of this kind of derivation is found, allegedly, in VOS structures in interrogative sentences without focus on the subject. In those cases, the subject may surface at the right edge of the sentence:

(64) ¿A quién le regaló (Tista) el coche (Tista)?
umped to whom him gave-3rdSG (Tista) the car (Tista)
’To whom did Tista give the car?’

32 See Uribe-Etxebarria’s (2002) analysis of wh-elements at the right edge of the clause in Spanish for arguments in favor of closely-related derivations. In particular, she claims that pied-piping and right-dislocation facts provide evidence for her analysis. As far as I can tell, her arguments can be straightforwardly applied to focused elements. See also Valmaia (2008) for relevant discussion on the syntax of floating quantifiers.
33 See Author (2010) for discussion of a number of apparent counter-arguments to this analysis found in the literature, (e.g., Costa’s 2002 discussion based on Portuguese). See Cecchetto (2004), a.o., for relevant discussion on the need that traces be c-commanded by their antecedent and derivations involving remnant movement.
This diversity of sentence final subjects can be further illustrated by comparing the syntax of transitive and unaccusative verbs: As stated in section 3, whereas the sentence-final subject of transitive verbs has been shown to be focused in statements, this is not necessarily the case for unaccusative verbs (Contreras 1976; see section 3). Thus, B1’s answer is grammatical both in the context of a what happened question, (65), and also in the context of narrow focus on the subject, (66), in contrast to B2’s reply which is infelicitous in any of those contexts.

(65)A1: ¿Qué ocurre?  = (2)
   what happened
   B1: Viene Porfirio.
   comes Porfirio
   ‘Porfirio is coming.’
   B2: ?*Porfirio viene.
   Porfirio comes

(66)A1: ¿Quién viene?
   who comes
   ‘Who is coming?’
   B1: Viene Porfirio.
   comes Porfirio
   ‘Porfirio is coming.’
   B2: ?*Porfirio viene.
   Porfirio comes

Given the EPP-properties of Spanish and the lack of focus on the subject –necessary to justify a derivation as (6)–, there is no reason for the subject to move in either (65)B1 or in (64). This suggests that in simple clauses other derivational options are available, thus underscoring the importance of investigating highly restricted syntactic context as the non-restructuring control clauses object of this study. As seen in the discussion, the number of derivational mechanisms available are reduced in these kinds of contexts, thus helping decide among potential analyses.

8. Further discussion on the remnant movement account

Within the current approach both leftmost and rightmost focus are implemented via movement of the focused XP to FocP in the left-periphery, with the final word order being contingent on the topicalization of TP. This view accords well with the idea that there is no
semantic difference between contrastive foci in Romance depending on their leftmost or rightmost position (see Brunetti 2003, 2009, against Domínguez 2004; see also Casielles-Suárez 2004, Herburger 2000 and Rooth 1985 for relevant discussion).

Furthermore, the present proposal is consistent with a transparent mapping between syntax and semantics. In particular, Chomsky (2001 and subsequent work) argues that the mapping between the Duality of Semantics and the Duality of Merge is systematic. In the words of Chomsky (2005: 140): 'To a large extent, EM [External Merge] yields generalized argument structure (theta roles, the “cartographic” hierarchies, (...) and similar properties); and IM [Internal Merge] yields discourse-related properties such as old information and specificity, along with scopal effects'. Uriagereka (2008) provides a rationale for this kind of view arguing for the idea that mapping a more or less entangled syntax to a semantics of comparable complexity is realistic, both from a developmental (learnability) and, ultimately, an evolutionary (minimalistic) perspective. According to this view, the relationship between focalization processes and movement qualifies as an instance of rich semantics related to movement. In turn, the movement of the TP past the subject hosted in the left-periphery follows from the fact that the TP constitutes old information (see (1)), which, as such, undergoes movement to a TopicPhrase, again an instance of rich semantics related to movement.34

8.1 On TP remnant movement

If the logic developed so far is on the right track, the present discussion provides evidence for the availability of TP remnant movement. While there are a number of works that assume the availability of this operation (e.g., Kayne 1994), there is some controversy in the literature. Specifically, Abels (2003; see also references therein) raises two objections to the availability of remnant TP movement drawing on Last Resort and the phasal nature of CP, respectively.35 According to him, Last Resort rules out movement from complement to specifier position within the same phrase.

