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Abstract
The topic of my thesis is the subjunctive mood in Slavic languages, which is a subject that has not received sufficient attention in theoretical linguistic literature so far. Even though Slavic languages do not feature dedicated subjunctive verb forms, Slavic subjunctives can be distinguished from indicatives because they are introduced through distinct clause-initial items. This observation led to the claim that subjunctive and indicative complements in Slavic correspond to two different embedded clause types, selected under formally distinct CP projections. Indicative CP was argued to constitute a marked syntactic option in embedded clausal environments, in the sense that it is selected by a specific group of predicates which share a common lexical feature, whereas subjunctive CP is selected as a default embedded option, by predicates which do not contain the relevant feature. This analysis allowed me to account for the lexical diversity of predicates that select the subjunctive in Slavic.
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The overall theoretical assumption behind this thesis is that subjunctive mood should be seen as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon, whose properties cannot be fully accounted for if one adopts a reductive approach that either focuses exclusively on semantics or just on the formal aspects related to subjunctive clauses. This is why I propose a more integrative approach in this dissertation, which looks at both the syntactic and the semantic properties of subjunctive complements, as well as their interaction through the syntax-semantics interface.

My analysis of the Slavic subjunctive is based on a more general thesis that I develop in the first part of the dissertation, which pertains to the cross-linguistic properties of the subjunctive mood. First of all, I argue that subjunctive can be found in two essentially different types of embedded syntactic environments across languages, which are labeled as Subj(uncate)1 and Subj(uncate)2. Subj1 corresponds to cases where a subjunctive complement is selected by the matrix predicate under a separate subjunctive CP, which is analyzed as the embedded equivalent of the matrix imperative CP (as in Han (1998) or Kempchinsky (2009)), whereas Subj2 involves cases where subjunctive morphology is introduced under a different syntactic clause type (e.g. in an indicative-type clause) in order to provide a meaningful contribution to the interpretation of the sentence. Subj1 complements, which are typically selected by intensional predicates such as desideratives or directives, are more stable across languages, whereas Subj2 clauses, commonly associated with epistemic or factive predicates, exhibit more cross-linguistic variation in their distribution. The syntactic difference between Subj1 and Subj2 in terms of clause types is one of the reasons why no purely semantic definition of the subjunctive (e.g. irrealis, non-veridicality etc.) could comprehensively cover its distribution.

This dissertation focuses primarily on Subj1, because Subj2 is shown to be less productive in Slavic (this being one of the examples of the variation in cross-linguistic distribution of Subj2). Even though Subj1 is associated with more coherent, irrealis-type semantics in the typical cases of subjunctive complementation (i.e. with complements defined as intensional subjunctives), the full distributional range of Subj1 clauses is shown to exhibit a much greater degree of semantic diversity in Slavic, which means that subjunctive cannot be subsumed under any global semantic definition even in Subj1 contexts. This diversity is
explained in light of the claim that Subj1 CP selection should be seen as the default syntactic option in embedded environments and, as such, it can be selected by predicates with very different lexical properties. I couch the analysis in this context within the framework of world-semantics, claiming that clauses such as declaratives and indicatives are anchored to a specific world, whereas clauses such as imperatives and subjunctives are not (a claim based on the more general theoretical perspectives outlined in Farkas (1992) and Portner (1997)). Thus, the selection of world-anchored indicative clauses in embedded contexts is analyzed as a marked syntactic option, achieved through the extra W(orld) feature present in the underlying lexical make-up of the selecting predicate, whereas subjunctive/embedded imperative CP is selected simply in the absence of W, as an Elsewhere option.

Before I applied this broader theoretical analysis in more detail in the context of various Slavic languages, I first had to tackle some initial problems pertaining to the overt realization of the Slavic subjunctive more generally. This is because the latter exhibits unusual morpho-syntactic marking, due to the fact that it is not identified through dedicated verbal morphology, which is the most common type of subjunctive marking cross-linguistically, but through a separate syntactic item, which resembles a complementizer and appears at the beginning of the subjunctive clause. Nevertheless, a comparative analysis of the typical contexts of subjunctive complementation in Slavic and Romance showed that Subj1 complements share the bulk of the underlying formal and semantic clausal properties in both language groups. As a result, I argued that Slavic and Romance Subj1 constitute the same clausal mood category, syntactically selected under the same type of CP.

A closer observation of the properties of subjunctives in different Slavic languages led me to establish a two-way typological distinction within the Slavic linguistic family between, on the one hand, the Balkan-type Slavic subjunctive (BlkS), extant in languages such as Bulgarian or Serbian and, on the other, the non-Balkan, or Russian-type Slavic subjunctive (RusS), extant in languages such as Russian, Polish or Czech. The subjunctive complements in these two groups of languages differ both when it comes to their exact morpho-syntactic realization and when it comes to their distribution. I chose to place the central theoretical focus of this dissertation on BlkS, and then apply the analysis proposed in the context of BlkS to RusS. This choice was motivated by the fact that Balkan languages exhibit unusual subjunctive distribution, which renders the study of BlkS particularly challenging. More precisely, BlkS distribution is much wider than the one observed with RusS, because BlkS is selected both by
control and by non-control verbs, whereas RusS (as well as subjunctive cross-linguistically) is not typically selected by (subject) control predicates.

The primary reason why the wide-ranging distribution of subjunctive complements in Balkan languages presents a particular theoretical challenge is because it entails a greater degree of semantic diversity of BlkS as such, making it difficult to analyze BlkS as a coherent mood category, especially if one approaches it from a purely semantic perspective. Nevertheless, the analysis I put forward, which looked at BlkS from the syntax-semantics interface prism, showed that BlkS complements in general, regardless of whether they appear in control or in non-control environments, can be viewed as part of the same Subj1 clausal mood, syntactically introduced under the same CP clause type. The lexical diversity of predicates that select this clause type was explained in light of the overall analysis of Subj1 selection as a default embedded option. The formal and semantic differences observed between various BlkS Subj1 complements were analyzed as the result of different syntactic derivations associated with clauses of this type, which can produce varying structural outputs at the syntax-semantics interface, resulting in different interpretations.

The theoretical generalizations reached on the basis of the study of BlkS were then applied to RusS. Despite the apparent differences in subjunctive complementation patterns between BlkS and RusS, particularly when it comes to subjunctive distribution, I was able to show that the analysis put forward in the context of BlkS was applicable to non-Balkan Slavic languages as well. The non-Balkan equivalents of BlkS Subj1 complements were shown to share the bulk of the underlying formal and semantic properties with the latter, even in those syntactic environments where the two groups of languages seem to exhibit greatest differences, i.e. in control contexts where Balkan Slavic languages typically employ the subjunctive and non-Balkan ones the infinitive. Hence both Balkan subjunctives and non-Balkan subjunctives/infinitives were argued to constitute the same Subj1 clausal mood. As a result, despite some differences in the overt subjunctive vs. infinitive morphology, Subj1 clause type as such was confirmed to have a stable distribution in the context of Slavic.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this dissertation will be the subjunctive mood in Slavic languages, and the formal and semantic properties of clauses that are associated with it. The syntactic context I will be primarily interested in is the one of subordination, i.e. cases where the subjunctive mood appears in the embedded complement clause introduced under different types of matrix predicates, which is the most typical syntactic environment where subjunctive can be found across languages (Palmer, 1986).

Slavic subjunctive in particular presents a challenging subject because it poses several types of broad theoretical problems, some of which are more general to the study of the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective, while others are more specific to the Slavic language group itself. The more general challenge related to the Slavic subjunctive has to do with defining the nature of this mood category in a way that accounts for the full distributional range of subjunctive clauses, which has proved to be a difficult problem for authors studying the subjunctive regardless of the language or language group they would focus on. On the other hand, Slavic subjunctive also presents some more specific difficulties that one is not faced with when studying the same mood category in other languages. The most salient among these is the fact that subjunctive-type complements in Slavic have a less clear morphological marking than is the case in most other languages where we observe this mood because, while subjunctive is typically marked through verbal morphology and a dedicated verb form cross-linguistically, Slavic languages do not contain such a subjunctive verb form. Hence the first question I will be faced with once I turn my attention to Slavic is to determine the exact strategy that these languages use in order to distinguish the subjunctive from other mood categories, such as the indicative.

Given that the study of Slavic subjunctive poses both the general theoretical problems related to defining the nature of this mood, as well as some more specific issues related to the absence of clear morphological marking for the subjunctive in this language group, my overall

---

1 For more on the general theoretical problems related to the subjunctive cross-linguistically, see 1.4.4.

1
objective in this dissertation will be two-fold: the first goal will be to show that, despite the lack of dedicated subjunctive verbal morphology, subjunctive can nonetheless be analyzed as a separate mood category in Slavic languages as well; the second, and more wide-ranging objective will be to account for the nature of the Slavic subjunctive mood, and incorporate the latter within a broader, cross-linguistic theoretical approach to the subjunctive, which will be developed in the introductory chapter.

The analysis I will propose in this context will provide a new way to approach the theoretical difficulties related to the subjunctive mood. As I already hinted at the beginning, the primary reason why subjunctive in general has always presented a particularly difficult subject for study is due to the fact that the range of syntactic contexts it can be found in do not easily lend themselves to any kind of coherent global definition for this mood category, either in a given language or cross-linguistically. As we will see in more detail in Section 1.4, none of the more influential semantic definitions that were proposed in order to account for the nature of the subjunctive mood (e.g. irrealis, non-veridicality, intensionality etc.) is both general enough to subsume all the syntactic contexts of subjunctive distribution, particularly some of the more problematic ones that we will observe shortly, but also restricted and precise enough to exclude other mood categories, such as the indicative, from its scope.

The way in which I will address these problems will be somewhat different than it was usually done in the literature on the subjunctive. When faced with the problematic cases of subjunctive distribution, most authors have attempted to adjust the semantic definitions of the subjunctive that were proposed previously so as to better fit the data. Here I will propose a different theoretical angle. The basic working assumption upon which my analysis of the Slavic subjunctive (and subjunctive more generally) will hinge is that subjunctive mood should be seen as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon, which means that one can observe systematic interactions between the formal syntactic properties associated with a given subjunctive clause and the type of interpretation it denotes in the semantic component. As a result, subjunctive meaning in general should not be analyzed in isolation from the type of syntactic environment that a given subjunctive clause appears in and the type of derivation it undergoes. This is why I will claim that no purely semantic definition can fully account for the properties of the subjunctive mood, but a more comprehensive analysis that takes into account both the syntactic and the semantic data pertaining to subjunctive complementation can reach a number of generalizations that allow us to have a better understanding about the basic nature of this mood category.
Before I develop the theoretical approach that I just briefly outlined in more detail, I will first begin by delineating the scope of my study, i.e. outlining which theoretical aspects related to the Slavic subjunctive I will be primarily concerned with and which ones I will leave to the side in the present dissertation.

1.1 Scope of the study

Given that Slavic subjunctive is a rather vast subject, both in terms of the number of languages contained in this linguistic family, as well as in terms of the theoretical problems it poses, I will not be able to treat it in an entirely comprehensive manner. What I plan to do instead is to prioritize those theoretical aspects which I consider to be central when it comes to determining the basic nature of the Slavic subjunctive mood in general, as well as focus on those languages which will be shown to be broadly representative of the Slavic language family as a whole when it comes to the realization and distribution of subjunctive complements.

First of all, as I already mentioned at the very beginning, the primary syntactic context that I will focus on in this study will be subjunctive subordination, involving embedded subjunctive clauses such as those we can observe in Romance examples in (1).²

(1) a.  *Je veux que tu viennes.*  (French)

   I want that you come2.sg.SUBJ

   ‘I want you to come.’

   b.  *Ordenó que vengas.*  (Spanish)

   ordered3.sg. that come2.sg.SUBJ

   ‘He ordered you to come.’

Some other contexts where subjunctive can appear, either in Slavic languages or cross-linguistically, will not be dealt with in as much detail, but only mentioned from time to time when relevant for the overall analysis. Those include, for instance: subjunctive uses in simple matrix clauses, where this mood typically denotes optative or imperative-type meanings (2);

² Until I describe the morpho-syntactic realization of the Slavic subjunctive in Chapter 2, the bulk of the illustrative examples that I will use in the introductory chapter will be taken from Romance languages (primarily French and Spanish), which have been most extensively studied in this context. These examples will allow me to sketch out the broad outlines of the analysis that will later on be applied to Slavic in more detail.
adjunct subjunctives, such as those appearing in purposive clauses (3); subjunctives appearing in conditional constructions (4); or subjunctives appearing in relative clauses, modifying an indefinite noun (5):

(2)  a.  *Qu’il vive cent ans.*  
that he live3.sg.SUBJ hundred years  
‘May he live a hundred years.’

   b.  *No vengas mañana.*  
no come2.sg.SUBJ tomorrow  
‘Don’t come tomorrow.’

(3)  *Il t’a acheté un billet de train pour que tu puisses venir.*  
he you has bought a ticket of train so that you can2.sg.SUBJ comeINF  
‘He bought you a train ticket, so that you can come.’

(4)  *Si hubieras venido ayer, me hubieras visto.*  
if have2.sg.SUBJ come yesterday, me have2.sg.SUBJ seen.  
‘Had you come yesterday, you would have seen me.’

(5)  *Je cherche une personne qui puisse accomplir cette tâche.*  
I seek a person who can3.sg.SUBJ accomplish this task  
‘I am seeking a person who can accomplish this task.’

Moreover, while my overall goal will be to account for the nature of the Slavic subjunctive mood from a global perspective, I do not intend to study in detail the precise linguistic properties related to subjunctive complements in each and every Slavic language, because that would require me to look at more than a dozen different languages, which is outside the scope of this dissertation. Rather, as I already mentioned, I will focus on a smaller number of languages, which will be shown as representative of the Slavic subjunctive as a whole. The languages that will be of primary interest in this context are Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian,³

---

³ Serbian and Croatian- the two varieties of the old Serbo-Croatian- are very similar in most areas of their grammar, but perhaps the most conspicuous syntactic difference between the two can be observed precisely in the context of subjunctive subordination, which is why I will refer to them separately in this study. The relevant differences in this context will be described later on in Chapter 3, once I focus on these languages in particular.
Russian, and to a somewhat lesser extent Polish. Even though I will not be able to deal with the subjunctive in each Slavic language, the main theoretical conclusions that I will reach on the basis of the analysis of these particular languages, if correct, should extend to the Slavic family more widely.

Furthermore, this dissertation will primarily consist of a synchronic and comparative study of the subjunctive mood in Slavic languages, and will not be as concerned with diachronic aspects related to Slavic subjunctives, which are quite complex and difficult to deal with comprehensively if one focuses on a relatively broad range of languages, as is the case in this study. I will only occasionally mention some diachronic developments that affected Slavic subjunctives from a descriptive point of view, when they will be useful to explain the current properties of this mood in a given language or group of languages, but this will never be the central focus of my study. Once again, the main issue I will be concerned with here are the synchronic properties of the subjunctive in different Slavic languages, as well as the relation that can be established between Slavic subjunctive and the same mood category in other language groups (primarily Romance).

Finally, when it comes to the syntax of subjunctive clauses, which will be one of the central theoretical concerns of this dissertation, I will build upon the basic minimalist structure, consisting of hierarchical CP-TP-vP projections (Chomsky, 1995). My primary area of interest in this context will be the higher clausal domain, known metaphorically as the left periphery of the clause, which includes CP and the functional projections below it (primarily the projections that will be analyzed as situated between CP and TP). This clausal area is particularly relevant when it comes to the study of the Slavic subjunctive because, as we will observe from Chapter 2 onwards, the formal distinction between the indicative and the subjunctive mood in Slavic is most prominently marked on the left periphery of the clause. As for the lower parts of the clausal structure, such as those containing projections associated with the vP layer, where notions such as the predicate’s argument structure and thematic relations are encoded, they will not be as relevant for my discussion on the Slavic subjunctive and will hence not feature prominently in this study.

Now that I have roughly defined my primary areas of interest, I will move on to describe the main thesis upon which this study will be based in more detail, as well as outline the organization of the following parts of the dissertation. First I will describe the thesis in relatively broad terms, in a way that is meant to have cross-linguistic relevance (1.2.1), and then I will outline in more detail how this main thesis will be applied in the context of Slavic (1.2.2).
1.2 Thesis and outline

As I already briefly explained at the beginning of the introductory chapter, the most wide-ranging claim upon which I will base my analysis of the subjunctive is that the latter should be seen as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon. As a result, one cannot fully account for the properties of this mood category without taking both of these linguistic facets related to subjunctive clauses into consideration. If one approaches the subjunctive from a more reductive perspective- for instance, from a purely semantic point of view, as was often the case-, the resulting analysis will not be complete. This is the main reason why, as we will see in more detail later on in 1.4, the semantic definitions of the subjunctive that were previously proposed in literature could not fully account for the nature of the subjunctive mood and for the distribution of subjunctive clauses.

1.2.1 Subjunctive as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon

The view of the subjunctive as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon is in line with the conceptual apparatus of the minimalist program which, as I already stated in 1.1, will provide the overall theoretical background upon which this dissertation will be based. The minimalist approach to grammar (which will be described in more detail in 1.3) states that various language components (e.g. lexicon, syntax, semantics etc.) function according to different modalities but nonetheless influence each other through interfaces, which means that one component should not be viewed in isolation from the others. In particular, the semantic component, where the final interpretation of a given clause is determined, should not be analyzed without taking formal, syntactic data into consideration, because the syntactic derivation is assumed to feed the interpretative component through the syntax-semantics interface or LF (Chomsky, 1995; 2001). In this context, I will adopt a relatively strict syntax-semantics mapping perspective, which is in line with the more recent cartographic approach to syntax (Rizzi, 1997; Cinque, 1999 a.o.), whereby most aspects of meaning associated with a given clause, particularly those pertaining to its modal interpretation, will be assumed to be encoded through some feature that is passed on from the syntactic derivation to the semantic component.

The broadest theoretical goal of this study will thus be to determine how the interplay between syntax and semantics can account for the meaning of a given subjunctive clause, particularly in those environments which are less typical from a semantic point of view and
which pose problems for the general definitions of the subjunctive that were proposed in literature. What I plan to do in this context is to take some of the more influential semantic definitions of the subjunctive that were proposed by different authors as the basis for my own approach (more on that in 1.4.3), and then put forward a theoretical account that incorporates those cases of subjunctive distribution that do not conform to these definitions alongside those which do conform to them. Once again, though, instead of trying to semantically broaden or adapt these definitions so as to force the atypical cases of subjunctive distribution to fit in, I will provide a syntactic, structure-based explanation for why such definitions do not apply to a given type of subjunctive clause.

The most general claim that I will make in this context is that the subjunctive mood as such is associated with a certain number of syntactic properties which explain why it cannot be defined in purely semantic terms. These syntactic properties can be resumed under two broad descriptive notions: the flexibility of uses of subjunctive morphological marking and the structural permeability of subjunctive clauses. The first notion- i.e. flexibility of uses- is based on the idea that subjunctive mood has a certain core syntactic context of its use, but subjunctive morphology can also be used outside of this core context, for various types of motivations, which can be either syntactic or semantic in nature. The core contexts of subjunctive use are those that will be defined as involving an embedded subjunctive CP clause type, which is lexically selected by the matrix predicate, whereas the non-core uses are those where subjunctive morphology appears outside of this syntactic clause type. As for the second relevant syntactic property of the subjunctive- i.e. structural permeability-, it is related specifically to the subjunctive CP clause type itself. As we will observe in more detail once I turn to Slavic, the subjunctive clause type subsumes complements of different structural sizes, which can contain more or less truncated structures. As a result, such complements produce varying structural outputs on the syntax-semantics interface, which can lead to different types of interpretations. This will explain why the range of meanings associated with the subjunctive mood cannot be subsumed under any broad semantic notion even in the core contexts of subjunctive use, i.e. contexts where the subjunctive is selected by the matrix predicate under a separate CP clause type.

I will first focus on the notion of flexibility of uses of the subjunctive, because this will allow me to delineate between those uses where the subjunctive corresponds to its own clause type and those where subjunctive morphology appears outside of this clause type. Once this has been achieved, I will be able to focus more closely on the properties of the subjunctive clause.
type itself, which will be of central concern for my subsequent analysis of Slavic subjunctive. As I already hinted above, the main difference between these two types of uses of the subjunctive should be related to the notion of selection: core uses, where subjunctive morphology appears under a separate syntactic clause type, correspond to cases where the embedded subjunctive clause is selected by the matrix predicate under a separate subjunctive CP; non-core uses, on the other hand, are those where the subjunctive as such is not selected, but introduced through a different type of syntactic mechanism under a different clause type, which can appear in both embedded and in matrix contexts.

We could already briefly observe a few examples of the contrast between core and non-core uses of the subjunctive in some of the sentences I introduced at the beginning of this dissertation: clauses such as those in (1), where subjunctive mood appears in the embedded complements selected by predicates such as desideratives or directives, will be analyzed as part of the core uses of the subjunctive; clauses such as those in (2-5), where subjunctive appears outside of the typical subordination contexts of its distribution, do not involve selection and constitute some of the examples of the flexibility of subjunctive use. In the following section, I will focus on the different types of uses of the subjunctive that can be observed in the context of subordination, which is the syntactic environment that I will be primarily interested in here.

1.2.1 Selected vs. non-selected subjunctive (Subj1 vs. Subj2)

The idea that there are different types of subjunctive clauses in subordinate contexts, which can be distinguished in terms of selection, is not new to this study. For instance, a well-known distinction that has been widely observed in the cross-linguistic literature on the subjunctive in this context is the one between intensional subjunctive complements, which is the type of subjunctive we already observed in (1) (reproduced below), and the so-called polarity subjunctives, which typically appear under epistemic predicates when the latter are negated or questioned, as in (6-7).

(1) a.  

Je veux que tu viennes.  

I want that you come2.sg.SUBJ

‘I want you to come.’

---

b. Ordenó que vengas.  
ordered3.sg. that come2.sg.SUBJ  
‘He ordered you to come.’

(6)  
a. Je ne crois pas qu’il soit parti.  
I neg. believe not that he hasSUBJ left  
‘I don’t believe he left.’
b. Je ne pense pas qu’il puisse venir demain.  
I neg. think not that he canSUBJ comeINF tomorrow  
‘I don’t think he can come tomorrow.’

(7)  
a. No creo que venga mañana.  
not believe1.sg. that come3.sg.SUBJ tomorrow  
‘I don’t believe she will come tomorrow.’
b. No pienso que sea el culpable.  
not think1.sg. that be3.sg.SUBJ the culprit  
‘I don’t think he is the culprit.’

Various authors (Farkas, 1992b; Quer, 1998; Stowell, 1993 a.o.) have suggested that the difference between subjunctive complements such as those in (6-7) and those in (1) should be viewed through the prism of selection: while intensional subjunctives (a term I will continue to employ throughout this dissertation when referring to complements such as those in (1)) are lexically selected by the matrix predicate, polarity subjunctives should not be seen as selected by the matrix verb per se. This becomes obvious in light of the examples in (8), where we can observe that, in the absence of a non-veridical matrix operator such as negation, epistemic verbs like think or believe typically introduce the indicative, not the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause.5

---

5 One Romance language which constitutes a strong exception in this context is Italian, because it introduces the subjunctive with epistemic verbs more widely, regardless of the presence or absence of a non-veridical polarity operator in the matrix clause (Farkas, 1985; Giorgi, 2009). I will not address this issue here, given that Italian or Romance in general are not my main focus.
Therefore, it is clear that the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause is less closely related to the lexical properties of the matrix predicate in polarity subjunctives than it is in intensional subjunctives, where the introduction of the indicative mood in the embedded clause always results in ungrammaticality:

(9)  
\[ \text{a. } \star \text{ Je veux que tu viens.} \quad \text{(French)} \]
\[ \text{I want that you comeIND} \]

\[ \text{b. } \star \text{ Ordenó que vienes.} \quad \text{(Spanish)} \]
\[ \text{ordered3.sg. that come2.sg.IND} \]

Hence the contrast between subjunctives such as those in (1) and those in (6-7) in terms of selection by the matrix predicate is rather straightforward.

Here I will propose to extend the observed distinction between intensional and polarity subjunctives in terms of selection to all cases of subordination where subjunctive mood appears: on the one hand, we have subjunctives that are selected by the matrix predicate under a separate subjunctive CP clause type; on the other hand, we have those complements where the subjunctive mood is not lexically selected by the matrix predicate, but introduced through a different syntactic mechanism under a different type of embedded clause. In addition to polarity subjunctives, the non-selected cases of subjunctive subordination will also be claimed to involve complements such as those that are used to express possibilities (10-11), doubts (12), as well as subjunctive complements associated with a factive interpretation (13-14):

(10)  
\[ \text{Es posible que venga mañana.} \quad \text{(Spanish)} \]
\[ \text{is possible that come3.sg.SUBJ tomorrow} \]
\[ \text{‘It is possible that he will come tomorrow.’} \]
Even though subjunctive complements in (10–14) seem to be more closely related with the lexical properties of the matrix predicate than polarity subjunctives in (6–7), because there is no additional element in the matrix clause other than the predicate that can be claimed to govern the use of the subjunctive (unlike with polarity subjunctives in (6–7), where the subjunctive use is clearly favored by the presence of matrix negation), I will claim that they are in fact not selected. Hence, I will make a broad distinction between subjunctives such as those in (1), on the one hand, and those in (6–7) and (10–14), on the other. In order to simplify the presentation, from this point onwards I will refer to the former group, i.e. selected subjunctives, as Subj(unctive)1 and to the latter, i.e. non-selected ones, as Subj(unctive)2.

There are several types of syntactic criteria that can be used in order to justify the Subj1 vs. Subj2 distinction that I just proposed. The most important one, noted by Farkas (1992b), has to do with the obligatory vs. variable use of subjunctive marking in a given complement. As we already observed in (9), when the subjunctive is selected by the matrix predicate (i.e. Subj1), the introduction of a different mood category in the embedded clause results in ungrammaticality. On the other hand, when it comes to Subj2 contexts, one observes more variation in embedded mood choice, both within a given language as well as cross-
linguistically. In the examples below, we can observe some cases of intra-linguistic variability between the use of the subjunctive and the use of the indicative in Subj2 cases:

(15) a. *Je ne crois pas qu’il est venu.*  
I neg. believe not that he hasIND come

b. *Je ne crois pas qu’il soit venu.*  
I neg. believe not that he hasSUBJ come
‘I don’t think that he came.’

(16) a. *Parece que llueve.*  
seem3.sg. that rain3.sg.IND
‘It seems that it is raining.’

b. *Parece que llueva.*  
seem3.sg. that rain3.sg.SUBJ
‘It seems as if it were raining.’
(Quer, 2009: 1781)

(17) a. *Je comprends qu’il est venu.*  
I understand that he hasIND come
‘I understand that he came.’

b. *Je comprends qu’il ne veille pas venir.*  
I understand that he neg. wantSUBJ not comeINF
‘I understand that he doesn’t want to come.’

As we can see in (15-17), subjunctive complements previously defined as Subj2- e.g. polarity subjunctives (15), epistemic subjunctives (16) and factive-type subjunctives (17)- can be replaced with indicatives without producing ungrammaticality, unlike their Subj1 counterparts in (9). This is the primary reason why it makes sense to distinguish between these two types of subjunctives in terms of selection: in Subj1 contexts, the introduction of the indicative is

---

6 Note, however, that one can generally observe some nuance interpretative differences depending on which mood appears in the embedded clause (which can be gauged from some of the glosses beneath the examples as well). The interpretative shifts that can be observed in this context will, in fact, be seen as the primary motivation for the introduction of subjunctive morphology in such cases. I will leave this issue to the side for the moment and come back to it towards the end of the dissertation (Chapter 6), once I focus specifically on Subj2-type complements, which will not feature prominently in this study because they are less productive in Slavic (see (19-20)).
banned because it produces a clash with the selectional requirements of the matrix predicate, given that the latter requires a subjunctive clausal complement; in Subj2 contexts, one observes a greater degree of variability because subjunctive per se is not selected by the matrix predicate.

In addition to the intra-linguistic contrasts we just observed between Subj1 and Subj2-type complements when it comes to variability in subjunctive use, one can also observe a similar distinction cross-linguistically. Various authors (Farkas, 1992b; Kempchinsky, 2009 a.o.) have noted that the most stable use of subjunctive across languages is associated with complements of the type exemplified in (1), i.e. intensional Subj1 complements: basically any language that contains a subjunctive mood will employ subjunctive-type morphology in clauses of this type. On the other hand, complements defined as Subj2 exhibit much more variation in subjunctive use across languages. One example of the differences in cross-linguistic distribution of Subj1 and Subj2, which is particularly relevant for my study, involves Slavic languages themselves. The latter robustly employ the subjunctive-type construction in the context of Subj1 complements, as we can observe in (18) below, but Slavic counterparts of Romance Subj2 complements generally ban the use of subjunctive marking, and only allow for the indicative mood to appear in the embedded clause, which can be observed thanks to the grammaticality contrasts in (19-20):⁷ ⁸

(18) a. Chce, zeby Jan przyszedl. (Polish)
    want1.sg. SUBJ John come

b. Chci aby Jan prishel. (Czech)
    want1.sg. SUBJ John come
    ‘I want John to come.’

(19) a. Kazhetsja, chto on prishel vchera. (Russian)
    seem3.sg. IND he came yesterday

---

⁷ As we can observe from the glosses, Slavic subjunctives are morphologically distinguished from indicatives in a different fashion than their counterparts in Romance (or most other) languages. As I already briefly hinted earlier on in 1.1, Slavic subjunctive is not marked verbally but via mood markers that appear on the left periphery of the clause. For the moment, I will leave the issue of the precise morpho-syntactic realization of the Slavic subjunctive to the side (it will be addressed in detail later on in 2), and only focus on the cross-linguistic differences related to subjunctive (Subj2) distribution.

⁸ Note, however, that some Subj2-type complements can be observed in certain Slavic languages as well, in particular the polarity subjunctives of the type exemplified in (6-7), but Subj2 in general is much less extant in Slavic. Some of the underlying reasons for the differences in Subj2 distribution (including in the context of different Slavic languages) will be addressed towards the end of the dissertation in Chapter 6, which will focus specifically on Subj2-type complements.
As we can observe in (19-20b), the use of subjunctive marking in Subj2-type environments generally produces ungrammaticality in Slavic. Slavic subjunctive is thus more restricted to Subj1-type complementation when it comes to its distribution.

As a result, the analysis of the subjunctive that I will propose in this thesis will primarily center on Subj1 complements, especially in those parts of the dissertation that focus specifically on Slavic subjunctive (Chapters 2-5), whereas Subj2 will only be dealt with in chapters that approach the subjunctive from a more cross-linguistic perspective (primarily 1 and 6). The following section will present some of the problematic aspects related more specifically to Subj1 complementation, which will be more relevant in the context of my study of Slavic subjunctive later on. Even though Subj1 complements of the type we observed so far- i.e. intensional subjunctives- are associated with relatively coherent, irrealis-type semantics that one typically observes with the subjunctive mood across languages, we will go on to observe that Subj1 clause type also subsumes some instances of subjunctive complementation that are more problematic from a semantic point of view.

1.2.1.2 Subj1 selection as the default embedded option

In addition to the cases of subjunctive subordination that we observed so far, which involved intensional Subj1 complements and Subj2-type clauses, there are also some other, less typical contexts of embedded subjunctive use, which we did not yet get the chance to observe. Note, for instance, the Slavic examples in (21-22) below:
Pocheo je da peva. (Serbian)

begun has SUBJ sing3.sg.

‘He began to sing.’

Toi uspja da dojde. (Bulgarian)

he managed SUBJ come3.sg.

‘He managed to come.’

Even though the complements in (21-22) exhibit the same subjunctive-related morphology as the more typical intensional subjunctives in Slavic, such as those we observed in (18), the two types of subjunctive complements have very little in common from a semantic point of view. While intensional subjunctives denote irrealis-type interpretations that are typically observed with the subjunctive mood across languages, complements of the type exemplified in (21-22) denote entirely realis, non-modalized interpretations, which makes them semantically anomalous in light of the cross-linguistic properties of the subjunctive. Nevertheless, once I turn to a closer analysis of this type of subjunctives (from Chapter 3 onwards), they will be shown to pattern more closely with intensional Subj1 complements than they do with indicatives (or Subj2 complements) when it comes to their clausal properties. This will lead to the conclusion that subjunctives such as those in (21-22) should be subsumed under the Subj1 clause type as well. The question then becomes how the matrix predicates which are as lexically diverse as those exemplified in (18), on the one hand, and those in (21-22), on the other, can nonetheless select the same Subj1 clause type as their complement.

In order to answer this question, a more precise formal account of the selection mechanism underlying Subj1 complementation will be needed. The analysis I will propose in this context, which will be developed in more detail in the subsequent parts of the dissertation, is based on the distinction between marked and default syntactic selection strategies. These two types of selection strategies will be used to account for different mood choices in embedded contexts: while indicative-type complementation will be analyzed as a marked embedded option, subjunctive (i.e. Subj1) complementation will be seen as a default, Elsewhere option in subordinated environments. Under this analysis, the fact that the same Subj1 complement

---

9 Once again, the issue of the exact morpho-syntactic realization of these subjunctive complements will be left to the side for the moment, and addressed from Chapter 2 onwards.

10 See Aronoff (1976) or Kiparsky (1973) for more on the notion of the Elsewhere strategy in different linguistic contexts.
type is selected by matrix predicates which are as lexically diverse as those we observed earlier on is no longer problematic from a conceptual standpoint because, if Subj1 CP selection is to be viewed as an Elsewhere strategy, then the selecting predicates are not required to share any type of inherent lexical property in order to introduce this same CP clause type as their complement. The only common property shared by these predicates is the fact that they do not contain the additional feature that is associated with the lexical make-up of indicative-selecting verbs, which allows the latter to select the indicative CP as their complement. A more precise formal account of the relevant feature, and of the subjunctive vs. indicative selection mechanisms more generally, will be proposed later on in 1.4, once I introduce some of the cross-linguistic analyses of mood that will be relevant for my own approach in this context.

The default-selection approach to Subj1 that I just briefly outlined will also be used as a formal basis to account for one of the broader syntactic properties associated with the subjunctive that I mentioned at the beginning, namely the structural permeability of Subj1 clauses. As we will observe later on (from Chapter 3 onwards), Subj1 clause type subsumes complements associated with different structural sizes, which can be subject to varying degrees of truncation. The structural truncation that we will observe in this context will be explained in light of the overall default-selection approach to Subj1: given that this clause type is not selected due to any type of inherent lexical property associated with the matrix predicate but simply as an Elsewhere option, this means that the selecting predicate will not always be compatible with all the features contained within the basic Subj1 CP structure. As a result, a number of Subj1-selecting predicates will truncate varying chunks of the Subj1 clausal structure in order to eliminate projections that contain features which do not match the matrix predicate’s lexical make-up.

This is where my overall analysis of the subjunctive as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon will gain central relevance, because the type of interpretation that a given Subj1 complement denotes will be seen as crucially dependent on its underlying structural make-up and the degree of truncation that it undergoes. The broadest generalization that will be made in this context is that the less truncation a given Subj1 complement undergoes, the closer its interpretation will be to the typical cross-linguistic subjunctive semantics, and vice versa. This is because complements associated with larger structures also contain a greater amount of semantic features pertaining to the subjunctive CP clause structure, which is why their meaning is more specified and closer to the typical subjunctive-related meaning than is the case with

11 See example (23) in Section 1.2.2 for a more detailed representation of the basic Subj1 clausal structure.
complements associated with smaller structures, which contain less of these features. The full range of formal and semantic contrasts that can be observed between different Subj1 complements in this context will be explained in much more detail later on, from Chapter 3 onwards, once I focus more closely on the issue of Subj1 distribution in Slavic.

1.2.2 Thematic organization of the study

Before I turn to Slavic subjunctive, I will first use the remainder of the introductory chapter to situate my approach within a broader theoretical context, first with regards to the overall conceptual framework that I will be assuming (1.3), and then with respect to other theoretical perspectives that were proposed in order to account for the cross-linguistic properties of the subjunctive mood (1.4). In Section 1.3, I will introduce the basic view of grammar that is assumed within the minimalist program, emphasizing those aspects of minimalism that will be of particular relevance for this study, specifically the minimalist take on syntax and its interfaces. In Section 1.4, I will focus more closely on the issues related to the subjunctive mood in particular, outlining a number of influential theoretical approaches that were proposed in order to account for the nature of the subjunctive, as well as some of the problems faced by such approaches, which will provide the motivation for the different theoretical angle that I will develop in the context of my analysis of the Slavic subjunctive later on.

After establishing the theoretical foundations for my study, I will move on, from Chapter 2 onwards, to the subject of Slavic subjunctive itself. Chapters 2-5 will focus on complements defined previously as Subj1, which are most relevant when it comes to the study of Slavic subjunctive, whereas issues related to Subj2 will be dealt with more briefly, and from a more cross-linguistic perspective, at the end of the dissertation in Chapter 6, given that we saw in (19-20) that this type of subjunctive is not as productive in Slavic as it is some other languages, particularly those belonging to the Romance group.¹²

In Chapter 2, I will look at the properties of the Slavic subjunctive mood from a more global perspective, as well as compare Slavic subjunctives with their Romance counterparts. My major goal in this context will be to demonstrate that Slavic languages, despite the lack of dedicated verbal morphology for the subjunctive, nonetheless contain a group of complements

¹² For terminological clarity, note that, from now on, whenever I employ the term ‘subjunctive’ or ‘subjunctive complement’ in a general sense, without further specification, I will be referring to complements previously defined as Subj1. Whenever I mention complements subsumed under the Subj2 label, I will do so explicitly.
which can be subsumed under the subjunctive clause type, because they systematically differ from their indicative counterparts in Slavic, while exhibiting the bulk of the underlying formal and semantic clausal properties that are observed with Romance Subj1 complements. The main conclusion that I will reach in this context will be that, even though Slavic subjunctive cannot be seen as a verbal mood, it can be analyzed as a *clausal mood* (a notion that will be defined in more detail later on in 2.2).

The arguments that I will put forward in order to make the case for the existence of the subjunctive as a clausal mood in Slavic will lead me towards the first major syntactic claim that I will make in relation to subjunctive vs. indicative complementation, namely the claim that subjunctives and indicatives are syntactically introduced through two different CP-projections. In Section 2.3, I will develop a formal account of these two types of CPs, which will analyze the differences pertaining to their internal structural make-up through the prism of the broader selection approach to subjunctive vs. indicative complementation that I just briefly introduced in the previous section (i.e. the idea that the indicative CP is selected as a marked embedded option whereas the subjunctive CP is selected by default). The formal analysis that will be proposed in this context will then be used to explain a series of syntactic and semantic contrasts that will be observed between indicative and subjunctive clauses, both in Slavic and cross-linguistically.

A closer examination of the subjunctive clause type that I will subsequently develop in 2.4 will show that the latter shares a cluster of common properties with matrix imperatives. As a result, both Subj1 complements and matrix imperatives will be claimed to be associated with the same type of CP, which is selected as a default option in embedded contexts. Once I hone in more closely on the formal properties of this CP, I will argue that the latter contains a hierarchical feature cluster consisting of a higher Dir(ective) feature, which performs a clause-typing function, and a lower modal Deo(ntic) feature, which encodes the type of modality that is typically observed with both matrix imperatives and embedded intensional subjunctives, i.e. deontic modality. The formal and semantic differences between various Subj1 complements in different Slavic languages that will be observed in the subsequent parts of this dissertation will then be analyzed as a function of how much of this basic Subj1 CP clause structure is preserved in a given complement by the end of its syntactic derivation, and shipped to the semantic component, and how much of it is truncated during the derivation and hence inaccessible to semantics.
Before focusing in more detail on a number of individual Slavic languages that will be of primary interest for this study (namely Bulgarian, Croatian, Serbian and Russian), I will end the discussion in Chapter 2 by introducing an important typological distinction that can be observed within the Slavic linguistic family in general based on the realization and distribution of the subjunctive mood in different languages. In 2.6, we will see that Slavic languages can be roughly divided in two groups based on the properties of their subjunctive: Eastern and Western Slavic languages, on the one hand, which all realize their subjunctive similarly as Russian; and South Slavic, or Balkan Slavic languages, on the other, which are closer to non-Slavic Balkan languages, such as Greek, than they are to non-Balkan Slavic languages when it comes to the syntactic realization and distribution of their subjunctive complements. The main theoretical focus of the subsequent parts of this study will then be placed on Balkan Slavic languages, whereas the analysis of the subjunctive in Slavic languages outside of the Balkans (primarily Russian) will basically consist of applying and generalizing the theoretical conclusions that will have been reached on the basis of my study of the Balkan subjunctive. The reason why I chose to focus my analysis primarily on Balkan Slavic is due to the fact that Balkan languages (both Slavic and non-Slavic) present some specific theoretical problems for the analysis of the subjunctive, mainly because they exhibit unusual distributional patterns in relation to this mood, which are not typically observed in other languages.

