On personal and impersonal *trebati* 'need' in Serbo-Croatian: Implications for raising

Maša Bešlin, University of Maryland

In this talk, I examine the properties of the Serbo-Croatian (SC) modal verb *trebati* 'need', which can appear in two apparently similar constructions (1).[1] The complement introduced by DA is finite in both sentences, and the only obvious difference between (1a) and (1b) is the presence versus absence of subject agreement morphology on *trebati* and the auxiliary. I will show that both (1a) and (1b) involve subject-to-subject raising, and argue that the lack of agreement in (1b) arises because the subject NP raises too late for the matrix agreement probe to 'see' it.

(1) a. Marija i   ja smo   treba-l-e   da ide-mo   na pijacu.
       Mary and I AUX.1PL need-LPTCP-FEM.PL. DA go- PRES.1PL on market
    b. Marija i   ja je   treba-l-o   da ide-mo   na pijacu.
       Mary and I AUX.3SG need-LPTCP-NEUT.SG DA go- PRES.1PL on market
       'Mary and I needed to go to the market'

The paradigm in (1) is exceptional because subject-verb agreement is generally obligatory in SC. The pattern in (1b) is observed with impersonal predicates such as *sevati* 'flash' (2). The lack of agreement is spelled out as 3rd person singular neuter for the past tense. I argue that the agreement pattern in (1b) arises for the same reason as in (2), namely because *trebati* 'need' has failed to agree with a nominal argument (which has φ-features to transmit).

(2) Seva-l-o   je.
    flash-LPTCP-NEUT.SG AUX.3SG
    'There was lightning'

I first show that both personal and impersonal *trebati* 'need' form part of a bi-clausal structure. Strong evidence from this comes from the licensing of Negative Polarity Items (NPIs). As illustrated in (3), so-called *i*-NPIs in SC are only licensed by superordinate negation (Progovac 1991). (4) shows that *i*-NPIs are licit in the complement position of the lexical verb only if the negation targets the modal verb. This is expected if there is a clausal boundary between the modal and the lexical verb.

(3) a. ***I**-ko **ne** voli **i**-šta.
        i-who NEG loves i-what
        intended: 'Nobody loves anything'
    b. Marija **ne** tvrdi da **i**-ko želi **i**-šta.
       Mary   NEG claims DA i-who wants i-what
       'Mary is not claiming that anybody wants anything'

(4) a. *Marko bi   treba-o /   treba-l-o   da **ne** uradi **i**-šta.
        Marko be.AOR.3SG need-LPTCP.MASC.SG need-LPTCP-DEF DA NEG do   i-what
        intended: 'Marko should not do anything'
    b. Marko **ne** bi   trebao /   trebalo   da uradi **i**-šta.
       Marko NEG be.AOR.3SG need-LPTCP.MASC.SG need-LPTCP-DEF DA do   i-what
       'Marko should not do anything'

I then provide evidence that *trebati* 'need' is a raising verb (and not a control verb). As (5) shows, impersonal *trebati* and the verb in its complement may never have independent subjects, regardless of whether they are co-referential (5a) or not (5b). The same is true for the agreeing form of *trebati.* In SC (and English), subject control verbs will allow overt embedded subjects if they are contrastively focused (6). I take the badness of (5a) in this same environment to suggest that *trebati* 'need' in (5) is a raising verb; it has no external role to assign, and its subject in well-formed sentences is raised from the subordinate clause. In the talk, I present additional evidence for the raising status of *trebati*, using the diagnostics from Wurmbrand 1999.

---

[1] I use past forms throughout for reasons of space; everything that is said is also valid for the present tense.

(5) a. Marija je   treba-l-o   da (*ONA)   ostane-∅   kod kuće.
    Mary   AUX.3SG need-LPTCP-NEUT.SG DA she.NOM.SG stay- PRES.3SG at   home
    intended: 'Mary and I need us to stay at home'

 b. Janko je   treba-l-o   da (*Petar)   ostane-∅   kod kuće.
    Janko AUX.3SG need-LPTCP-NEUT.SG DA Peter.NOM.SG   stay- PRES.3SG at   home
    intended: 'Janko needs Peter to stay at home' (adapted from Arsenijević & Simonović 2014:299)