34 The current analysis can be restated in phase-theoretic terms. E.g., López (2009) argues that Fin,P is a phase and that a contrastive feature is assigned to XPs that undergo focus preposing, in keeping with the idea that edge features, that is to say, surface semantics features are assigned at phase-edges (Chomsky 2000). López does not discuss rightmost corrective focus, but if his approach is on the right track, the contrastive nature which is part of corrective focus could be argued to follow from the intermediate step in the derivation where the rightmost XP is preposed (to the edge of the Fin,P phase within his proposal), prior to the movement of the TP remnant past the focused phrase. See Gallego (2007) for further discussion on phases in Spanish and Romance.

35 I would like to thank G. Müller for bringing the relevance of Abels’ work to my attention.
A constituent $\alpha$ may only be merged, i.e. base-merged or re-merged, if that leads to the immediate satisfaction of a previously unsatisfiable feature.

This is the case because the complement is already in a close relation with its selecting head and the said movement does not help establish a new checking relation (see also Pesetsky and Torrego 2007 and Branigan 2011, a.o.). In the case of the movement of TP to CP, this operation is too local, as it is movement from the complement position of CP to the Spec of CP. As a consequence, Last Resort would be violated. Still, the current analysis adopts the split CP hypothesis (see Rizzi 1997, a.o., for discussion and evidence in favor of that hypothesis):

$\text{(68) TopP... [FocP... [TP...}$

As acknowledged by Abels (2003: 108), under that hypothesis, the problem disappears: TP is the complement of FocP and it moves, not to the Spec of FocP, an operation that would violate Last Resort, but rather to the Spec of Top.P, above Foc.P. Moreover, both kinds of movement, focus movement and topic movement are sufficiently distinct to not be subject to any minimality restriction.

In a similar vein, the phasal nature of CP has been argued to prevent TP from moving (Abels 2003). Specifically, if CP is a phase, the only way for TP to move, be it to the CP-layer or past it, would be to move to the phase edge, that is to say, Spec,CP. As discussed, this is not possible, since Last Resort rules out movement from complement to specifier position within the same phrase – no new checking relation is established. However, within Chomsky’s framework, movement is not really driven by the need to establish new checking relations but by the need of phase-heads, and indeed heads in general, to have a specifier (Chomsky 2008; see also Lasnik 1999, a.o.). As a consequence, it is not clear that Last Resort prevents TP from moving, irrespective of the phasal nature of CP. Within this framework, a complement does not satisfy the EPP feature of the head of its phrase or else movement (internal merge) could never take place. As a consequence, movement from complement to specifier position within the same phrase leads to the satisfaction of a ‘previously unsatisfiable feature’, namely, the EPP feature.

Inasmuch as the present proposal provices empirical evidence for the availability of TP remnant movement, this research also constitutes an argument in favor of the EPP-driven framework, in spite of recent attempts to eliminate this property from the system (e.g., Branigan 2011).
9. Conclusion

This research has provided novel evidence for a two-step approach to sentence-final postverbal subjects in Spanish, where focus movement of the subject to the left-periphery is followed by the topicalization of the TP remnant. Evidence is provided by the properties of an understudied syntactic context, namely, corrective focus at the right edge, primarily in biclausal structures involving subject control. This analysis provides support for the traditional description of the distribution of overt subjects of infinitives in Spanish, which have been claimed to be banned from complement infinitival clauses and allowed elsewhere (Fernández Lagunilla 1987). This is a non-trivial result for approaches developed assuming the correctness of this generalization (Ortega-Santos 2003, Fernández Lagunilla 1987, Sitaridou 2002 and Solà 1992, a.o.) and for Case Theory, PRO's Theorem and their revisions. Furthermore, evidence has been provided in favor of the availability of remnant TP movement in the grammar.
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