Chapter 3, which will deal with Slavic languages of the Balkan region, will thus constitute the theoretical core of this dissertation. The analysis that I will put forward there will be primarily focused on Bulgarian, Croatian and Serbian, but I will often be making references to other, non-Slavic Balkan languages, such as Greek or Romanian, as well, because, as we will observe throughout that chapter, Balkan languages in general exhibit a remarkable degree of similarity when it comes to the properties of their subjunctive mood, despite belonging to several different language families. Section 3.1, which will primarily focus on the more typical intensional Subj1 complements, will provide a formal account of the morpho-syntactic realization of Balkan subjunctive, first from a broader perspective (3.1.1-3.1.2), and then in the context of Balkan Slavic (3.1.3-3.1.4) in more detail. In the remaining parts of Chapter 3, I will then widen the scope of the analysis beyond the typical intensional subjunctives in order to look at the distribution of subjunctive complements in Balkan languages in a more comprehensive manner.

13 The reason for this is the phenomenon called Balkan sprachbund (see 3.1 and 3.2 for more detail).
Section 3.2 will introduce the issues related to Balkan subjunctive distribution from a more descriptive perspective, outlining the various syntactic environments where Balkan subjunctive can be found, as well as the problems that some of them pose for the analysis of the subjunctive. In this context, we will see that the verb groups that select Subj1 clauses are far greater in number in Balkan languages than they are in most other languages, because Balkan Subj1 complements are selected both by non-control and by control verbs, whereas subjunctive is generally not associated with (subject) control predicates from a cross-linguistic perspective. Such wide distribution of the Balkan subjunctive will also be shown to result in a much greater degree of semantic diversity associated with the Balkan Subj1 clause type than the one we typically observe with its cross-linguistic counterparts, which will present a whole host of additional problems for the analysis of the subjunctive mood as such. This is the primary reason why, once again, the main theoretical focus of this dissertation will be placed on Balkan Slavic.

Section 3.3 will then propose an analysis that will address the problems related to Balkan subjunctive distribution. This section will represent the most important theoretical part of Chapter 3, as well as of the dissertation as a whole, because the generalizations I will propose there in order to account for the data related to Balkan subjunctive distribution will later on be applied to the Slavic subjunctive more generally. The main claims that will be made in 3.3 can be summarized as follows:

(i) All subjunctive complements selected by predicates that will be outlined in 3.2 constitute the same Subj1 clause type, despite the syntactic and the semantic diversity we will observe between them. This conclusion will be justified by showing that, despite their internal diversity, all of these subjunctive complements exhibit a cluster of common clausal properties that distinguish them from their indicative counterparts.

(ii) Subj1 clause structure, in its basic form, contains the subjunctive/imperative CP, with the C-head that consists of the Dir>Deo feature cluster I talked about earlier, as well as the lower modality layer, which consists of several projections that encode different types of modal meanings. The most important modal projections that I will be using in my analysis are those related to deontic modality – i.e. the type of modality that is used to indicate how the world should be, according to certain norms, expectations, desires etc., as well as dynamic modality, which is the type of modality most closely related to
notions such as ability or capacity (derived from the Old Greek *dynamai*, ‘to be able’).14 Thus, the full structure underlying the subjunctive clause type, which will be relevant for my analysis in 3.3, corresponds to the (simplified) representation below:

(23) \[ CP \ C_{Dir>Deo} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{deontic}} [\text{ModP}_{\text{dynamic}} [\text{TP} [vP…]]]] \]

(iii) The broader analysis of Subj1 selection as a default embedded option will imply that a number of predicates that select this clause type will not be semantically compatible with all the features contained within the basic Subj1 clause structure in (23). As a result, the projections which contain features that are incompatible with a given verb’s lexical make-up will be truncated by the time the syntactic derivation reaches the interface with semantics. This is where the property of structural permeability associated with the Subj1 clause type comes into play.

(iv) All the syntactic and semantic diversity that will be observed between various Balkan Subj1 complements will be accounted for by referring to the different degrees of truncation that the Subj1 clause structure in (23) undergoes before it reaches the syntax-semantics interface, depending on the lexical properties of the selecting predicate. Those complements that are associated with a larger structure by the time they reach the interface with semantics will be closer to the typical (i.e. intensional, irrealis) subjunctive meaning, because they send a greater number of subjunctive-related features to LF, whereas complements that are structurally smaller are also further removed from the typical subjunctive meaning because they send a smaller amount of these features to LF.

(v) Given that the basic semantic characteristics of every Balkan Subj1 complement can be determined by looking at how many projections associated with the subjunctive clause structure in (23) it maintains by the end of its syntactic derivation, the overall semantics related to Balkan Subj1 clause type as such can be analyzed in terms of a syntactico-

---

14 Some authors, such as Palmer (1986), make a distinction between ‘deontic modality’, related to obligations, and ‘bouletic modality’, related to wishes. Here I will subsume both of the types of modal meanings under the ‘deontic’ category because they will be seen as closely related, both from a semantic and from a syntactic point of view.
semantic continuum or scale, which I will call the *subjunctivity scale* (Socanac, 2012). One end of this scale is occupied by those complements that preserve the full structure in (23): they are complements selected by directive predicates (e.g. *order, request, demand*), which can be described as embedded imperatives. The other end of the subjunctivity scale is occupied by Subj1 complements that truncate the entire left periphery (including the modality layer) down to TP, and which contain no modal dimension to their meaning: they are complements selected by verbs such as aspectuals (e.g. *begin, continue*) or implicatives (e.g. *manage, succeed, dare*), some of which we already observed earlier on in (21-22). The semantic layers within the subjunctivity scale can be roughly summarized as in (24):

(24)  

\[
\text{Directivity} > \text{Deontic modality} > \text{Dynamic modality} > \text{vP-related semantics}
\]

All the claims outlined in (i)-(v) stem from my overall view of the subjunctive as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon: once again, the semantic properties of a given Subj1 complement, and the position that the latter will occupy within the subjunctivity scale, crucially depend on its underlying structural make-up.

As I already hinted earlier on, the subsequent parts of the dissertation, in particular Chapter 4, will largely consist of applying the analysis that was proposed in the context of Balkan subjunctive to Slavic languages outside of the Balkans (primarily Russian), with the goal of determining whether the theoretical account developed in 3 is applicable to Slavic subjunctive as a whole. In the first part of Chapter 4 (Section 4.1), I will focus on the more typical intensional subjunctives in non-Balkan Slavic, showing that such complements can be subsumed under the same type of syntactic analysis as the one that was proposed in relation to their Balkan counterparts in 3.1. The second part of the chapter (Section 4.2) will then look at the issue of subjunctive distribution, which is the area where we will observe the greatest degree of divergence between Balkan and non-Balkan Slavic languages, because the latter do not introduce the subjunctives in control environments, but use the infinitives in this context. Nevertheless, these infinitive complements will be shown to exhibit the bulk of the underlying formal and semantic clausal properties that we previously observed in relation to their control-

---

15 I borrowed the term ‘subjunctivity scale’ from the lecture on Serbo-Croatian subjunctive held by Boban Arsenijević at the Geneva University in 2012. Arsenijević used the term in a completely different context, though.
subjunctive counterparts in Balkan languages, which will ultimately lead to the conclusion that both subjunctives and infinitives in non-Balkan Slavic languages can be subsumed under the same Subj1 clause type as Balkan subjunctives. This conclusion will be further reinforced by introducing a range of cross-linguistic data, pertaining both to Slavic and to non-Slavic languages, which will demonstrate that infinitives and subjunctives in general are very close and often interchangeable categories.

In Chapter 5, I will provide a summary of the main theoretical generalizations that will have been reached on the basis of my study of the Slavic subjunctive by that point. All of these generalizations will pertain to Subj1-type complementation, which represents the bulk of subjunctive distribution in Slavic (and which, given the analysis in 4.2, will be claimed to subsume both subjunctives and infinitives). In Chapter 6, on the other hand, I will put forward a shorter and somewhat more tentative theoretical account in relation to the group of complements previously defined as Subj2, which are more prominent in Romance than they are in Slavic languages. The main claim that will be made there is that Subj2 clauses involve indicative-type syntactic complementation, where subjunctive morphological marking is introduced under an indicative CP. This analysis will be backed up by showing that Subj2 complements pattern more closely with indicatives than they do with Subj1 complements when it comes to their formal and semantic clausal properties. Finally, Chapter 7 will wrap up the dissertation and suggest some avenues for future research.

1.3 General theoretical framework: Minimalist syntax and its interfaces

As I already hinted several times earlier on in the introduction, my study of the Slavic subjunctive will be primarily based on the conceptual apparatus provided by the minimalist program (Chomsky, 1995; 2001 a.o.). I will begin the exposition in this section by briefly outlining the overall minimalist view of the architecture of grammar, and then I will introduce in greater detail some more specific minimalist notions that will be of particular importance for the analysis that I will develop later on.

According to minimalism, the language faculty consists of various components, which function according to different modalities but which are nonetheless related and influence one another through interfaces. In this system, the syntactic derivation (or narrow syntax, as defined in Chomsky (1998)) plays a central role, because it allows to link up different language
components. We can see the illustration of this view of language below, represented by the so-called Y-model (sometimes also referred to as the T-model) of grammar:

(25)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-P system</th>
<th>C-I system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF(phonetic form)</td>
<td>LF(logical form)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to the directionality of processing of linguistic information, the standard assumption, which I will be adopting here as well, is that lexicon provides input to syntax, which then, in turn, provides inputs to PF and LF interfaces at the end of the derivation. As we can see in (25), the role of syntax according to this view of language is to relate the information originating from the lexicon with the PF interface, where pronunciation is determined, and LF, or syntax-semantics interface, where interpretation is determined.

The function of the syntactic derivation in this context is to reorganize lexical information in such a way as to adapt the linguistic expression to the requirements of both PF and LF. The lexicon is assumed to give instructions to the syntactic computation by means of different types of features (e.g. phonological, formal, semantic), and the role of syntax is then to rearrange these features through different types of operations, such as movement, so as to achieve full interpretability at LF and PF. Once full interpretability has been achieved, the linguistic expression is sent to the extra-linguistic modules related to the production and comprehension of language. My study will put a particular focus on the syntax-semantics interface or LF, as well as the interface between lexicon and syntax, which will be relevant when discussing the issue of selection in particular. On the other hand, PF-related considerations will be left to the side because they are less relevant for the analysis of the

---

16 The acronyms A-P and C-I refer to external, non-linguistic systems with which the grammar interfaces, namely the articulatory-perceptual system and the conceptual-intentional system, respectively (Chomsky, 1995). I will abstract away from these systems and only focus on the strictly linguistic components.
subjunctive that I will propose in this thesis. Before I look at the relevant interfaces, I will first briefly outline the minimalist view of syntax itself, focusing on those areas that will be pertinent for my analysis later on.

1.3.1 Narrow syntax

The basic syntactic operations according to the standard minimalist approach developed by Chomsky are *Merge* and *Agree*. Merge is the fundamental syntactic mechanism that allows structural build-up to take place, deriving the structure (in a bottom-up direction under the standard assumption) by inserting lexical items into the derivation, turning them into syntactic objects\(^{17}\) (SO), and then combining SOs of increasing syntactic complexity. As for Agree, it is the operation that relates two SOs that have been separately merged in the structure, and is assumed to be motivated by feature-checking requirements.

Features in general are viewed in minimalism as providing the motivation for the bulk of syntactic operations that we observe within the clausal structure. Under the standard approach, they are divided into interpretable and uninterpretable pairs.\(^{18}\) A feature that is defined as uninterpretable (\(uF\)) needs to be checked and deleted before the structure can be sent to LF (or PF), which is achieved in an Agree-configuration with the interpretable instance (\(iF\)) of the same feature (Chomsky, 1995). In this context, one instance of a given feature functions as a *Probe* which looks for another instance of the same type of feature that it can establish an Agree relationship with. The latter is thus defined as the Probe’s *Goal*, and it needs to be situated within the Probe’s c-command domain, under standard minimalist assumptions. The feature-checking between the Probe and the Goal can be accomplished either through simple Agree, whereby the \(uF\) is checked off against the relevant \(iF\) in a long-distance configuration, or through movement (sometimes referred to as *internal merge*), whereby the Probe attracts its Goal, checking the \(uF\) in a local configuration with \(iF\), either through head adjunction, or through a Spec-head relationship (depending on the type of movement we have, i.e. *head* vs. *XP*). According to Chomsky (1995), whether or not the Agree mechanism underlying feature

---

\(^{17}\) *Syntactic objects* (not to be confused with the notion of object in the context of argument structure) can be defined as “rearrangements of properties of the lexical items of which they are ultimately constituted.” (Chomsky, 1995: 226). They are the result of an operation whereby a lexical item is taken from the lexicon, passed through the *numeration* and inserted into syntax. Here I will abstract away from some of the finer points pertaining to the lexicon-syntactic interface, including numeration, since the most important linguistic interface in the context of my study will be LF.

\(^{18}\) Chomsky (1995) also put forward a related distinction between valued and unvalued features, which I will not be using here.
checking involves movement depends on the notion of feature strength: \( uF \) that is defined as \emph{strong} requires local checking and therefore provokes movement, whereas \emph{weak} \( uF \) can be checked through simple, long-distance Agree without Move. I will adopt this proposal here as well.\(^{19}\)

One more general issue with regards to feature checking and movement that needs to be addressed concerns the structural relation between the \( uF \) and \( iF \) instances of a given feature. The question that needs to be posed in this context is whether the \( uF \) that provokes movement is situated in the target position or within the moved element itself. The earliest version of minimalism, as formulated in Chomsky (1993), opted for the latter approach, stating that movement can only be motivated by the principle of \textit{Greed}, whereby the strong \( uF \) is contained within the moved element itself, which therefore moves for its own feature-checking requirements. However, more recent minimalist theorizing, including Chomsky (1995), tended to replace the principle of Greed with the principle of \textit{Attract}, where the movement is target-driven, i.e. the \( uF \) that motivates movement is situated within the position that is targeted by movement, and not in the moved element itself. This principle is more conceptually compatible with the minimalist view of syntactic derivation because, given the standard assumption that the structure is built in a bottom-up fashion, the Attract-principle allows the \( uF \) to be eliminated as soon as it is inserted in the structure, because the relevant \( iF \) has already been merged lower down within the Probe’s c-command domain and can thus be immediately attracted. I will therefore adopt the Attract approach to movement here as well.

When it comes to my analysis of the subjunctive in particular, the only type of feature-checking relationship that I will be focusing on is the one that involves the left periphery of the clause (i.e. the subjunctive CP and the modality layer in (23)). The feature that will be of most interest in this context is the modal Deo(ntic) feature, which will be seen as related to left-periphery movements in both matrix imperative and embedded subjunctive contexts. Given the broader approach to feature checking and movement that I just described, the uninterpretable \( u\text{Deo} \) instance of this feature will be seen as situated under the higher C-head, which will be analyzed as the target for left-periphery movements, whereas the interpretable \( i\text{Deo} \) feature will be seen as inserted under one of the lower modal heads represented in (23), specifically the one that encodes deontic modality:

\(^{19}\)I should note, though, that feature strength remains a somewhat vague notion, which needs to be more clearly defined. It is a useful conceptual tool when it comes to accounting for the presence vs. absence of syntactic movement in a given context, but some of the more independent, principled motivations for the strong vs. weak feature distinction still need to be hashed out. This will be left for some future study.
(26) \[ [\text{CP } \text{C\textsubscript{uDeo} } [\text{ModP } \text{Mod \textsubscript{iDeo}}]] \]

Whether the Agree relationship that is established between these two instances of the Deo-feature involves movement or not will depend on the feature strength of \( u\text{Deo} \): in languages where the latter is strong, we will observe left-periphery movements in imperative or subjunctive clauses, while in languages where it is weak, we will not observe such movements, because \( u\text{Deo} \) will be checked through a long-distance Agree configuration with \( i\text{Deo} \) without attracting any overt element to \( C \).

In addition to accounting for the formal phenomena related to syntactic operations such as movement, the minimalist feature-based analysis that I just presented will also have broader relevance in the context of my study of the subjunctive. In particular, the idea that we have interpretable features that survive the syntactic derivation and affect the interpretation once they reach the interface with semantics will serve as the formal basis to explain the interpretative differences that we will observe between various types of subjunctive complements. In order to introduce the analysis that I will develop in that context, I will begin by briefly describing the minimalist notion of interface.

1.3.2 Lexicon-syntax interface

I will first look at the interface between lexicon and syntax, because this is where the features that I just discussed are claimed to originate from, under standard minimalist assumptions. I will abstract away from some of the more complex theoretical issues pertaining to this interface in general, such as the finer analysis related to converting lexical items into syntactic objects through the numeration stage, in order to just focus on those aspects that are relevant for my study. The most important notion that I will be using in this context is the one of selection, which involves an operation whereby a given SO takes out a separate item from the lexicon and introduces it into the structure. Although selection is usually related to a specific featural requirement of the selector, I will argue that this is not necessarily always the case (specifically, it is not the case when it comes to Elsewhere-type selection, which I will claim is at play in the context of Subj1 complementation).

The selection environment that will be most relevant in the context of this study is the one where the predicate (usually a verb) selects a given CP clausal type as its complement. Depending on their lexical properties, verbs may require different types of embedded CP
complements. The most obvious example of this is the fact that certain verbs require a declarative CP and others an interrogative CP in their complement clause, as shown by the grammaticality contrasts below:

(27) a. *John thinks that Mary will come.
   b. *John thinks if Mary will come.

(28) a. *John wonders that Mary will come.
   b. John wonders if Mary will come.

I will claim that a similar situation obtains in the context of subjunctive vs. indicative complementation as well: indicative-selecting verbs require an embedded CP of the declarative type, such as the one in (27a), whereas subjunctive-selecting verbs require a different type of CP, namely the embedded imperative CP (as I already briefly explained earlier on in 1.2.2). As a result, the ungrammaticality that is caused by the introduction of an indicative-type complement under a subjunctive-selecting verb (as in (9), for instance) should be accounted for through a similar formal analysis as the one that was proposed in order to explain the grammaticality contrasts of the type exemplified in (27-28): in either case, the ungrammaticality is caused by the fact that the embedded CP-complement does not correspond to the selectional requirements of the matrix predicate.

One of the most important syntactic principles that has generally been claimed to govern the structural relationships involving selection is the locality constraint, which stipulates that the selector and the selectee must be in a local configuration (at least at some level of linguistic representation). Various versions of the locality constraint, which analyzed the latter as being more or less strict, have been proposed in generative literature at least since Chomsky (1965). Without going too deeply into the various approaches that were put forward in this context, I will assume a relatively simple version of the locality constraint in my analysis of clausal complementation, stipulating that no embedded linguistic material should intervene between the selecting matrix predicate and the selected embedded CP (regardless of whether there is an overt complementizer or some other element in C or whether the latter is empty).\(^{20}\) We can observe one manifestation of this type of locality constraint on the example of English below,

\(^{20}\) The only exception in this context might be extra-sentential topics, which are separated from the embedded clause through a prosodic break. I will not discuss such elements in this study.
where we can see that not even fronted elements associated with the left periphery of the clause, such as the focalized negative constituent in (29-30), can intervene between the matrix verb and the complementizer situated in the embedded C-head that was selected by this verb.

(29)  I said that under no circumstances should he leave.

(30)  * I said under no circumstances that should he leave.

The notion of locality of selection will be important once I turn to the analysis of Slavic subjunctive, because it will allow me, among other things, to disambiguate between different possible structural descriptions that can be proposed in relation to a given type of subjunctive complement in a given language.

The final notion related to selection that will be relevant for my analysis of the subjunctive is the one of asymmetry: the selector and the selectee are assumed to be in an asymmetric-type relation. I will argue that this asymmetry should be observed both on the syntactic and on the semantic level. Syntactically, the selector must be in a hierarchically superior structural position with respect to the selectee, introducing the latter within its c-command domain. Semantically, the selector must define the basic lexical properties of the selectee (by determining the type of selectee it requires), but the selectee cannot have a meaningful impact on the semantics associated with the selector. When it comes to subjunctive complementation, this means that the selecting predicate must introduce a subjunctive CP clausal complement within its c-command domain as well as determine the basic semantic properties associated with this CP complement. Therefore, when the subjunctive is selected by the matrix predicate (i.e. in Subj1 complementation), the basic modal meaning denoted by the embedded CP clause should be fully determined by the matrix predicate, with subjunctive morphology per se being semantically vacuous in such cases. This analysis will be relevant once I turn to a more detailed comparative study of Subj1 and Subj2 complements later on in 6, because we will observe that Subj2-type complements establish a different type of relationship with the matrix predicate in this context, which is more symmetric in nature than the one we observe with Subj1. This will then serve as an additional argument for the claim that the subjunctive in such cases is not lexically selected by the matrix predicate.
1.3.3 Syntax-semantics interface (LF)

The final theoretical aspect related to minimalism that I will focus on in this exposé is the interface between syntax and semantics or LF (I will use the two terms interchangeably), which will constitute the most important linguistic area when it comes to my study of the subjunctive. The notion of LF was originally put forward by May (1985) in order to account for the differences in quantifier scope, but minimalism tends to use this notion a bit more widely, in order to account for phenomena related to binding more generally, or for theta-relations, among others (Szabolcsi, 2003). In this study, I will analyze the interpretative scope of the syntax-semantics interface in a bit wider sense still, claiming that the structural input that is sent to LF is also relevant when it comes to determining notions such as modality and world-relations between clauses (more on the latter will be said in 1.4). Thus, the concept of interpretable features that I introduced earlier on will also be used to encode these types of meanings.21

Such an approach to LF will allow me to develop a more precise formal analysis related to the generalization, outlined earlier on in 1.2, which stated that the interpretation of a given subjunctive complement is crucially dependent on its syntactic properties and, more specifically, on the size of its underlying structure, with those complements that denote more typical subjunctive semantics (i.e. intensional subjunctives) also being structurally larger than the complements which are less typical from a semantic point of view (such as those we observed earlier on in (21-22)). This generalization will be formally accounted for through the prism of feature superset-subset relations, because the interpretation of a given complement will be seen as dependent on the amount of interpretable, subjunctive-related features that it sends to LF. Thus, given that complements associated with larger structural sizes also send a greater amount of features related to the basic Subj1 CP clause structure in (23) to LF, this will explain why their meaning is more specified and more in line with the cross-linguistic semantics that we typically observe with the subjunctive mood than is the case with complements associated with more truncated structures, which only send a subset of subjunctive-related features to LF. This analysis will be developed in more detail from Chapter 3 onwards, once I focus more closely on the issue of subjunctive distribution in Slavic.

21 This is not an entirely radical proposal, because various authors have already put forward analyses that assume the existence of modality-related semantic features, including Han (1998), Kempchinsky (2009) or Krapova (1998), among others.
Another aspect pertaining to the minimalist analysis of the syntax-semantics interface that will be relevant for my subsequent study has to do with the phase-based approach to the relation between the syntactic derivation and LF. This theoretical perspective, originally formulated in Chomsky (2001), argues that the derivation is not sent to the semantic component in one single go, but in various cyclic stages, described as phases. The phasal approach to grammar is primarily motivated by considerations related to economy, because it is argued that a lesser computational burden is placed on the interpretation if the structure is not sent to LF in a single chunk but in various cycles. The phase-based perspective also assumes a slightly more open interface between syntax and semantics, because it argues that once a given phase is interpreted, it can be sent back to the syntactic component in order to participate in further computations. However, once a phase is sent back to the derivation, its syntactic contribution is more restricted, and it cannot freely combine with other parts of the structure outside of that phase.

As for the exact syntactic functioning of phases, various different proposals have been put forward in literature following Chomsky (2001). Here I will largely stick to Chomsky’s original formulations, because they will provide sufficient explanatory adequacy in the context of my study of the subjunctive. Chomsky identified two different phasal domains within clausal structure: the vP and the CP phase. He analyzed these phases as syntactically opaque domains, which behave in accordance with the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), given below:

\[(31)\] In phase \(\alpha\) with head \(H\), the domain of \(H\) is not accessible to operations outside \(\alpha\), but only \(H\) and its edge.

(Chomsky, 2001)

Thus, after the CP or the vP phase have been interpreted at LF and returned back to the derivation, they can only be accessed by an outside element through phase edges, which correspond to the head and the specifier of CP and vP projections.

In this dissertation, I will be primarily interested in the CP phase, while the vP phase will be left to the side because, as I already explained several times, the most relevant clausal area when it comes to the study of subjunctive in Slavic is the left periphery of the clause. I will be using the notion of CP phase, and its syntactic analysis in terms of PIC, in order to determine the differences in terms of structural size that can be observed between various types of complements, specifically between indicatives, on the one hand, and subjunctives, on the other,
as well as between different types of subjunctive complements themselves. Once again, the structural contrasts that we will observe in this context will then be systematically correlated to the semantic differences that can be noted between these different complements as well.

The phasal status associated with a given embedded complement will be gauged primarily by looking at the types of binding relationships that it can establish with respect to the matrix clause. This will allow me to relate the more contemporary phasal approach to syntax with the older syntactic notion of binding domains, which was relevant within the Government and Binding framework, developed by Chomsky (1981). In this context, I will study the phasal properties associated with a given clause through the prism of the well-known conditions on the binding of (pro)nominals, given in a simplified version below:

(32)  
a. A: an anaphor must have an antecedent within its own binding domain.
b. B: a pronoun must have an antecedent outside its binding domain.
c. C: a referential expression cannot be bound by an antecedent.

The relevant conditions in the context of my study will be the conditions A and B. In (33-34) we can see an example of their application:

(33)  
a. John promoted himself.
b. * John, thinks that himself, should be promoted.
(34)  
a. * John, promoted him,
b. John, thinks that he, should be promoted.

In (33) we can see that an anaphor such as himself must be bound by an antecedent clause-internally, in accordance with the Condition A, whereas in (34) we can note that a pronoun such as him must be bound clause-externally, in accordance with the Condition B.

If we apply these conditions to the area of phasehood, then we must say that an anaphor situated within a given CP phase cannot be bound by an antecedent situated outside of that phase, with the opposite being true of a pronoun. The broader generalization that can be proposed in this context is that inter-phasal binding dependencies are only compatible with anti-locality constraints, such as the condition B, whereas locality constraints, such as the condition A, are typical of phase-internal binding relationships. As a result, whenever we observe matrix-
embedded syntactic relationships that are subject to locality constraints, this will be seen as indicative of the non-phasal status of the embedded complement in question.

Another difference that should be noted when it comes to local and anti-local binding relationships such as those in (33-34) has to do with the linguistic domain where they are established: while anaphor binding, as in (33a), should be seen as a syntactic-type relationship, pronoun binding, as in (34b), is better analyzed as established within the semantic component. This is evidenced by the fact that, in (33a), the anaphor himself can only refer to John and cannot co-refer with any other antecedent, whereas in (34b), the pronoun him can also optionally co-refer to some other antecedent in the discourse, as shown through the grammaticality contrast below:

(35)  a. * John\textsubscript{i} promoted himself\textsubscript{j}.

b. John\textsubscript{i} thinks that he\textsubscript{ij} should be promoted.

The data in (35) are best explained by saying that the anaphor should be seen as co-indexed with its antecedent within the syntactic component, so their co-reference is already determined by the time the structure reaches the interface with semantics, whereas the pronoun is co-indexed with its antecedent only in the semantic component, which is why the interpretation is more context-dependent in such cases. This will allow me to reconcile the latter type of binding relationships with the broader PIC constraint: despite the fact that anti-local binding such as the one in (35b) crosses a phase boundary, this does not violate PIC because the binding in question is not syntactic in nature (PIC being a syntactic constraint). The same observation will also apply to other cross-phasal binding relationships that we will observe in the latter parts of this dissertation.

At this point, I have outlined in a general sense the overall conceptual framework that will be relevant for the study of the Slavic subjunctive in my dissertation. Now I will move a bit closer to my subject matter by introducing some theoretical approaches that have been proposed in the literature in order to account for the nature of the subjunctive mood in particular, and the way in which the latter differs from its indicative counterpart. I will begin the following section by introducing some of the more influential analyses that were put forward in this context, placing a special focus on those theoretical approaches that will be more relevant for my study later on, and then I will discuss some of the problems and insufficiencies related to
these analyses, which will justify the alternative approach that I will go on to introduce in my study of the Slavic subjunctive.

1.4 Subjunctive vs. indicative: Cross-linguistic theoretical approaches

Subjunctive mood, and mood distinctions in general, have been extensively studied within descriptive grammars and traditional linguistics, while more contemporary theoretical linguistics and generative grammar in particular tended to place a greater focus on other clausal properties, such as tense or aspect (Quer, 2009). Nevertheless, in recent years there has been a proliferation of studies dealing with issues related to mood within theoretical and generative frameworks as well. Here I will only focus on some of the more influential approaches that were put forward in this context, and then I will explain how I will incorporate some of them within my own study.

1.4.1 Realis vs. irrealis

Traditionally, subjunctive has been distinguished from the indicative on the basis of the semantic difference between realis and irrealis-type interpretations: while the indicative mood tends to be associated with realis interpretations, introducing propositions interpreted in the actual world, subjunctives typically introduce propositions that are not situated in the actual world, and are hence irrealis. So, for instance, the most typical context in which indicative is used is in simple matrix assertions, which are interpreted in the actual world of the speaker by default, whereas subjunctive does not appear in such semantic environments. When it comes to subordination, which is the primary syntactic context I will be interested in here, indicative is typically observed in complements to predicates such as assertives (36), which again introduce realis-type propositions, whereas subjunctive complements are most widely associated with intensional verbs such as desideratives (37), which introduce irrealis propositions.

(36)  
Il a dit que Jean est venu.  
he has said that John hasIND come  
‘He said that John came.’
Il veut que Jean vienne.

he wants that John comeSUBJ

‘He wants John to come.’

Nevertheless, a closer look at the distribution of subjunctive and indicative complements across languages reveals that this distinction based on realis and irrealis interpretations is too simplistic. Observe, for instance, the Romance clauses below:

(38)  a.  Jean pense qu’il vient.

John thinks that he comesIND

‘John thinks that he is coming.’

b.  Creo que Ana está lista.

believe1.sg. that Ana isIND ready

‘I believe that Ana is ready.’

(39)  a.  Je suis content qu’il soit venu.

I am glad that he hasSUBJ come

‘I am glad that he came.’

b.  Lamento que no viniera.

regret1.sg. that not came3.sg.SUBJ

‘I regret that she did not come.’

In (38), we can see the indicative mood being introduced in complements to verbs like think or believe, which are associated with epistemic modality and are hence not as straightforwardly realis as the one in (36). In (39), on the other hand, we can observe the subjunctive mood in complements to psych predicates associated with a factive interpretation, usually defined as factive emotives. Such predicates introduce propositions that must be interpreted as true in the actual world and are hence entirely realis.

These are only some of the examples of the problematic aspects related to indicative and subjunctive distribution that have rendered the traditional realis/irrealis distinction obsolete in this context. The primary theoretical concern of the authors dealing with mood distinctions,
specifically in the context of subjunctive vs. indicative subordination, has thus been to reach a semantic refinement that surpasses the crude realis vs. irrealis approach and that is better able to account for the distributional data pertaining to these mood categories. The approaches that I will be looking at here can be roughly divided in two groups: the first one distinguishes between indicatives and subjunctives on the basis of truth commitment (Giannakidou, 1998; Hopper, 1975 a.o.); the second one distinguishes between these two moods on the basis of possible worlds or situation semantics (Farkas, 1992b; Portner, 1997 a.o.). The second type of approaches will prove to be more relevant in the context of my study, which is why I will describe them here in more detail.

1.4.2 Truth-commitment approaches

The approaches to mood distinctions that are based on truth-semantics argue that indicative and subjunctive complements should be distinguished based on whether they involve truth commitments towards the propositions they denote: while indicatives entail such a commitment, subjunctives do not. Perhaps the most influential theoretical notion that has been proposed in this context is the one of (non)veridicality (Giannakidou, 1994; 1998; 2009; Zwart, 1995 a.o.), which, in turn, builds upon and refines an earlier notion of (non)assertivity (Hopper, 1975; Hopper&Terrel, 1974). According to Giannakidou (1998; 2009 a.o.), indicatives are associated with veridical predicates, which are those that introduce propositions that are true in some individual’s epistemic model, whereas subjunctives are associated with non-veridical predicates, where there is no such truth inference. The difference is schematized in (40) below:

(40) A propositional operator F is veridical iff Fp entails or presupposes that p is true in some individual’s epistemic model; otherwise F is non-veridical. (Giannakidou, 2009: 1889)

This approach straightforwardly accounts for the most canonical uses of the indicative and the subjunctive mood. In simple matrix assertions, which is the most typical context of indicative use, one assumes a truth commitment on the part of the speaker by default,23 whereas in the typical contexts of subjunctive use - i.e. in complements to irrealis-type predicates such as

---

23 Dishonesty or distrust are generally discounted in truth-semantics, and left for pragmatic-type analyses, which is why I ignore such possibilities here as well.
desideratives- there can be no truth commitment because truth judgments do not enter into consideration at all in such contexts (as we will see in more detail shortly once I turn to situational-semantics approaches to mood distinctions).

The analysis of mood distinctions in terms of (non)veridicality is also able to surpass some of the difficulties that were noted in the context of the traditional realis vs irrealis perspective. For instance, an individual can be committed to the truth of the embedded proposition without the latter necessarily being realized in the actual world, which is most obvious in the context of complements to epistemic verbs such as think or believe. In fact, this approach allows to nicely account for mood distributions with this type of verbs that were noted earlier on in 1.2, because it can explain why such epistemic verbs typically select the indicative when they occur on their own but introduce the subjunctive in the presence of some non-veridical polarity element in the matrix clause, such as negation:

(41) a.  *Je pense qu’il est venu.*  (French)
I think that he hasIND come
b.  *Je ne pense pas qu’il soit venu.*
I neg. think not that he hasSUBJ come
‘I (don’t) think he came.’

(42) a.  *Creo que Juan está listo.*  (Spanish)
believe1.sg. that John isIND ready
b.  *No creo que Juan esté listo.*
not believe1.sg. that John isSUBJ ready
‘I (don’t) believe John is ready.’

In (41-42a), we must introduce the indicative in the embedded clause because some individual $x$, in this case the speaker/subject, is committed to the truth of the embedded proposition (even if, once again, the latter is not necessarily true per se). In (41-42b), on the other hand, the insertion of the negative polarity marker in the matrix clause removes this truth presupposition, shifting the interpretation from veridical to non-veridical, which explains why the subjunctive is used.
1.4.3 World-semantics approaches

The second type of approaches to mood distinctions between indicative and subjunctive complements that I will look at here are based on possible worlds or situation semantics, featuring most prominently in Farkas (1985; 1992b) and Portner (1997). The theoretical perspectives outlined by Farkas and Portner will prove to be particularly relevant in the context of my study, which is why I will describe them here in greater detail, as well as explain the way in which I will adapt them to the needs of my analysis later on.

1.4.3.1 Extensional vs. intensional world anchoring (Farkas, 1992)

Farkas started out her analysis by looking at some of the earlier truth-commitment approaches to subjunctive vs. indicative mood distinctions, noting some problems with them and proposing to refine them. First of all, she proposed that the truth of the proposition must be relativized to what she calls individual anchors and the world(s) associated with those individual anchors, the latter functioning as the modal base for a given proposition. Thus, for instance, in simple assertions such as the one in (43), the individual anchor is the speaker and the modal base in which the proposition’s truth obtains is the actual world of the speaker.

(43) \textit{John has a sister.}

On the other hand, when it comes to subordination, the relevant individual anchor is not the speaker but the matrix subject. Thus, if we look, for instance, at complements to epistemic predicates, as in in (44), the embedded proposition (i.e. “John has a sister”) is true in the world anchored to the subject, but not necessarily true in the actual world of the speaker, as shown by the possibility of contradictory continuation in (45):

(44) \textit{Mary thinks that John has a sister.}

(45) \textit{Mary thinks that John has a sister, but he doesn’t.}

One of the reasons why Farkas considered that truth commitment as such should not be seen as the crucial factor behind mood selection are data related to fiction verbs such as those
in (46) and (47). These types of predicates introduce propositions that cannot be true either in
the world of the speaker or in the world of the matrix subject, and are hence not veridical, but
they still systematically select the indicative across languages, as we can see below.

(46)  \textit{J’ ai rêvé que j’étais au lycée à nouveau.} \quad \text{(French)}
\begin{align*}
\text{I have dreamt that I was in high school again} \\
\text{‘I dreamt that I was in high school again.’}
\end{align*}

(47)  \textit{Mintió que yo era el culpable.} \quad \text{(Spanish)}
\begin{align*}
\text{lied3.sg. that I was the culprit} \\
\text{‘He lied that I was the culprit.’}
\end{align*}

Farkas thus proposed that the relevant criterion behind mood choice is not truth commitment
but rather the type of world anchoring associated with a given proposition. What distinguishes
all of the indicative complements we observed in (43-47) from their subjunctive counterparts
selected by verbs such as desideratives or directives is the fact that the propositions associated
with the former are anchored to a single world (which may or may not correspond to the actual
world), whereas subjunctive-related propositions can only be anchored to a set of possible
worlds. Farkas defined the former type of anchoring as \textit{extensional} and the latter as \textit{intensional}.
The predicates that she defined as extensional (i.e. those that anchor the embedded proposition
to a particular world; e.g. \textit{say, affirm, think, believe, lie, dream} etc.) will select the indicative in
the embedded clause, whereas verbs that can be defined as intensional (i.e. those that do not
anchor the embedded proposition to any single world but to a set of possible worlds; e.g. \textit{want,
desire, order, insist} etc.) will select the subjunctive. This is the origin of the notion of
intensional subjunctive that I use extensively in this dissertation as well.

Farkas recognized, however, that not all types of subjunctives conform to the definition
of intensionality as I just described it. This is the case, for instance, with subjunctive
complements introduced under factive-emotive or epistemic predicates (i.e. Subj2-type
complements, as they were defined here), which involve extensional world-anchoring. Farkas
accounted for those cases of subjunctive distribution on the basis of the observation that, unlike
intensional subjunctives, where the use of subjunctive morphology is constant, these other types
of subjunctives exhibit variability with the indicative mood (as we could already observe here
in 1.2 as well). Farkas used this observation in order to propose a generalization which stated
that those cases of subjunctive distribution which are not predictable on semantic grounds (i.e. those which do not correspond to the definition of intensional subjunctives) involve complements selected through an arbitrary mood feature, which explains the variability in mood choice that they exhibit, whereas intensional subjunctives are selected through a specified subjunctive feature, hence the lack of mood-choice optionality in this type of complements. In this sense, my distinction between Subj1 and Subj2 in terms of selection is similar to, and partly based on, Farkas’ distinction between intensional subjunctives and other types of subjunctives on the basis of the type of mood feature that is used to introduce them.