(6)   Marija je   žele-l-a   da (ONA)   ostane   kod kuće.
      Mary   AUX.3SG want-LPTCP-FEM.SG DA she.NOM.SG. stay-3SG at   home
      'Mary wanted HERSELF to stay home'

I then ask why the sentence-initial NP with *trebati* does not obligatorily trigger agreement. First, I show that this NP is indeed a (derived) subject. One piece of evidence for this claim comes from relativization. In SC relative clauses, it is generally impossible to front an NP between the relative pronoun and the subject, even when the subject is null (7a). In this structure, spec CP is occupied with the relative pronoun *kog* 'who', but *Marija i Jovana* 'Marija and Jovana' is trying to fit in the same position. Crucially, the NP that precedes impersonal *trebati* is still possible, (7b). The fact that *Marija i Jovana* in (7b) is not competing with the relative pronoun suggests that it is in an A-position, not an A'-position.

(7) a. *[Čovek [kog   [**Marija   i   Jovana**]ᵢ   *pro* / Marko   tvrdi-∅   da tᵢ vid-e]] je visok.
       man   who.ACC Mary.NOM and Jovana.NOM 3SG   Marko   claim-3SG DA   see-3PL is tall
       intended: 'The man who Mary and Jovana s/he/Marko claims see is tall'

 b. [Čovek [kog   [**Marija i   Jovana**]ᵢ treba-∅   da tᵢ vid-e]] je visok.
    man   who.ACC Mary   and Jovana   need-3SG DA   see-3PL is tall
    'The man who Mary and Jovana need to see is tall'

To account for the contrast in (1a-b), it is also crucial to take note of the data in (8); the subject can stay in the embedded clause if the verb is in the non-agreeing form (8a), but not if it is in the agreeing form (8b). Subject licensing in situ poses a problem for analyses on which raising applies in order to satisfy unvalued features on the nominal (e.g., Case, Chomsky 2008). Similarly, motivating the raising though a movement probe on matrix T will have difficulties explaining why the subject in (8a) can remain in situ, unless an expletive *pro* is assumed.

(8) a. Treba-l-**o**   **je**   da **Marija i   ja** ide-mo na pijacu.
       need-PTCP-NEUT.SG AUX.3SG DA Mary   and I   go-1PL on market
       'Mary and I should have gone to the market'

 b. *Treba-l-e   smo   da **Marija i   ja** idemo   na pijacu.
    need-PTCP-FEM.PL AUX.3PL DA Mary   and I   go-1PL on market
    intended: 'Mary and I should have gone to the market'

Instead, I will claim that (this kind of) A-movement is fully optional, it can occur at any stage of the derivation (or not), and it is constrained only by the requirement that the output be well-formed (see Baker & Vinokurova 2010 and Rezac, Albizu & Etxepare 2014 for explorations of this idea in different domains). Assume also that the agreement probe can only 'see' the subject NP if it has raised to spec TP of the matrix clause; in the talk, I explore two ways to implement this idea. With these assumptions in place, answers to several questions become clear. Since there is no movement probe, the subject NP can move (1) or stay in situ (8a). Since movement of this kind is a free operation, it can occur before or after agreement probing. If the NP moves before agreement probing, the probe will agree with it (1a). If it moves after probing, we get default agreement on T (1b). The subject is free to *not* move, but it is then not visible to the agreement probe, which is why only the non-agreeing form of *trebati* is possible in such cases, cf. (8a-b).

References: Baker, M. C., & N. Vinokurova. 2010. Two modalities of case assignment: Case in Sakha. *NLLT, 28*(3), 593–642. ►Chomsky, N. 2008. On phases. *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, 133–166. MIT Press. ►Progovac, Lj. 1991. Polarity in Serbo-Croatian: Anaphoric NPIs and pronominal PPIs. *LI 22*(3). 567–572. ►Rezac, M., P. Albizu & R. Etxepare. 2014. The structural ergative of Basque and the theory of Case. *NLLT, 32*(4), 1273-1330. ►Simonović, M. & B. Arsenijević. 2014. Ličnost i bezličnost srpskog glagola *trebati*: Avanture teorijske lingvistike u prenormiranom domenu. *Jezik, književnost, marginalizacija*, 278–304. ►Wurmbrand, S. 1999. Modal verbs must be raising verbs. *WCCFL 18*(1), 599–612.