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Subjunctive vs Indicative periphery

- Crosslinguistic evidence supports the hypothesis that subjunctive and indicative clauses differ in size.

1. Indicative and subjunctive periphery in Ndebele
   a. indicative: $[C \in [TP, T] \in [v \ldots]]$
   b. subjunctive: $[C \in [TP, T] \in [v \ldots]]$

Proposal

- Morphosyntactic asymmetries between indicative and subjunctive clauses are not selected properties, but the result of reduced periphery
- Reduced periphery is due to either:
  - base generation, or
  - derivational deletion
- Evidence: clause size variability

Negation

(2) a-nghi-pleki
(3) ngi-nga-pleki

Negation

1. Class I agreement
2. Subject in focus?
3. Augmentless subject?

Possibility of subject focus

   think.1sg comp 1Zodwa only 1s-FUT−come,IND
   *I think only Zodwa will come*
5. Ngifsuka ukuthi zodwa kuphela a-buye.
   wish.1sg comp 1Zodwa only 1s-come,SA
   *I hope only Zodwa comes*

Agreement morphology

- Agreement prefix (class 1) shows allomorphy sensitive to mood:
  - Indicative clauses (4): a-
  - Subjunctive clauses (5): a-

Augmentless subjects

6. Angisi kuthi mama a-ngeke.
   wish.1sg.NG comp 1mother 1s-leave,SA
   *I don’t wish for mom to leave*
7. Angicabangi kuthi *u(a)-ma-
   wish.1sg.NG comp aug 1mother 1s-leave,IND
   *I don’t think mom will leave*

Evidence for the reduced-periphery view

- Proposal: The properties of subjunctive clauses are reduced-periphery effects
- Alternative: the asymmetries are directly related to clause type (e.g. [z1] → a/-sape)
- Evidence: these asymmetries are specific to clause size, not clause type, comes from relative clauses:
  - they are indicative but show some properties of subjunctive clauses
  - clause size variability within a single clause type (SBJ vs OBJ relatives) results in mixed properties.

Deriving the asymmetries

Negation

indicative: $[C : a \in [TP, T] \in [v \ldots]]$
subjunctive: $[C : [TP, T] \in [v \ldots]]$

Subject focus and agreement morphology

(8) Subjunctive:
(9) Indicative:

- IND: TopP probes for a ϕ-goal ⇒ always attracts the subject → subjects always topical
- SBJV: no agreeing TopP ⇒ subjects are not necessarily topical

Augmentless subjects

the lack of augment ⇒ structural case (Halpert, 2012)

• C can get case (it’s nominal: augment, ϕ-features)
• Sub-licensing: a C bearing structural case is a structural case licensor.
• Phase-bound locality is required. All left-peripheral XPs are phases (Müller, 2010)

Evidence for the reduced-periphery view

- Proposal: The properties of subjunctive clauses are reduced-periphery effects
- Alternative: the asymmetries are directly related to clause type (e.g. [z1] → a/-sape)
- Evidence: these asymmetries are specific to clause size, not clause type, comes from relative clauses:
  - they are indicative but show some properties of subjunctive clauses
  - clause size variability within a single clause type (SBJ vs OBJ relatives) results in mixed properties.

Clause size variability: relative clauses

• Ndebele relative clauses are indicative: $[CP _{\{TP, [TP, T]\}}]$
• Nonetheless, they show some properties of reduced clauses

1. Mixed properties of relative clauses
   a. umfana a- u- nga- si- diyo inkwaka subject relative
   ‘boy assoc 1s-neg: 7-to-ate ?bread
   ‘the boy who didn’t the bread’
   b. inkwaka a- u- nga- si- diyo object relative
   ‘bread assoc 1s-neg: 7-to-ate
   ‘the bread that he didn’t eat’

- Movement-triggered Structure Deletion (Pesetsky’s (2016) “Exfoliation”):
  - Structural Description: [WP ... φ ... [vP ... [CP ...,]], where WP and VP are phases.
  - Structural Change: Replace WP by γP
  - Last Resort: Applies only to enable Merge(β, α) without violating PIC

1. Low Negation ⇒ TP deleted in both OBJ and SUBJ relatives
2. Agreement allomorphy ⇒ TopP deleted only in OBJ relatives
   • this alternation has the distribution of anti-agreement:
     - local subject extraction: a-
     - any other extraction: a-
     ⇒ The matrix indicative agreement prefix (a-) is the anti-agreement prefix.
3. Subject focus possible
   • In object relatives, the overt subject of the RCs is the lower copy in Spec,TP.
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