Nevertheless, our two perspectives also differ in some important ways. Most significantly, I claim that mood selection by the matrix predicate involves different embedded clause types, and that the difference between the stable and the unstable use of subjunctive (Subj1 vs. Subj2, respectively) is related to whether the subjunctive is selected by the predicate under a separate subjunctive CP clause type or whether it is introduced through a different syntactic mechanism under a different CP clause type. The cases where we observe variability between the use of the indicative and the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause will be analyzed as involving indicative CP-complementation, with the possibility of introducing subjunctive morphology in the embedded clause through a later, post-selection syntactic mechanism.\footnote{See Chapter 6, Section 6.1 for a more detailed presentation of this analysis.} The advantage of this approach is that it will allow me to explain why Subj2 complements, such as those introduced under factive-emotive or epistemic-type predicates, exhibit a cluster of formal and semantic clausal properties in which they differ from intensional (Subj1) subjunctive complements while patterning with indicatives, as we will observe in more detail once I focus specifically on this type of complements later on in 6. Such clausal contrasts between Subj1 and Subj2 complements are not explained under Farkas’ approach.

Nevertheless, some aspects related to Farkas’ theoretical perspective that I just briefly outlined will be greatly relevant for the analysis that I will propose in the subsequent parts of this dissertation. In particular, the distinction that she established between extensional and intensional world-anchoring will be crucial when it comes to accounting for the different types of selection mechanisms that underlie indicative and subjunctive complementation. This is because the semantic contrast between extensional and intensional world-anchoring will be seen as related to marked vs. default selection strategies in embedded syntactic environments. More specifically, extensional anchoring, whereby the embedded proposition is anchored to a single, specific world will be analyzed as a more marked option from a conceptual point of
view than intensional anchoring, whereby the embedded proposition is only anchored to a non-specified set of possible worlds. This will allow me to justify the claim, briefly sketched out earlier on in 1.2.1, according to which extensionally-anchored indicative complements should be seen as selected as a marked embedded option, whereas subjunctive (in particular Subj1) complements, which do not exhibit this type of world-anchoring, are selected by default. This analysis will be further developed a bit later on, once I relate Farkas’ theoretical perspective to the one put forward in Portner (1997).

1.4.3.2 Situational semantics and truth judgments (Portner, 1997)

The part of Portner’s analysis which will be most important in the context of my study has to do with the distinction that he established between different types of clauses (specifically indicative and subjunctive clauses) based on the propositional content they denote. Once I relate Portner’s observations in this context with Farkas’ world-anchoring approach, this will provide the conceptual grounding for the analysis that will be applied to the Slavic subjunctive mood in the following chapters. Here I will outline a relatively simplified version of the argument put forward in Portner (1997), which will be condensed in such a way as to suit the purposes of my study, while abstracting away from some of the finer points pertaining to the theoretical framework of situational semantics which will not be as relevant for me here.25 Nevertheless, I will take care not to misrepresent any part of Portner’s analysis.

The semantic distinction that Portner used as the basis for his study of different mood categories is the one between propositions that can be judged as true or false and those that cannot, the former typically associated with clauses such as indicatives or declaratives, and the latter with subjunctives or imperatives. Thus, for instance, a proposition denoted by an indicative complement introduced under a factive predicate such as know or discover will necessarily be judged as true, while those denoted by complements introduced under epistemic (e.g. think, believe) or assertive (e.g. say, claim) predicates will be judged as either true or false, depending on the context.26 On the other hand, subjunctive complements to verbs like

---

25 See Kratzer (1989) or Portner (1997) for more detail on the situational-semantics perspective in general.

26 Note that these observations are also applicable to Subj2 complements, which will serve as yet another argument in favor of the claim that such clauses involve indicative-type (vs. Subj1) complementation. For instance, factive-emotive subjunctives pattern in this context with indicatives introduced under factive verbs like know or discover, while polarity subjunctives pattern with indicatives introduced under epistemic verbs like think or believe. See Chapter 6 for more detail on this point.
desideratives (*want, prefer*) or directives (*order, demand*) cannot be judged as true or false, as illustrated by the nonsensical nature of the examples below:

(48)  

a. # *John wants Sue to win and what he wants is true.*

  (Portner, 1997: 171)

b. # *John demands that Sue leave, and what he demands is true.*

In this context, Portner established a distinction between two types of propositions: *persistent propositions*, which are those that can be judged as true or false (denoted by indicative-type clauses), and *nonpersistent propositions*, which are those that cannot receive a truth value (denoted by clauses such as subjunctives or imperatives).\(^{27}\) The explanation for the contrast that these two types of propositions exhibit in this context harkens back to world-semantics: according to Portner (and the theoretical assumptions behind situational-semantics more generally), the only type of situations where notions such as truth and falsity enter into consideration are worlds or, to be more precise, *whole worlds*. As a result, clauses such as those associated with the indicative mood can be judged as true or false because they semantically contain whole worlds. On the other hand, subjunctive clauses such as the ones in (48) do not contain whole worlds but, in Portner’s words, “only some bizarre, spatiotemporally gerrymandered ones” (171). As a result, they cannot receive a truth value. Here I will relate this contrast between the two types of propositions in question to the different world-anchoring mechanisms described in the previous section.

The distinction between persistent and nonpersistent propositions as I just described it can be explained in light of the world-semantics analysis put forward in Farkas (1992b), because it can be seen as related to the different types of world-anchoring mechanisms that we talked about in the previous section. As I explained earlier, extensional anchoring involves a proposition being grounded within a single, specified world, whereas intensional anchoring associates the proposition to a non-specified set of possible worlds. Even though this contrast does not directly follow from the whole vs. non-whole worlds distinction relevant in the context of situational semantics, it can be reconciled with it. When comparing his approach to the one put forward in Farkas (1992b), Portner stated that, while extensional-type anchoring involves

\(^{27}\) See Portner (1997) for a more detailed explanation of the semantic difference between these two types of propositions, and why it is defined in terms of persistence (which, in turn, is related to the semantic notion of *expandability*). I will not expound upon it here, because this would require me to put forward a very detailed development of the conceptual apparatus of situational semantics that would be of no direct use for my study.
whole worlds, intensional anchoring can be analyzed as involving “modal contexts [that] are only sets of smaller situations, and in this sense they describe mere parts of worlds” (206). As a result, propositions that are associated with whole worlds- i.e. persistent propositions that can be judged as true or false- can be seen as compatible with Farkas’ extensional world-anchoring, while propositions that are not associated with whole worlds- i.e. nonpersistent propositions that cannot receive a truth value- can be reconciled with the notion of intensional world anchoring. Even though I will not pursue some of the finer points pertaining to these semantic perspectives in further detail, it was important to briefly reconcile the main theoretical claims put forward in Farkas (1992b) and Portner (1997) because the study of the subjunctive that I will propose later on will combine aspects related to both of their approaches.

1.4.3.3 World feature

At this point, I will put forward a syntactic application of the semantic observations made by Farkas and Portner. In this context, I will explain the semantic contrasts between indicatives and subjunctives that we just noted (i.e. contrasts in terms of their propositional content and the type of world-anchoring they involve) by referring to the different syntactic selection mechanisms that underlie the introduction of these two types of clauses in embedded contexts. This is where the discussion related to the default vs. marked mood selection that I briefly sketched out earlier on in 1.2, where I claimed that subjunctive CP should be seen as the default embedded option, will become relevant once again. In the following paragraphs, I will explain how this analysis pertaining to embedded mood selection can be couched within the world- semantics framework that I just introduced.

First of all, I should note that any type of analysis that views the subjunctive as a default mood is somewhat counter-intuitive, because the standard view assumes the indicative to be a more neutral semantic mood, whereas subjunctive is typically seen as associated with more specific, marked semantics (Quer, 2009). Nevertheless, the world/situational-semantic approaches to mood distinctions that I just outlined can be used to reverse these standard assumptions, because they imply that indicative-related semantics are more specified than those associated with the subjunctive: the world-anchoring analysis in Farkas (1992b) views indicatives as being grounded within a specific world, whereas subjunctives are associated with a non-specified set of possible worlds; the situational-semantics analysis in Portner (1997) posits that only the indicative mood is required to appear in a specific semantic environment
(more on that will be said a bit later on in 1.4.4), whereas subjunctive is not. Portner thus explicitly argues that the subjunctive should be seen as a semantic default, with indicative being the marked mood. Here I will not analyze the subjunctive mood per se as a semantic default but will instead view the subjunctive clause type (i.e. Subj1) selection as a syntactic Elsewhere option in the context of clausal complementation.

Since the most important differences between indicative and subjunctive complements that we noted so far can all be related to world semantics, I will propose to formally account for them by positing a type of mood feature that specifies world-relations between clauses, i.e. the W(orld) feature. This feature should be seen as providing extensional world-anchoring in the sense of Farkas (1992b), i.e. it grounds the proposition it is related to within a specific world. When applied to embedded syntactic environments, the W-feature will allow me to formalize the distinction between indicative and subjunctive complements in terms of selection by the matrix predicate in a more precise manner. First of all, indicative complements will be analyzed as selected as a marked embedded option by extensional predicates that contain the W-feature in their underlying lexical make-up, as illustrated in (49) below:

\[
(49) \quad \begin{array}{c}
V_w \\
\hline
\text{CP}_w \\
\text{Select/Agree}
\end{array}
\]

The Agree chain in (49), established between W contained within the lexical make-up of the selecting predicate and the corresponding feature contained in the embedded CP structure, extensionally anchors the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base from a semantic point of view. As a result, the proposition in question will also be interpreted as persistent, in the sense of Portner (1997), and it will be able to receive a truth value. When it comes to subjunctive complements, on the other hand, their selection does not involve the same type of Agreement relationship, because they are selected as a default embedded option by predicates which are not extensional and which therefore do not contain W in their lexical make-up. As a result, subjunctive complements are not grounded within the matrix modal base but are instead interpreted with respect to a non-specified set of possible worlds, which is why the propositions they denote are nonpersistent and cannot receive a truth value.

In addition to explaining the main semantic differences that we observed between indicatives and subjunctives so far, the analysis of embedded mood selection that I just presented will also allow me to account for a series of syntactic contrasts that we will observe
later on between these two types of complements across languages (see 2.2-2.3). Moreover, the
default-selection approach to the subjunctive in particular will also be used as a basis to explain
the formal and semantic diversity associated with clauses subsumed under the Subj1 clause
type, which we will observe in more detail once I focus my analysis on Slavic subjunctive
distribution later on in Chapters 3 and 4. Before moving on to Slavic subjunctive, I will first
conclude the introductory chapter by briefly noting some problematic aspects related to all the
cross-linguistic semantic approaches to the subjunctive that were outlined here in 1.4, which
will then serve as further motivation for the different theoretical angle that I will be taking in
my subsequent analysis of the subjunctive mood.

1.4.4 Problems for the cross-linguistic approaches to the subjunctive

In general, the cases of subjunctive distribution that have posed most problems for the semantic
analyses of this mood category are those where subjunctive complements appear in factive-type
semantic environments, typically when they are introduced under factive-emotive predicates
(as in (50a) below) or under cognitive-type verbs (as in (50b)). Such complements are
problematic, first of all, for the truth-commitment approaches to mood selection (described
earlier on in 1.4.2) because, in addition to denoting factive, realis-type propositions, they also
presuppose a strong truth commitment, both on the part of the subject and on the part of the
speaker, towards the proposition denoted by the subjunctive complement. We can observe this
thanks to the semantic awkwardness of the examples below, where the propositions denoted by
these factive subjunctives are contradicted:

(50)  a. # Elle regrette qu’il soit parti, mais il n’est pas parti. (French)
    she regrets that he hasSUBJ left, but he neg. has not left
    ‘She regrets that he left, but he didn’t leave.’
   
    b. # Elle comprend qu’il ne veuille pas le faire, mais il veut le faire.
    she understands that he neg. wantSUBJ not it doINF, but he wants it doINF
    ‘She understands that he does not want to do it, but he wants to do it.’

As a result, the matrix predicates in (50) can only be described as veridical (in fact, as strongly
veridical, in the sense of Giannakidou (1998)) and hence they would be expected to introduce
the indicative mood in the embedded clause, which is contrary to facts.
The data of the type exemplified in (50) are also problematic for the situational-semantics approach to the subjunctive mood put forward in Portner (1997), because they contradict the most important semantic distinction that Portner established between indicative and subjunctive clauses in terms of their propositional content, i.e. the distinction between indicative-related persistent propositions and subjunctive-related nonpersistent propositions. The fact that subjunctive complements such as those in (50) entail a strong truth-commitment on the part of the speaker/subject means that they should be subsumed under Portner’s definition of persistent propositions (i.e. propositions containing whole worlds), given that only persistent propositions can be associated with a truth value. Therefore, the indicative vs. subjunctive distribution across languages does not always fall along the lines of the semantic distinction between persistent and nonpersistent propositions, contrary to the expectations implied by Portner’s situational-semantics approach.

The data such as those in (50) also contradict one more specific claim that Portner made on the basis of his study of mood distributions in Italian (Italian being the primary focus of Portner’s analysis of the subjunctive), which was related to the default vs. marked mood distinction that he established between the indicative and the subjunctive. In this context, Portner argued that indicative constitutes a marked mood in Italian because it can only be used in clauses which are semantically factive, whereas subjunctive is a default mood because it is not associated with any such specific semantic requirement. The only restriction on the use of the subjunctive is to be employed “whenever the indicative is inappropriate” (Portner, 1997: 197). Given that the indicative is only appropriate in factive contexts, this therefore implies that subjunctive should not appear in such semantics environments. Yet, not only does the subjunctive appear in factive-type clauses in the French examples we observed in (50), but it also does so in Italian, as we can see in the example below:

(51) *Gianni rimpiange che sia partita.*  
John regrets that hasSUBJ left-fem.  
‘John regrets that she left.’  
(Giorgi, 2009: 1841)

Therefore, the default-mood approach to the subjunctive as it was outlined in Portner (1997) is faced with problems when confronted with subjunctive distribution data such as those in (50-51). The default-selection analysis of the subjunctive that I am defending here, however, does
not face such problems, because it only applies to Subj1-type complementation, whereas complements such as those in (50-51) were subsumed under the Subj2 label (see 1.2.1.1).

Finally, we can also note some problems related to subjunctive distribution when it comes to the world-semantics approach outlined in Farkas (1992b), although they do not involve the same type of complements as those we observed so far. Even though complements selected by verbs such as factive emotives clearly do not correspond to Farkas’ definition of the subjunctive in terms of intensional world anchoring, the author had a way of circumventing this problem. As I already noted earlier on in 1.4.3.1, Farkas claimed that subjunctive complements of this type differ from their intensional counterparts in that they are selected through an arbitrary mood feature, which explains why they exhibit variability with the indicative mood, as shown in (52):

(52) *Marie regrette que Paul est / soit parti.* (French)
Mary regrets that Paul isIND/isSUBJ left
‘Mary regrets that Paul left.’
(Farkas, 1992b: 71)

On the basis of this type of data, Farkas made a larger prediction stating that all cases of subjunctive distribution that are not predictable on semantic grounds (i.e. that do not correspond to the definition of the intensional subjunctive) should exhibit the same type of variability as the one we observed in (52). This prediction can be maintained in light of the Romance non-intensional subjunctive complements that we observed so far, but it faces problems if we look at some other languages in this context.

In fact, we do not even have to move our focus away from Romance languages to notice that Farkas’ prediction does not apply to all cases of subjunctive distribution. If we look, for instance, at a Balkan Romance language such as Romanian, we will be able to observe the type of subjunctive complements that differ both from intensional subjunctives in that their selection is not predictable on semantic grounds, as well as from factive-type subjunctives such as the one in (52) in that they do not exhibit variability with other mood categories. This is the case, for instance, with Romanian subjunctive complements selected by verbs such as aspectuals, such as the one in (53).

---

28 Subjunctives in Romanian, similarly as in Slavic, are not marked verbally but through a separate item situated on the left periphery of the clause, as we can observe from the gloss below the example in (53). Once again, I will
This type of complements denote entirely realis propositions, grounded in the actual world of the speaker, so the use of subjunctive in such cases cannot be predicted on semantic grounds, given that the complements in question do not involve intensional world-anchoring in the sense of Farkas (1992b). However, as we can observe through the ungrammaticality resulting from the insertion of the indicative mood marker in the embedded clause in (54b), the use of subjunctive in such cases is actually obligatory.

(54) a. * Ion incepe ca scrie.

b. Ioan begins IND write3.sg.

This type of subjunctive complementation thus cannot be accounted for under the semantic approach put forward in Farkas (1992b). Therefore, even a cursory glance at some of the more problematic aspects related to the cross-linguistic distribution of the subjunctive mood was enough to reveal that most of the influential semantic analyses that were proposed in order to account for the nature of the subjunctive are not able to cover the full range of its distribution. These are some of the reasons why I consider that a purely semantic approach to the subjunctive cannot provide a comprehensive analysis of this mood category. As a result, in the following chapters of this dissertation, I will put forward a more integrative approach that takes into account both the syntactic and the semantic properties associated with subjunctive complements, as well as the way in which these two types of properties may influence each other through the LF interface.
52), will be dealt with more briefly, towards the end of the dissertation in Chapter 6, because they involve Subj2-type complements that are not productive in Slavic.

At this point, I have introduced the theoretical perspectives that will be most relevant for my analysis, outlined the overall minimalist conceptual framework that I will be using, as well as explained some of the problematic aspects related to the study of the subjunctive that I will be concerned with in the remaining parts of this dissertation. As a result, I can now move on to my main subject, i.e. Slavic subjunctive. In the following chapter, I will approach the subjunctive mood in Slavic languages from a more global perspective, focusing primarily on the more typical cases of subjunctive complementation. The first part of the chapter (2.1-2.2), which will consist of a comparative analysis between the Slavic and the Romance subjunctive, will show that Slavic subjunctives share the bulk of the underlying clausal properties exhibited by their Romance counterparts, which will allow me to claim that, despite the lack of dedicated subjunctive verbal morphology, subjunctive should nonetheless be analyzed as a separate clausal mood category in Slavic as well. The observations that I will make in this context will then be used in the second part of the chapter (2.3-2.4) as the basis for a more precise formalization of the subjunctive CP clause type. The latter will then serve as the groundwork for a more in-depth analysis of different subjunctive complements in various Slavic languages that will be studied in Chapters 3 and 4.
CHAPTER 2

SLAVIC SUBJUNCTIVE AS A CLAUSAL MOOD: INDICATIVE VS. SUBJUNCTIVE CLAUSE TYPES

As I already briefly explained at the very beginning of the dissertation, the subjunctive mood in Slavic languages is a challenging subject because, in addition to presenting some of the more general theoretical difficulties related to the study of the subjunctive from a cross-linguistic perspective, it also presents some more specific problems, stemming primarily from the fact that the morpho-syntactic marking for the subjunctive in Slavic is not as clearly evident as it is, for instance, in Romance languages that we looked at in the introductory chapter. Observe, for instance, the Slavic examples in (55), involving embedded complements selected by desiderative verbs.

(55)  a.  *Ja hochu, chtoby Ivan prishel.*  (Russian)
       I want that John come

  b.  *Chce, zeby Jan przyszedl.*  (Polish)
      want1.sg. that John come
      ‘I want John to come.’

Even though desiderative predicates such as those in (55) are most widely associated with the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective, the verb forms that appear in the embedded complements in the Slavic examples above cannot be seen as dedicated subjunctive markers, because the same type of verb form can also be observed in a number of other syntactic contexts in these languages. In fact, on a morphological level, such verb forms are marked for past tense, and are thus most typically used in simple matrix clauses with a past tense interpretation, such as those in (56) below:

(56)  a.  *Ivan prishel vchera.*  (Russian)

       Ivan come yesterday

  b.  *Jan przyszedl wczeraj.*  (Polish)
      ‘John came yesterday.’
Hence there is no way to overtly distinguish between the typical contexts of indicative use in (56) (i.e. simple matrix assertions) and the typical contexts of subjunctive use in (55) (i.e. intensional complements selected by desiderative predicates) by simply looking at verbal morphology. Nevertheless, once we focus on some other clausal properties related to complements such as those in (55), we will see that they can be clearly distinguished from indicatives across Slavic languages through other means. In order to demonstrate this, I will compare the typical cases of subjunctive complementation that we observed earlier on in Romance with their clausal equivalents in Slavic.

2.1 Subjunctive complements in Romance and Slavic: Surface morphology

As we know by now, subjunctive complements in Romance languages such as French or Spanish are distinguished from indicatives by means of a separate verb form:

(57) a.  *Je pense que Jean vient.*

    I think that John comesIND

    `I think that John is coming.'

   b.  *Je veux que Jean vienne.*

    I want that John comeSUBJ

    `I want John to come.'

(58) a.  *Pienso que viene Juan.*

    think1.sg. that comesIND John

   b.  *Quiero que venga Juan.*

    want1.sg. that comeSUBJ John

This is not only the case in Romance, because similar types of subjunctive verb forms can also be observed in a wide array of other languages, including German, Hungarian, Icelandic and many others, which is why subjunctive marking is often seen as synonymous with distinctive verbal morphology (a view which I will oppose here). Let us now study in more detail how subjunctive-type clauses can be distinguished from indicatives in Slavic languages.
If we look at the embedded complements introduced under the Slavic equivalents of the Romance predicates in (57-58), we can immediately notice some obvious morphological differences between such complements in Slavic as well: 29

(59) a. *Ja dumaju, chto Ivan prishel.*  
I think that John came  
‘I think that John came.’

b. *Ja hochu, chtoby Ivan prishel.*  
I want that John come  
‘I want John to come.’

(60) a. *Mysle, ze Jan przyszedl.*  
think1.sg. that John came

b. *Chce, zeby Jan przyszedl.*  
want1.sg. that John come

(61) a. *Mislja, che Ivan dojde.*  
think1.sg. that John came

b. *Iskam da dojde Ivan.*  
want1.sg. that come John

We can see the overt morphological contrasts between indicative and subjunctive-type complements in (59-61) marked out in bold above, which are consistent across a wide array of Slavic languages: regardless of whether we have an Eastern Slavic language such as Russian, Western one such as Polish, or Southern one such as Bulgarian, the most important morphological distinction between indicative and subjunctive-type complements is expressed through complementizer-like elements situated on the left periphery of the clause (i.e. *chtto* vs. *chtoby, ze* vs. *zeby* and *che* vs. *da*, respectively). 30 On the other hand, the verb forms appearing

29 Whenever I introduce Slavic examples throughout the remainder of this dissertation, I will use a relatively simple transcription, based on the English alphabet, in order to facilitate the reading for non-native speakers. I will thus ignore any special characters or diacritics that can be observed in written Slavic. As I already explained in 1.3, the exact pronunciation of these clauses and all other strictly PF-related concerns are less relevant when it comes to the study of the essential properties of the subjunctive mood as such, so I will simplify that part of the discussion as much as possible.

30 Some Slavic languages that I will study later on, specifically Serbian and Croatian, constitute a bit of an exception here. This is because they introduce both indicative and subjunctive complements with apparently the
in these complements do not allow us to observe any type of contrast with regards to indicative vs. subjunctive verbal morphology, which once again confirms that these Slavic languages do not contain dedicated subjunctive verb forms.

The latter observation makes it more difficult to incorporate Slavic subjunctive-type complements into any type of cross-linguistic theoretical framework related to the subjunctive, because, as I already said, this mood tends to be seen as synonymous with distinctive verbal morphology. Nevertheless, some of the more in-depth studies of the subjunctive that were proposed in recent theoretical literature (a few of which I will introduce here later on as well) showed us that subjunctive complements across languages are not only characterized by distinctive verbal morphology but also by a series of additional formal and semantic clausal properties, which distinguish them from other types of clauses, especially those associated with the indicative mood. These types of properties will be the main focus of my analysis in the remaining parts of this chapter.

### 2.2 Subjunctives vs. indicatives in Romance and Slavic: Distinct clausal properties

In the previous section, we noticed that, despite the lack of dedicated subjunctive verbal morphology in Slavic, one can nonetheless observe systematic morphological differences between the Slavic counterparts of Romance indicative and subjunctive complements as well. As we saw in (59-61), the most prominent morphological contrast between these two types of complements in Slavic is situated on the left periphery of the clause, which features distinct complementizer-like items that are used to introduce indicative and subjunctive-type complements into the structure. This would immediately suggest a possible analysis of such complements in terms of separate clause types: when viewed through the prism of classical selection theory, briefly outlined in 1.3, the data in (59-61) would seem to indicate that we have two groups of verbs with distinct lexical properties, which motivate them to select two distinct types of CP-clausal complements. The argument that I will put forward throughout the remainder of this chapter will demonstrate that this is indeed the case.

---

same type of left-periphery item: the complementizer _da_. Nevertheless, once I focus on Serbian/Croatian more closely (later on in 3.1.4), I will show that the indicative-related _da_ and the subjunctive-related _da_ actually constitute two separate lexical items in these languages as well.
Note, first of all, that the contrast we observed between indicative and subjunctive complements in (59-61) can be seen as reminiscent of the one that was noted earlier on in 1.3 between declarative and interrogative complements in English. The English examples that were introduced in that context (reproduced below) showed that predicates can have specific selectional requirements when it comes to clausal complementation, which need to be respected in order to avoid ungrammaticality.

(62)  
   a.  * John thinks if Mary will come.
   b.  John thinks that Mary will come.

(63)  
   a.  John wonders if Mary will come.
   b.  * John wonders that Mary will come.

One can make a similar observation when it comes to subjunctive-type complementation in Slavic as well, because if the left-periphery items we observed in Slavic subjunctives in (59-61) were switched with those used in indicatives, the result would be ungrammatical, as we can see in (64-66) below:

(64) *Ja hochu, chto Ivan prishel.  
      I want thatIND John come  (Russian)

(65) Chce, ze Jan przyszedl.  
      want1.sg. thatIND John come  (Polish)

(66) *Iskam che dojde Ivan.  
      want1.sg. thatIND come John  (Bulgarian)

This is, therefore, the first indication that Slavic subjunctive-type complements such as those exemplified earlier on in (59-61) can be seen as corresponding to a separate clause type, introduced under a CP projection that is different from the one used in indicatives.

In fact, the observations we just made in relation to Slavic subjunctives make it easier to analyze such complements through the prism of local selection by the matrix predicate than is the case with their Romance counterparts, because Slavic subjunctive markers were shown
to be related to the left periphery of the clause, which means that they appear in a local configuration with respect to the selecting predicate. Romance subjunctive marking, on the other hand, appears on the embedded verb, which is more distant from the selecting verb in the matrix clause, with at least the complementizer and the embedded subject usually intervening between the two. Nevertheless, some authors (Giorgi, 2009; Giorgi&Pianesi, 1997 a.o.) have suggested that subjunctive and indicative complements in Romance can be analyzed as introduced through different types of complementizers as well, which are morphologically indistinguishable on the surface but which exhibit some distinct syntactic properties. The theoretical account that I will propose in this chapter will go in the same direction, because I will analyze both Romance and Slavic subjunctives as constituting distinct clausal mood categories, syntactically introduced through CP projections that are different from those associated with their indicative clausal counterparts. The only difference between Slavic and Romance subjunctive in this context is the fact that the latter, in addition to being a clausal mood, is also a verbal mood.

2.2.1 Clausal vs. verbal mood

Before I present the comparative analysis of Romance and Slavic subjunctive data in further detail, I will begin by first describing more precisely what is meant by the notion of clausal mood, and how the latter can be related to the notion of verbal mood, which is a more familiar term in the context of the subjunctive. These two notions will be seen as closely related, because distinctive verbal morphology in relation to mood marking will be shown to be correlated to distinctive clausal properties. The most relevant observation that will be made in this context when it comes to Slavic subjunctive in particular is that the latter shares a cluster of common clausal properties with its Romance verbal mood counterpart, and can hence be subsumed under the definition of the subjunctive as a clausal mood.

The notion of clausal mood that I will be using here is based on a similar notion of sentential mood, put forward by authors such as Harnish (1994) or Jary&Kissine (2014), among others. These authors defined the concept of sentential mood in terms of a systematic cluster of

---

31 The analysis put forward by these authors was based primarily on Italian data.
32 The distinctive clausal properties that we will observe in this context are only related to complements that were previously defined as Subj1, whereas Subj2-type clauses, once again, pattern more closely with indicatives than they do with Subj1 complement in this sense. Therefore the notion of clausal mood that I am using here only applies to Subj1.
related formal, semantic and overt morpho-phonological properties associated with a given sentence type, which are observed regardless of the presence or absence of distinctive verbal morphology for this sentence type in a given language. The sentential-mood analysis has typically been applied to imperatives, the basic idea being that, even though not all world languages contain dedicated imperative verb forms, they should nonetheless all feature the type of sentences that allow to express directive speech acts (the latter being usually seen as the primary function associated with the imperative mood\textsuperscript{33}). Hence the implication is that those languages which do not contain imperative verb forms should nonetheless contain the imperative as a sentential mood.

The analysis in terms of sentential mood is not entirely transferable to subjunctive complementation, primarily because this notion was applied to the sentence as a whole and was thus seen as crucially related to the prototypical function and the illocutionary force associated with a given sentence type. Subjunctive clauses, on the other hand, cannot be analyzed in terms of a prototypical illocutionary function, because they typically appear in embedded CP structures with no direct access to illocution, which is why one cannot fully apply the notion of sentential mood as I just described it to the subjunctive. Nevertheless, this does not make it impossible to view the subjunctive as associated with a distinct clause type, because the notion of clause type need not necessarily be related to illocutionary force: we have already seen, for instance, that verbs can select for interrogative or declarative clause types in embedded contexts (e.g. 62-63), which exhibit different clausal properties (distinct CP-marking, among others), without entailing any kind of shift in the illocutionary force of the sentence as such (both sentences in (62-63) being interpreted as declarative as a whole). I will argue that the same applies to subjunctive vs. indicative complementation as well: the latter can also be analyzed as involving two distinct clause types, which do not directly influence the illocutionary force of the entire sentence.

This is where the notion of clausal mood comes into play. If we replace the term sentential mood with clausal mood, this allows us to maintain most aspects pertaining to the sentential-mood analysis that I introduced earlier on (in particular the idea that mood marking should not necessarily be seen as synonymous with distinctive verbal morphology), while only removing the issue of illocutionary force from consideration. Clausal mood will thus also be analyzed in terms of a cluster of common morpho-syntactic and semantic properties associated with a given clause type, which are shared across languages regardless of whether this clause

\textsuperscript{33} See Jary\&Kissine (2014) and the references therein.
type also exhibits distinctive verbal mood morphology or not. This is the approach that I will apply to Slavic subjunctive throughout the remainder of this dissertation.

Note that using the notion of clausal mood (or syntactic mood, depending on the exact terminology one employs) in the context of the analysis of the subjunctive, as opposed to exclusively viewing the latter as a verbal mood, is not by any means new to this study. Various authors have already proposed a similar analysis of the subjunctive in a number of languages where the latter is not associated with dedicated verbal morphology. One could mention, for instance, Landau (2004), who suggested a similar approach in the context of Hebrew, which does not contain subjunctive morphology but does contain what the author defined as a syntactic subjunctive clause type, which shares a number of clausal properties associated with subjunctive complements in those languages where the subjunctive is also marked through verbal morphology. The same type of analysis was also extensively applied to languages of the Balkan region, such as Greek or Romanian, which, similarly to Slavic, contain no subjunctive verbal morphology but do contain a subjunctive marker in the left periphery of the clause (Farkas, 1984; Krapova, 1998; Philippaki-Warburton, 1994; Rivero, 1994 a.o.). All of these languages have been analyzed as exhibiting subjunctive-type clauses which share some of the clausal properties observed with their counterparts in those languages, such as Romance, where subjunctive is also marked as a verbal mood.

Slavic subjunctive can be viewed through this same prism. We have already seen a number of indications which point towards a possible analysis of the Slavic subjunctive as a separate clausal mood: Slavic subjunctive-type complements we looked at so far were associated with distinctive morphological marking on the left periphery of the clause, which appeared in the same types of syntactic contexts as subjunctive verbal morphology in Romance, i.e. in complements to intensional verbs such as desideratives. In the following paragraphs, I will reinforce the analysis of Slavic subjunctive as a clausal mood by showing that subjunctive clauses in Slavic languages also share a number of additional formal and semantic properties with their Romance counterparts.

---

34 See Chapter 3 for a much more detailed presentation of such analyses.
35 A number of authors have, in fact, already analyzed Slavic subjunctives in similar terms, although usually in the context of individual Slavic languages, and not in the context of the Slavic language group as a whole, as I am doing here. See Antonenko (2008), Krapova (1998), Todorovic (2012) or Tomaszewicz (2012), among others.
2.2.2 Romance and Slavic subjunctives as clausal moods

In this section, we will observe that Romance and Slavic subjunctives share a cluster of common properties in a number of areas, which include (among others): the types of modal meaning that they denote; their temporal properties; common distributional patterns; as well as some common formal properties in relation to control (or anti-control, to be more precise). The observations that will be made in this context will lead to the conclusion that Romance and Slavic subjunctive can both be analyzed as belonging to the same clausal mood category, which involves the same type of syntactic CP complementation. The latter will then be analyzed in more formal detail in Sections 2.3 and 2.4.

2.2.2.1 Distributional and semantic similarities

We could already observe some shared mood patterns between Romance and Slavic languages in relation to complements selected by desiderative-type verbs. Such complements were shown to exhibit distinct morphological marking with respect to their indicative counterparts in both groups of languages (the only difference being related to the type of item which encodes this distinctive marking), which can thus be seen as the first indication of a possible common analysis of Romance and Slavic subjunctives in terms of clausal mood. Here I will further motivate such a common analysis by showing that the distinctive subjunctive-related morphological marking in the two language groups is not just observed in complements to desideratives, but also in a range of additional syntactic environments where subjunctive typically appears from a cross-linguistic perspective. Observe, for instance, the examples below:\(^{36}\)

\[(67) \quad \begin{align*}
    \text{a.} & \quad \text{Pide que vengas mañana.} & \quad \text{(Spanish)} \\
    & \quad \text{ask3.sg. that come2.sg.SUBJ tomorrow} \\
    \text{b.} & \quad \text{On prosit, chtoby ty prishel zavtra.} & \quad \text{(Russian)} \\
    & \quad \text{he asks SUBJ you come tomorrow} \\
    \quad & \quad \text{‘He asks you to come tomorrow.’}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{36}\) In order to avoid redundancy, only one example is given for each intensional-type verb group in Romance and Slavic languages, but the same complementation patterns hold throughout.
(68) a. *Je m’attends à ce que tu viennes demain.*  
    (French)  
    I expect that you comeSUBJ tomorrow

b. *Ochakvam da dojesh utre.*  
    (Bulgarian)  
    expect1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg. tomorrow
    ‘I expect you to come tomorrow.’

(69) a. *Suggerisco che venga domani.*  
    (Italian)  
    suggest1.sg. that come3.sg.SUBJ tomorrow

b. *Proponu je, zeby przyszedl jutro.*  
    (Polish)  
    suggest1.sg. SUBJ come tomorrow
    ‘I suggest that he comes tomorrow.’

As we can see in (67-69), distinctive subjunctive-related mood morphology in Romance and Slavic is also observed in complements to verbs such as directives, as well as a number of other irrealis future-referring predicates which can be described as intensional verbs, in the sense of Farkas (1992b) (see 1.4.3.1). Such a form-meaning pairing is expected under the analysis of the subjunctive as a clausal mood. In the following sections, we will see that the shared properties of Romance and Slavic subjunctive-type complements are not just related to intensional semantics and distinctive morpho-syntactic marking, but to a number of other clausal areas as well.

2.2.2.2 Tense

Another distinctive clausal property, which has been widely observed with subjunctive complements in languages where the subjunctive is marked as a verbal mood, is related to tense: subjunctive clauses across languages tend to exhibit what could be described as anaphoric or deficient tense, which is dependent on the tense of the matrix clause (Landau, 2004; Manzini, 2000; Picallo, 1985; Quer, 1998; Raposo, 1987). In this sense, subjunctives are closer to control infinitivals than they are to indicatives, which are associated with more independent temporal properties. One of the manifestations of this contrast is the fact that, in indicative complements, the embedded predicate can generally denote all types of temporal relations with respect to the reference time of the matrix predicate,37 whereas in the case of subjunctives, the embedded

---

37 The notion of *reference time* is borrowed from Stowell (1993).
predicate is typically restricted to a future-referring interval with respect to the matrix tense and, as a result, it cannot denote an event that took place prior to the one denoted by the matrix predicate. As we can see below, this contrast is well observed in Romance languages such as French (70) or Spanish (71).

(70) a. *Je crois qu’il est venu hier/ vient maintenant/ viendra demain.
   I believe that he has come yesterday / comes now/ will-come tomorrow
b. *Je veux qu’il vienne / *soit venu hier.
   I want that he comeSUBJ / hasSUBJ come yesterday

(71) a. Creo que llegó ayer / está llegando ahora / llegará mañana.
   believe1.sg. that came3.sg. yesterday / is coming now / will-come3.sg. tomorrow
b. Quiero que vengas / *hayas venido ayer.
   want1.sg. that come2.sg.SUBJ / have2.sg.SUBJ come yesterday

If subjunctive exists as a clausal mood in Slavic, one would expect Slavic subjunctive-type complements to exhibit the same temporal restrictions as the ones we just observed in the context of Romance. The Bulgarian (72), Russian (73) and Polish (74) examples below demonstrate that this is indeed the case:

(72) a. Mislja, che toi otide vchera / otiva dnes / shte otide utre.
   think1.sg. IND he left yesterday / leaves today / will leave tomorrow
b. Iskam toi da otide utre / *otide vchera.
   want1.sg. he SUBJ leave3.sg. tomorrow / left3.sg. yesterday

(73) a. Ja dumaju, chto on ushel vchera / ukhodit segodnya / ujdít zavtra.
   I think IND he left yesterday / leaves today / will-leave tomorrow
b. Ja hochu, chtoby on ushel zavtra / *on ushel vchera.
   I want SUBJ he leave tomorrow / he left yesterday

(74) a. Mysle, ze on odszedł wczoraj / odchodzi dzisiaj / odejdzie jutro.
   think1.sg. IND he left yesterday / leaves today / will-leave tomorrow
b. Chce, zeby on odszedl jutro / * odszedl wczoraj.

want1.sg. SUBJ he leave tomorrow / left yesterday

The same property holds throughout all verb types given in (67-69): they are all associated with the same type of dependent tense restricted by the temporal coordinates of the matrix predicate, which is typical for subjunctive complements cross-linguistically.

2.2.2.3 Subject obviation

Another property that Slavic subjunctives will be shown to share with their Romance counterparts is related to the area of control and the referential properties of the embedded subject in subjunctive complements. In this context, it has been widely observed that typical subjunctive complements (i.e. intensional subjunctives) are cross-linguistically associated with an anti-control phenomenon known as subject obviation, which precludes the possibility of conjoint reference between the matrix and the embedded subject (Bouchard, 1984; Everaert, 1986; Farkas, 1992a; Manzini, 2000; Picallo, 1985; Ruwet, 1984). This is another area where subjunctive complements differ from indicatives, because the latter allow for an optionally co-referential embedded pro subject. The contrast is illustrated in the Romance examples below:

(75)  

a. Jean pense qu’il viendra demain. 
John thinks that he will come tomorrow
‘John thinks that he will come tomorrow.’

b. Jean veut qu’il vienne demain. 
John wants that he comeSUBJ tomorrow
‘John wants *(him) to come tomorrow.’

(76)  

a. Juan dice que (pro) vendrá mañana.  
John says that he will come tomorrow

b. Juan quiere que (pro) venga mañana.  
John wants that he comeSUBJ tomorrow

The same contrast can also be observed in a number of Slavic languages, as we can see in the examples below:
(77) a. *Ivan* dumaet, chto on*ij* pridiot zavtra.
John thinks IND he will-come tomorrow
b. *Ivan* hochet, chtoby on*ij* prishel zavtra.
John wants SUBJ he come tomorrow

(78) a. *Jan* mysli, ze (*pro*ij*) odejdzie jutro.
John thinks IND he will-leave tomorrow
b. *Jan* chce, zeby (*pro*ij*) odszedl jutro.
John wants SUBJ he leave tomorrow

Hence this is yet another common property that Slavic subjunctives share with their Romance
verbal mood counterparts.38

The data introduced here in 2.2 thus allow us to relate the Slavic subjunctive to its
Romance counterpart in the context of the clausal-mood approach to the subjunctive, because
Slavic subjunctives were shown to share a cluster of common formal, semantic and morpho-
phonological properties with their verbal-mood counterparts in Romance: on a morpho-
phonological level, they were both shown to be associated with distinctive overt marking (the
only difference being that, unlike Romance, Slavic subjunctive is not marked through verbal
morphology but through a separate, clause-initial item); semantically, Romance and Slavic
subjunctives were shown to be associated with intensional-type predicates and the same range
of irrealis-type modal meanings; they were shown to be associated with the same dependent
temporal properties; and finally, they were shown to exhibit the same anti-control property of
subject obviation. In the following sections, where I will put forward a more precise formal
analysis of the subjunctive clause type in Romance and Slavic, we will observe a number of
additional clausal properties that are shared by subjunctive complements in these two groups
of languages, which will thus further reinforce the analysis of the Slavic subjunctive as a distinct
clausal mood.

38 I should note, however, that the subject obviation property is not as uniformly observed across Slavic languages
as the previous phenomena that we looked at here were. In some Slavic languages (particularly South Slavic ones),
complements such as those in (75-78) do not exhibit obviation, as we will see in more detail later on in this chapter
(Section 2.4 in particular). Nevertheless, the contrasts that we will observe in this context should not be seen as
related to any type of essential difference in the inherent properties of the subjunctive clausal mood in Slavic as
such. Instead, they will be shown to stem from some more general cross-linguistic phenomena related to the syntax
of control, which will be described in more detail later on.
2.3 Indicative CP vs. Subjunctive CP: Syntactic analysis

In addition to showing the common formal and semantic patterns that can be observed between Romance and Slavic subjunctives, the analysis in the previous section also demonstrated that these complements exhibit a series of distinctive clausal properties with respect to their indicative counterparts, which points towards an analysis of indicatives and subjunctives in terms of two distinct clause types. In this section, I will further develop this analysis by arguing that these two types of clauses should be seen as introduced through two distinct types of CP projections, which exhibit different formal properties. Once I formalize the properties of these CP projections in more detail, this will allow me to account for the full range of formal and semantic contrasts that we observed between indicative and subjunctive clauses so far, both in Slavic and cross-linguistically.

The broadest generalization that can be drawn from the comparative analysis of indicative and subjunctive complements that was proposed in the previous parts of this dissertation is that subjunctives seem to constitute more ‘deficient’ clausal domains than indicatives. Their relative deficiency in this context was manifested in several different ways. If we harken back to the world-semantics analyses from Chapter 1 (Section 1.4.3), we can recall that subjunctives were shown to be more deficient than indicatives in terms of their propositional content: while the latter denote full-fledged propositions (i.e. ‘persistent propositions’, in the sense of Portner (1997)), which can be judged as true or false, the former denote more deficient (non-persistent) propositions, which cannot receive a truth value. In Chapter 2, we observed several other areas of relative subjunctive deficiency with respect to indicatives. Subjunctive complements were shown to be more deficient when it came to their temporal properties, given that they exhibit dependent tense which is restricted by the temporal coordinates of the matrix predicate, whereas indicatives are associated with more independent tense, allowing the embedded predicate to denote all types of temporal relations with respect to the matrix predicate. Subjunctives could also be argued to exhibit a degree of deficiency when it comes to the issue of embedded subject licensing that we just discussed in the previous section: while indicatives allow for a full referential scope associated with the embedded subject, subjunctives restrict it to non-control readings with respect to the matrix subject, which is thus another area where subjunctive complements are more formally dependent on the matrix clause than indicatives are.
In this section, I will propose a syntactic analysis that explains all of these observed contrasts between indicative and subjunctive complements. They will be accounted for by identifying a precise formal distinction related to the underlying structural make-up of the CP projections associated with these two types of clauses. In order to reach a more precise analysis in this context, I will begin by looking at the syntactic properties related to subjunctive and indicative complements through the prism of the phasal approach to syntax that I introduced earlier on in the introductory chapter (see 1.3.3). One way in which we could use the phasal analysis in order to account for the fact that subjunctives were shown to constitute more deficient clausal domains than indicatives would be to say that the latter type of complements have a full phasal status whereas the former do not. In the following several sections, I will see whether such an analysis can be maintained.

2.3.1 Non-phasal properties of subjunctive complements

As I outlined in 1.3.3, the only type of phasal domain that I will be focusing on in this dissertation is the clausal CP-domain (with the verbal vP phasal domain left to the side). Recall that phases, including the CP-phase, were described in Chomsky (2001) as syntactically opaque domains, which function in accordance with the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) (reproduced below):

(79) In phase $\alpha$ with head $H$, the domain of $H$ is not accessible to operations outside $\alpha$, but only $H$ and its edge.

The most straightforward application of PIC to different types of embedded syntactic environments would state that those complements which are syntactically opaque in accordance with (79) should be analyzed as phasal CP domains, whereas those that do not observe PIC and are more transparent in this context should be viewed as non-phasal domains which lack an embedded CP projection. The latter type of analysis was sometimes applied to certain types of non-finite structures across languages, such as infinitives or small clauses, for instance, whose anaphoric properties in areas such as tense or control were analyzed as a result of the absence of the embedded CP (Kempchinsky, 1986; Watanabe, 1993 a.o.).

Some authors have proposed to apply a similar analysis to subjunctives as well (at least to certain types of subjunctives in certain languages), claiming that, unlike indicatives, which
constitute phasal CP domains, subjunctives should be seen as non-phasal, non-CP domains
(Bobaljik&Wurmbrand, 2013; Livitz, 2014; Wurmbrand, 2013). Some of the observations
made here so far may lend themselves to the same type of analysis, for instance the fact that
subjunctives were shown to be more temporally anaphoric and dependent on the matrix tense
than indicatives. If we were to analyze the phenomenon of temporal anaphoricity in the context
of inter-clausal dependencies in terms of a syntactic binding relationship between the matrix T
and the embedded T, then the fact that subjunctives exhibit anaphoric properties in this context
could indicate that the PIC constraint does not apply to this type of complements, suggesting a
possible analysis of subjunctives as non-phasal, non-CP domains.

Another type of data that may point towards the same conclusion is related to control,
which represents an additional area where subjunctives exhibit a degree of permeability when
it comes to matrix-embedded binding relations. For instance, subjunctive complements are open
to object control from the matrix clause when they are selected by certain types of predicates,
such as directives. We can observe some cross-linguistic Romance and Slavic examples of this
type of matrix-embedded control relationship in the context of subjunctive complementation
below:

(80)   \textit{Te\textsubscript{i} dije que vengas.}  \hspace{2cm} \text{(Spanish)}
you told1.sg. that come2.sg.SUBJ
‘I told you to come.’

(81)   \textit{Prisilio ga\textsubscript{i} je da ode\textsubscript{i}.}  \hspace{2cm} \text{(Croatian)}
forced him has SUBJ leave3.sg.
‘He forced him to leave.’

(82)   \textit{Volodja ugovor\textsubscript{i} Nadju\textsubscript{i} ctoby ona\textsubscript{i} poehala v Evropu.}  \hspace{2cm} \text{(Russian)}
Volodja convinced Nadia SUBJ she go to Europe
‘Volodja convinced Nadia to go to Europe.’
(Antonenko, 2008: 4)

Moreover, a number of languages even exhibit subject control in subjunctive complements,
which is a rarer phenomenon, given that the subjunctive is more typically associated with the
opposite, anti-control property of subject obviation across languages, as we just observed earlier
on in 2.2.2.3. Nonetheless, languages such as Greek or Romanian, for instance, allow for subject control in subjunctives as well. 39

\[(83)\]  
\textit{O Kostas theli na odhiji.}  
\text{(Greek)}

the Kostas wants SUBJ drive3.sg.  
‘Kostas wants to drive.’  
\text{(Roussou, 2009: 1812)}

\[(84)\]  
\textit{Ion vrea sa plece.}  
\text{(Romanian)}

John wants SUBJ leave3.sg.  
‘John wants to leave.’  
\text{(Cotfas, 2011: 27)}

Even though subject control is not a widely-observed phenomenon in subjunctives across languages, the existence of data such as those in (83-84), as well as the fact that subjunctives are more generally open to object control from the matrix clause, can serve as additional arguments for the non-phasal approach to the subjunctive clause type as such.  

In addition to the control data in (80-84), another argument for the non-phasal analysis of subjunctives can be found by looking at the reverse, anti-control phenomenon of subject obviation. A number of authors have analyzed this cross-linguistic subjunctive property as an additional manifestation of the syntactically anaphoric nature of this type of clauses (Picallo, 1985; Raposo, 1987; Progovac, 1993 a.o.). The analyses in this context were made primarily within the Government&Binding (GB) framework, in reference to the notion of binding domain, but they can be translated to the more contemporary phasal approach to syntax as well. The basic argument was that subjunctives are associated with syntactically transparent structures which involve an extension of the embedded binding domain into the matrix clause. The subject obviation data was then explained by referring to the binding conditions on (pro)nominals, specifically the condition B governing the binding of pronouns (reproduced below for convenience):

---

39 Subject control in the context of subjunctive complementation is only observed in a restricted group of languages, primarily those situated in the Balkan region, and is the result of some more general linguistic phenomena that affected languages associated with this geographical area. More on the latter will be said in Chapter 3 (specifically Section 3.2).
B: a pronoun must have an antecedent outside its binding domain.

Under the assumption that the matrix and the embedded clause in subjunctive contexts are part of the same binding domain, the embedded *pro* subject cannot enter into a control relationship with the matrix subject (as we observed in examples such as those in (75-78)) because its controller cannot be within the same binding domain, given the condition B in (85). Hence the effect of subject obviation.

This GB-based analysis can be used to advance the non-phasal approach to the subjunctive as well. The ban on subject-control reading in subjunctive clauses, under the approach outlined above, is a locality-type constraint, given that it governs the control relationships within a single binding domain. As we noted earlier on in 1.3.3 when I first introduced the phasal approach to syntax proposed in Chomsky (2001), locality constraints are only compatible with phase-internal syntactic relationships. Hence, whenever we observe locality constraints in the context of inter-clausal dependencies, this can be seen as indicative of the absence of the embedded CP phase boundary between the matrix and the subordinate clause. Therefore, if one adopts the GB-type approach to subject obviation that I just outlined above (which I will not be doing here, however- see 2.4), the anti-control data related to subjunctives can be used as an additional argument for the non-phasal analysis of this type of clauses.

Another piece of cross-linguistic data which shows subjunctives exhibiting matrix-embedded locality-type constraints was noted specifically in Italian, and it concerned the syntactic relationship of long-distance anaphor (LDA) binding (Giorgi, 1983). This is another area where one can observe contrasts between indicatives and subjunctives, because LDA binding is allowed over subjunctive complements (86) but banned over indicatives (87):

(86) * [Quel dittatore], spera che i notiziari televisivi parlino delle proprie gesta.
that dictator hopes that the news TV talk3.pl.SUBJ about self’s deeds
‘That dictator hopes that the news shows will talk about his own deeds.’

(87) [Quel dittatore], ha detto che i notiziari t.v. hanno parlato delle proprie gesta.
that dictator has said that the news TV have3.pl.IND talked about self’s deeds
‘That dictator has said that the news shows have talked about his own deeds.’

(Constantini, 2009: 95-96)
The indicative and subjunctive complements in (86-87) exhibit a syntactic contrast in relation to the condition A, which governs the binding of anaphors (again reproduced below):

(88) A: an anaphor must have an antecedent within its own binding domain.

Therefore, while the ban on LDA binding in the context of indicative complements is compatible with the phasal status of this type of clauses, because it is in line with the PIC constraint, the fact that the subjunctives allow this type of binding relationship to be established between the matrix and the embedded clause can be seen as an additional indication of the lack of embedded CP phase boundary in such cases.

The data we observed here in 2.3.1 showed us that subjunctives exhibit a number of cross-linguistic syntactic properties which are uncharacteristic of phasal structures, differing in this sense from their indicative counterparts, which therefore suggests that subjunctive clause type in general could be analyzed as a non-phasal, non-CP syntactic domain. This is not the analysis I will adopt here, however.

2.3.2 Phasal properties of subjunctive complements

The reason why I will claim that subjunctives should not be seen as non-phasal domains is because they do not exhibit all the expected syntactic properties associated with clearly non-phasal structures, some of which we will observe later on in this dissertation (see Sections 3.3 or 4.2, for instance). Rather, they are associated with mixed syntactic phenomena when it comes to phasehood: while the data from the previous section showed some non-phasal properties related to subjunctive complements, the data that we will observe here will show subjunctives patterning with phasal embedded domains, such as indicatives.

The first syntactic area that will allow us to observe subjunctives exhibiting phase-like properties has to do with anti-locality constraints in the context of inter-clausal dependencies. The relevant phenomenon that we will discuss here is related to Slavic subjunctives in particular and, more specifically, to the properties of possessive pronouns that appear in this type of complements in languages such as Russian or Croatian.\(^\text{40}\) The possessive pronouns in these languages can come in two guises: the form \textit{svoj/a}, which functions as an anaphor and observes

\(^{40}\) Observations in relation to Russian in this context are taken from Avrutin & Babyonyshev (1997) and Antonenko (2008). Croatian observations are mine.
the locality condition A; and the forms *ego* in Russian or *njegov/a* in Croatian, which observe the anti-locality condition B and function as pronouns. Thus, as we can see in the examples below, long-distance binding over the indicative-type clauses requires the introduction of the possessive pronoun (as in (90)), whereas binding within a single clausal domain requires the introduction of the possessive anaphor *svoj* (89): 41

(89) a.  
\[Volodja, provodil (*ego)/svoju, zhenu v Evropu.\]  
Volodja saw-off his / his wife to Europe  
‘Volodja saw off his wife to Europe.’  
(Avrutin & Babyonyshev, 1997: 4)

b.  
\[Ivan, voli (*njegovu)/svoju, zhenu.\]  
John loves his / his wife  
‘John loves his wife.’

(90) a.  
\[Ivan, dumaet, chto *ego/*svoja, zhena krasivaja.\]  
John thinks that his / his wife beautiful

b.  
\[Ivan, misli da je njegov/(svoja, zhena lijepa.\]  
John thinks that is his / his wife beautiful  
‘John thinks his wife is beautiful.’

The important observation to make here in the context of the current discussion is that subjunctives in these languages pattern with indicatives when it comes to matrix-embedded possessive pronoun vs. anaphor binding, i.e. they observe the anti-locality constraint corresponding to the condition B, as we can see below in (91):

(91) a.  
\[Ivan, hochet chtoby *ego/*svoja, zhena poehala v Evropu.\]  
John wants SUBJ his / his wife go to Europe  
(Antonenko, 2008: 11)

41 Note, moreover, that the binding relationship in (90) should be seen as semantic (as opposed to syntactic) in nature, similarly as the anti-local binding of English pronouns that I talked about earlier on in 1.3.3 (see (35) in particular), because the antecedent for the embedded possessive pronoun in such cases is context-dependent (i.e. it can be the matrix subject, which is the default reading, but it can also be some other individual \( x \) in the discourse). In this way, such structures remain in full accordance with PIC, which would be less obvious if we had a syntactic-type binding relationship between the matrix and the embedded clause.
b. *Ivan, hoche da njegova, / (*svoja,*) žena ode u Europu.*  (Croatian)
   John wants SUBJ his / his wife go to Europe
   ‘John wants his wife to go to Europe.’

Data such as those in (91) argue against the view of subjunctives as non-phrasal domains that lack an embedded CP boundary because, if that were to be the case, then complements in (91) would be expected to pattern with simple matrix clauses such as those in (89) with regards to local anaphor binding, which is contrary to facts. Moreover, subjunctives also exhibit contrasts in this context with respect to some other types of embedded clauses, such as obligatory control infinitivals, which will be analyzed later on as non-phrasal syntactic domains (see Section 4.2). As we can observe in the examples below, the latter type of complements exhibit matrix-embedded anaphor binding in relation to possessives, differing in this sense from subjunctives in (91):

(92) a. *Ivan, nachal voditi svoj avtomobil.*  (Russian)
   John began driveINF his car
   ‘John began to drive his car.’

b. *Ivan, mora završiti svoju zadacu.*  (Croatian)
   John must finishINF his homework
   ‘John must finish his homework.’

All of the data in (89-92) thus argue against a non-phrasal analysis of the subjunctive, at least in the Slavic languages that we are looking at here.

Another, more cross-linguistic indication that subjunctives should not be seen as entirely non-phrasal syntactic domains is related to tense. Even though subjunctive complements were shown to be associated with more dependent temporal properties than indicatives, one can also note some additional contrasts in this context between subjunctives, on the one hand, and control complements of the type exemplified in (92), on the other, which will, once again, be analyzed as clearly non-phrasal domains later on. Authors such as Krapova (1998) or Landau (2004) have noted that the latter exhibit more anaphoric temporal properties than subjunctives, on the basis of grammaticality contrasts such as those we can observe below:42

---

42 Krapova and Landau made their observations in this context on the basis of the analysis of Balkan languages in particular, such as Bulgarian, but the temporal contrasts they noted obtain cross-linguistically as well.
The data in (93-95) allow us to observe that, while subjunctive complements can introduce an embedded tense marker that conflicts with the matrix tense (i.e. we can insert a future-referring adverbial in the embedded clause even though the matrix tense is past), control infinitivals cannot. This means that, unlike the latter type of clauses, which are entirely temporally anaphoric, subjunctive complements are associated with at least some independent temporal content (even though, on the whole, their tense is more dependent than the one associated with indicatives).

The reason why the data in (93-95) are relevant in the context of the current discussion on phasehood is because the grammaticality contrasts we observed there are best explained by claiming that the two types of complements exemplified above differ when it comes to their phasal status and the presence vs. absence of the embedded CP projection. The fact that infinitive complements in (93-95b) cannot be associated with temporal markers that conflict
with the matrix tense can be straightforwardly accounted for if we assume that such clauses do not project an embedded CP. This would imply that the embedded clause in such cases is syntactically incorporated within the matrix clausal domain and therefore the matrix and the embedded clause end up being associated with a single, matrix CP, and hence constitute a single time frame. As a result, introducing conflicting tense markers in (93-95b) results in ungrammaticality for the same reason as it would within the confines of a single clause:

(96) * John left tomorrow.

On the other hand, the fact that one can introduce conflicting tense markers within subjunctive complements in (93-95a) suggests that the latter denote a separate time frame, which is restricted by the matrix predicate, but not identical to the matrix tense. Therefore, such complements cannot be seen as part of the matrix clausal domain, but should be analyzed as constituting a separate CP-clausal domain. This, in turn, implies that they should not be seen as entirely non-phasal either.

The more dependent and deficient temporal properties that subjunctives were nonetheless shown to exhibit with respect to indicatives could then be analyzed in several different ways. One possible analysis would be to claim that subjunctives involve some type of matrix-embedded tense-binding mechanism that is established through the embedded CP-projection, as suggested in Kempchinsky (1986) or Landau (2004), among others. This type of binding relationship would then no longer violate the PIC constraint, because the latter allows for inter-phasal syntactic dependencies to be established through the CP phase edge. Such an analysis could therefore reconcile the temporal dependence of the subjunctive with its phasal status. Alternatively, the subjunctive vs. indicative contrasts in terms of temporal dependence could be explained by postulating a formal difference in the type of CP projection that these clauses are associated with, with the subjunctive CP not being as fully phasal as the indicative CP, and thus allowing for the PIC constraint to be relaxed in certain contexts. An analysis of this type would then be able to explain not just the temporal dependence of the subjunctive, but also the fact that clauses of this type were shown to be associated with a number of other properties that are not characteristic of phasal domains (as we observed earlier on in 2.3.1). These are some of the reasons why I will end up adopting such an approach here.
2.3.3 Subjunctive CP as a deficient phase

The analysis put forward in the previous two sections would suggest that subjunctive complements contain an embedded CP projection, which is why they do not entirely pattern with non-phasal, non-CP domains, but that this CP is somehow structurally deficient and more transparent than the indicative CP, which is why subjunctives do not fully pattern with the latter type of clauses either when it comes to their phasal status. Here I will put forward a formal analysis that accounts not just for the observed syntactic contrasts between indicative and subjunctive clauses in terms of phasehood, but also for the semantic differences that the two types of clauses were shown to exhibit earlier on when it comes to their propositional content (i.e. the fact that indicatives denote world-anchored persistent propositions that can be judged as true or false while subjunctives denote non-persistent propositions which are not extensionally world-anchored and which cannot receive a truth value).

All of these contrasts can be accounted for by postulating a single formal distinction with regards to the internal make-up of the indicative and the subjunctive CP, which will be analyzed as related to the different selection mechanisms underlying the introduction of these two types of clauses in embedded contexts, i.e. the fact that the indicative CP constitutes a marked embedded syntactic option whereas the subjunctive CP is selected by default. Recall that the argument I put forward in this context earlier on in 1.4 was couched within the framework of world semantics: indicatives were seen as selected by predicates that contain a W(orld)-feature in their underlying lexical make-up, which grounds the embedded indicative proposition within the matrix modal base, whereas subjunctives were seen as selected simply in the absence of W, as an Elsewhere option, which is why they are not semantically anchored to the matrix modal base but only to a non-specific set of possible worlds. Here I will propose to relate this difference with regards to the selection mechanisms underlying indicative and subjunctive complements to the formal make-up of the embedded CP projection associated with these two types of clauses.

First of all, the fact that indicatives were shown to exhibit more fully-fledged phasal properties than subjunctives would suggest that they contain ‘something more’ in their embedded CP structure, which explains why the indicative CP constitutes a greater barrier to long-distance binding operations than its subjunctive counterpart. I will argue that this extra property corresponds to an additional projection present in the indicative CP structure, which subjunctives do not contain. The claim that I will make here is that the selection of indicative
complements involves an Agree relationship between the W-feature contained in the lexical make-up of the matrix predicate and the corresponding feature contained within a syntactic projection associated with the embedded CP domain - let’s call the latter W(orld)P(hrase).

\[(97) \quad V_w \quad \text{CP}[WP_w] \quad \text{Select/Agree} \]

The semantic consequences related to the selection mechanism in (97) were already explained earlier on in 1.4: the Agree chain that is established in this context is what allows to extensionally anchor the embedded indicative proposition to the matrix modal base, whereas the absence of the relevant Agree chain in subjunctives, which are selected in the absence of W, explains why they cannot be world-anchored to the matrix modal base. Here I will focus on the syntactic implications of this analysis.

From a syntactic perspective, the WP in (97) should be analyzed as the highest projection contained within the left periphery of the embedded clause, given that it must be in a local configuration with the selecting matrix predicate. In this sense, WP could be seen as a type of syntactic equivalent of the cartographic ForceP projection proposed in Rizzi (1997) (although the two are not functionally equivalent). Let us further assume that this highest left-periphery projection, besides its semantic function that I already described, also has a syntactic, derivational role. Thus, in addition to semantically bringing about the extensional world anchoring of the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base through the binding relationship in (97), the WP projection should also be seen as syntactically establishing what we might call \textit{phase closure}, closing off the CP domain to external syntactic operations and establishing the latter as fully phasal. The phasal differences that we observed between indicatives and subjunctives can then be explained by claiming that the subjunctive CP constitutes a more deficient phasal domain because it does not contain this highest left-periphery projection that encodes phase closure (given that, once again, it is selected in the absence of W, as a default syntactic option).

If the analysis I just outlined were to be fully confirmed in light of cross-linguistic syntactic data related to different embedded clausal environments, this would then allow me to propose a syntactic generalization whereby, instead of a simple binary distinction between phasal and non-phasal domains in embedded contexts, we would have a 3-way distinction in this sense: on the one end, there would be clauses such as indicatives, which constitute full
phasic domains because they contain the highest WP within their CP-structure; then there are clauses such as subjunctives, which exhibit mixed phasic properties because they contain a ‘deficient’ CP structure, given that they do not project WP; and then there are various different non-phasic clausal domains which do not contain CP at all (or contain a sufficiently impoverished left-periphery structure so as to be syntactically transparent). If this generalization is valid, then the PIC constraint itself should be somewhat relativized. A strict version of PIC as it was postulated in Chomsky (2001) (see (79)) would then not equally apply to all CP-domains, but only to a certain type of CP-domain- i.e. the one containing the highest WP projection encoding phase closure within the CP structure. Even though the syntactic data we looked at so far might suggest that this generalization is on the right track, a more detailed syntactic analysis of different embedded CP domains would be required before I can fully vouch for its validity, which I will not attempt to provide here because this would take me too far away from my main subject. Instead, I will use the remainder of this chapter in order to focus more closely on the internal make-up of the subjunctive CP itself, which I did not yet analyze in any type of detail.

2.4 Subjunctive CP as the embedded imperative CP

The first preliminary question that needs to be posed before we can look into the internal formal properties of the subjunctive CP in more detail is whether the embedded subjunctive clause type can be related to any of the main CP clause types that one observes in matrix environments across languages, i.e. the declarative, the interrogative or the imperative CP, or whether the subjunctive CP is entirely separate. Some of the observations we made in the previous parts of this dissertation already suggest that the most likely answer in this context is that subjunctive CP should be related to the matrix imperative CP (a conclusion that will be further reinforced here in 2.4).

If we go back once again to the world-semantics discussion from the introductory chapter, we can recall that subjunctives were claimed to semantically pattern with imperatives, whereas indicative complements were claimed to pattern with matrix declaratives: while the latter denote world-anchored persistent propositions that can be judged as true or false, the former denote nonpersistent propositions, which are not world anchored and which therefore cannot receive a truth value. While in the previous section I provided a syntactic analysis that
formally accounted for the contrast that is observed in this context between subjunctives and indicatives, here I will provide a formal explanation for the semantic correlation between matrix imperatives and embedded subjunctives that I just described. The analysis I will put forward in this context will culminate in the conclusion that the subjunctive CP should be seen as the embedded equivalent of the matrix imperative CP.

2.4.1 Common properties of imperative and subjunctive clauses

First of all, we will observe that subjunctive and imperative clauses exhibit a number of common patterns across languages, both from a semantic and from a syntactic point of view, and then I will account for these shared patterns by proposing a common formal analysis in relation to the subjunctive/imperative CP. In the next several subsections we will see that, in addition to the similarity with regards to their propositional content that we already noted, subjunctive and imperative clauses are also closely related when it comes to a whole series of other clausal properties that they exhibit, including modality, tense, or anti-control, among others.

2.4.1.1 Direction of fit

The first common property that we will observe between imperatives and subjunctives is purely semantic in nature, and it will, once again, allow me to put these two types of clauses on one side, and clauses such as declaratives/indicatives on the other. The semantic property I am referring to is the so-called *direction of fit*, which was first established as a notion in Searle&Vanderweken (1985). These authors applied this notion to matrix contexts, but here we will see that it can also be translated to embedded syntactic environments.

Searle&Vanderweken (S&V) distinguished between different types of matrix utterances in relation to their *illocutionary point* or, to put it in world-semantics terms, with respect to the relation between the utterance and the world. The relevant distinction for the purposes of this study is the one between assertive-type utterances, whose function is to describe a world, and directive-type utterances, whose function is to get the world to match a certain state of affairs. The former are thus described as associated with a *word-to-world fit* (roughly speaking, they involve statements about how the world *is*, so the goal is for the statement (i.e. *word*) to match the world), whereas the latter are seen as associated with the opposite, *world-to-word fit* (i.e.
they involve statements about how the world *should be*, and hence the goal is for the world to match the statement (i.e. *word*). In the matrix contexts that S&V focused on, the clause type that corresponds to the former fit direction are declaratives and the one that corresponds to the latter are imperatives.

Even though S&V focused on matrix contexts where we have direct access to illocutionary force and the actual world of the speaker, their analysis can be transposed to embedded syntactic environments as well, as long as we shift the modal base away from the world of the speaker to the world of the matrix subject. If we apply the notion of fit direction to indicative and subjunctive complements, this will allow us to observe yet another cross-linguistic semantic difference between them. Indicative complements pattern with matrix declaratives in that they are associated with a *word-to-world* fit (the only difference being that the relevant world in this context is that of the matrix subject and not (necessarily) that of the speaker): whether an indicative complement is selected by an assertive, factive or by an epistemic-type predicate, they still involve statements that describe a given world. Subjunctives, on the other hand (to be more precise, intensional Subj1 complements, which are the subject of discussion here\(^{43}\)), pattern with imperatives: they involve statements about how the world should be according to the matrix subject, and are hence associated with a world-to-word fit.\(^{44}\) The only difference between imperatives and subjunctives in this context is related to the syntactic environments they appear in, i.e. matrix vs. embedded clauses, respectively. The relevant point, however, is that we observe the same shift in the direction of fit from *word-to-world* towards *world-to-word* with both types of clauses.

The difference in the fit direction that we just observed between indicative and subjunctive complements should also be seen as related to the type of modality that they can denote. If indicatives are associated with any modality, the latter tends to be epistemic, expressing different degrees of certainty about the state of the world as described by the indicative clause, which is compatible with a word-to-world fit (regardless of the degree of certainty or doubt expressed by a given indicative proposition). Subjunctive, on the other hand, is typically associated with deontic modality, i.e. the type of modal meanings that express how the world should be according to certain norms, expectations, desires etc. Of course, this is also the type of modality we observe in simple imperatives. Deontic modality can in fact be seen as

\(^{43}\) Once again, Subj2 pattern more closely with indicatives when it comes to fit directionality as well

\(^{44}\) A similar imperative-subjunctive link when it comes to fit direction was already proposed in the context of English subjunctive-type clauses by James (1986).
synonymous with world-to-word fit because both notions apply to statements about how a given world should be according to some individual $x$.

2.4.1.2 Deficient tense

Another area where one can observe common properties in relation to subjunctive and imperative clauses across languages is tense. Recall first of all the examples in (70-74), where we saw that subjunctives are cross-linguistically associated with dependent tense properties and can only denote a restricted, future-referring temporal interval with respect to the reference time of the matrix predicate, as shown by the impossibility of anterior past-tense readings in the embedded subjunctive complement (a couple of relevant Slavic examples are reproduced below):

(98) a.  *Iskam toi da dojde utre / * dojde vchera.*  (Bulgarian)
      want1.sg. he SUBJ come3.sg. tomorrow / came3.sg. yesterday

b.  *Ja hochu, chtoby on prishel zavtra/ * on prishel vchera.*  (Russian)
      I  want  SUBJ he come tomorrow / * he came yesterday

The same type of restricted, semantically future-referring time frame can also be observed with simple imperatives, as shown by the ungrammaticality that ensues if we insert a past adverbial in an imperative clause:

(99) a.  *Viens hier!*  (French)
      come2.sg.IMP yesterday

b.  *Dodji jucher!*  (Croatian)
      come2.sg.IMP yesterday

 c.  *Come yesterday!*  (English)

The only difference between imperatives and subjunctives when it comes to their temporal interpretation is, once again, related to the syntactic contexts they appear in: imperatives are independent matrix clauses, with direct access to deictic time, and hence the tense anchor with respect to which their future-referring interpretation is determined is the utterance time, whereas subjunctives are dependent embedded complements selected by the matrix predicate, and hence
their tense anchor is the reference time of the selecting predicate.\textsuperscript{45} The relevant point, however, is that both types of clauses are temporally restricted by a tense anchor in the same way.

2.4.1.3 Distributional overlaps

Another piece of evidence in favor of the common analysis of imperatives and subjunctives that I will be proposing here can be noticed by looking at their distribution, which exhibits a number of cross-linguistic overlaps (as already noted by authors such as Han (1998), Kempchinsky (2009) or Rivero&Terzi (1995), among others). If we look at some languages where both the subjunctive and the imperative are associated with their own verbal morphology, we can notice that subjunctive verb forms are often used as suppletives for imperatives in matrix contexts, usually because the use of imperative verbal morphology is banned in a certain type of syntactic environment. This is the case, for instance, in third person imperative clauses in Romance languages such as French or Spanish, which can only be introduced through a construction involving the C-item \textit{que} followed by the subjunctive verb form, as shown in (100):

\begin{align*}
(100) & \quad \text{a. } Qu’ il vienne \text{ demain!} \\
& \quad \text{that he comeSUBJ tomorrow} \\
& \quad \text{(French)} \\
& \quad b. \quad Que venga \text{ mañana!} \\
& \quad \text{that come3.sg.SUBJ tomorrow} \\
& \quad \text{‘Let him come tomorrow.’}
\end{align*}

Moreover, if we look at negative imperatives in Spanish in particular, we can see that such clauses always feature subjunctive verb forms (regardless of person), because Spanish disallows the use of imperative verbal morphology in the presence of negation (Rivero&Terzi, 1995):

\begin{align*}
(101) & \quad \text{a. } No \text{ vengas } \text{ mañana!} \\
& \quad \text{no come2.sg.SUBJ tomorrow} \\
& \quad \text{‘Don’t come tomorrow!’}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{45} The distinction between utterance time and reference time in this context is, once again, based on Stowell (1993).
b. *No lo hagáis!*
   no it do2.pl.SUBJ
   ‘Don’t do it (y’all)!’

Furthermore, we can also observe subjunctive markers appearing in imperative-type matrix contexts in some languages where subjunctive is not marked through verbal morphology but through separate syntactic items. Most importantly, this is also the case in Slavic, as we can see on the basis of Serbian and Bulgarian examples below:

(102) *Nemoj da zakasnish!* (Serbian)
   neg. SUBJ be-late2.sg.
   ‘Don’t be late!’

(103) *Da chetesh!* (Bulgarian)
   SUBJ read2.sg.
   ‘Read!’

Besides providing additional evidence for the cross-linguistic link between imperatives and subjunctives, the data in (102-103) also have wider relevance in the context of my study, because they allow us to observe yet another shared pattern between Slavic and Romance subjunctives (i.e. subjunctive markers can be used as suppletives for imperatives in both groups of languages), which thus further reinforces the common clausal-mood approach to the subjunctive in these languages.

2.4.1.4 Verbal morphology

Another area where we can notice a link between imperatives and subjunctives across languages has to do with the morphological make-up of the verb forms used in the two types of clauses. The verbal morphology used in imperatives and subjunctives tends to be very similar cross-linguistically, with the verbs that appear in these clauses often sharing the same root/stem form and differing only in inflectional endings. This can be most clearly observed if we look at some Romance verbs that have irregular subjunctive and imperative forms, such as *be* and *know* in French and Spanish. Below, we can see that these verbs appear under a similar morphological
form in subjunctives and imperatives, which is different from the one they exhibit when they are associated with the indicative mood.

(104) a. **Sois tranquille!**  
be2.sg.IMP calm  
‘Be calm!’

b. *Je veux que tu sois tranquille.*  
I want that you beSUBJ calm  
‘I want you to be calm.’

c. *Tu es tranquille.*  
you areIND calm  
‘You are calm.’

(105) a. **Sache - le!**  
know2.sg.IMP it  
‘Know this!’

b. *Il faut que tu le saches.*  
it is-necessary that you it knowSUBJ  
‘You must know this.’

c. *Tu le sais.*  
you it knowIND  
‘You know it.’

(106) a. **Sé tranquilo!**  
be2.sg.IMP calm

b. *Quiero que seas tranquilo.*  
want1.sg. that be2.sg.SUBJ calm

c. *Eres tranquilo.*  
be2.sg.IND calm
As we can see in (104-107), either these verb forms are the same in both imperative and subjunctive contexts (as is the case with French verb être ‘be’), or they only differ in their inflectional endings, while sharing the same stem form.

Interestingly, a similar observation in this context can also be made in some Slavic languages that do not have dedicated subjunctive verbal morphology, such as Serbian and Croatian.

In (108) we have a very similar situation as the one we observed in (104-107) in Romance languages: the verb be appears under a similar morphological form in imperatives and subjunctives, but under an entirely different one in indicatives. Thus, similarly as distributional data from the previous section, the examples in (104-108), in addition to showing that the subjunctive-imperative link obtains widely across languages, also allow us to observe further shared patterns between Romance and Slavic subjunctives. Moreover, the data in (108) in particular are interesting in that they may also suggest that the subjunctive-related verb forms in some Slavic languages, even though they cannot be seen as the primary subjunctive markers, might nonetheless have some mood properties of their own (a more detailed analysis in this context will be left for future research).
2.4.1.5 Anti-control

The final common property of imperatives and subjunctives that I will look at here, which is somewhat less obvious on the surface, is related to the area of control or, more precisely, anti-control. The anti-control property that we will go on to observe in this context is manifested in relation to the subjects of matrix imperative and embedded subjunctive clauses, restricting their reference to non-control readings. Recall that we already observed a similar type of anti-control effect in relation to subjunctives earlier on in 2.2.2.3 when we were discussing the phenomenon of subject obviation, which precluded conjoined reference between the matrix and the embedded subject in the context of subjunctive complementation (a couple of relevant Slavic examples are reproduced below).

\[(109) \quad \text{a. } \text{Ivan, hochet, chtoby on\textit{\textsuperscript{v}}/\textit{j} ushel.} \quad \text{(Russian)}
\]

John wants SUBJ he leave

\[ \text{b. } \text{Jan, chce, zeby (pro\textit{\textsuperscript{v}}/\textit{j}) odszedl.} \quad \text{(Polish)}
\]

John wants SUBJ he leave

‘John wants *(him) to leave.’

Nevertheless, the subject-obviation data such as those in (109) will be analyzed separately from the common anti-control effect that we will observe in relation to subjunctive and imperative clauses: the latter will be seen as a function of a special feature associated with the imperative/subjunctive CP structure (more on that a bit later on in 2.4.2), whereas the obviation observed in complements such as those in (109) will be analyzed as a result of a broader linguistic phenomenon, which is not directly related to the inherent structural properties of the subjunctive clause type.

The phenomenon in question is the so-called ‘subjunctive-infinitive competition’ (SIC), which has already been proposed as an explanation for the subject-obviation data we observe in subjunctives by a number of different authors (Bouchard, 1984; Farkas, 1992a; Schlenker, 2005 a.o.). As its name implies, SIC suggests that subjunctives and infinitives compete for similar types of embedded syntactic environments (which often involve one and the same
selecting predicate), with infinitives restricted to control contexts and subjunctives to non-control contexts.\(^{46}\) This allows to account for the data of the type exemplified below:

\[(110)\]

a. *Ivan, hochet, chtoby on\(*_{ij}\) ushel.*

John wants SUBJ he leave

b. *Jan, chce, zeby (pro\(*_{ij}\) odszedl.*

John wants SUBJ he leave

‘John wants *(him) to leave.’

\[(111)\]

a. *Ivan, hochet (PRO\(^{orj}\) ujti.*

John wants leaveINF

b. *Jan, chce (PRO\(^{orj}\) odejsc.*

John wants leaveINF

‘John wants *(him) to leave.’

As we can observe in the Slavic examples in (110-111), verbs such as desideratives can introduce the subjunctive in the embedded clause only in the context of non-control readings, while infinitives are restricted to control readings, which can thus be used to explain the subject obviation effect that we noted in relation to complements such as those in (110). The same observation holds for Romance languages as well.

The idea that SIC is responsible for the subject-obviation effect we observe in subjunctives is further reinforced if we look at some languages where, for different types of reasons, the competition between infinitives and subjunctives is somewhat relaxed, or no longer in play.\(^{47}\) This is the case, for instance, in a number of languages situated in the Balkan region, including Slavic ones such as Bulgarian or Serbian, which no longer observe SIC because they have largely replaced their infinitives with subjunctives, for reasons that will be explained in more detail in the following chapter (see Section 3.2 in particular). As a result, such languages do not exhibit subject obviation in subjunctive complements such as those in (109-110), because we no longer have the infinitive variant competing for control contexts:

\(^{46}\) SIC is more straightforwardly applicable to subject-control than to object-control environments. The latter type of syntactic contexts, involving clauses such as those we observed earlier on in (80-82), sometimes allow for the subjunctive to be associated with control readings in some languages that otherwise exhibit SIC in relation to subject control. I will not attempt to account for this contrast here.

\(^{47}\) The relevance of such languages in the context of the SIC approach to subject obviation was first noted by Farkas (1992a).
As we can see in (112-113), subjunctive complements in these languages are compatible both with control and with non-control readings. A similar, but reverse property is also observed in a language such as English, where the infinitive has largely replaced the subjunctive. As a result, as we can note from the translations below the examples in (112-113), English infinitives introduced under verbs such as desideratives are also compatible both with control and with non-control readings, depending on the type of embedded subject we have (i.e. overt subject vs. PRO).

However, SIC cannot be seen as the comprehensive explanation behind subject obviation data cross-linguistically, because this anti-control effect obtains in certain types of syntactic environments independently of SIC. This can be most easily observed if we look, once again, at some of the languages where SIC is no longer in play. For instance, even though languages such as Bulgarian or Serbian do not exhibit subject obviation across all intensional subjunctives, which is typically the case in Romance or in most Slavic languages, they nonetheless contain a group of subjunctive complements which do exhibit this anti-control phenomenon, as we can see below in (114-115):

(112)  
*Ivan* _hoče da_ (pro_i/j) _ode._  
(Serbian)  
John wants SUBJ he leave3.sg.  
‘John wants *(him) to leave.’

(113)  
*Ivan* _iska da_ (pro_i/j) _dojde._  
(Bulgarian)  
John wants SUBJ he come3.sg.  
‘John wants *(him) to come.’

(114)  
*Ivan* _je naredio da_ (pro_i/j) _ode._  
(Serbian)  
John has ordered SUBJ he leave3.sg.  
‘John ordered *(him) to leave.’

(115)  
*Ivan* _zapovjeda (pro_i/j) da dojde._  
(Bulgarian)  
John orders he SUBJ come3.sg.  
‘John orders *(him) to come.’
The same property is observed in English as well, which also bans subject-control readings in complements such as those in (114-115), even though English clauses of this type involve an infinitive, not a subjunctive construction.

(116) \( He_i \) ordered *(him\(_j\))* to come.

The group of complements that exhibits subject obviation independently of SIC in these languages is associated with a specific type of semantic properties and selected only by a restricted and well-defined group of predicates. The latter correspond to the definition of directive verbs (e.g. order, command, insist etc.), which introduce complements that denote reported directive speech acts and can thus be defined as embedded imperatives. This is where the cross-linguistic link between subjunctives and imperatives in terms of anti-control will come into play.

Matrix imperatives are associated with a similar type of anti-control property as the one we just observed in the context of subjunctive complements such as those in (114-115), as was originally noted by Kempchinsky (1998; 2009 a.o.). The only difference is that the anti-control effect in matrix imperatives is not established with respect to some higher subject, given that they involve independent clausal structures, but with respect to the speaker: imperative clauses disallow conjoined readings between the subject and the speaker, which is manifested through the ban on imperatives appearing in first person singular (Kempchinsky, 2009). Nevertheless, if we abstract away from the difference between matrix vs. embedded syntactic environments, we can note that the anti-control effect related to subjunctive complements of the type exemplified in (114-115) and matrix imperatives in general functions in essentially the same way. In both cases, it is established with respect to the relevant external illocutionary point: in subjunctive complements, the illocutionary point in question is the higher matrix subject, hence the ban on conjoined reading between the embedded and the matrix subject and the effect of subject obviation; in matrix imperatives, the relevant illocutionary point is the speaker, hence the ban on conjoined reading between the subject and the speaker and the ban on imperatives appearing in first person singular. As I suggested at the beginning of this section, the anti-control effects we observe in this context will be explained by referring to the underlying feature make-up related to the CP projection used to introduce imperative and subjunctive clauses into the structure, which I will analyze in more detail in the following section.
2.4.2 Imperative/subjunctive CP: Formalization

All of the data put forward so far here in 2.4 point towards the conclusion that matrix imperatives and embedded subjunctives should be seen as closely related clauses: they were shown to semantically pattern in terms of their propositional content, direction of fit and the type of modality they denote; they exhibit the same type of dependent temporal properties; they pattern in relation to anti-control; and they also exhibit a number of cross-linguistic overlaps in their distribution. The way in which I will propose to account for this wide range of shared properties between the two types of clauses is by claiming that they should be seen as syntactically associated with the same type of CP projection, with the subjunctive CP corresponding to the embedded instance of the matrix imperative CP. This is not a particularly new or radical proposal, because a similar approach was also put forward by authors such as Han (1998) or Kempchinsky (2009), among others. In fact, I will use parts of the analyses proposed by these authors as a basis for my own study of the imperative/subjunctive CP.

The only type of formal point I made so far with regards to the internal make-up of the subjunctive CP (and, by extension, imperative CP as well) was that, unlike its indicative CP counterpart, it does not contain the extra WP projection which was seen as associated with extensional world-anchoring from a semantic point of view and phase closure from a syntactic point of view. At this point, I will focus more closely on some of the intrinsic properties associated with the subjunctive/imperative CP itself. I will begin by analyzing the properties of this CP in matrix imperative environments, and then I will apply the analysis that will be proposed in this context to embedded subjunctives.

2.4.2.1 Matrix imperative contexts

First of all, I am operating under the assumption that all matrix clauses are syntactically introduced under a CP projection, regardless of whether the latter contains some overt item or whether it is empty. This is because such a projection is necessary in order to denote clause type once the syntactic derivation reaches the interface with semantics. In this sense, every C-head should be seen as containing some type of interpretable clause-typing feature, which is related to the prototypical function pertaining to a given type of clause. As a result, just like Chomsky (1995) claimed that the C-head associated with questions contains an iq feature
denoting interrogative force, I will claim that a similar type of clause-typing feature is present within the imperative CP as well.

While the prototypical function of questions is to denote interrogative force, imperatives have generally been argued to be prototypically associated with directive speech acts (see Jary&Kissine (2014) and the references therein). Therefore, I will claim that the clause-typing function in the latter type of clauses is encoded through an interpretable Directive feature. This is not a particularly new proposal either: the same type of analysis was already put forward in Han (1998), who postulated the same type of feature within the imperative CP. Han suggested, moreover, that this Directive feature is only a subpart of a larger feature cluster contained within the imperative operator situated in C. I will also adopt this part of her analysis (with a slight modification that I will explain later on as I develop the argument).

The main reason why I will claim that we need to postulate an additional feature, besides Directive, within the imperative CP structure has to do with some more general theoretical aspects related to the minimalist view of syntax that I introduced earlier on in 1.3. The relevant aspect in the context of the current analysis in particular has to do with the type of minimalist approach to movement that I ended up adopting. Recall Section 1.3.1, where I argued that all movement should be analyzed through the prism of the Attract principle (as opposed to Greed), whereby the uF that causes movement is situated within the target position, and not within the moved element itself. Thus, for instance, whenever we observe CP-related movements in a given clause, the latter should be seen as motivated by some uF situated under C. One type of syntactic context where such movements are widely observed across languages involves interrogative wh-type clauses, such as the ones below:

(117) \textit{What} do you want to do \textit{ti}? 

(118) \textit{Où} veux-\textit{tu aller} \textit{ti}? \hspace{1cm} \text{(French)}
where want-you goINF
‘Where do you want to go?’

(119) \textit{Kad} mozhesh dochi \textit{ti}? \hspace{1cm} \text{(Croatian)}
when can2.sg. comeINF
‘When can you come?’
As we can see in (117-119), this type of clauses exhibit left-periphery movements of different types of wh-elements across a wide array of languages. This is why, along with the interpretable, clause-typing q-feature, such clauses were argued to contain an additional, uninterpretable wh-feature in C, which motivates the movements we observe in (117-119) (Chomsky, 2001).

A similar situation obtains in imperatives as well, because a number of languages also exhibit left-periphery movements in this type of clauses, particularly verb movements.\footnote{I will not make an essential distinction between XP-type movements such as those in (117-119) and head movements of verbs such as those we will observe in (121-123) when it comes to the overall feature-checking approach to movement that I am assuming here: all of these movement operations will be analyzed as governed by the Attract principle, whereby the relevant uF is situated in the target projection. The discussion on some of the larger theoretical implications of such a unified approach to movement will be left for future study.} One language where this kind of movement can be more easily noticed is Hungarian, because it contains some verbs that come along with a separate particle, and one can observe different positioning between the verb and the particle depending on the type of clause we have. More specifically, in simple matrix declarative clauses, such as the one in (120), the particle precedes the verb, but in imperatives (121), it is the verb that precedes the particle:\footnote{Genoveva Puskas (p.c.).}

(120) \textit{Elmegy ebed utan.}  
PART-leave3.sg. lunch after  
‘He is leaving after lunch.’

(121) \textit{Menj el ebed utan!}  
leave2.sg.IMP PART lunch after  
‘Leave after lunch!’

The syntactic contrasts in (120-121) are most straightforwardly explained by claiming that the verb has moved to C in the imperative clause in (121).

Similar types of movements can also be observed in imperative clauses in some other languages. For instance, Rivero&Terzi (1995) noted the presence of verb movement to C in Spanish and Greek imperatives on the basis of contrasts in the positioning of the verb in relation to object pronouns, the former following the latter in declarative clauses but preceding them in imperatives:
Rivero&Terzi analyzed this movement as being motivated by an attractor feature present in the imperative C, which is a similar type of analysis as the one I will be adopting here as well.

What the data in (121-123) imply, given the overall approach to movement that I am assuming in this study, is that we need to postulate an additional feature within the imperative CP structure, because the clause-typing Directive feature cannot be seen as motivating the movements we observed in the examples above, given that it is interpretable and thus cannot function as an attractor Probe. The additional feature that is going to be required in order to account for C-movements in imperatives will thus need to be uninterpretable. In order to determine the exact formal nature of this feature, I will begin by briefly presenting the analysis put forward by Han (1998), who already argued that the imperative C should be seen as associated with more than one feature.

Han claimed that the imperative C-head contains an operator consisting of two features, which are organized in a hierarchical configuration: the higher Directive feature, which denotes clause type and illocutionary force, and the lower Irrealis feature, which denotes modality of unrealized interpretations. The idea that these features are configured hierarchically is a non-trivial claim which allowed Han to relate imperatives with other types of clauses, including subjunctives, through feature superset-subset relations. More specifically, she argued that imperatives contain a full Directive>Irrealis feature cluster, whereas subjunctives only contain the lower Irrealis feature. The analysis Han proposed in this context allowed her to account,
among other things, for the distributional overlaps between these two types of clauses across languages (some of which we observed here earlier on as well).

Moreover, Han analyzed these two features as associated with dual properties, in the sense that they have both syntactic and interpretative repercussions. For instance, she argued that the higher Directive feature semantically performs a clause-typing function, but can also cause left-periphery movements in the context of matrix imperative syntax, such as those we observed in (121-123). I will adopt the same general assumption with regards to the dual properties of these features, but I will depart from Han’s approach in that I will analyze the lower modal feature as the one that motivates movement, given that the higher, clause-typing Directive feature is interpretable. Another slight difference that I will introduce with respect to Han’s analysis has to do with the labelling that will be used in the context of this lower modal feature contained within the imperative C. *Irrealis* is semantically too broad a term for the purposes of my approach to the imperative/subjunctive clause type, because the only type of modality that is associated with either matrix imperatives or the typical intensional subjunctives which are the current focus of my analysis is the deontic-type modality, i.e. the type of modality that describes how the world should be and that is associated with a world-to-word fit direction. As a result, I will relabel the Irrealis feature as *Deontic*.

The imperative C as such will therefore be seen as associated with the Dir(ective)\textgreater Deo(ntic) feature cluster, represented below:

(124) \[ [C \text{ Dir>Deo}] \]

Even though directivity and deontic modality are closely related semantic notions, they are not quite identical, which is why the distinction in (124) is not redundant from a semantic point of view. While the Dir-feature will only be analyzed as denoting a certain specific type of deontic modality, i.e. the one related to directive speech acts (orders, requests, pleas etc.), Deo will be seen as associated with a broader range of deontic-type meanings, also related to notions such as wishes, expectations, preferences etc. This distinction will prove to be especially relevant once the imperative CP structure in (124) is applied in the context of subjunctive complementation, because it will allow me to account for some finer semantic differences that will be observed between various types of subjunctive complements, which will be analyzed in terms of feature superset-subset relations.
2.4.2.2 Embedded subjunctive contexts

Before I focus on the semantic differences that can be observed between various complements subsumed under the subjunctive clause type, which will be done in the following chapter once I turn to the issue of Slavic subjunctive distribution (Sections 3.2 and 3.3 more specifically), I will first apply the formal analysis that was just put forward in the context of the matrix imperative CP to embedded subjunctive environments, which will allow me to account for some of the properties related to subjunctive complements that we already observed. The property that I will be particularly focusing on in this context is the anti-control subject obviation effect that we observed earlier on in 2.4.1 in relation to subjunctive complements such as those exemplified in (114-115). This is where the dual semantic and syntactic repercussions associated with the Dir-feature will come into play\(^\text{50}\) (the effect of the Deo-feature in subjunctive contexts will be studied later on, once I focus more closely on the syntactic derivation of subjunctives in different Slavic languages (Sections 3.1 and 4.1)).

Recall, first of all, the distinction I made earlier on in 2.4.1 between the subject-obviation effects which were seen as a result of the larger SIC phenomenon and those that were argued to be related to the inherent structural make-up of the subjunctive/imperative CP. The latter type of anti-control effects were shown to obtain independently of SIC, in complements to directive predicates that can be described as embedded imperatives. As a result, the subject obviation effect we observe in this type of subjunctives will be analyzed on a par with the anti-control property that we noted in the context of imperatives (i.e. ban on subject-speaker co-reference): they will both be explained by referring to the same type of formal item associated with the imperative/subjunctive CP structure. The analysis that I will propose in this context is similar to, and partly based on, the one already put forward in Kempchinsky (2009), so I will begin by first briefly introducing Kempchinsky’s approach before I further develop my own.

\(^{50}\)The fact that I will apply the Dir-feature to embedded subjunctive contexts is another aspect in which my analysis will depart from the one put forward in Han (1998), because Han explicitly stated that this feature cannot appear in embedded syntactic environments given that its function is to denote illocutionary force, which is restricted to matrix contexts. Nevertheless, since I already made a distinction between the notion of illocutionary force, which applies to matrix clauses, and clause type, which is also relevant in embedded contexts, I will argue that the Dir-feature can appear in embedded subjunctives as well, but only with a specific group of intensional subjunctive complements, namely those denoting reported directive speech acts, which can semantically be described as embedded imperatives. The difference between such complements and matrix imperatives in terms of access to illocutionary force could then be explained either by positing that Dir denotes illocutionary force (in addition to clause type) only in matrix imperative contexts, or by positing an additional feature associated with the imperative CP, which is related specifically to illocutionary force, and restricted to matrix contexts. I will not further pursue this analysis here, since imperatives per se are not my main focus.
Kempchinsky also claimed that the subject obviation effect we observe in subjunctive complements should be seen as a function of a specific anti-control formal item which is present both in matrix imperative and in embedded subjunctive structures. She defined the latter as an imperative-type operator, which semantically restricts the interpretation of the subject in imperative and subjunctive clauses. Kempchinsky argued that this operator is present in the left-periphery structure related to intensional subjunctives in general, which were shown to exhibit subject obviation in the Romance languages that the author focused on in her analysis (primarily French and Spanish). Kempchinsky defined all such complements as embedded imperatives and claimed that they constitute core cases of subjunctive complementation, which involve lexical selection by the matrix predicate. These are some of the aspects that bring our two approaches together.

Nevertheless, our analyses also differ in several ways, some of which will prove to be important when it comes to accounting for the different types of anti-control data that we observe in subjunctives across languages. The first difference is related to our analysis of the formal properties of the anti-control item associated with the imperative and subjunctive CP structure: Kempchinsky analyzed the latter as an operator, whereas I will analyze it as a feature, which is only a subpart of a larger operator associated with the imperative/subjunctive CP. The feature in question is Dir, which I introduced in the previous section, i.e. the highest feature contained within the imperative operator in C (the latter consisting of the hierarchical Dir>Deo feature cluster). This is where the dual properties associated with Dir will come into play: in addition to denoting clause type, Dir will also be analyzed as causing the anti-control effect that we observed in both matrix imperatives and embedded subjective. The anti-control effect in question is manifested through the ban on conjoined reading between the subject of the clause containing Dir (i.e. subjunctive or imperative) and the relevant external illocutionary point (i.e. the matrix subject in the case of subjunctives and the speaker in the case of imperatives), as I already explained at the end of the previous section.

The fact that I analyze the anti-control item contained within imperative and subjunctive CP structures as a feature, as opposed to Kempchinsky who analyzed it as a larger operator, is important because it implies a different range of application related to this item in embedded contexts. The imperative operator, which Kempchinsky analyzed as responsible for the subject obviation effect we observe in (Romance) subjunctives, is present with the entire range of complements defined earlier on as intensional subjunctives, which can explain why these types of complements were shown to exhibit a cluster of common properties with matrix imperatives.
in a number of clausal areas. On the other hand, the Dir-feature, i.e. a subpart of the larger imperative operator situated in C, is only present with a certain type of intensional subjunctives, namely those that are selected by directive predicates and that denote reported directive speech acts. These are the types of complements where subject obviation was shown to obtain independently of the larger phenomenon of subjunctive-infinitive competition, because we also observed this anti-control effect in languages where either the infinitive (e.g. Serbian, Bulgarian) or the subjunctive (e.g. English) has been progressively lost (to a greater or lesser degree) from productive use, relaxing the competition between these two types of complements in embedded contexts (the relevant examples are reproduced below).

(125) \textit{Ivan, je naredio da (pro-\textit{\^o}j) ode.} (Serbian)
John has ordered SUBJ he leave3.sg.
‘John ordered *(him) to leave.’

(126) \textit{Ivan, zapovjada (pro-\textit{\^o}j) da dojde.} (Bulgarian)
John orders he SUBJ come3.sg.
‘John orders *(him) to come.’

(127) \textit{He ordered *(him) to come.}

On the other hand, the remaining intensional subjunctive complements, such as those selected by desiderative verbs, will be argued to contain a truncated imperative operator in C, which only consists of the lower Deo feature but not the higher anti-control Dir feature. This explains why such complements do not exhibit subject obviation independently of SIC, as we could also observe earlier on through the example of some Balkan Slavic languages (once again, I reproduce the relevant examples below).

(128) \textit{Ivan, hoche da (pro-\textit{\^o}j) dodje.} (Serbian)
John wants SUBJ he come3.sg.
‘John wants (him) to come.’
The contrasts in (125-129) cannot be explained under Kempchinsky’s approach (which, once again, focused specifically on (non-Balkan) Romance languages), but they follow naturally from the approach developed here. In fact, not only does the feature analysis I just proposed in the context of the imperative/subjunctive CP allow to account for the control contrasts in (125-129), but it can also be used to explain some of the finer semantic differences that can be observed between intensional subjunctives exemplified above: while complements such as those in (125-126), which are claimed to contain Dir, only denote a specific type of deontic modal meaning that is associated with this feature, i.e. the meaning related to (reported) directive speech, complements of the type exemplified in (128-129), which contain Deo but not Dir, can also denote meanings related to wishes, as well as a broader range of deontic-type interpretations that are not as closely related to the prototypical meaning associated with the imperative mood, as we will observe in more detail later on once we focus more closely on the distribution of such subjunctive complements (among others) in Slavic. The formal and semantic contrasts in (125-129) thus represent the first illustration of the feature superset-subset relations that will be claimed later on to obtain more broadly between complements subsumed under the subjunctive clausal mood.

Moreover, the contrasts with regards to the structural make-up of the subjunctive/imperative CP that we just noted between subjunctive complements such as those in (125-126), on the one hand, and those in (128-129), on the other, also harken back to one of the more general syntactic properties related to the subjunctive clause type that was outlined at the very beginning of this dissertation, namely its structural permeability, i.e. the fact that different types of complements subsumed under the Subj1 clause type can be subject to varying degrees of truncation. The examples we just observed allowed us to notice the first concrete manifestation of this general property because, while complements in (125-126) were claimed to contain the full featural range associated with the imperative/subjunctive CP, those in (128-129) were shown to contain a more truncated CP structure. In the following chapters, we will observe some further examples of structural truncation affecting complements belonging to the subjunctive clause type, which will ultimately allow me to account for the full range of formal and semantic contrasts that we will observe between them. Before I move on to that part of the
analysis, though, I will first briefly recap the most important generalizations that were reached so far in this chapter, which will then serve as a theoretical basis for a more in-depth analysis of subjunctive complements in various individual Slavic languages later on, and then I will end the chapter by introducing a broader typological split that can be observed within the Slavic linguistic family as a whole based on the way in which different languages realize and distribute their subjunctives.

2.5 Summary

The main goal of this chapter was two-fold: first to compare some of the clausal properties of Romance and Slavic subjunctive-type complements in order to demonstrate that the subjunctive can be analyzed as the same clausal mood category in both groups of languages; and then to formalize the properties of the subjunctive clause type in more detail. The first objective was especially important in the context of Slavic, because the latter does not contain dedicated subjunctive verbal morphology, so I had to demonstrate the existence of Slavic subjunctive as a clausal mood before I could move any further with the analysis.

The notion of clausal mood, defined as a cluster of related formal, semantic and overt morpho-phonological properties that are cross-linguistically associated with a certain clause type, was shown to be applicable to Slavic subjunctive as well. The latter was shown to pattern with its verbal mood counterpart in Romance when it comes to the following set of properties (among others): the use of distinctive subjunctive morphology in the same types of embedded syntactic environments (the only difference being that this distinctive morphology is realized verbally in Romance and through separate left-periphery items in Slavic); common semantic modal interpretation (i.e. both Romance and Slavic subjunctives were shown to be selected by a range of predicates that correspond to the definition of intensional verbs); common dependent temporal properties; similar formal properties in areas such as anti-control; as well as some distributional overlaps with simple imperatives, among other shared properties. Thus, the only real difference between Romance and Slavic subjunctive is that the former constitutes both a clausal and a verbal mood, and is marked most prominently through verbal morphology, whereas the latter only constitutes a clausal mood, and is marked most prominently in the left periphery of the clause.
Subjunctive complements were also shown to systematically differ from indicatives both in Slavic and in Romance languages. On the whole, the subjunctive clause type can be defined as a more deficient clausal domain than its indicative counterpart. This relative deficiency is manifested in various different ways: semantically, subjunctives are not anchored to any specific world and thus, unlike indicatives, they cannot function as full-fledged, persistent propositions that can receive a truth value; syntactically, subjunctives exhibit less phasal properties than indicatives, and do not conform to PIC in all contexts. All of these different types of contrasts were accounted for by postulating a single formal distinction with regards to the underlying structural make-up of the CP projections associated with the two types of clauses. The distinction in question was related to the marked vs. default selection mechanisms underlying indicative vs. subjunctive complementation. Indicatives, which are selected by predicates containing the W(orld) feature in their lexical make-up, were claimed to be associated with a corresponding W-feature in their CP structure, which is contained in a high left-periphery projection WP. Subjunctives, which are selected in the absence of W as an Elsewhere strategy, do not project this WP in their CP-structure. In addition to semantically providing extensional world-anchoring via a binding relationship with the matrix W-feature, this high WP projection was also argued to syntactically establish phase closure. As a result, those CP-domains that contain it- e.g. indicatives- constitute full phasal domains functioning in accordance with PIC, whereas those CP domains that do not contain it- namely subjunctives-, constitute deficient phases, which do not always function in accordance with PIC.

In addition to differing from indicatives, subjunctives were shown to systematically pattern with another clause type, namely the imperative. The common clausal properties that were noticed between matrix imperatives and subjunctive complements led to the conclusion that the two should be seen as associated with the same type of CP projection, with the subjunctive CP corresponding to the embedded instance of the matrix imperative CP. The latter was analyzed as a projection of the C-operator which contains a hierarchical feature cluster consisting of a higher Directive feature and a lower Deontic feature. Both of these features were argued to have dual semantic and syntactic properties: the former denotes directive clause type and causes a syntactic anti-control effect; the latter denotes deontic-type modality and functions as an attractor probe in syntax, causing various types of left-periphery movements. While we observed some of these movements in matrix imperative contexts in this chapter, the subsequent parts of this study will allow us to observe similar types of movements in embedded subjunctive complements as well.
The formal account of the (anti)control data pertaining to different types of subjunctive complements with which I ended the analysis in this chapter confronted us with one of the more general syntactic properties associated with the subjunctive clause type as such, namely its permeability to structural truncation. We could observe this property because those intensional subjunctive complements that do not exhibit subject obviation independently of SIC were argued to be associated with a truncated CP structure, which does not contain the anti-control Dir-feature. The analysis that will be put forward in the next two chapters will appeal to this structural truncation mechanism in order to account for a wider range of subjunctive-related phenomena, which will be observed in the context of a closer analysis of subjunctive distribution in different Slavic languages.

Before I focus more closely on the properties of subjunctive complements in different Slavic languages, which will be done in Chapters 3 and 4, I first need to make one last broader point pertaining to the Slavic subjunctive mood in general. As I briefly hinted earlier on, there is a more general typological distinction that needs to be established in the context of Slavic subjunctive complementation between two groups of languages which exhibit systematic differences with regards to the morpho-syntactic realization and distribution of their subjunctive complements. The relevant distinction is the one between Slavic languages of the Balkan region (roughly corresponding to the traditional South Slavic classification) and Slavic languages outside of the Balkans (i.e. Eastern and Western Slavic). The former group will be shown to be associated with more complex subjunctive complementation patterns, which is why it will command a greater deal of attention in the remaining parts of this dissertation.

2.6 Balkan vs. non-Balkan Slavic subjunctive

In the previous parts of this chapter we could observe that all Slavic languages exhibit similar morpho-syntactic marking in relation to their subjunctive complements: they all mark the subjunctive most prominently on the left periphery of the clause, as opposed to Romance languages, which mark it through verbal morphology. Nevertheless, if we look more closely at the properties of these left-periphery subjunctive markers in Slavic, as well as at the subjunctive construction as a whole, we will notice some differences within the Slavic group of languages as well. In order to briefly outline the relevant differences (which will be accounted for in much more detail later on in Chapters 3 and 4), I will compare two languages which will be shown as
representative of a larger typological split within the Slavic subjunctive: Russian (130) and Bulgarian (131).

(130)  *Masha hochet, chtoby Ivan prishel.*  
Mary wants, SUBJ John come
‘Mary wants John to come.’

(131)  *Ivan iska da dojde Marija.*  
John wants SUBJ come3.sg. Mary
‘John wants Mary to come.’

The most easily observable difference between subjunctive complements in these two languages is the one related to verb forms that appear in such clauses. Russian subjunctives feature a non-finite verb form, typically used to denote past tense (see (56), for instance), which acquires a futurate interpretation when appearing in subjunctive complements. In Bulgarian subjunctives, on the other hand, we observe a finite verb form, inflected for person and number, which is usually simply referred to as the present indicative verb form (e.g. Krapova, 1998). This difference is reflective of a wider typological split within the Slavic subjunctive, because the same type of finite verb form as the one we observe in Bulgarian is also extant in languages such as Croatian, Serbian or Macedonian (i.e. South Slavic languages), whereas the non-finite morphological past form that we observe in Russian is also extant in Polish, Czech or Slovak (i.e. Eastern or Western Slavic languages).

This is not the only morphological difference between the subjunctives in these two groups of Slavic languages, because an additional contrast can be noticed in this context if one focuses more closely on the morphological make-up of the subjunctive markers situated on the left periphery of the clause. More specifically, the Russian complementizer-type item that is used in subjunctives- i.e. *chtoby*- is a morphologically more complex element than the Bulgarian *da*, because the former is the result of a morphological merger of two separate items, whereas the latter is an atomic unit in its own right:

(132)  *Masha hochet, chtoby Ivan prishel.*  
Mary wants, SUBJ John come
Unlike the Bulgarian *da*, which is an indecomposable unit, Russian *chtoby* consists of two separate elements: a complementizer-like element *chtov*, which exhibits the same overt form as the indicative complementizer, and the item *by*, which is seen as a mood marker (Brecht, 1977; Franks&King, 2000). The latter is often used outside of subjunctive contexts as well, most commonly in conditional-type constructions, such as the one below:

(134) *Ja s udovol’stvijem poshel by zavtra v teatr.*  
I with pleasure go would tomorrow in theater  
‘I would happily go to the theater tomorrow.’  
(Franks&King, 2000: 191)

The difference in the morphological properties of Russian and Bulgarian left-periphery subjunctive markers is reflective of the same typological split within the Slavic language family as the one we observed in the context of verbal morphology: once again, Eastern and Western Slavic languages exhibit the Russian pattern in this context, while Southern Slavic languages exhibit the Bulgarian pattern. In fact, as we will see in more detail in Chapter 3, South Slavic languages, which are all roughly situated within the Balkan peninsula, are closer to other, non-Slavic Balkan languages (e.g. Greek, Romanian, Albanian) when it comes to the morphosyntactic realization of their subjunctives than they are to Slavic languages of the Western and Eastern group. Hence, instead of using the traditional classification of Slavic languages according to different geographical markers (i.e. Eastern, Western and Southern), the relevant distinction that needs to be made when it comes to Slavic subjunctive in particular is the one between Balkan and non-Balkan Slavic languages. Thus, from now on, I will refer to the Balkan-type subjunctive (BlkS), on the one hand, which subsumes languages like Serbian, Croatian or Bulgarian, and non-Balkan, or Russian-type subjunctive (RusS), on the other, which subsumes most non-Balkan Slavic languages.

Moreover, one can observe a similar split, dividing Slavic languages along roughly the same lines, when it comes to the distribution of subjunctive complements as well.\footnote{The split in terms of subjunctive distribution is not as clear-cut, however, as it is when it comes to subjunctive realization, because South Slavic languages exhibit more varied patterns in this context: Croatian, for instance, is...} As we will
see in more detail once I turn to a closer analysis of Balkan Slavic in the following chapter (specifically Sections 3.2 and 3.3), this group of languages exhibits some atypical cases of subjunctive distribution. These primarily involve subjunctives appearing in control environments, such as the ones exemplified below:

(135) a. *Ivan zapochva da kara kolata.*  
   John begins SUBJ drive3.sg. car-the  
   (Bulgarian)

b. *Ivan pochinje da vozi auto.*  
   John begins SUBJ drive3.sg. car  
   ‘John begins to drive the car.’  

RusS-type languages, on the other hand, do not exhibit this type of subjunctives. As we can observe on the basis of Russian and Polish examples in (136), these languages employ the infinitive, not the subjunctive construction, in such control environments:

(136) a. *Ivan nachinajet vodit’ avtomobil.*  
   John begins driveINF car  
   (Russian)

b. *Ivan zaczyna prowadzic samochod.*  
   John begins driveINF car  
   (Polish)

The reason for the differences we observed between BlkS and RusS complementation in (135-136) is related to a specific linguistic development which affected languages situated within the Balkan region. The development in question, which is part of a larger range of phenomena subsumed under the term *Balkan sprachbund,*\(^{52}\) is the *infinitive loss:* as I already briefly hinted earlier on in 2.4, most Balkan languages have progressively lost their infinitives (to a greater or lesser degree) and replaced them with finite subjunctive complements (Joseph, 1983). As a result, BlkS can be found both in control as well as in non-control syntactic environments (explaining, among other things, the lack of obviation effects in BlkS complements to desideratives, for instance), which means that BlkS exhibits a much wider
closer to Russian when it comes to its subjunctive distribution; Serbian exhibits mixed BlkS and RusS distributional patterns; whereas Bulgarian is closer to other Balkan languages, such as Greek or Albanian, in this sense, as we will see in more detail in Chapter 3.

\(^{52}\) See Section 3.2 for a more detailed account of Balkan sprachbund in the context of subjunctive distribution, or Miseska Tomic (2006) for more on Balkan sprachbund in general.
distribution than the one we typically observe with the subjunctive mood cross-linguistically. This, in turn, presents a number of additional theoretical problems when it comes to the study of BlkS which (at least on the surface) one is not faced with when studying RusS, or subjunctives in most other languages. More specifically, the wider subjunctive distribution that one observes in Balkan languages also implies a greater degree of semantic diversity associated with BlkS as such, which makes it more difficult to analyze the latter as a coherent mood category. This is the primary reason why the central theoretical focus of the remainder of this thesis will be placed on BlkS, whereas the study of RusS will largely consist of applying the analysis proposed in the context of BlkS to non-Balkan Slavic languages.

The subsequent study of the subjunctive in Slavic languages that I will propose can be resumed as follows: first, in Chapter 3, I will address the difficulties posed by BlkS, proposing an analysis that will culminate in a number of theoretical generalizations. Then, in Chapter 4, I will study RusS through the prism of these generalizations, in order to determine whether they can be seen as relevant in the context of Slavic subjunctive more widely. By the end of Chapter 4, I will be able to claim that the main points of my analysis apply to both BlkS and RusS.
CHAPTER 3

SUBJUNCTIVE COMPLEMENTS IN BALKAN SLAVIC (BlkS)

This chapter will deal with the theoretical issues related to the Balkan Slavic subjunctive, which poses a number of specific problems for the study of the subjunctive mood, as we briefly observed at the end of Chapter 2. The analysis that I will propose here will mostly focus on subjunctive complements in Bulgarian, Croatian and Serbian, but I will be making numerous references to other, non-Slavic Balkan languages as well (primarily Greek), because languages in this region, despite belonging to several different linguistic families, exhibit a remarkable degree of similarity when it comes to the properties of their subjunctive mood, both in term of its realization and in terms of its distribution (this being one of the manifestations of the Balkan sprachbund phenomenon that I briefly introduced in 2.6). The convergence between various Balkan languages with regards to the morpho-syntactic realization of the subjunctive will be illustrated in Section 3.1, whereas their common distributional patterns will be looked at in 3.2 and 3.3.

The discussion in 3.1 will remain largely focused on the more typical, intensional subjunctives, of the type we looked at in Chapter 2, whereas other types of BlkS complements will be dealt with in the subsequent sections of this chapter, once I turn my attention to the issue of BlkS distribution. I will open up the analysis in 3.1 by first looking at the morpho-syntactic realization of intensional subjunctives in a broader array of Balkan languages, both Slavic and non-Slavic, which will allow me to introduce some of the more influential theoretical approaches that were proposed by other authors in this context. Then I will use some of these approaches as a backdrop for my own analysis, which will be developed in more detail once I turn my attention to Balkan Slavic languages (Bulgarian in 3.1.3 and Croatian in 3.1.4). After I conclude the analysis of the syntactic realization of BlkS in Section 3.1, the remaining parts of this chapter will then deal with the issues related to BlkS distribution, which presents the most difficult theoretical challenge when it comes to the study of BlkS.

Section 3.2 will present BlkS distribution on a more descriptive level, outlining the various verb groups that select the subjunctive in Balkan languages, as well as some of the problems they pose for the study of the subjunctive mood as such. Section 3.3 will then address
these problems, and propose a common syntactic analysis for all BlkS complements that will have been outlined in 3.2. Despite the great degree of formal and semantic diversity that will be observed between these complements, they will all be syntactically subsumed under the same Subj1 clause type. The contrasts that they exhibit will be explained, as I already hinted earlier on, through the mechanism of structural truncation, whereby different BlkS complements will be seen as associated with structures of different sizes, which can be more or less truncated. This will, in turn, imply that various BlkS complements can send different types of feature outputs associated with the Subj1 CP structure to the syntax-semantics interface, resulting in different interpretations.

The semantic differences that we will observe between various BlkS Subj1 complements in this context will be accounted for through feature superset-subset relations, which will be seen as determined on the basis of the structural size associated with a given complement: those complements that are structurally larger also send more features associated with the subjunctive/imperative CP structure to the semantic component, whereas those that are smaller only send a subset of features associated with this structure to LF (which can be larger or smaller, depending on the complement). This analysis will culminate in the conclusion that the Subj1 clause type should be semantically analyzed in terms of a scale of related, hierarchical and structure-dependent meanings, which I will call the subjunctivity scale. One end of this scale will be occupied by complements that contain the full feature range associated with the subjunctive/imperative CP (i.e. complements selected by directive verbs or embedded imperatives, such as those we observed in (125-126)), which will thus be defined as the core subjunctive group, whereas the other end will be occupied by complements (such as those selected by control verbs in (135), for instance) that have stripped all modality-related features from their structure, and are hence associated with entirely non-modalized interpretations. Later on, in Chapter 4, I will then attempt to determine whether a similar semantic analysis can be applied in the context of RusS as well.
3.1 Morpho-syntactic realization of BlkS

Before I turn to a closer study of Balkan Slavic languages, I will first look at some of the more broadly shared patterns that characterize subjunctive complementation across Balkan languages in general. I will begin by describing how BlkS is realized on the overt morphological level, and then I will introduce some of the syntactic analyses that were put forward in literature in order to account for the clausal properties of such complements.

3.1.1 BlkS mood markers

As we already observed in Chapter 2 on the example of some Balkan Slavic languages, BlkS is not marked through verbal morphology, but through separate, uninflected markers situated on the left periphery of the clause. As we can see in the examples below, subjunctive and indicative complements in Balkan languages are distinguished through different types of left-periphery items (similarly as in Slavic more generally, modulo the nuance contrasts explained in 2.6):

(137) a. *O Pavlos ipe oti efije i Roxani.*
    the Paul said IND left the Roxanne
    ‘Paul said that Roxanne left.’

b. *Thelo na kerdisi o Janis.*
    want1.sg. SUBJ win3.sg. the John
    ‘I want John to win.’
    (Giannakidou, 2009: 1886-1887)

(138) a. *Maria crede ca Ion a plecat.*
    Mary believes IND John has left
    ‘Mary believes that John left.’

b. *Maria vrea sa plece Ion.*
    Mary wants SUBJ leave3.sg. John
    ‘Mary wants John to leave.’
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Even though BlkS markers we see in the examples above differ when it comes to their exact morphological manifestation from language to language, the important observation is that all these Balkan languages use the same type of strategy to distinguish subjunctive-type complements from indicatives, i.e. distinctive left-periphery markers.

There is no general consensus in Balkan literature as to the exact syntactic nature of BlkS markers such as those in (137-139b), but the types of theoretical approaches that were proposed in order to account for their properties can be roughly divided in two groups. The first group of authors analyze these items as complementizers (Comps from now on), occupying the same C-position as their indicative counterparts in (137-139a) (Agouraki, 1991; Dobrovie-Sorin, 1994; Krapova, 1998; Tsoulas, 1993 a.o.). The primary motivation for this type of analysis is the fact that the subjunctive and indicative markers appear in complementary distribution in most Balkan languages, i.e. they cannot co-occur in the same structure. Hence the conclusion is that they compete for the same position. The second group of authors, which are greater in number, analyze BlkS markers as mood or modal particles, which are not inserted in C but somewhere lower down in the structure (Giannakidou, 1998; Philippaki-Warburton, 1985; Rivero, 1994; Rudin, 1985; Terzi, 1992 a.o.). The main motivation for this type of analyses is the fact that BlkS markers exhibit a number of properties that are not typically associated with Comps (some of which we will observe later on as well).

The theoretical approaches that view BlkS markers as mood particles have usually implied a slight articulation of the basic minimalist clausal architecture consisting of CP-TP-vP projections. This is because the authors that approached BlkS markers from this perspective generally assumed such items to be inserted in an additional functional modal projection, situated below CP and above TP. The projection in question has usually been labeled as MoodP (Philippaki-Warburton, 1985; Giannakidou 1998 a.o.), or as ModalP (Rivero, 1994; Rivero&Terzi, 1995 a.o.), depending on the author:
On the other hand, those approaches that view BlkS markers as C-inserted Comps do not require the structural articulation of the type illustrated in (140) and can thus be seen as more compatible with the basic minimalist framework. However, there are various reasons to nonetheless prefer the former type of approaches to BlkS markers, which view them as mood particles, as opposed to Comps. Here I will look at some of the more general types of evidence that argue in favor of this type of analysis in relation to such items, whereas more detailed evidence in this context will emerge once I turn to a finer study of BlkS complements in the Slavic languages that I will be primarily interested in here (i.e. Bulgarian and Croatian).

The first reason to reject the Comp-analysis of BlkS markers is the fact that even the main argument in favor of this approach- i.e. the complementary distribution of BlkS markers and indicative Comps- is not valid in all Balkan languages. As we can see on the examples of Romanian and Albanian below, the subjunctive markers- sa and te respectively- can sometimes co-occur with a higher Comp- ca and qe, respectively: 53

(141)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vreau</th>
<th>ca</th>
<th>Petru</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>citeasca</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>carte.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>want1.sg.</td>
<td>that Peter SUBJ</td>
<td>read3.sg.</td>
<td>a book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I want Peter to read a book.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(142)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Une dua</th>
<th>qe</th>
<th>Brixhida</th>
<th>te</th>
<th>kendoje.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td>that Brigitte SUBJ</td>
<td>sing3.sg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I want Brigitte to sing.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rivero, 1994)

Therefore, it is clear that, at least when it comes to languages such as Romanian or Albanian, the subjunctive markers cannot be analyzed as C-inserted Comps, given that the C-position can be occupied by a higher Comp. Even though this is not the case in other Balkan languages, the

---

53 Even though the Comps in (141)-142) share a similar overt form with the indicative Comps in these languages, my overall analysis, which views indicatives and subjunctives as introduced through two distinct CP-projections that are locally selected by the matrix predicate, would predict that the Comps related to these two types of clauses in Albanian and Romanian constitute different syntactic items- a similar claim as the one that was put forward by Giorgi&Pianesi (1997) and Giorgi (2009) in the context of the Italian Comp che. This claim is unproblematic when it comes to Romanian, where the indicative and the subjunctive-related ca are phonetically distinguished through slightly different pronunciations (Farkas, 1984). The Albanian data require further study.
more general unifying tendencies that characterize BlkS complementation as such would argue against the analysis that views BlkS markers in languages such as Romanian or Albanian as entirely different syntactic items than their counterparts in other Balkan languages.

Another piece of evidence that points towards an analysis of BlkS markers as inserted in some lower structural position below C, which can be observed more widely across Balkan languages than the type of evidence we saw in (141-142), is related to the positioning of BlkS markers with respect to the embedded verb: BlkS mood markers appear in a much more contiguous position with respect to the embedded verb than is the case with indicative Comps (Farkas, 1984; Krapova, 1998; Rouchota, 1994; Roussou, 2009 a.o.). This can be observed, for instance, if we look at the positioning of the embedded subjects in the two types of structures: in the case of indicatives, the subject occupies the standard EPP position between the Comp and the embedded verb, whereas in subjunctives the subject cannot appear between the BlkS marker and the verb. The only acceptable syntactic configurations in the latter case are those where the subject is either post-verbal or appears before the BlkS marker.

(143) a. *Nomizo __ oti o Kostas efije.* (Greek)
think1.sg. IND the Kostas left3.sg.
'I think that Kostas left.'
b. *Thelo (o Kostas) na (*o Kostas) fiji (o Kostas).*
want1.sg. the Kostas SUBJ the Kostas leave3.sg. the Kostas
'I want Kostas to leave.'
(Roussou, 2009: 1822)

(144) a. *Maria crede ca Ion a plecat.* (Romanian)
Mary believes IND John has left
'Mary believe that John left.'
b. *Maria vrea (Ion) sa (*Ion) plece (Ion).*
Mary wants John SUBJ John leave3.sg. John
'Mary wants John to leave.'

(145) a. *Mislja __ che Ivan otide.* (Bulgarian)
think1.sg. IND John left3.sg.
'I think that John left.'
b.  *Iskam  (Ivan) da  (*Ivan) otide  Ivan.
   ‘I want John to leave.’

The grammaticality contrasts in (143-145), which clearly show that BlkS markers appear in a more contiguous syntactic configuration with the embedded verb than is the case with indicative Comps, are most straightforwardly explained by claiming that the former are inserted in a lower structural position than the latter.

The final piece of evidence against the Comp-analysis of BlkS markers that I will put forward here is related to some non-subordinated syntactic environments where such items can appear. As we can observe on the examples of Greek and Balkan Slavic below, BlkS markers can be found in some matrix clauses which are associated with similar types of irrealis modal meanings as the ones we observe in subjunctions.

(146) a.  *Na etrexe.*  
   SUBJ run3.sg.
   ‘I wish he were running.’
   (Roussou, 2009: 1811)

b.  *Na min to pis!*  
   SUBJ not it say2.sg.
   ‘Don’t say this!’
   (Giannakidou, 2009: 1893)

(147) a.  *Da chetes!*  
   SUBJ read2.sg.
   ‘Read!’
   (Bulgarian)

b.  *Nemoj da idesh!*  
   neg. SUBJ go2.sg.
   ‘Don’t go!’
   (Serbian)

The fact that BlkS markers such as the Greek *na* or the Slavic *da* can appear in matrix contexts further argues against the analysis of such items as Comps because, given that the primary function of Comps is to turn an independent clause into a dependent embedded complement,
there is no reasons why they should appear in simple matrix clauses (Philippaki Warburton, 1993).

The evidence presented in (141-147) above forms sufficient grounds for me to adopt the starting hypothesis according to which indicative and subjunctive-related left periphery elements are not the same syntactic type of C-items in Balkan languages, but the items such as the Greek na, the Romanian sa or the Bulgarian da should instead be viewed as inserted in some lower structural position below C. In this sense, my syntactic analysis in relation to such elements will be closer to the one put forward by authors which viewed BlkS markers as particles, as opposed to Comps, but I will also depart from their approaches in certain aspects. As I mentioned a bit earlier, most authors that viewed BlkS markers as mood particles analyzed them as inserted in some type of functional modal projection situated between CP and TP. This is not the analysis that I will adopt in the context of Balkan Slavic, however. Even though I will maintain a structure similar to the one in (140), which contains a functional modal projection that is the locus of clausal modality in the typical subjunctive contexts, I will not analyze this projection as the one that hosts BlkS markers.

The primary reason why I will not view BlkS markers in languages such as Balkan Slavic as inserted under any type of modal head is the fact that such items can appear in some complements that are not associated with any modality, a number of which we have already observed earlier on (see (135) or (21-22), for instance). The relatively strict syntax-semantics mapping perspective that my study is based on argues against the presence of any type of functional modal projection in the underlying structures of clauses that do not denote any modality in the semantic component. As a result, I will claim that BlkS markers should be seen as inserted under a different syntactic position, which is even lower down in the structure than the modal projection in (140). More specifically, I will claim such items to be inserted under the temporal T-head position. This type of analysis will not only allow me to account for the possibility of BlkS markers appearing in non-modalized semantic environments, but it will also explain some additional properties, specifically related to tense, that will be observed with such elements. In order to introduce this analysis, I will first present an approach that was put forward by Giannakidou (2009) in the context of Greek, where the author argued that the Greek subjunctive particle na should be seen as a type of temporal operator, and then I will show that a similar analysis can be applied to Balkan Slavic as well.
3.1.2 Greek subjunctive mood marker (Giannakidou, 2009)

The analysis proposed by Giannakidou focused primarily on the relationship between the subjunctive particle *na* and the embedded verb that appears in Greek subjunctive complements. The latter exhibits some specific properties (which will be shown to be shared by its Balkan Slavic counterparts later on as well) whereby it differs from its indicative verbal counterpart. Even though the verb that appears in Greek subjunctive complements cannot be seen as a dedicated subjunctive marker in its own right, given that it is not restricted to subjunctive contexts (for instance, it also appears in matrix future-tense constructions, as we will see later on), it nonetheless exhibits some systematic differences with respect to the verbs appearing in indicative complements, including on the overt morphological level. More specifically, the verbs appearing in these two types of embedded syntactic environments differ when it comes to the type of aspectual marking they are associated with, with the subjunctive-related verb marked for perfective and the indicative-related verb marked for imperfective aspect:

(148) \[ \textit{Nomizo oti kerdizei o Janis.} \]
\[ \text{think1.sg. IND win3.sg.IMPERF the John} \]
\[ \text{‘I think that John is winning.’} \]

(149) \[ \textit{Thelo na kerdisi o Janis.} \]
\[ \text{want1.sg. SUBJ win3.sg.PERF the John} \]
\[ \text{‘I want John to win.’} \]
\[ \text{(Giannakidou, 2009:1887)} \]

Giannakidou used some of the distinct properties that are more generally associated with these two aspectual verb forms in Greek as the basis for the analysis she proposed, so I will begin by briefly outlining the relevant properties pertaining to such verbs which can be observed regardless of the type of environment they appear in, and then I will focus more closely on the data related to Greek subjunctive complementation in particular.

Some of the more general properties related to the Greek aspectual verbal system as they were summarized by Giannakidou will be shown to obtain in the context of Balkan Slavic languages later on as well, which is why it is worth describing them in a word or two. First of all, any verb in Greek is obligatorily marked for both tense and aspect. The tense distinction is
the one between past and non-past: past denotes anteriority with respect to some time \( n \) (typically utterance time in matrix contexts or reference time of the matrix predicate in the context of subordination), whereas non-past denotes events that are simultaneous or futurate with respect to \( n \). The distinction with regards to aspect, as already noted above, is the one between perfective and imperfective. Like in most languages, perfective aspect is associated with eventive meaning: according to Comrie (1976), “perfectivity indicates the view of a situation as a single whole, without distinction of the various separate phases” (16). Imperfective aspect, on the other hand, is used for more generic readings or to denote progressive and ongoing events- once again, a standard situation cross-linguistically.

What is more specific to Greek and some other Balkan languages in this context, including the Slavic languages that I will focus on later, is the contribution of aspect to mood, which we already observed in (148-149) above, i.e. the fact that verbs associated with the imperfective aspect appear in indicative-type complements whereas perfective verbs appear in subjunctives. The relation between aspect and mood is observed specifically in the context of non-past tense: indicative-related verbs exhibit imperfective non-past morphology, whereas subjunctive-related verbs are associated with the morphological form of perfective non-past (PNP from now on). The bulk of Giannakidou’s subsequent analysis focused on the tense properties of PNP verbs, and the type of temporal relationship they establish in embedded contexts with the subjunctive mood marker \( na \). The conclusions that Giannakidou reached on the basis of this analysis with regards to the nature of the Greek subjunctive marker will be shown to be applicable in the context of its Balkan Slavic counterparts later on as well.

Giannakidou started off her analysis by looking at data of the type exemplified in (150), which demonstrate the temporal deficiency of PNP verbs.

(150) * Kerdisi o Janis.
    win3.sg.PNP the John
    (Giannakidou, 2009: 1898)

Unlike their imperfective counterparts, PNP verbs cannot be used in simple matrix clauses of this type because they cannot refer to utterance time on their own, hence the ungrammaticality

---

54 Giannakidou put forward a detailed argument to justify why a language such as Greek, strictly speaking, does not contain present tense but only non-past. I will not present this argument here in detail, since this issue is not of central relevance for my analysis.
in (150). Giannakidou formally accounted for this by claiming that such verbs are associated with a dependent, future-referring tense variable $t$, which needs to be bound by a separate tense anchor in order for the structure to be legitimate.\textsuperscript{55} Thus, for instance, when PNP appears in matrix clauses accompanied by the future-tense operator *tha*, which syntactically binds the dependent variable $t$ and semantically anchors its interpretation with respect to utterance time, the sentence is perfectly fine from a grammatical standpoint:

(151) \begin{tabular}{lllll}
 & FUT & win3.sg.PNP & the John & \\
Tha & kerdisi & o & Janis. & \\
‘John will win.’
\end{tabular}

\hspace{0.5cm} (Giannakidou, 2009: 1900)

Giannakidou’s temporal analysis of the Greek PNP verb becomes relevant for my study once the author applies it to embedded subjunctive environments. In this context, Giannakidou argued that PNP establishes the same type of tense-binding relationship with the Greek subjunctive marker *na* as the one we just observed in relation to the future-tense marker *tha* in matrix clauses. Both of these items render the PNP verb appearing in their c-command domain syntactically legitimate, which is why both the matrix future-tense construction in (151) as well as the embedded subjunctive construction in (149) are grammatical (unlike the sentence in (150), for instance). In fact, a similar type of grammaticality contrast as the one we noted in (150-151) with regards to the use of PNP in matrix contexts obtains in embedded environments as well: while the use of PNP is legitimate in subjunctives introduced under the particle *na*, it is ungrammatical in indicatives introduced under the Comp *oti*: \textsuperscript{56}

(152) a. *Nomizo oti kerdisi o Janis.

think1.sg. IND win3.sg.PNP the John

\textsuperscript{55}Giannakidou based her analysis in this context on the theoretical perspective put forward in Abusch (2004), who looked at the tense properties of the English future modal *will*. Abusch argued that *will* can be semantically decomposed into two separate components: the dependent, future-referring tense variable $t$ and the higher operator *n*, the latter denoting present tense and anchoring $t$ with respect to utterance time, hence the future interpretation of *will*. Giannakidou argued that Greek PNP verbs can be analyzed similarly as *will* in this context, the only difference being that they do not intrinsically contain *n*, which thus needs to be provided by some separate operator in the structure, hence the temporal deficiency of PNP. See Giannakidou (2009), Section 5 in particular.

\textsuperscript{56}The only way to render the PNP form legitimate in the context of an indicative complement such as the one in (152a) would be to accompany it by some separate tense operator such as *tha*, which once again reflects the situation we observed in simple matrix clauses.
b. *Thelo na kerdisi o Janis.*
want1.sg. SUBJ win3.sg.PNP the John

The grammaticality contrast in (152) thus suggests that the two items used to introduce indicative and subjunctive clauses in Greek (i.e. *oti* and *na*) exhibit different properties with regards to tense: while the indicative *oti* functions as a classical Comp and does not accomplish any additional temporal function, the subjunctive *na* should be analyzed as a type of tense operator, which performs an equivalent function as the one we observed with the future-tense operator *tha* (i.e. binding of the dependent t variable intrinsic to PNP verbs).\(^{57}\)

Once I focus on the temporal properties of Balkan Slavic equivalents of the Greek subjunctive marker *na*, we will see that the same type of approach as the one proposed by Giannakidou in the context of Greek also applies to Balkan Slavic languages such as Bulgarian or Croatian, which will lead to the conclusion that the subjunctive markers in these languages should be analyzed as tense operators as well. Before I move on to that part of the analysis, I will first look at some of the more general syntactic properties associated with the Balkan Slavic subjunctive. First I will turn my focus to subjunctive complements in Bulgarian, where one can observe the broader morpho-syntactic patterns related to BlkS as they were described earlier on in 3.1.1 in a more straightforward manner, and then I will move on to Croatian, where the study of the subjunctive will prove to be a bit more challenging, because subjunctive complements in this language are not as clearly marked as they are in other Balkan languages, as we will observe in more detail later on in 3.1.4.

3.1.3 **Bulgarian subjunctive complements**

As we already saw at the beginning of 3.1, the basic distinction when it comes to the morpho-syntactic realization of indicatives and subjunctives in Bulgarian is similar to the one we just observed in Greek: the difference between the two types of complements is most clearly exhibited on the left periphery of the clause, with indicatives introduced through the Comp *che* and subjunctives through the item *da* (the relevant examples are reproduced below).

\(^{57}\) On a sidenote, this provides an additional argument against analyzing BlkS markers such as *na* as syntactic equivalents of Comps such as *oti*. While the latter is limited to a classical Comp function and, as a result, it cannot bind the t-variable in the PNP verb and render the structure in (152a) legitimate, the particle *na* also functions as a tense operator, which is why the use of PNP in subjunctives is grammatical. The same type of observation will also be shown to hold in the context of Balkan Slavic later on.
I will begin my study of the Bulgarian subjunctive by focusing on the basic syntactic properties associated with the subjunctive marker *da* in (153b), which will allow us to see in more detail how the broader syntactic analysis that was proposed earlier on in 3.1.1 in relation to BlkS markers in general applies to Bulgarian, and then I will focus more closely on some of the underlying clausal properties related to subjunctives in this language.

3.1.3.1 Subjunctive marker *da*: Syntactic analysis

Recall that the arguments put forward earlier on in 3.1.1 showed that BlkS markers should be analyzed as mood particles, as opposed to Comps. The first type of evidence that was introduced in favor of this approach had to do with the syntactic contiguity that we observed between the subjunctive marker such as the Bulgarian *da* and the embedded verb, which did not obtain with the indicative Comp.

(154)  
*Mislja, che Ivan dojde.*
think1.sg. IND John came3.sg.
‘I think that John came.’

(155)  
*Iskam da Ivan otide.*
want1.sg. SUBJ John leave3.sg.
‘I want John to leave.’

As we can see in (154-155), while the embedded subject in indicative complements typically appears between the Comp *che* and the verb (154), the same type of configuration is impossible in complements introduced under the subjunctive *da* (155), which suggests that the latter is much more contiguous to the embedded verb than the indicative Comp. Once again, this is not
only a property of the Bulgarian subjunctive, but a broader syntactic pattern related to BlkS complementation in general.

Some authors have nonetheless attempted to reconcile data of the type exemplified in (155) with the analysis that views the Bulgarian da as a Comp inserted in C, and not as a lower particle. For instance, Krapova (1998) argued that the contiguity observed between da and the verb could be analyzed as the result of verb movement to C, whereby the particle da and the verb end up situated under the same head position. This analysis is not a priori implausible, because we already observed V-movements to C in matrix imperative clauses earlier on in 2.4, which were argued to be associated with the same type of C-projection as subjunctives. Thus, the idea that we have V-movement to C in Bulgarian subjunctives could in principle be related to similar feature-checking motivations (more specifically, checking of uDeo in C) as those that were argued to be at play when it came to imperative-related left-periphery movements cross-linguistically. If this were to be the case, then the V-movement in Bulgarian subjunctive complements could be used as an additional argument in favor of my overall syntactic approach to the syntactic clause type as such.

However, there are several types of evidence that argue against such an analysis of Bulgarian subjunctives. First of all, even if we assumed that the verb moves up to C and ends up in a local configuration with the subjunctive da, which would allow to reconcile data of the type exemplified in (155) with the C-insertion analysis of da, such a configuration would remain problematic in light of the examples such as the one in (156):

(156)  
Iskam Ivan da dojde.  
want1.sg John SUBJ come3.sg.  
‘I want John to come.’

As we can see in (156), the embedded subject (i.e. Ivan) can precede the item da in Bulgarian subjunctives. Thus, if we assumed that da is inserted in C, then the word ordering in (156) would pose locality problems in the context of selection, because the embedded subject would intervene between the selecting predicate and the selected Comp. On the other hand, the analysis that views the subjunctive da as a particle inserted in some lower structural position does not face such problems because it still allows for a local relationship between the matrix verb and a (phonetically null) C-head to be established within the structure related to clauses such as the one in (156).
Another type of evidence that argues against the Comp-analysis of the item *da* has to do with cases where this element appears outside of embedded syntactic environments related to subjunctive complementation. Recall that we observed earlier on in 3.1.1 that the Bulgarian *da* and its BlkS equivalents are often used in matrix clauses as well, such as those in (157-158) below:

(157)    *Da chetes!*
        SUBJ read2.sg.
        ‘Read!’

(158)    Ivan *da* dojde vednaga pri men!
        John SUBJ come3.sg. immediately to me
        ‘John should immediately come to me.’
        (Laskova, 2012: 388)

As I already noted earlier on, typical Comps would not be expected to widely appear in non-subordinated environments, given that their primary syntactic function is to turn an independent clause into a complement. The Bulgarian *da*, however, is often used in matrix contexts such as those illustrated in (157-158). Moreover, the matrix configuration in (158) in particular provides a further argument against the analysis of the item *da* as a C-related element because it allows us to observe that the latter can be preceded by the clausal subject in this context as well.

Some additional data that go against the C-insertion analysis of *da* will be introduced later on, once we look at different types of Bulgarian subjunctives in the context of a broader study of BlkS distribution. This will allow us to observe that BlkS markers such as the Bulgarian *da* can appear in some complements that contain syntactically anaphoric and transparent structures. Such complements will be shown to exhibit properties characteristic of non-phasal domains, and will thus be analyzed as lacking the embedded CP projection altogether (see 3.3. for more detail). The fact that the subjunctive *da* will nonetheless be observed in such complements as well will therefore provide a further argument against the idea that this item can be seen as a C-inserted Comp.

These are therefore some of the reasons why I will consider that the Bulgarian *da* is not a Comp inserted under C but a particle generated in some lower structural position. As I already mentioned in 3.1.1, the authors that analyze BlkS markers such as *da* as particles generally view...
these items as being merged in the head position associated with a functional modal projection situated between CP and TP (which I will label here as ModP).

\[(159) \quad [CP \quad [\text{ModP} \ldots \text{Mod} \ldots \text{Mod}] \quad [TP \quad [vP \ ]]])\]

This is not the analysis I will adopt here, however. Rather, I will argue that subjunctive particle *da* is situated lower down below ModP in the structure in (159).

The reasons why I will claim that *da* should not be seen as inserted in Mod are primarily semantic in nature. The syntactic data related to Bulgarian subjunctives we looked at so far can all be more or less easily reconciled with the analysis in (159), even those that may appear more problematic on the surface, such as the ban on the embedded subject intervening between the particle and the verb. For instance, even though the standard EPP-approaches to subject licensing (Chomsky, 1981; Chomsky&Lasnik 1993 a.o.), which view the latter as situated in the SpecIP/TP position (an approach that I will not be adopting here, incidentally- see 3.3), would predict that the subject should be able to appear between the particle situated in Mod and the verb situated within vP, all that needs to be done in order to reconcile this approach with the data of the type exemplified in (155) is to stipulate that the verb moves to Mod in subjunctive contexts, thus ending up in a local configuration with *da*, and banning the subject from intervening between them. What is more problematic when it comes to the Mod-analysis of *da* in (159), especially in light of the syntax-semantics mapping approach assumed in this study, is the fact that some of the semantic properties that will be observed with the Bulgarian particle *da* (as well as its BlkS equivalents) will be difficult to reconcile with the idea that the latter is associated with a modal head.

The most problematic issue in this context, which I already alluded to earlier on, is the fact that the Bulgarian *da* can appear in some subjunctive complements that are not semantically associated with any type of modality, a couple of which we have already observed in the previous parts of this study (I reproduce one relevant example below).

\[(160) \quad \text{Ivan zapochva da kara kolata.}\]

John begins SUBJ drive3.sg. car-the

‘John begins to drive the car.’
Other than assuming that the Mod-head in (159) has no interpretative repercussions once the structure related to complements such as the one in (160) reaches the interface with semantics, which would be contrary to the overall syntax-semantics mapping approach that I adopt here, there is no way to reconcile data of the type exemplified in (160) with the Mod-insertion analysis of *da*.

Another reason why I will claim that the particle *da* is not associated with a modality-type projection is the fact that its primary function in the context of subjunctive complementation will not be seen as related to modality but to tense. This will argue in favor of the syntactic analysis that views the item *da* as situated under a different, tense-related position - i.e. the T-head-, which appears below Mod:

\[(161) \quad [\text{CP} \quad [\text{ModP} \quad [\text{TP} \ldots \text{T}_{\text{DA}} \quad [\text{vP} \quad ]]]] \]

The analysis in (161) will also allow me to reconcile the syntax related to the particle *da* with the fact that this item can appear in non-modalized semantic environments, as I will explain in more detail later on. Before I do that, though, I will first demonstrate that the temporal analysis that was proposed by Giannakidou (2009) in the context of the Greek particle *na* applies to the Bulgarian *da* as well, which will further reinforce the claim that the latter should be seen as inserted under T.

3.1.3.2 *Da* as a tense operator

Recall that Giannakidou argued that the Greek subjunctive marker *na* should be analyzed as a type of tense operator, which syntactically binds the dependent \(t\) variable contained within the subjunctive-related PNP verb. This allowed the author to account for the grammaticality contrasts of the type observed below in (162-163):

\[(162) \quad \text{Thelo} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{kerdisi} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{Janis.} \quad \text{want1.sg. SUBJ win3.sg.PNP the John} \quad \text{‘I want John to win.’} \]

\[(163) \quad * \quad \text{Kerdisi} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{Janis.} \quad \text{win3.sg.PNP the John} \]
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The clause in (163) was argued to be ungrammatical because there is no separate tense operator in the structure that can bind the dependent $t$ variable associated with PNP in such cases, whereas the subjunctive complement in (162) is fine because the subjunctive particle *na* functions as a tense operator that can bind the said variable. In the following paragraphs, I will show that the same type of observations can be maintained in the context of Bulgarian as well.

Note, first of all, the examples in (164-165), where we can see that Bulgarian exhibits the same type of aspectual input in the context of mood distributions as the one that we observed earlier on in Greek:

(164)  
\[ \text{Mislja che toi pishe pismo.} \]
think1.sg. IND he write3.sg.IMPERF letter
‘I think that he is writing a letter.’

\[ \text{Iskam toi da napishe pismo.} \]
want1.sg. he SUBJ write3.sg.PERF letter
‘I want him to write a letter.’

(165)  
\[ \text{Mislja che toi chete kniga.} \]
think1.sg. IND he read3.sg.IMPERF book
‘I think that he is reading a book.’

\[ \text{Iskam toi da prochete kniga.} \]
want1.sg. he SUBJ read3.sg.PERF book
‘I want him to read a book.’

While indicative complements such as those in (164-165a) typically introduce verbs associated with the imperfective aspect, subjunctives (164-165b) introduce perfective verbs.\(^{58}\)

Moreover, the perfective-present verb forms of the type exemplified in (164-165b) appear to exhibit the same type of deficient temporal properties as those we observed with their Greek PNP counterparts. Authors such as Maslov (1959) or Fielder (1993) noted that present-tense verbs appearing in simple matrix clauses in Bulgarian are typically associated with imperfective, not the perfective aspect.\(^{59}\) Hence the grammaticality contrasts below:

\(^{58}\) The latter types of verbs are usually referred to as present-perfectives in Bulgarian literature, as opposed to non-past (Fielder, 1993; Maslov, 1959 a.o.), which is why I will not be using the PNP label in this context.

\(^{59}\) The only exception in this context is the so-called ‘historical present’ (see Fielder, 1993: 32).
The same type of contrast is observed in the context of indicative complementation as well, because present-tense verbs appearing in indicatives introduced under the Comp che must be associated with the imperfective, not the perfective aspect (which once again reflects the situation we observed earlier on in Greek - see (152), for instance):

(168) a. Toi kazva, che Ivan pishe pismo.
    he says IND John write3.sg.IMPERF letter
    ‘He says that John is writing a letter.’

The ungrammatical nature of the examples in (166-168b) can thus be seen as the first indication that Bulgarian perfective-present verbs could be viewed through the prism of the same type of temporal analysis as the one that was proposed by Giannakidou in the context of their Greek counterparts, i.e. as temporally deficient verb forms, which cannot define clausal tense on their own, but require the presence of some separate tense operator.

Such an analysis becomes even more plausible if we look at the types of syntactic environments where perfective verb forms such as those in (166-168b) become grammatically acceptable. This is yet another area where Bulgarian situation mirrors the one we observed earlier on in Greek: the use of perfective-present verbs becomes grammatical if the latter are accompanied by a separate temporal operator, such as the future marker shte. In such cases,
these verb forms can be used both in matrix clauses as well as in embedded indicative complements:

(169) a. *Toi shte prochete kniga.
    he FUT read3.sg.PERF book
    ‘He will read a book.’
  
b. *Az misija che toi shte napishe pismo.
    I think IND he FUT write3.sg.PERF letter
    ‘I think that he will write a letter.’

Once again, the same situation obtains in Greek as well:

(170) a. *(Tha) kerdisi o Janis.
    FUT win3.sg.PNP the John
    ‘John will win.’
  
b. *Nomizo oti *(tha) kerdisi o Janis.
    think1.sg. IND (FUT) win3.sg.PNP the John
    ‘I think that John will win.’

Given all the data we just observed in (166-170), the conclusion must be that perfective-present verbs in Bulgarian can be analyzed on a par with their Greek PNP counterparts when it comes to their temporal properties: all of these verb forms should be seen as associated with a dependent t-variable, which needs to be bound by some separate tense operator in syntax, such as the Greek *tha* or the Bulgarian *shte*, in order to render the structure grammatical and to enable the verb to receive a precise temporal interpretation.

The crucial observation when it comes to my analysis of the Bulgarian subjunctive in particular is that the subjunctive particle *da* patterns with a tense operator such as *shte* in this context, in that they both render the perfective verbs appearing in their c-command domain syntactically acceptable (the relevant examples that allow us to observe this are reproduced below).
(171) a. Toi shte prochete kniga.
   he FUT read3.sg.PERF book
   ‘He will read a book.’

b. Iskam toi da prochete kniga.
   want1.sg. he SUBJ read3.sg.PERF book
   ‘I want him to read a book.’

The data in (171), once again, mirror the situation we observed in Greek earlier on, because the Greek subjunctive marker *na* was shown to establish the same type of temporal relation with the PNP verb as the one that obtains with its Bulgarian counterpart in (171b). As a result, just like the Greek *na*, the Bulgarian subjunctive particle *da* should also be analyzed as a tense operator, which syntactically binds the dependent *t* variable contained within perfective verbs, and provides the semantic temporal anchor for the interval within which such verbs can be interpreted (the anchor in question corresponding to the reference time of the matrix predicate in this context).

As I already explained earlier on, the way in which I will propose to syntactically account for these tense-related properties associated with the Bulgarian subjunctive particle *da* is by claiming that the latter is inserted under the temporal T-head position (as opposed to some higher modal head or C-head). In addition to explaining the temporal properties of the Bulgarian subjunctive marker, this analysis will also allow me to account for the fact that this item can appear in non-modalized semantic environments, such as the one we observed earlier on in (160). Now that I have accounted for the basic syntax of the Bulgarian subjunctive particle *da*, I will expand my focus in order to look at the syntactic derivation of Bulgarian subjunctive clauses from a broader perspective.

3.1.3.3 Syntactic derivation of Bulgarian subjunctives

This is the point where the more general syntactic analysis pertaining to the subjunctive CP clause type that I proposed earlier on (Section 2.4 in particular) in the context of a broader study of Slavic subjunctive complementation will begin to receive a more concrete syntactic application. First of all, recall that subjunctive CP was analyzed as the embedded instance of the matrix imperative CP, the latter being a projection of an imperative operator in C, which
contains a hierarchical feature cluster consisting of the higher, clause-typing Dir(ective) feature, and the lower modal Deo(ntic) feature, as illustrated below:

\[(172) \quad \text{[CP } \text{C}_{\text{Dir} \rightarrow \text{uDeo}}\]  

For the moment, I will abstract away from Dir and only focus on the Deo feature, given that the latter was argued to have a greater impact on the syntactic operations taking place within a given subjunctive/imperative clause, since it was analyzed as an uninterpretable feature which can function as an attractor Probe and cause movements. I will reintroduce Dir within my analysis later on in 3.3 once I focus on BlkS distribution and the formal and semantic differences that can be observed between various BlkS complements.

Recall that the introduction of an uninterpretable uDeo feature within the imperative/subjunctive CP structure was originally motivated by the fact that various different languages exhibit left-periphery movements in matrix imperative clauses (see (120-123) in 2.4.2.1). Such movements were seen as motivated by the feature-checking requirements of the strong uDeo in C, which needs to be locally checked by the interpretable iDeo instance of the same feature. The latter will be analyzed as initially inserted under the Mod-head that is the locus of deontic modality, and which is situated between the higher C containing uDeo and the lower T-head where the subjunctive particle is externally merged, as illustrated below:

\[(173) \quad \text{[CP } \text{C}_{\text{iDir} \rightarrow \text{iDeo}} \text{ [ModP } \text{Mod}_{\text{iDeo}} \text{ [TP } \text{TDA } [\text{vP }]])\]  

Given the broader syntactic analysis of the subjunctive clause type as an embedded instance of the matrix imperative CP, I will argue that the same type of Agree/feature checking mechanism that is responsible for movements in imperatives obtains in subjunctive complements as well. The prediction, therefore, is that we should also observe left-periphery movements in embedded subjunctive contexts, specifically in those languages where uDeo is strong (given the overall feature-strength approach to movement based on Chomsky (1995)).

Shifting back to Bulgarian, we already noted earlier on that some authors argued that one can indeed observe such movements within subjunctive complements in this language. For instance, Krapova (1998) claimed that the subjunctive C-head in Bulgarian contains an uninterpretable Mood feature which is checked via verb movement to C. If we recall the discussion from earlier on, this allowed Krapova to reconcile her analysis of the subjunctive da
as a C-inserted item with the observed syntactic contiguity between $da$ and the verb. Nevertheless, even though the presence of V-C movement in Bulgarian subjunctives would be desirable in light of my overall approach to subjunctive syntax, we have already observed various types of evidence that argue against this analysis. As a result, the feature-checking mechanism pertaining to Deo in (173) will need to be accounted for in a different fashion when it comes to Bulgarian subjunctives.

Before I analyze how the feature-checking of $u$Deo obtains in Bulgarian, I first need to address a separate issue with regards to the structural analysis in (173) that is left hanging, related specifically to the syntax of the subjunctive $da$ in light of the claim that the latter is inserted in T. Recall that one of the original motivations for this claim was the fact that $da$ can appear in non-modalized semantic environments, such as the one associated with the clause we observed earlier on in (160), which would be difficult to account for if $da$ was viewed as externally merged under some modal head or under subjunctive C. The potential problem with this analysis, however, is that the structure proposed in (173) does not allow to straightforwardly account for the modal properties that this element does typically exhibit. Regardless of the existence of clauses such as the one in (160), where $da$ is introduced under realis-type predicates such as aspectuals which do not appear to be associated with any modality, this item nonetheless exhibits modal properties in most contexts of its use, not just in embedded intensional subjunctives, but also in matrix clauses such as those we observed earlier on in (156-157), where the use of $da$ crucially contributes to the deontic modal interpretation of the sentence. The desired analysis of the syntax of $da$ would therefore be the one that accounts both for the fact that this item is typically associated with modal interpretations, as well as the fact that it can sometimes appear in non-modalized semantic environments.

The way in which I suggest to account for all this is by proposing a syntactic mechanism whereby the item $da$ situated in T establishes an Agree relationship with the higher deontic Mod head. The precise formal nature of this relationship is illustrated below:

\[
\text{(174) } [\text{ModP} \text{ Mod}_i [\text{Deo}] [TP \text{ TDA } i[\text{Deo}]]] \tag{174}
\]

As we can see in (174), the Agreement that is established in this context results in feature transfer, whereby the $i$Deo feature is transferred from Mod to the particle $da$ under T, thus
endowing the latter with the modal properties that this item is typically associated with.\textsuperscript{60} The Agree mechanism in (174) obtains in certain types of syntactic environments but not in all of them, explaining why $da$ is not always associated with modalized interpretations. In order to illustrate in more detail how this analysis works in the context of subjunctive complementation, let us look at the step-by-step derivation and structural build-up of Bulgarian subjunctives.

As I already implied earlier on in the introductory chapter, I will assume a derivational, bottom-up approach to structure build-up in my syntactic analysis of subjunctive complementation, which is in accordance with the overall minimalist view of syntax (see 1.3). The first relevant Merge operation when it comes to my analysis of the Bulgarian subjunctive is the one whereby the T-head, projecting TP, is merged on top of vP (I ignore the vP-internal Merge operations, since they are less relevant for the present discussion). This is the operation whereby the subjunctive $da$ is first introduced in the structure, as we can observe below.

\[(175)\]

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (T) {T};
  \node (TP) [below right of=T] {TP};
  \node (vP) [below right of=TP] {vP};
  \node (da) [below left of=vP] {$da$};
  \draw (T) -- (TP);
  \draw (TP) -- (vP);
  \draw (da) -- (TP);
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

At this point, $da$ only functions as a tense operator, in accordance with the analysis proposed earlier on 3.1.3.2, i.e. it binds the dependent $t$-variable contained in the embedded verb, which has already been merged vP-internally (a bit more on the latter Merge will be said later on). Crucially, though, the derivational step in (175) does not yet endow the particle $da$ with any type of modal feature, because the relevant Mod projection has not yet been merged in the structure. This is what will ultimately allow me to account for $da$ appearing in non-modalized semantic environments: (175) will be argued to constitute the final derivational step in the structural build-up associated with the atypical, non-modalized Bulgarian subjunctives such as the one in (160) (as well as its BlkS equivalents in general). Such complements will be shown to be associated with syntactically anaphoric, non-phasal properties, which will be explained by claiming that their structure is truncated all the way down to TP. This still allows for the particle $da$ to be inserted in the structure of such clauses, but it does not allow it to acquire any type of modal property, given that the Agree relationship in (174) hasn’t yet obtained, which

\textsuperscript{60} This proposal is based on some of the more general syntactic analyses of Agreement which view the latter as involving feature transfer or feature sharing (see Frampton, 2000; Legate, 2005; or Bobaljik, 2008 a.o.).
therefore explains why *da* can be found in non-modal subjunctive complements of the type we observed in (160).

The next relevant derivational step in the build-up of Bulgarian subjunctives is the one whereby the Mod-head, which contains *iDeo* and projects ModP, is merged on top of TP.\(^{61}\)

\begin{equation}
\text{(176)}
\end{equation}

Once the Merge operation in (176) has taken place, the subjunctive marker *da* in T enters into Agreement with Mod, which results in feature transfer of Deo from Mod to *da*, endowing the latter with the modal properties that are typically observed with this item. At this point, therefore, *da* can function both as a tense operator and as a modal particle, which are the usual dual properties we observe with this element.

The next, and final step in the syntactic derivation of Bulgarian subjunctives, is the one that merges the C-head, containing *uDeo* and projecting subjunctive/imperative CP, on top of ModP, as shown below in (177):

\begin{equation}
\text{(177)}
\end{equation}

Given that all *uF* features must be checked and deleted before the structure reaches the interface with semantics, the final question that needs to be answered is how this feature-checking is achieved when it comes to *uDeo* in Bulgarian subjunctives. Under the standard minimalist

---

\(^{61}\) For the purposes of the present discussion, I ignore the internal structure related to clausal modality, which will be analyzed later on in terms of a slightly more articulated syntactic layer as opposed to a single projection (see 3.2-3.3). Here I only focus on the projection encoding deontic modality, which contains the *iDeo*-feature, because this projection is most relevant when it comes to accounting for the properties of the subjunctive particle *da*, as well as for the derivation of the typical intensional subjunctives in Bulgarian, which are the focus of the present analysis.
assumptions, this can be done in one of two ways: either through simple Agree, whereby $uF$ is checked off against the relevant $iF$ in a long-distance configuration; or through Agree combined with Move, whereby the relevant $iF$ is carried by some overt item under the projection that contains $uF$ in order to check the latter locally. There are several reasons to assume that Bulgarian exhibits the former strategy.

First of all, the fact that we observed earlier on that the embedded subject in Bulgarian subjunctives can precede the particle *da* and appear at the beginning of the clause (see (156)) would suggest that the item *da* does not end up under the C-head selected by the predicate, the latter remaining empty in this context, because otherwise the configuration of the type exemplified in (156) would imply a violation of the locality constraint on CP-selection. Another argument against the claim that *da* moves to C has to do with the syntactic contiguity that we observed between the particle *da* and the embedded verb in Bulgarian subjunctives. The only way to reconcile this contiguity with the idea that *da* moves to C, given my overall syntactic analysis of Bulgarian subjunctives (specifically the T-insertion analysis of *da*), would be to claim that somehow both the particle and the verb move up to C in order to check uDeo, which would be difficult to justify in light of the Economy principle given that at least one of these movements seems superfluous. As a result, I will argue that there is no overt C-related movement in Bulgarian subjunctives: the uDeo in C is weak and can hence be checked through a long-distance Agree configuration with iDeo that has been transferred from Mod to *da*, as illustrated below.62

(178)  
\[
{\begin{array}{c}
\text{[CP} \\
\quad \text{C}_{[\text{ModP} \ \text{Mod} \ \text{[TP} \\
\quad \quad \text{T}_{DA \ [i\text{Deo}] \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{[vP]]}]}}] \\
\text{Agree/Check}
\end{array}}
\]

Nevertheless, once we focus on the syntactic derivation of subjunctives in some other Slavic languages (including Croatian in the following section), we will observe that this type of clauses

62 While the feature transfer of iDeo from Mod to *da* in Bulgarian subjunctives may appear as trivial from a syntactic, feature-checking standpoint, because uDeo in C could have just as well been checked off via Agreement with iDeo in Mod, which would not have required any preceding syntactic operation to take place, this proposal is crucial when it comes to accounting for the semantic properties associated with the Bulgarian subjunctive particle (most importantly, the fact that it can but needn’t be associated with modal interpretations). Moreover, the claim that Deo is transferred from Mod to the particle *da* in T will also become relevant from a syntactic point of view once I turn to the analysis of subjunctive derivation in Croatian, because it will allow me to account for the movement that the subjunctive particle will be shown to undergo from T to C in this language. See 3.1.4.3 for more detail.
can also exhibit overt movements to C, as would be expected under my overall analysis of the Subj1 clause type.

Before I can claim to have the full structural description of the syntactic derivation of Bulgarian subjunctives, I still need to say a word or two about the positioning of the verb within the vP structure, even though the latter is not of central concern for my analysis. Under the assumption that the vP constitutes a relatively articulated syntactic layer, and given the observed syntactic contiguity between da and the verb, it makes sense to claim that the latter is situated in some high vP-related projection that is close to T. In this context, I will claim that the verb appears under the head position of the Asp(ectual)P projection, which has often been analyzed as the highest projection within the verbal layer, situated in a close syntactic configuration with TP (Borer, 1994; Thompson, 2006; Travis, 1992 a.o.).

(179) \[\text{[CP \{ModP TP…T da \{AspP…Asp v [VP]\}\}]\]

In addition to accounting for the syntactic contiguity observed between the verb and the subjunctive particle in T, this analysis can also account for the more general observation that verbal aspect plays a greater role in the context of mood distinctions in Balkan languages, such as Greek or Bulgarian (as well as Croatian, as we will see in the following section), than is typically the case from a cross-linguistic perspective. Moreover, the representation in (179) can also explain some of the semantic properties associated with verbs that appear in Bulgarian subjunctive complements, specifically the fact that, while being temporally deficient, such verbs are nonetheless fully specified for aspect on a semantic level (regardless of whether or not a given aspectual interpretation is associated with its usual morphological marking). As we can see below, subjunctive-related verbs in Bulgarian can denote both perfective and imperfective-type meaning.

(180) \text{Iskam da dojdes v sedem chasa / vseki den.} \[\text{want1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg. today at seven hour / every day}\]

‘I want you to come today at seven o’clock / every day.’

---

63 The vP-internal movements that allowed the verb to end up in this position are of less concern for my current analysis, so I will ignore this issue here.
The representation in (179), which claims that the subjunctive verb is directly associated with the aspectual Asp head, allows to straightforwardly account for all these observations.

At this point, I claim to have reached a comprehensive syntactic analysis related to the derivation of Bulgarian subjunctive complements, which is sufficient to account for the basic properties associated with the typical intensional subjunctives that were the primary focus of my study of BlkS so far. The syntactic account I proposed in this context will be further refined and articulated later on in 3.3, once I focus on the issue of BlkS distribution and look at some finer formal and semantic differences that can be observed between various types of BlkS complements. Before I do that, however, I will first assess whether a similar analysis as the one I just proposed in the context of Bulgarian can be used to account for the properties of intensional subjunctives in the second Slavic language that I will focus on in my study of BlkS, namely Croatian.64

3.1.4 Croatian subjunctive complements

Subjunctive mood in Croatian will require a greater deal of attention because it presents some problematic aspects that are not observed in Bulgarian or in most other Balkan languages. The main problem in this context is the fact that indicative and subjunctive-type complements in this language are introduced through left-periphery items that are overtly indistinguishable:

(181) a. Znam da je otishao.  
know1.sg. that has3.sg. left  
‘I know that he left.’

b. Hochu da dodje.  
want1.sg. that come3.sg.  
‘I want him to come.’

As we can observe in (181), both the typical indicative-selecting predicates such as know and the typical subjunctive-selecting predicates such as want introduce their complements through the left-periphery item da in this language. Hence, it is not as clear if subjunctive-type

64 All the observations that will be made in 3.1.4 are valid for Serbian as well, given that the subjunctive complements I will be looking at in this section have identical properties in both languages/varieties. The issue of language labeling will be explained shortly.
complements in Croatian can be analyzed as belonging to the larger Balkan subjunctive mood, given that the latter is typically associated with distinctive mood particles, as we observed at the beginning of 3.1. Nevertheless, a closer analysis of the properties of Croatian subjunctive-type clauses that I will put forward in this section will allow me to ultimately reach the conclusion that these complements share the bulk of the properties associated with their BlkS counterparts, including a separate subjunctive particle, the only difference being that the latter shares the same overt form with the indicative Comp in this language.

Before I move on to a closer study of the subjunctive in Croatian, I need to begin by briefly addressing some more peripheral, terminological issues related to the name of the language that I will be using (i.e. Croatian vs. Serbian), in order to avoid any confusion for the reader. Due to the close linguistic proximity between the standard Croatian and Serbian, they were considered as two varieties of the same language- i.e. Serbo-Croatian- for the best part of the 20th century. Nevertheless, after the break-up of former Yugoslavia, each newly-independent country adopted its own variety of Serbo-Croatian as their official language (i.e. Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin), which eventually resulted in languages being referred to separately in linguistic literature as well. Even though some authors continue to refer to the language as Serbo-Croatian (Boskovic or Arsenijevic, for instance), the post-1990s convention when it comes to native authors has increasingly been to refer to the language according to their native variety.65 Here I will largely follow that convention (without any deeper linguistic implications as to the question whether these should be seen as separate languages or not), and refer to the language as Croatian (since this is my native variety), at least when discussing the grammatical properties that are commonly shared by all varieties of the old Serbo-Croatian.

Nevertheless, I should also note that subjunctive complementation represents one of the few grammatical areas where one can observe a genuine linguistic difference between Serbian and Croatian,66 in particular when it comes to the distribution of subjunctive complements. As we will see in more detail in 3.2 and 3.3, subjunctive distribution in Serbian is much wider than the one that obtains in (standard) Croatian, because, generally speaking, the speakers of Serbian prefer to use the subjunctive construction in (subject) control contexts where Croatian speakers

---

65 Thus, some refer to the language as Serbian (Bulatovic, Radisic, Todorovic a.o.), some as Croatian (Cavar, Grivec a.o.), some as Bosnian (Leko a.o.) A more recent label that one also comes across in this context is BCMS (i.e. acronym for Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian). I will not use this label here, since the relevant distinctions in the context of the subjunctive that I will be dealing with concern primarily Serbian and Croatian.

66 Bosnian and Montenegrin tend to pattern more closely with Serbian than with Croatian in this context, although there are some regional variations within the varieties themselves.
prefer to use the infinitive, although the preferences are subject to regional variations within the two languages as well (for reasons that will be explained more closely in 3.2). In this section, I will be dealing with the most typical cases of subjunctive complementation, involving intensional subjunctive complements (mostly those selected by desiderative verbs) appearing in non-control syntactic environments. The formal and semantic properties of such complements are essentially the same in Serbian and Croatian, and hence I will refer to the language as Croatian in this section, according to my native variety. However, in the following sections (3.2 and 3.3), which will deal with distributional issues related to BlkS, I will make a distinction between the two languages/varieties, and refer to the language from there on as Serbian, because the latter will be shown to pattern more closely in this context with other Balkan languages than Croatian does.

Now that this terminological issue has been dealt with, I can focus more closely on the more relevant linguistic aspects related to Croatian subjunctives. As we saw at the beginning of this section, Croatian is problematic in this context because both its indicative- and its subjunctive-type complements are introduced through the element da, which seems to constitute an important contrast with respect to other Balkan languages we looked at so far. Nevertheless, the arguments I put forward in Socanac (2011; 2012), and which I will further develop here, as well as the arguments proposed by some other authors, such as Todorovic (2012) (I will be coming back to the latter in more detail towards the end of this section), have shown that Croatian/Serbian also contains distinct subjunctive and indicative-type clauses, introduced through different (albeit morphologically indistinguishable) left-periphery items.

3.1.4.1 Indicatives vs. subjunctives: Overt morphological differences

The first observation that will allow me to relate Croatian subjunctive-type clauses to their counterparts in some of the Balkan languages that we looked at previously has to do with the overt morphological make-up of this type of complements. Even though Croatian indicatives and subjunctives are not associated with distinctive mood particles, the two types of complements can often be distinguished on the basis of the aspectual morphology associated with verbs appearing in the embedded clause (Bulatovic, 2008; Socanac, 2011; Todorovic, 2012). In this sense, Croatian patterns with languages such as Greek and Bulgarian, because subjunctive-type complements tend to be associated with perfective, whereas indicatives are
associated with imperfective verbal aspect. We can observe the shared properties between
Croatian and a language such as Greek in this context on the basis of examples below:

(182) a.  \textit{Nomizo oti kerdizei.}  
\textit{(Greek)}  
think1.sg. IND win3.sg.IMPERF
‘I think that he is winning.’

b.  \textit{Thelo na kerdisi.}  
want1.sg. SUBJ win3.sg.PERF
‘I want him to win.’

(183) a.  \textit{Znam da Ivan dolazi.}  
\textit{(Croatian)}  
know1.sg. that John come3.sg.IMPERF

b.  \textit{Znam da Ivan dodje.}  
know1.sg. that John come3.sg.PERF
‘I know that John is coming.’

(184) a.  \textit{Hochu da dolazish.}\textsuperscript{67}  
\textit{(Croatian)}  
want1.sg. that come2.sg.IMPERF

b.  \textit{Hochu da dodjes.}  
want1.sg. that come2.sg.PERF
‘I want you to come.’

The aspectual contrasts between the indicative and the subjunctive-type complements in (183-
184) constitute the most noticeable difference between the two types of clauses in Croatian, as
well as the first obvious property in which subjunctive complements in this language pattern
with their BlkS counterparts in languages such as Greek or Bulgarian. Moreover, some authors,
in particular Bulatovic (2008), have argued that the perfective verb forms we observe in (183-
184) also pattern with their Greek counterparts when it comes to tense, in that their temporal

\textsuperscript{67}The use of imperfective aspect in Croatian subjunctive-type complements is degraded unless we insert an
aspectual marker which forces an imperfective reading, as in (i):

(i) \textit{Hochu da dolazi svaki dan.}  
\textit{want1.sg. that come3.sg.IMPERF every day}
‘I want him to come every day.’
contribution is better described as non-past than as present. As a result, I will be using the perfective non-past (PNP) label in this context as well (as in Bulatovic (2008) Socanac (2011), or Todorovic (2012), a.o.). In the following paragraphs, we will observe that these are only some of the many common properties that Croatian subjunctives share with their BlkS counterparts.

The analysis that I will put forward throughout the remainder of this section will primarily focus on the properties of the item *da* situated in the left periphery of subjunctive-type clauses, because this is the most problematic element when it comes to the analysis of Croatian subjunctives. I will demonstrate that this item exhibits a host of different properties with respect to its indicative counterpart, which will allow me to claim, first of all, that indicative *da* and subjunctive *da* are two separate formal elements, and secondly, that the subjunctive *da* can be analyzed on a par with its more overtly marked counterparts in other Balkan languages, i.e. as a mood particle.

3.1.4.2 Indicative *da* vs. subjunctive *da*

The analysis of the subjunctive-related *da* as a particle (as opposed to a Comp) is not entirely new to this thesis: in addition to Socanac (2011; 2012), where I already developed the basic outlines of the approach that I will present here, a similar type of analysis was also proposed independently in Todorovic (2012), as well as in some earlier studies (e.g. Golab, 1964; Jakab, 1999, a.o.). Todorovic, in particular, devoted her entire dissertation to studying the differences between the indicative and the subjunctive-related *da* (or veridical and non-veridical *da*, according to her terminology), which is why I will compare the results of our two studies towards the end of this section. The comparison I will put forward there will be useful not just to assess the relative merits of our two approaches, but also because it will allow me to introduce some finer aspects of the syntactic analysis that will be developed later on once I turn to the study of BlkS distribution.

Let us begin by first focusing on the sentence in (185) below, which does not involve a subjunctive complement but an embedded future-tense construction introduced in an indicative-

---

68 See Bulatovic (2008) for a more detailed tense-semantics argument for why this label applies, which I will not further develop here.
69 See Todorovic (2012) for a more detailed presentation of these earlier studies.
70 Todorovic refers to the language as Serbian, but the terminological distinction is not relevant for the argument in this section, since subjunctive complements that we will look at here have the same properties in Croatian and Serbian, as I already explained.
type complement. The reason why this example is nonetheless relevant for the argument that I will present here is because it allows us to immediately observe that there is more than one element with the overt form *da* that can be introduced in the same structure in this language:?

(185)  
\[ \text{Znam da che Ivan da dodje.}\]
know1.sg. that FUT John PART come3.sg.
‘I know that John will come.’

The higher *da* in (185) is a classical Comp, selected by the factive cognitive verb *znati* ‘know’, which is associated with the indicative mood across languages. The second *da*, on the other hand, cannot be seen as a Comp because it appears much lower down in the structure, beneath the embedded subject and the future auxiliary.

In fact, the position of this lower *da* is contiguous to the embedded verb, as shown by the ban on the insertion of linguistic material, such as the subject or adverbs, between *da* and the verb:

(186) a.  
\[ \text{Znam da che (Ivan) da (*Ivan) dodje.}\]
know1.sg. that FUT John PART John come3.sg.PNP

b.  
\[ \text{Znam da che Ivan (utra) da (?utra) dodje.}\]
know1.sg. that FUT John tomorrow PART tomorrow come3.sg.PNP
‘I know that John will come tomorrow.’

This is reminiscent of the situation we observed earlier on in the context of subjunctive complements in some other Balkan languages, such as Greek, Bulgarian or Romanian (see 3.1.1). Recall that the subjunctive particles in these languages were shown to exhibit syntactic contiguity with respect to the embedded verb, which we observed thanks to similar types of grammaticality contrasts as those in (186). Moreover, the verb form used in Croatian examples in (185-186) is the same PNP form that we already observed in Greek subjunctives in 3.1.2, as

---

71 The future-tense construction in (185) is more typical of Serbian than it is of Croatian, because Croatian speakers generally prefer to put the infinitive after the future auxiliary *che* instead of the *da*+finite V construction. This, once again, reflects the more general difference between Croatian and Serbian when it comes to the use of infinitives, which will be explained in more detail later on in 3.2. For the ease of exposition, however, I will continue to refer to the language as Croatian at this point, because the example in (185) only serves as the introductory point to the study of the deeper properties of the indicative and the subjunctive *da*, which are relevant for both Croatian and Serbian. Moreover, the construction in (185) is not ungrammatical in Croatian, but only somewhat marginal, and less commonly used than in Serbian.
well as in the Greek future-tense construction introduced by *tha*, which is similar to its Croatian equivalent in (185-186). Hence we can already notice some common linguistic patterns between Croatian and its Balkan counterparts that will be relevant for the analysis later on, even though we are not yet dealing with Croatian subjunctive complementation per se.

Another piece of data, which more specifically points to the conclusion that the lower *da* we saw in (185-186) shares some syntactic properties with the subjunctive particles in other Balkan languages, can be noticed if we compare the Croatian future-tense construction we observed in these examples with its counterpart in Romanian. Notice, in particular, the particles that are used in this context:

(187) \[ \text{Ja chu da idem.} \] (Croatian)
\[ \text{I FUT PART go1.sg.} \]
\[ \text{‘I will go.’} \]

(188) \[ \text{O sa merg.} \] (Romanian)
\[ \text{FUT PART go1.sg.} \]

Crucially, the particle that Romanian uses to express future tense in such constructions is the same distinctive particle that we can observe in Romanian subjunctives, such as the one in (189):

(189) \[ \text{Vreau sa citeasca o carte.} \]
\[ \text{want1.sg. SUBJ read3.sg. a book} \]
\[ \text{‘I want him to read a book.’} \]

Thus, we already have a number of indications that the particle *da* used in future-tense constructions in Croatian shares some of the properties observed with subjunctive particles in other Balkan languages, pointing towards a possible common analysis in this context. Nevertheless, since the relevant Croatian examples we looked at so far did not involve subjunctive complements but a different type of clause, further evidence will be needed before I can claim that Croatian contains the same type of mood particle as other Balkan languages. In the following sections, I will demonstrate that this is indeed the case by showing, first of all, that the lower particle *da* we observed in Croatian examples in (185-186) is the same formal
element as the item *da* used to introduce Croatian subjunctive-type complements, such as the one in (184). This will, in turn, imply that the indicative-related *da* and the subjunctive-related *da* cannot be the same syntactic item, given that configurations such as those in (185-186) show them to be inserted in two distinct positions within the structure. The subjunctive *da* will then also be shown to share the bulk of the formal and semantic properties observed with its more overt BlkS counterparts in other languages.

3.1.4.2.1 Subjunctive *da* as a tense operator

The most obvious link that can be made between the use of *da* in the future-tense construction such as the one in (185) and the use of *da* in subjunctive-type complements such as the one in (184) is related to the morphological form of the verb that appears in such contexts, the latter being associated with the same PNP morphology in both types of environments:

(190) a. *Ivan che da dodje.*
   John FUT PART come3.sg.PNP
   ‘John will come.’

b. *Hochu da dodjesh.*
   want1.sg. that come2.sg.PNP
   ‘I want you to come.’

This also constitutes another common property that can be observed between Croatian and a language such as Greek in this context: as noted earlier, Greek also uses the same PNP verb form in both subjunctive and future-tense equivalents of Croatian examples in (190). In the following paragraphs, we will see that this is only one in a series of common patterns that can be observed between Croatian and its Balkan counterparts when it comes to constructions of this type.

Recall, first of all, that the perfective verbs of the type exemplified in (190) were shown to exhibit deficient temporal properties in languages such as Greek and Bulgarian, which meant that they could not define clausal tense on their own, hence the ungrammaticality of the examples below:
The same property can be observed with PNP verbs in Croatian as well, as we can see on the basis of grammaticality contrasts resulting from the use of perfective vs. imperfective aspect in simple matrix clauses:

(193) a. \textit{Ja stizhem.} \\
    I arrive1.sg.IMPERF

    b. * \textit{Ja stignem.} \\
    I arrive1.sg.PNP

(194) a. \textit{Ja chitam knjigu.} \\
    I read1.sg.IMPERF book

    b. * \textit{Ja prochitam knjigu.} \\
    I read1.sg.PNP book

This suggests that the same type of temporal analysis that was applied to Greek PNP verbs by Giannakidou (2009), and that I extended later on to their Bulgarian counterparts, may be valid in the context of Croatian as well. In other words, Croatian PNP could also be seen as a temporally deficient verb form that contains a dependent tense variable \( t \) which needs to be bound by a separate operator in syntax.\footnote{The only slight difference between Croatian and its Balkan counterparts in this context is that Croatian PNP can be used to denote matrix future tense without a separate operator being overtly present in the structure. Thus, the examples such as those in (193-194b) are significantly improved if we insert an adverbial that forces a future-tense reading:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{(i) Ja stignem sutra.} \\
       I arrive1.sg.PNP tomorrow \textit{'I arrive tomorrow.'}
\end{itemize}

Nevertheless, rather than claiming that this constitutes an exception with respect to the observed behavior of perfective verbs in other Balkan languages, it makes more sense to claim that the PNP in such cases is also bound by a separate tense operator in syntax, the only difference being that the latter is phonetically null. I leave a more detailed discussion of this type of construction for future work.
detail at the types of environments where the use of PNP morphology becomes acceptable, i.e. those where the PNP verb is accompanied by the particle *da*.

This is where the common properties of the item *da* used in future-tense constructions such as the one in (190a) and the item *da* used in subjunctives such as the one in (190b) begin to emerge more clearly: in both cases, these elements can be seen as accomplishing a tense-operator function and binding the dependent *t* variable associated with the PNP verb, which would explain why the use of PNP is perfectly acceptable (in fact preferred) in these contexts, as opposed to the matrix clauses where the PNP is unaccompanied by the element *da*. The latter can also be seen as providing the same semantic function in both of these types of constructions, i.e. it establishes the temporal anchor for the future-directed interval within which the PNP verb can be interpreted, which is the same type of function as the one we observed earlier on with its Greek and Bulgarian counterparts. The only difference between the two types of clauses in (190) in this context is related to the syntactic environments they appear in and to the type of item that selects *da*: in matrix future-tense clauses, such as the one in (190a), *da* is selected by the future auxiliary (shortened grammaticalized form of the verb *htjeti* ‘want’), which provides direct access to utterance time, and hence the temporal anchor established by *da* corresponds to the utterance time; in embedded subjunctive clauses (as in (190b)), *da* is selected by the matrix predicate, and hence the tense anchor it establishes corresponds to the reference time of the matrix predicate. Nevertheless, the semantic tense-anchoring function associated with this item is otherwise the same in both cases. Hence, it makes sense to conclude that the element *da* in the future-tense construction such as the one in (190a) and the element *da* in the subjunctive complements of the type exemplified in (190b) constitute the same linguistic item, accomplishing the same tense-operator function.

What this implies, in turn, is that the subjunctive-related *da* and the indicative-related *da* cannot be the same item: as we saw earlier on in (185) (reproduced below), the two *da*’s are associated with two distinct structural positions:

(185)  
\[
\text{Znam } \text{*da} \text{ che } \text{Ivan} \text{ *da} \text{ dodje.}
\]

\[
\text{know1.sg. that FUT John } \text{PART come3.sg.PNP}
\]

\[
\text{‘I know that John will come.’}
\]

Therefore, while the indicative *da* is a classical Comp inserted in C, subjunctive *da* should be analyzed as a particle, inserted somewhere lower down in the structure below C (more on that
a bit later). Moreover, since the temporal function of the subjunctive-related *da* in Croatian was shown as equivalent to the one associated with subjunctive particles in Bulgarian and Greek (i.e. they all render the PNP verb syntactically legitimate and semantically restrict its temporal scope in the same way), this would strongly suggest that the Croatian subjunctive *da* should be analyzed on a par with its more overtly marked counterparts in other Balkan languages. In order to further confirm this conclusion, I will introduce some additional properties that Croatian subjunctive *da* will be shown to share with subjunctive markers in other languages, properties which are more specifically related to mood and modality.

3.1.4.2.2 Subjunctive *da* as a mood particle

What the argument presented so far showed is that we have two separate formal items with the overt form *da* that are used to introduce indicative and subjunctive complements in Croatian, and that the subjunctive-related *da* can be analyzed as a temporal operator, which functions in the same way as its counterparts in other Balkan languages that we looked at before. Nevertheless, before I can claim with certainty that Croatian subjunctive-related *da* should be analyzed as a subjunctive mood particle on a par with the more overt BlkS markers, I need to demonstrate that, in addition to sharing their temporal properties, it also shares their modal properties. In order to do so, I will look at some of the semantic contributions of the Croatian particle *da* that can be observed outside of the typical cases of subjunctive subordination, which will allow us to note further common patterns between the Croatian *da* and subjunctive mood markers in other languages.

Let us first look at some of the matrix clauses where *da* can be found, and compare its distribution with that of the Greek subjunctive particle *na* in this context. When appearing in matrix syntactic environments, both of these items are typically used to express imperative-type meanings (195), optative-type meanings (196), or they appear in questions (197):

(195) a. *Na min to pis!* *(Greek)*

PART not it say2.sg.

‘Don’t say this!’

(Giannakidou, 2009: 1893)
b. \textit{Da se nisi pomakla!} \hfill (Croatian)
\begin{flushleft}
PART se-refl. not-be2.sg. move
\end{flushleft}
‘Don’t you move!’
(Todorovic, 2012: 93)

\begin{itemize}
\item[(196)] a. \textit{Na eisai efichisemos.} \hfill (Greek)
\begin{flushleft}
PART be2.sg. happy
\end{flushleft}
‘May you be happy.’
\item[(197)] a. \textit{Na treksi?} \hfill (Greek)
\begin{flushleft}
PART run3.sg.
\end{flushleft}
‘Can he run?’
(Roussou, 2009: 1811)
\item[(196)] b. \textit{Da si ziv i zdrav.} \hfill (Croatian)
\begin{flushleft}
PART be2.sg. alive and healthy
\end{flushleft}
‘May you be alive and healthy.’
(Todorovic, 2012: 92)
\item[(197)] b. \textit{Da dodjem?} \hfill (Croatian)
\begin{flushleft}
PART come1.sg.
\end{flushleft}
‘Should I come?’
\end{itemize}

What the data in (195-197) allow us to observe, in addition to the distributional similarities between the Greek \textit{na} and the Croatian \textit{da}, is that most matrix environments where these two items appear can semantically be described as non-veridical (according to Giannakidou’s definition given earlier on in 1.4.2- see (40)), either because they denote world-to-word-type meanings associated with imperative or optative constructions, or because they appear in questions, which are non-veridical by nature. This, of course, is the same type of meaning that one typically observes with the subjunctive as well, which therefore provides additional evidence for the analysis of the Croatian \textit{da} as a subjunctive mood marker.

Such an analysis is further reinforced if we compare the non-subordinated uses of \textit{da} with similar syntactic uses related to the subjunctive markers in those languages where subjunctive is marked as a verbal mood. For instance, the use of \textit{da} in matrix imperative-type environments that we saw in (195) is reminiscent of the imperative-related use of subjunctive
verb forms in a Romance language such as Spanish, especially in the context of negative imperative clauses where Spanish cannot employ imperative verbal morphology (see Rivero&Terzi, 1995):

(198) a.  *Da se nisi pomaknuo!* (Croatian)
    SUBJ se-refl. not-be2.sg. move
    
    b.  *No te muevas!* (Spanish)
    no you move2.sg.SUBJ
    ‘Don’t move.’

A similar type of common pattern between Croatian and Spanish can also be observed if we look at the use of subjunctive markers in conditional-type clauses, specifically in the context of counter-factual conditionals (sometimes also referred to as subjunctive conditionals- see Quer (2009)). As we can see below in (199), Croatian introduces the irrealis antecedent in this context through the particle *da*, whereas Spanish employs subjunctive verbal morphology within the same type of irrealis antecedent:

(199) a.  *Da si doshao ranije, vidio bi me.* (Croatian)
    SUBJ be2.sg. come earlier, saw would2.sg. me
    
    b.  *Si hubieras venido antes, me habrías visto.* (Spanish)
    if had2.sg.SUBJ come earlier, me would-have2.sg. seen
    ‘Had you come earlier, you would have seen me’

All the data in (195-199) therefore strongly argue in favor of the analysis of the Croatian particle *da* as a subjunctive mood marker.

Thus, the overall conclusion that can be proposed in light of my analysis of Croatian subjunctive so far is that the latter exhibits essentially the same underlying properties as its BlkS counterparts, the only difference being that Croatian subjunctive marker is not as distinctive on the surface as its equivalents in other Balkan languages, such as Greek or Bulgarian. This conclusion will be further reinforced once we focus on the issue of BlkS distribution, where the particle *da* will once again be shown to exhibit the exact same patterns as its BlkS counterparts. Before I move on to that part of the analysis, though, I will first focus more closely on the syntactic derivation of subjunctive complements in Croatian, in order to see whether the
analysis that was proposed earlier on to account for the derivation of their Bulgarian subjunctive counterparts can be applied in the context of Croatian as well.

3.1.4.3 Syntactic derivation of Croatian subjunctives

The basic syntactic analysis that was proposed earlier on in the context of Bulgarian subjunctive, which I will now assess in light of Croatian data, can be summarized as in (200):

(200)  [ CP \[ C_{[uDeo]} \] [ModP Mod [TP T_{DA} [iDeo] [AspP v [vP...]]]] ]

Agree/Check

The most important syntactic claims related to the analysis represented in (200) had to do with the syntagm of the Bulgarian mood marker *da*, as well as the feature-checking mechanism pertaining to the *uDeo* feature in C. The former was claimed to be inserted under the temporal T-head position, which allowed to account, among other things, for the observed temporal properties related to the Bulgarian subjunctive particle, as well as for its syntactic contiguity with the embedded verb (the latter having been analyzed as situated within the AsP-head, which is contiguous to T). As for the feature-checking mechanism related to Deo, it was claimed to be accomplished through a simple, long-distance Agree relation between *uDeo* in C and *iDeo* associated with the particle *da* in T (the latter having received *iDeo* through the mechanism of feature transfer between Mod and T, as shown earlier on in 3.1.3.3), which was sufficient to check *uDeo* because the latter was analyzed as weak in Bulgarian. In the following paragraphs, I will assess whether a similar analysis can be applied to Croatian subjunctives as well.

The first issue I will focus on in this context is the place of insertion of the Croatian mood particle *da*, and then I will look at the derivation of subjunctive complements in this language from a broader perspective. First of all, the data such as those we observed in (185), where we could see the item *da* co-occurring with the indicative Comp, clearly show that the subjunctive *da* in Croatian cannot be seen as inserted in C but must be analyzed as generated somewhere lower down in the structure, which is thus another aspect in which this item patterns with its BlkS counterparts. Given the basic structural description I assume in my analysis of BlkS in general, corresponding to the syntactic representation in (200), the only remaining candidates that can host *da* are the modality-related Mod-head and the temporal T-head. There are several different types of arguments that favor the latter over the former in this context.
The arguments in favor of the T-insertion of Croatian *da* are roughly the same as those that were advanced earlier on to argue for the same analysis with regards to its Bulgarian counterpart. The first argument is related to the observed temporal properties of these items: both the Bulgarian and the Croatian particle *da* were shown to function as tense operators, syntactically binding the dependent *t* variable contained within the PNP verb and semantically providing a temporal anchor for the interval within which such verbs can be interpreted. Another, even more important argument that was advanced in favor of the T-insertion analysis of *da* in Bulgarian was related to the distribution of subjunctive *da*-complements in this language and, more specifically, the fact that the particle *da* was shown to appear in some subjunctive clauses, such as the one we observed earlier on in (160) (reproduced below), that are not semantically associated with any modality.

(160)  
Ivan zapochva *da* kara kolata.  
John begins SUBJ drive3.sg. car-the  
‘John begins to drive the car.’

Given the overall syntax-semantics mapping perspective assumed in this thesis, the existence of clauses of the type exemplified in (160) argued against the analysis of the Bulgarian *da* as inserted under any type of higher modal head, because the latter would preclude it from appearing in such non-modalized semantic environments.

As we can see on the basis of the example in (201) below, the same type of issue is at play when it comes to the distribution of the Croatian particle *da* as well: just like its Bulgarian counterpart, this item can also appear in non-modalized contexts.\(^{73}\)

\(^{73}\) Even though the complements of the type exemplified in (201), which are syntactically associated with obligatory subject control, are more typical of Serbian than they are of Croatian, for the reasons I briefly sketched out at the beginning of 3.1.4 (and which I will explain in more detail later on in 3.2), there is no reason to presume that the particle *da* we observe there is not the same type of formal item as the particle *da* we observed in Croatian subjunctive examples so far. If we look at subjunctive distribution in other Balkan languages (as we will do in 3.2 and 3.3 in more detail), where BkS markers are more overtly marked, we can note that there is no difference in the formal make-up of subjunctive particles regardless of whether they appear in non-control or in control syntactic environments, so there is also no reason to assume that the particle *da* appearing in non-control contexts (as in Croatian subjunctive complements we focused on so far) and the particle *da* appearing in a control complement such as the one in (201) are a different formal item either. The only difference pertaining to the particle *da* in these two types of contexts will be seen as related to the syntactic operations that this item undergoes after it has been inserted in T. More on that shortly.
Ivan pochinje da vozi auto.
John begins SUBJ drive3.sg. car
‘John begins to drive the car.’

The best way to account for all of these data is to claim that the Croatian subjunctive particle *da*, just like its Bulgarian counterpart, is also inserted under the temporal T-head position, which appears below any type of projection related to modality, given the structure in (200).

The only important contrast between Croatian and Bulgarian when it comes to the syntax of the particle *da* has to do with the positioning of this item with respect to the embedded verb in subjunctive complements. Even though the Croatian data we looked at so far in this context seemed to suggest that the Croatian *da* exhibits the same type of contiguity with the lower verb as its Bulgarian counterpart, because this was shown to be the case in future-tense constructions such as those in (186), the same degree of contiguity is not observed in subjunctive complements in the two languages. The relevant contrast between Croatian and Bulgarian in this context can be most easily noticed by looking at the syntactic positioning of the embedded subject in such clauses. So far, all of the Croatian subjunctive examples I used have contained an empty *pro* subject, which did not allow us to observe any type of syntactic difference between the two languages in this context. However, if we introduce a nominal subject in an embedded subjunctive complement in Croatian, we can observe a clear syntactic contrast with respect to Bulgarian, as shown in the examples below:

(202) a. *Iskam Ivan da (*Ivan) dojde.*
(Bulgarian)

b. *Hochu da Ivan dodje.*
want1.sg. SUBJ John come3.sg.
(Croatian)
‘I want John to come.’

As we can see in (202), the canonical position for the embedded subject in Croatian subjunctive complements is the one between *da* and the verb, and in this sense subjunctives do not syntactically differ from indicatives, whereas the same type of configuration results in ungrammaticality in Bulgarian.

The contrast between the two languages in this context is not just observed when it comes to the embedded subject intervening between the subjunctive particle and the verb, but
also when it comes to the possibility of inserting other elements, such as adverbs or focus, between these two items, all of which can be done in the context of Croatian subjunctives, as we can observe through the examples in (203):

(203) a. Hocu da sutra dodjesh.
    want1.sg. SUBJ tomorrow come2.sg.
    ‘I want you to come tomorrow.’

b. Hocu da IVANA pozovete.
    want1.sg. SUBJ JOHN invite2.pl.
    ‘It is JOHN that I want you to invite.’

The data in (202-203) therefore suggest that Croatian particle da does not have identical syntactic properties as those we observed with its Bulgarian counterpart (or with BlkS markers more generally), but that it occupies a higher structural position than the latter, which is further removed from the embedded verb, explaining the lack of syntactic contiguity in (202-203).

Therefore, we now have two contrasting sets of data related to the Croatian subjunctive particle da that need to be accounted for: on the one hand, the latter patterns with its Bulgarian counterpart in that it accomplishes the same temporal function of binding the dependent t variable in the PNP verb, and in that it exhibits the same sort of contiguity with the lower verb in certain types of syntactic environments (namely in future-tense constructions such as those we observed in (186)); on the other hand, the Croatian particle da is further removed from the embedded verb in the context of typical subjunctive complementation than is the case with its Bulgarian counterpart. The syntactic configuration exemplified in (203b) in particular, which shows that the Croatian particle da appears above fronted focus, would suggest that this item occupies a very high position within the embedded left periphery, which is higher than the projection serving as the locus for focalization. The way in which I will propose to account for these different sets of syntactic patterns is simple: I will claim that the Croatian da is inserted under the same T-head as its Bulgarian counterpart, hence their shared properties, but then, unlike the latter, it moves from T to C, hence the contrasts between Bulgarian and Croatian subjunctives in relation to data such as those in (202-203). In order to explain the underlying reasons for this difference in the syntactic behavior of the particle da in two languages, I will now look at the step-by-step derivation of Croatian subjunctives, similarly as was done earlier on in the context of Bulgarian.
The derivation of Croatian and Bulgarian subjunctives will not differ when it comes to the Merge operations that underlie the structural build-up of subjunctive complements, but only with regards to the syntactic operations that take place within the overall structural framework associated with the subjunctive clause type. The first relevant Merge operation when it comes to the derivation of Croatian subjunctive complements is thus the same as the one we observed earlier on in the context of Bulgarian, i.e. the operation whereby the head $T$, and its projection TP, are merged on top of vP (once again, I ignore vP-internal Merge operations):

\[
(204)
\begin{array}{c}
T \\
\downarrow \\
TP \\
\downarrow \\
vP \\
\end{array}
\]

As explained earlier on, this is also the derivational step where the subjunctive particle $da$ is externally merged in the structure under $T$. Given that the exact same situation was argued to obtain at this derivational stage in the context of Bulgarian as well, this allows me to account for all the common patterns that we observed between the Bulgarian and Croatian particle $da$.

The derivational step in (204) can explain, first of all, the temporal properties associated with both the Croatian and the Bulgarian $da$: given that they are both analyzed as inserted in $T$, they can both be argued to function as temporal operators, binding the dependent tense variable associated with the verb situated lower down within vP. Moreover, this analysis can also explain the fact that the Croatian particle $da$ is structurally contiguous with the lower verb in the future-tense constructions such as those in (186). In this context, we can apply a similar type of explanation as the one proposed earlier on for Bulgarian subjunctive complementation more generally: $da$ in such cases remains under $T$, in a syntactically contiguous position with respect to the lower verb (the latter will be argued to be situated in Asp, which is immediately contiguous to $T$, in Croatian as well). The reason why Croatian $da$ does not move up to $C$ in such cases is because this movement will be seen as crucially related to the feature-checking requirements associated with the subjunctive CP, which is not present in structures such as those related to clauses in (186), given that they do not involve subjunctive complementation. Finally, the analysis in (204) will, once again, be used to explain why the Croatian particle $da$, like its Bulgarian counterpart, can appear in non-modalized semantic environments: complements such as those in (160) or (201), which do not denote any modality, will be shown...
to constitute non-phasal syntactic domains, whose structural build-up stops at the derivational step in (204), before any modality-related projection is merged within the structure.

The next derivational step in the build-up of Croatian subjunctive complements is, once again, identical to the one we observed at the same stage in the context of Bulgarian subjunctives earlier on: it is the step whereby the modal head Mod, which contains the interpretable deontic feature $iDeo$, is merged on top of TP:

\[(205)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ModP} \\
\text{Mod} \left[ i_{Deo} \right] \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{da}
\end{array}
\]

Just like it was argued earlier on in the context of Bulgarian, this is also the derivational stage that endows the particle $da$ with its modal properties. Once again, the particle $da$ in T establishes an Agree relationship with Mod, which allows it to acquire the modal feature $iDeo$ through the mechanism of feature transfer, as illustrated below in (206):

\[(206)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ModP} \\
\text{Mod} \left[ i_{Deo} \right] \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{da} \left[ i_{Deo} \right] \\
\text{Agree/F-transfer}
\end{array}
\]

At this point, therefore, the particle $da$, in addition to being endowed with semantic modal properties, can also syntactically function as a potential feature-checker for $iDeo$ in C.

The feature-checking property associated with the Croatian particle $da$ becomes relevant in the context of the final derivational step in the structural build-up of Croatian subjunctive complements, i.e. the step whereby the subjunctive C, containing $iDeo$ and projecting CP, is merged on top of Mod, as illustrated below:
This is the point where we observe the most important difference between the syntactic derivation of Croatian subjunctive and the one associated with their Bulgarian counterparts: in the latter case, the particle da stays under T, checking uDeo in C through a long-distance Agree configuration, but in the former case, the item da must be analyzed as moving to C, given the data of the type exemplified in (202-203). The syntactic contrast between Croatian and Bulgarian in this context can be explained by postulating a single formal distinction with regards to the feature make-up of their subjunctive CP: unlike Bulgarian subjunctives, which contain a weak uDeo in C, their Croatian counterparts contain a strong uDeo, which needs to be checked locally. Given that this type of feature checking can only be achieved by the particle da, the latter is then attracted and head-adjoined to C, as illustrated below in (208):74

The analysis in (208) can account for all the relevant properties associated with the Croatian subjunctive particle that we observed so far: it explains both the shared patterns that this item was shown to exhibit with respect to its Bulgarian counterpart (which are accounted for under the assumption that they are both inserted under T), as well as the contrasts we observed.

74 If we want to maintain the Head Movement Constraint proposed by Travis (1984) in the context of the head movement of da from T to C, then we can simply add that da passes through the modal head on its way to C. Even though this additional stipulation would have no meaningful impact on my analysis of Croatian subjunctive derivation, one would need to provide some broader theoretical justifications for it (especially in light of the Attract (vs. Greed) approach to movement (including head movement) that I am assuming in this thesis). I will not attempt to do so here.
between the two (explained by the fact that the Croatian *da*, unlike its Bulgarian counterpart, subsequently moves to C).

Before I end my analysis of Croatian subjunctive derivation, I will add a couple of words concerning the properties of the verb that appears in this type of clauses. Like its Bulgarian counterpart, the latter will be analyzed as situated under Asp, i.e. the highest head within the verbal vP layer, as illustrated below:

(209) \[
[\text{CP} \ [\text{ModP} \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{AspP} \ \text{Asp} \ V \ [\text{vp}]]]]]]
\]

This analysis allows to explain the shared properties that we observed between Croatian and Bulgarian subjunctive-related verb forms. First of all, given that AspP is immediately contiguous to the T-head where *da* is inserted, the structural representation in (209) allows to explain the contiguity that is observed between the verb and the particle *da* in those syntactic environments where the latter does not move up to C (e.g. in future-tense constructions such as those in (186)). The same analysis also accounts for the semantic properties associated with verbs that appear in subjunctives, specifically the fact that, while they are temporally deficient, they are fully specified for aspect on the semantic level. As we can observe in (210) below, these types of verbs in Croatian, just like their Bulgarian counterparts, can denote both perfective and imperfective-type meanings:

(210) a. \*Hochu da dodjesh sutra u pet.\*  
want1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg.PNP tomorrow at five  
‘I want you to come tomorrow at five.’

b. Hochu da dolazish svaki dan.\textsuperscript{75}  
want1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg.IMPERF every day  
‘I want you to come every day.’

This is, once again, straightforwardly accounted for given the analysis in (209).

At this point, therefore, we have a reasonably complete formal account of the syntactic properties associated with the typical subjunctive complements in the Balkan Slavic languages.

\textsuperscript{75} Once again, even though PNP is the preferred verb form in Croatian subjunctives, the imperfective is not banned outright, and can be used when the subjunctive complement is clearly associated with imperfective aspectual readings, which is the case in (210b).
that were the main focus of my analysis so far. Once again, the basic structural description in (209) will be further refined and articulated later on in 3.3 once I focus on some finer syntactic and semantic differences that can be noticed between various subjunctive complements in the context of BlkS distribution more broadly. Before I move on to that part of the analysis, I will first briefly compare my syntactic account of the subjunctive particle 

\( da \) in Croatian with the one proposed in Todorovic (2012) for Serbian, which is the most detailed study devoted to this issue in recent literature. The reason why Todorovic’s study will be interesting in this context is because the author primarily focused on subjunctive complements that exhibit the property of obligatory control, which I haven’t looked at in detail until now, but which will receive a major amount of attention in the remaining parts of this chapter.

3.1.4.4 Socanac (2011) vs. Todorovic (2012): Different theoretical perspectives on the syntax of the subjunctive 

\( da \)

The analysis of the syntactic properties related to the subjunctive marker 

\( da \) that I just proposed, which is primarily based on Socanac (2011), is broadly similar to the one put forward in Todorovic (2012), but our approaches also differ in some important aspects. The main common thread between our analyses is the fact that we both view the subjunctive 

\( da \) as a particle, which is associated with a lower structural position than the indicative Comp 

\( da \). The main difference between our approaches pertains to the analysis of the syntactic behavior of the subjunctive particle 

\( da \) after it has been inserted in the structure (specifically its behavior with regards to movement). In the following paragraphs, I will explain this difference in more detail, as well as argue that my analysis of the syntactic properties of 

\( da \) allows to account for the Serbian/Croatian subjunctive data in a more comprehensive manner.

First of all, before I compare our two approaches, I will begin by briefly sketching out the main outlines of the theoretical perspective put forward in Todorovic (2012). Todorovic based her analysis on Giannakidou’s semantic (non)veridicality approach to mood distinctions, proposing to develop a syntactic application of this approach in the context of subjunctive and indicative complementation in Serbian. The main claim that Todorovic made in this context was that indicative complements are introduced via a veridical 

\( da \), whereas subjunctive complements are introduced via a non-veridical 

\( da \), with the two items exhibiting different structural properties. Here I will briefly focus specifically on the syntactic analysis that Todorovic proposed in the context of the non-veridical 

\( da \).
Todorovic adopted a somewhat different overall structural perspective in her analysis than the one I am assuming here. Her account was based on the syntactic system developed in Progovac (2005), which distinguished between the higher subject layer and a lower object layer. In this context, Todorovic claimed that the veridical, indicative da is inserted under a higher, subject-related polarity projection, while the non-veridical, subjunctive da is inserted under a lower, object-related polarity projection. I will not introduce this syntactic system in more detail, since I will not be using it here, but the syntactic distinction that Todorovic made between the higher domain of insertion of the indicative veridical da and the lower domain of insertion of the subjunctive non-veridical da is broadly reminiscent of my own syntactic analysis. Even though I did not deal with the properties of the indicative-related da per se in much detail, since the latter is not my primary concern here, I did claim several times that, unlike the subjunctive da, the indicative da should be seen as a classical Comp, which implies that it must be inserted in a high left-periphery C-projection reserved for Comps. Subjunctive da, on the other hand, was claimed to be merged lower down, under the T-head, which is similar to the claim Todorovic made in the context of her non-veridical da.

While my analysis broadly agrees with Todorovic’s account as I described it so far, modulo some theoretical distinctions regarding our view of the structural make-up of the clause, the most important difference between our two perspectives concerns the analysis of the syntactic behavior of the subjunctive (non-veridical) da after its insertion in the structure. Todorovic explicitly stated that the latter never moves from the lower to the higher clausal domain, which is contrary to the syntactic analysis I am proposing here. In the following paragraphs, I will show that Todorovic’s analysis is not able to account for the full range of syntactic data that we observe in relation to Serbian/Croatian subjunctive distribution, which my analysis based on da-movement will be better able to do (as I will briefly explain here and then in much more detail later on in 3.3).

The analysis put forward by Todorovic does not account for the full range of syntactic data related to subjunctives in Serbian because she focused primarily on subjunctive complements introduced under control predicates, a few of which we briefly observed earlier on as well.76 As we will see later on in 3.3 once I focus in more detail on such controlled subjunctives, the complements of this type indeed do not exhibit da-movement, and therefore Todorovic’s account is not strictly speaking wrong in this context. However, Todorovic argued that the conclusions she reached on the basis of data that only pertain to controlled subjunctives

76 See the Bulgarian example in (160) or the Serbian example in (201), for instance.
should be seen as valid for all cases of subjunctive complementation in Serbian, which is an overgeneralization. For instance, it is difficult to reconcile her claim that the subjunctive \textit{da} never moves up from the lower clausal domain where it was inserted with some of the data we previously observed, such as the fact that this item can precede the embedded subject (202) or fronted focus in (203), pattering in both cases with the indicative-related \textit{da}. Here we will observe some additional data that argue against Todorovic’s claim that the subjunctive \textit{da} does not move to the higher clausal domain.

The main syntactic effect of this assumed lack of movement, according to Todorovic, is that the subjunctive non-veridical \textit{da}, unlike the indicative veridical \textit{da}, never creates a clausal boundary between the embedded and the matrix clause, rendering all subjunctive complements syntactically transparent domains. When translated to the more contemporary phasal approach to syntax that I am assuming here (outlined in 1.3.3), this would mean that all subjunctive complements in Serbian constitute non-phasal domains. While earlier on in 2.3 we could observe that subjunctives in general do cross-linguistically exhibit some non-phasal properties and do not adhere as strictly to Chomsky’s PIC constraint when it comes to binding phenomena as indicatives do, I also showed that subjunctives, including specifically some Serbian/Croatian subjunctives, exhibit a number of phasal properties as well, and hence should not be analyzed as non-phasal domains. For instance, subjunctive complements in this language were shown to manifest the same type of anti-locality constraints in the context of possessive pronoun vs. anaphor binding as those we observed in indicatives (the relevant examples are reproduced below):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(211)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ivan vidi svoju/ ?* njegovu} \textit{zenu}.
\textit{John loves his / his wife}
\item \textit{Ivan hoche da * svoja/ njegova} \textit{zna dodje}.
\textit{John wants SUBJ his / his wife come3.sg.}
\item \textit{Ivan misli da je * svoja/ njegova} \textit{zha najljepsha}.
\textit{John thinks that is his / his wife most-beautiful}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Todorovic’s claim that subjunctives in general constitute syntactically transparent, non-clausal domains would predict that the clause in (211b) should pattern with the one in (211a), not the one in (211c), with the subjunctive complement exhibiting local anaphor binding from the matrix clause in accordance with the condition A of GB theory, which is contrary to facts.
In fact, even some of the syntactic evidence that Todorovic herself used in her dissertation in order to prove that subjunctive complements introduced under a non-veridical da in Serbian constitute non-clausal domains do not apply to the full range of subjunctive distribution in this language. For instance, Todorovic claimed that Serbian subjunctives differ from indicatives when it comes to their clausal status because, unlike the latter, they can allow certain types of clitics (namely pronominal clitics) to climb from the embedded to the matrix clause, or because they do not allow narrow negation scope over the embedded clause, all of which was meant to demonstrate the syntactically transparent nature of subjunctive complements in Serbian (as well as the lack of da-movement in this context). The problem, however, is that Todorovic’s predictions only apply to subjunctives associated with subject control, but not to non-control subjunctives (i.e. most of the subjunctive complements we looked at so far in this dissertation). Just as when it came to pronoun vs. anaphor binding, non-control intensional subjunctives pattern with indicatives when it comes to these phenomena as well. As we can observe by comparing indicative and subjunctive complements in (212-213), the latter pattern with the former in that they ban all types of clitic climbing from the embedded to the matrix clause (including the one involving pronominal clitics) (212), and in that they are compatible with narrow negation scope over the embedded clause (213):

(212) a. *Ne (* ga) tvrdim da ga pozajem.
not him claim1.sg. IND him know1.sg.
‘I don’t claim that I know him.’
want1.sg him SUBJ him invite2.sg.PNP
‘I want you to invite him.’

(213) a. Mislim da ne dolazi.
think1.sg. IND not come3.sg.
‘I think that he is not coming.’
b. Zahtijevam da ne ode.
demand1.sg. SUBJ not leave3.sg.PNP
‘I demand that he not leave.’

77 See Todorovic (2012: 131-141).
The fact that the particle *da* scopes over negation in (213), as well as the fact that it presents a clausal boundary to clitic climbing in (212), is best analyzed under the approach that I developed here earlier on, which argued that this item moves up to C.

Once again, though, it should be noted that all of these tests related to syntactic transparency do function in accordance with Todorovic’s predictions when it comes to control-type subjunctives that she looked at in her thesis (including the test based on possessive anaphor binding in (211), which did not feature in her dissertation), as we will see in more detail later on in 3.3 once I turn my attention to this type of complements. This is what I meant when I said that Todorovic’s syntactic analysis is not strictly-speaking wrong in the context of her dissertation, given that the latter primarily focused on control complements, but the claim that her account is applicable to all cases of Serbian subjunctive complementation is incorrect. The analysis of the latter requires a more fine-grained approach, which I will develop in the remaining parts of this chapter, where I will focus on the issues related to BlkS distribution.

3.2 BlkS distribution: Description

In this section, I will outline the distribution of BlkS complements, as well as some of the theoretical issues it poses, on a more descriptive level, whereas in the following section (3.3), I will tackle these issues by proposing a syntactic account that will allow me to coherently subsume most cases of BlkS distribution that we will observe here under the broader analysis related to the subjunctive clause type that was proposed earlier on in 2. The description of BlkS distribution that I will put forward here in 3.2 will address this subject from a more general perspective, looking at both Slavic and non-Slavic languages in this context, which will allow us to once again observe the broadly shared grammatical patterns related to subjunctive complementation which obtain across various different languages situated in the Balkan region. Section 3.3 will then once again primarily focus on Balkan Slavic data.

First of all, before I focus on the more problematic aspects related to BlkS distribution, let us begin by briefly noting some cases of BlkS complementation which are more typical from a cross-linguistic perspective, involving complements defined as intensional subjunctives. The latter appear under a similar range of predicates in both Balkan and non-Balkan languages. Thus, in addition to complements selected by desiderative verbs, which were the primary focus of my analysis of BlkS so far, this type of subjunctive can also be observed with verbs such as
directives (214), verbs of advice or suggestions (215), as well as a number of other similar types of future-referring predicates that are cross-linguistically associated with the subjunctive mood (216-217):

(214) \[ Tu \ ipa \ na \ fiji. \]  
\hspace{1cm} (Greek) 
\hspace{1cm} him told1.sg. SUBJ leave3.sg.  
\hspace{1cm} ‘I told him to leave.’  
\hspace{1cm} (Roussou, 2009: 1814)

(215) \[ Predlagam \ da \ dojdes. \]  
\hspace{1cm} (Bulgarian) 
\hspace{1cm} suggest1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg.  
\hspace{1cm} ‘I suggest that you come.’

(216) \[ Pristao \ je \ da \ dodjem. \]  
\hspace{1cm} (Croatian) 
\hspace{1cm} accepted has3.sg. SUBJ come1.sg.  
\hspace{1cm} ‘He accepted that I come.’

(217) \[ Ma \ astept \ sa \ vina. \]  
\hspace{1cm} (Romanian) 
\hspace{1cm} me expect1.sg. SUBJ come3.sg.  
\hspace{1cm} ‘I expect him to come.’

In the following parts of this section, we will observe that, in addition to complements selected by intensional predicates such as those in (214-217), BlkS can also be found in a number of other types of embedded syntactic environments, most of which are much less typical when compared to the cross-linguistic properties of the subjunctive mood. The main objective of my subsequent analysis in 3.3 will then be to incorporate such atypical cases of BlkS distribution alongside the more typical intensional subjunctives under a common theoretical account pertaining to the subjunctive clause type.

The first issue that I will be concerned with once I turn to some of the more problematic aspects related to BlkS distribution will be to distinguish between those BlkS complements that will be claimed to belong to the subjunctive clausal mood (i.e. Subj1) and those that will be analyzed as introducing subjunctive morphological marking under a different syntactic clause type (i.e. Subj2). This will be important because BlkS will be shown to exhibit both Subj1 and
Subj2-type complements (although the latter are much less productive than in Romance) which do not straightforwardly conform to the broader analysis of the subjunctive clause type that I proposed earlier on. Only the complements defined as Subj1 will then be of immediate interest for my study of BlkS, given that Subj2 complements are not analyzed as part of the subjunctive clause type (see 1.2). The subsequent analysis in this chapter will thus only focus on the problematic aspects related to Subj1 complements, which are more specific to BlkS, whereas BlkS Subj2 will only be dealt with later on in Chapter 6, where I will address Subj2-type complementation from a more cross-linguistic perspective.

3.2.1 Subj1 vs. Subj2 in the context of BlkS

The first problematic case of BlkS distribution that we will look at here involves complements such as those in the examples below.78

(218)  

_Pistevo na elise to provlima._  
believe1.sg. SUBJ solved3.sg. the problem  
‘I believe that he solved the problem.’  
(Roussou, 2010: 4)

(219)  

_Ne vjarvjam da dojde._  
not believe1.sg. SUBJ came3.sg.  
‘I don’t believe he came.’

Unlike intensional subjunctives we observed earlier on in (214-217), complements in (218-219) do not conform to my broader approach to the subjunctive clause type, which viewed the latter as introduced under the imperative-type CP (see 2.4). The main reason for this is the fact that subjunctive clauses such as those above pattern more closely with indicatives than they do with intensional subjunctives or imperatives when it comes to their basic semantic properties. First of all, they denote epistemic-type modality, which is often associated with the indicative mood, 

---

78 The fact that a language such as Bulgarian uses subjunctive morphology in this type of complements, which will be defined as Subj2, constitutes a bit of an exception in the context of Slavic subjunctive, because the latter generally does not exhibit Subj2-type complementation, as we observed earlier on in 1.2.1 (see (19-20) in particular). The Bulgarian exception in this context will be accounted for later on in Chapter 6 (Section 6.2 more specifically), where I will explain some of the underlying reasons for the differences in Subj2 distribution across languages, including in Slavic.
and not deontic modality that one observes with imperatives and intensional subjunctives. This means that they also pattern with epistemic-type indicatives when it comes to the semantic properties that we discussed earlier on in 1.4: they denote persistent propositions, which can be judged as true or false, and are extensionally anchored to the matrix modal base. As a result, just like their Romance counterparts that we observed earlier on in Chapter 1, subjunctives such as those in (218-219) will be subsumed under the Subj2 label, i.e. they will be analyzed as clauses where subjunctive morphological marking appears in the context of indicative-type syntactic complementation (see 6.1 for more detail on this analysis).

There are several additional reasons that argue in favor of the Subj2-approach to BlkS complements such as those in (218-219). The main syntactic argument that can be proposed in this context has to do with the degree of stability in the use of embedded subjunctive marking. Recall that the first formal criterion that was used earlier on in the introductory chapter (Section 1.2.1 in particular) to distinguish between Subj1- and Subj2-type complements was related to the obligatory vs. variable use of subjunctive marking in the embedded clause: Subj1 complements, which were analyzed as lexically selected under a separate subjunctive CP, were shown to exhibit obligatory subjunctive marking in this context; Subj2 clauses, on the other hand, which are not selected under this subjunctive CP, were shown to exhibit variability between the use of the subjunctive and the indicative mood marking in the embedded clause. This is another area where BlkS complements such as those in (218-219) pattern with their Romance Subj2 counterparts that we looked at earlier on in Chapter 1 (see (15-17), for instance): the Greek subjunctive marker *na* in (218) can be replaced by the indicative Comp *oti* (220), and the Bulgarian subjunctive *da* in (219) can be replaced by the indicative *che* (221), without producing ungrammaticality in this context:

(220)  
\[ Pistevo \ oti \ elise \ to \ provlima. \]
believe1.sg. IND solved3.sg. the problem
‘I believe that he solved the problem.’
(Roussou, 2010: 4)

(221)  
\[ Ne \ vjaryjam, \ che \ shte \ dojde. \]
not believe1.sg. IND FUT come3.sg.
‘I don’t believe she will come.’
This is also where BlkS Subj2 complements of the type exemplified in (218-219) differ from their BlkS Subj1 counterparts that we looked at in the previous parts of this chapter, given that the introduction of indicative-mood marking in the latter type of complements produces an ungrammatical result, as we can observe in the examples below:

(222)  *Thelo na / *oti liso to provlima.  (Greek)
want1.sg. SUBJ/ IND solve1.sg. the problem
‘I want to solve the problem.’
(Roussou, 2010: 3)

(223)  *Iskam da / *che dojde.  (Bulgarian)
want1.sg. SUBJ/ IND come3.sg.
‘I want him to come.’

The contrasts in (220-223) are expected given the broader analysis that distinguished Subj1 from Subj2 complements in terms of lexical selection by the matrix predicate.

Another reason why complements such as those in (218-219) should be subsumed under the Subj2 label is the fact that they pattern with indicatives, while differing from Subj1, in relation to a number of other clausal areas as well, such as tense for instance. Recall that we observed earlier on in Chapter 2 that one of the main differences between the indicative and the subjunctive clause type across languages had to do with the temporal properties associated with the embedded clause: indicative complements were shown to be associated with independent tense, which meant that they could denote all types of temporal relationships with respect to the matrix tense, whereas subjunctive complements were shown to be more temporally dependent, and restricted to a future-referring tense interval with respect to the reference time of the matrix predicate. This is another area where we can observe a distinction between Subj1- and Subj2-type BlkS complements. As we can see on the basis of the grammaticality contrasts below, the latter are associated with indicative-like independent tense, as shown by the possibility of anterior temporal readings (224), whereas the former exhibit the temporal restrictions characteristic of the subjunctive clausal mood (225):
These are, therefore, some of the reasons why complements of the type exemplified in
(224) will be subsumed under the Subj2 label, and left to the side for the moment, given that
they do not belong to the subjunctive clause type that is the main focus of my present analysis.
This, however, does not mean that we will not be dealing with problematic cases of subjunctive
distribution in the context of my current study of BlkS. On the contrary, in the remainder of
Section 3.2, we will observe a series of examples of BlkS distribution involving complements
which will be defined as Subj1, because they will be shown to formally pattern with the more
typical intensional Subj1 complements with regards to the phenomena we just looked at above,
even though they will have very little to do with the typical subjunctive or imperative-related
semantic interpretations. The complements that correspond to this description are those selected
by obligatory-control predicates, which I will refer to as control subjunctives (term taken from
Landau, 2004).
3.2.2 BlkS distribution in control environments

Control subjunctive complements that we will look at here are more idiosyncratic to the languages of the Balkan region, because they exhibit various different types of properties that are not typically observed with subjunctives in non-Balkan languages, as will be explained in more detail shortly. In (226-232) below, we can observe some examples of different types of control predicates that introduce embedded subjunctive complements across a wide array of Balkan languages:

(226) *Ivan trjabva da dojde.*  
John has-to SUBJ come3.sg.  
‘John has to come.’  
(Bulgarian)

(227) *O Kostas bori na odhiji.*  
the Kostas can3.sg. SUBJ drive3.sg.  
‘Kostas can drive.’  
(Roussou, 2009: 1815)

(228) *Ivan zna da pliva.*  
John knows(how to) SUBJ swim3.sg.  
‘John knows how to swim.’  
(Serbian)

(229) *Nauchio je da vozi auto.*  
learned has SUBJ drive3.sg. car  
‘He learned to drive the car.’  
(Serbian)

(230) *Maria perpiqet te shkruaje.*  
Mary try3.sg. SUBJ write3.sg.  
‘Mary is trying to write.’  
(Albanian)

(231) *Ion a reusit sa vina.*  
John has managed SUBJ come3.sg.  
‘John managed to come.’  
(Romanian)
(232) Toi pochna da studira pravo.  (Macedonian)
he began3.sg. SUBJ study3.sg. law
‘He began to study law.’

BlkS control complements are thus typically selected by predicates such as modal verbs (226-227), verbs of knowing (228-229), implicatives (230-231), or aspectual verbs (232), the latter of which we already observed earlier on thanks to some Balkan Slavic examples.

BlkS clauses in (226-232) exhibit a number of atypical patterns in the context of the cross-linguistic properties of the subjunctive mood. They are unusual from a semantic point of view because they exhibit a degree of semantic diversity that is not typically observed with the subjunctive in non-Balkan languages. More on this will be said a bit later on, once I assess complements of the type exemplified in (226-232) in light of my broader analysis of the subjunctive clausal mood. Furthermore, these complements are also unusual from a syntactic perspective, because they exhibit obligatory subject control, whereas subjunctives across languages were shown to be typically associated with the reverse, anti-control property of subject obviation in this context (see 2.2.2.3 or 2.4.1.5, for instance).

Note, moreover, that subject control in the context of BlkS is not achieved through the usual cross-linguistic means- i.e. via non-finite verb forms, such as infinitives or gerunds. Rather, predicates such as those in (226-232) introduce complements associated with finite verbal morphology, where the control reading obtains due to the relationship of agreement sharing that is established between the matrix and the embedded predicate.79 The obligatory control associated with such complements therefore entails that the matrix and the embedded predicate cannot exhibit distinct φ-features, as we can observe thanks to the ungrammatical nature of the examples below:

(233) * Ivan trubva da dojdete.  (Bulgarian)
John must3.sg. SUBJ come2.pl.

(234) * Pochinje da studiram pravo.  (Serbian)
begin3.sg. SUBJ study2.sg. law

79 See Landau (2004) and the references therein for a more detailed formal analysis of this BlkS-related control mechanism.
The atypical control patterns that we observe with such BlkS complements are related to some diachronic developments that affected languages situated in the Balkan peninsula, which I will briefly explain before I move on with the analysis.

The fact that finite subjunctive complements appear in control structures in Balkan languages is related to linguistic phenomena subsumed under the term *Balkan sprachbund*, as I already briefly mentioned earlier on in 2.6. The relevant phenomenon in this context is the one of infinitive loss: many languages situated in the Balkan region have lost their infinitives (to a greater or lesser degree) and replaced them with finite subjunctives at some stage in their evolution, hence the wide distribution of BlkS complements that we just observed.80 The phenomenon of infinitive loss took place across Balkan languages independently of the broader typological differences between them, but it was subject to some regional variation: to put it in relatively simple terms, those languages that are situated more to the South-East of the Balkan region (e.g. Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian) have lost their infinitives in greater measure than languages situated more to the West (e.g. Croatian) or to the North (e.g. Romanian) of the Balkans (Joseph, 1983; Miseska Tomic, 2006, a.o.).

One of the examples of the regional variation in the spread of the infinitive-loss phenomenon that is particularly relevant when it comes to my study can be observed in the case of Balkan Slavic, specifically Serbian and Croatian, which exhibit one of the most conspicuous grammatical differences in this context. On the whole, Serbian was affected by the infinitive loss in greater degree than Croatian, due to their different geographical position: Serbian is spoken more to the East of the Balkans and Croatian more to the West, which is why Serbian speakers tend to use subjunctives in control contexts much more often than Croatian speakers,81 who prefer to employ the infinitive in control structures such as those in (226-232), given that Croatian was less affected by infinitive loss.

(236) a.  *Ivan mora dochi.*

John must comeINF

---

80 See Joseph (1983) for a more comprehensive diachronic account of this phenomenon, which I will not develop here.

81 Standard Serbian actually productively employs both control subjunctives and infinitives, with the latter being progressively lost only in some southern dialects. Here I will only focus on Serbian control subjunctives.
As a result, when I turn to the analysis of BlkS distribution, which is what I will be doing throughout the remainder of this chapter, I will refer to this language as Serbian, given that the latter exhibits more Balkanized properties in the context of subjunctive distribution than Croatian does.\textsuperscript{82}

Now that I have briefly explained some of the diachronic reasons behind the idiosyncratic subjunctive complementation patterns that we observe in Balkan languages, as well as some of their different synchronic manifestations, I will turn to a closer theoretical study of these BlkS complements. First of all, given the unusual syntactic and semantic properties that we observed in relation to BlkS control subjunctives such as those in (226-232), whereby they differ from all Subj1 complements that we looked at so far in this dissertation, I need to begin by assessing whether these complements can nonetheless be analyzed as part of the Subj1 clausal mood, or whether they involve a different type of syntactic complementation, similarly as was proposed in the context of epistemic-type Subj2 BlkS complements such as those exemplified earlier on in (218-219).

If we only remain focused on the more easily observable formal and semantic properties associated with BlkS complements of the type exemplified in (226-232), then the latter type of analysis might appear more plausible. Not only were such complements shown to exhibit obligatory-subject control, which is the opposite formal property from the subject obviation that we typically observe with Subj1 clauses in this context, but a number of these complements are also associated with the type of semantic properties that have little or nothing to do with the typical meaning that we observe with intensional subjunctive or imperative clauses. This is particularly obvious when it comes to BlkS complements to implicative or aspectual predicates, such as those exemplified earlier on in (231-232), which are associated with entirely realis, non-modalized semantic interpretations, completely unrelated to the typical deontic modal interpretations that we observed with Subj1 or imperative clauses so far. Thus, under the view

\textsuperscript{82} In order to simplify the presentation, I will be referring to the language as Serbian throughout Sections 3.2 and 3.3, even when discussing those cases of subjunctive complementation where the latter exhibits the same properties as Croatian (i.e. non-control subjunctives), which will allow me to avoid unnecessary terminological complications.
of Subj1 clausal mood as a cluster of related morpho-syntactic and semantic properties that are shared between complements subsumed under this clause type (see 2.2), it is difficult to view complements such as those in (226-232) as part of the same mood category as the more typical intensional subjunctives.

Nevertheless, if we look at some other properties associated with BlkS control complements, then the analysis that would exclude them from the Subj1 clausal mood no longer appears as obvious. First of all, even though some control subjunctives, such as those in (231-232), do not exhibit the typical modal meanings that we observed with Subj1, others do. This is most obviously the case with control complements to deontic modal verbs, such as the one in (226) for instance, which exhibit the same type of deontic modality and world-to-word fit direction as the one we observed with intensional subjunctives and matrix imperatives. Therefore, we cannot systematically exclude all BlkS complements associated with obligatory-subject control from the Subj1 clausal mood analysis just on the basis of their semantic properties. It is also implausible to suggest that only some of these complements, such as the one in (226), should be subsumed under the Subj1 label, while others, such as those in (231-232), should not, because the formal properties associated with all of these complements, when it comes to their subjunctive morphological marking or subject control, for instance (as well as a number of other ones that we will observe later on), are essentially the same. Therefore, a principled analysis of Subj1 clausal mood in this context would need to either include all of the BlkS complements in (226-232) under this label or exclude them. Some of the data that will be presented in the following paragraphs will argue in favor of the former type of approach to these control subjunctives.

Recall that the basic distinction between Subj1-type complementation and other types of clauses where subjunctive morphology can appear, such as Subj2, was related to the notion of selection: Subj1 complements, unlike Subj2, were seen as lexically selected by the matrix predicate under a separate subjunctive clause type. As a result, the use of subjunctive morphology in Subj1 complements was shown to be obligatory, whereas Subj2 clauses exhibited more variability with the indicative mood, as we also observed in the context of BlkS Subj2 earlier on in (218-219). If we now approach BlkS control complements through the same prism, we can note that they pattern with Subj1, not with Subj2-type clauses in this context:

(237)  
Ivan trjabva da / *che dojde.  
John must SUBJ / IND come  
(Bulgarian)
The ungrammaticality stemming from the introduction of indicative markers in control BlkS complements exemplified above shows us that the use of subjunctive marking in such cases is obligatory, which suggests that such complements should also be seen as selected under the subjunctive clause type, rather than any other syntactic CP type.  

83 Some of the complements we noted earlier on in (226-232) may appear to constitute an exception in this context. This is the case, for instance, with complements introduced under the predicate know, exemplified earlier on in (228). As we can observe on the basis of Bulgarian examples below, this predicate can introduce both the indicative marker (che) and the subjunctive marker (da) in the embedded clause, differing in this sense from predicates such as those in (237-239) above:

(i) a. Znae, che toi e bil vtori v listata. know3.sg. IND he has been second on list-the  
   ‘He knows that he was second on the list.’
 b. Znae da pluva.  
   know3.sg. SUBJ swim3.sg.  
   ‘He knows how to swim.’

The mood variation in (i), however, should not be seen as the same case of syntactic optionality as the one we observed with Subj2-type clauses (e.g. 218-221). This is because the two embedded variants in (i) constitute two distinct clause types: the indicative variant in (ia) exhibits all the clausal properties associated with the indicative clause type, whereas the subjunctive variant in (ib) exhibits clausal properties that are more typical of the Subj1 clause type. As a result, for instance, the latter cannot be associated with the indicative-related independent tense, as shown by the ungrammaticality stemming from the introduction of past-tense markers in the embedded clause:

(ii) * Znam da e pluval vchera. know1.sg SUBJ has swum yesterday

In this sense, the subjunctive complement in (ii) patterns with Subj1 clauses, as opposed to indicatives.

Subj2-type complements, on the other hand, always exhibit the basic clausal properties related to the indicative clause type, regardless of the morphological mood marking (i.e. indicative vs. subjunctive) that appears in the embedded clause. Thus, for instance, as we observed several times already, Subj2 complements, such as the Greek and Bulgarian epistemic-type subjunctives exemplified in (224), can denote all types of temporal relations with respect to the matrix tense, including anteriority, pattering in this sense with indicatives. Later on in 6 we will see that this is only one of many clausal properties that such complements share with indicatives. As a result, the cases of mood-choice optionality involving Subj2, such as those we observed in the context of BlkS earlier on in (218-221), should be distinguished from those exemplified above in (i): in the former case, we have a single, indicative-CP selecting verb, which can optionally introduce subjunctive morphology in the embedded clause, producing only a slight shift in the modal interpretation (more on that in 6) but keeping all the basic indicative-related clausal properties; in the latter case, however, the optionality is only apparent, because we actually have two separate lexical entries (the factive know in (ia) and the dynamic modal know in (ib) in this particular case), one of which selects the indicative clause type, while the other selects the subjunctive (i.e. Subj1) clause type in its complement. Therefore, the use of subjunctive marking with the latter is actually obligatory.

83
Another indication that the control subjunctives we observed in (226-232) should be subsumed under the Subj1 label is the fact that they also exhibit other clausal properties that are characteristic of the subjunctive clause type. For instance, they pattern with the more typical intensional Subj1 complements when it comes to tense as well. As we can observe in the examples below, BlkS control subjunctives are subject to similar types of temporal restrictions as the ones we observe with intensional subjunctives, because both of these types of complements ban anterior tense readings.  

(240) a. * Hochu da je doshao juche. (Serbian)
    want1.sg. SUBJ has come yesterday
b. * Ma astept sa a venit ieri. (Romanian)
    me expect1.sg. SUBJ has come yesterday

(241) a. * Ivan trjabva da dojde vchera. (Bulgarian)
    John must SUBJ came3.sg. yesterday
b. * Ivan pokushava da je stigao juche. (Serbian)
    John tries SUBJ has arrived yesterday
c. * Toi zapochva da e karal kolata vchera. (Bulgarian)
    he begins SUBJ has driven car-the yesterday

In this sense, control subjunctives such as those in (241) differ not only from indicatives but also from BlkS Subj2 complements that we observed earlier on in 3.2.1, which were shown to be associated with indicative-type independent tense, as evidenced by the fact that they are compatible with anterior temporal readings:

(242) a. Pistevo na elise to provlima echtes. (Greek)
    believe1.sg. SUBJ solved3.sg. the problem yesterday
    ‘I think he solved the problem yesterday.’

84 In fact, the control subjunctive complements such as those in (241) will be shown to exhibit even more deficient temporal properties than the ones we observe with the more typical intensional subjunctives such as those in (240). In this context, the latter will be analyzed as associated with dependent tense, whereas the former will be seen as associated with completely anaphoric tense. Nevertheless, for the moment, the relevant observation is that they all exhibit more deficient temporal properties than indicatives or Subj2.
b. *Ne vjarvjam da dojde vchera.*  
   (Bulgarian)  
   not believe1.sg. SUBJ came3.sg. yesterday  
   ‘I don’t believe he came yesterday.’

All of this, therefore, strongly suggest that BlkS control complements should also be included under the Subj1 clausal-mood analysis, despite some of the atypical properties that they exhibit in this context. This is because all of them display at least some of the related formal and semantic patterns that characterize Subj1 clausal mood as such. For instance, control subjunctives were shown to exhibit the same relation between the obligatory morpho-syntactic marking for the subjunctive and the dependent temporal properties of the subjunctive that we also observed earlier on in the context of the more typical intensional Subj1 complements. Moreover, some control subjunctives, such as those selected by deontic modals, also exhibit a wider set of properties that are typical of the Subj1 clause type, because they denote the same type of modality that we observe in the more typical cases of Subj1 complementation as well. All of these observations point towards the conclusion that control subjunctives should be analyzed as Subj1-type clauses as well. This analysis will be further reinforced later on in 3.3 once we focus more closely on the formal relation that can be established between control subjunctives and intensional subjunctive complements in the context of the Subj1 clause type.

The Subj1-approach to BlkS control complements, however, brings forth a whole host of additional theoretical problems that will need to be addressed. Most importantly, it implies that BlkS Subj1 mood as such is associated with a much greater degree of formal and semantic diversity than the one we typically observe with the Subj1 clausal mood across languages, which makes it difficult to subsume BlkS under a broader cross-linguistic approach to Subj1. This is the primary reason why I chose to place the central theoretical focus of my study of Slavic subjunctive on those Slavic languages that are situated in the Balkan region.

The diverse properties associated with BlkS Subj1 will ultimately be explained in light of the broader analysis of the subjunctive that I proposed in the first part of the dissertation, specifically in light of the claim that Subj1 clause type should be seen as the default syntactic option in embedded contexts, as well as the claim that clauses of this type can be subject to varying degrees of structural truncation, which can lead to both formal syntactic contrasts as well as interpretative contrasts once the structure associated with different types of Subj1 complements reaches the interface with semantics. Before I move on to analyze BlkS distribution through this broader theoretical prism, I will first use the next section to precisely
list and catalogue all the Subj1-selecting predicates that I will be dealing with throughout the remainder of this chapter.

3.2.3 BlkS Subj1-selecting predicates

Here I will classify BlkS Subj1-selecting predicates into different groups on the basis of the relevant properties that they and their complements exhibit, which distinguish them from other groups of complements. The first division that needs to be established in this context concerns the more typical intensional subjunctives, such as those we observed earlier on in (214-217). As I already alluded to previously in Chapter 2 when I first discussed some of the properties related to Balkan Slavic complements of this type (see 2.4.2.2 in particular), the latter should be divided in two separate groups, because one can observe some systematic contrasts when it comes to the formal and semantic properties that they exhibit (more on those later). The first group of complements in this context are those selected by directive predicates (e.g. order, request, tell etc.), which were defined earlier on as embedded imperatives, and which were argued to exhibit the full feature range associated with the subjunctive/imperative CP. The second group, on the other hand, includes all the remaining intensional-type subjunctives, selected by verbs such as desideratives, as well as a number of other irrealis predicates (e.g. expect, suggest, accept etc.), which still exhibit the broad semantic properties typical of the subjunctive clausal mood but which no longer contain the full feature cluster related to Subj1 CP. In order to distinguish between the two relevant groups of predicates in this context, I will refer to the former as directives and to the latter simply as future-referring predicates.

The remaining divisions that I will establish in the context of my analysis of BlkS distribution concern the control predicates that we looked at earlier on in 3.2.2. The first group of BlkS-selecting control predicates that needs to be outlined here are modals, which should be divided in two types: deontic modals (e.g. should, must), which denote world-to-word-type meanings, and dynamic modals (e.g. can), which are related to notions such as ability or capacity. It is important to make the distinction between these two types of modal verbs because, while the former are still associated with the deontic modal interpretations that are typical of the Subj1 and the imperative clausal mood, the latter denote more realis-type interpretations which are less typical in this context. The dynamic-modal group will also
subsume verbs of knowing (e.g. *know, learn*), because the subjunctive-selecting variants of these verbs are associated with a dynamic modal reading (Roussou, 2009). 85

The remaining verb groups that I will be dealing with in 3.3 are those that, on the surface, appear as most problematic for the analysis of BlkS Subj1 as a clausal mood, because they select the subjunctive despite the fact that they are associated with entirely realis, non-modalized interpretations. They can also be divided into two groups: *implicatives* (e.g. *manage, succeed*) and *aspectuals* (e.g. *begin, continue, finish*). The main challenge I will be faced with when it comes to complements selected by these types of predicates will be to incorporate them alongside the more typical intensional subjunctives under the same Subj1 clausal mood analysis.

All the BlkS-selecting verb groups that I will be dealing with in my subsequent analysis can thus be summarized as follows:

(243) a. Directives (e.g. *order, command, tell, beg*)
b. Future-referring predicates (e.g. *want, prefer, suggest, expect, accept*)
c. Deontic modals: (e.g. *must, should*)
d. Dynamic modals (e.g. *can, know (how to]*)
e. Implicatives (e.g. *succeed, manage, dare*)
f. Aspectuals (e.g. *begin, continue*)

While the list in (243) does not necessarily include each and every BlkS-selecting predicate, the analysis I will propose in the following section should be broadly applicable to all cases of BlkS Subj1 complementation. Moreover, given the fact that the same basic subjunctive complementation patterns were shown to obtain throughout Balkan languages (modulo some regional differences related to infinitive loss that were explained earlier on), the conclusions I reach later on in 3.3, even though they will be primarily based on Balkan-Slavic data, should apply to BlkS in general.

---

85 See n.83 for an explanation as to why the apparent mood optionality related to complements introduced under such predicates (i.e. the introduction of subjunctive vs. indicative mood in the embedded clause) is not the same as the one we observe in Subj2 cases, and why such predicates should nonetheless be associated with the Subj1 clause type.
3.3 BlkS distribution: Analysis

This section will be of crucial importance in the context of the overall argument in this thesis, because the analysis I will put forward here will allow me not just to provide a coherent account of BlkS-related data, but it will also result in a number of generalizations which will then be used as the basis for my subsequent study of the remaining, non-Balkan Slavic languages (primarily Russian) that I will deal with later on in Chapter 4.

The main problem that I will be facing in my study of BlkS distribution has to do with the formal and semantic diversity that we observed between complements subsumed under the BlkS Subj1 clause type, which makes it difficult to incorporate the latter within a broader, cross-linguistic analysis of the subjunctive as a clausal mood. Given the overall theoretical assumption that I am working under in this thesis- i.e. the idea that subjunctive should be seen as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon-, the starting hypothesis in this context will be that the main semantic differences that can be observed between various BlkS complements should be explained by some type of related contrasts pertaining to the underlying syntactic structure associated with these clauses, which can result in different structural outputs at LF. Thus, before I delve deeper into my study of BlkS distribution, I will begin by first presenting a more detailed description of the basic clausal structure that I will assume to be relevant in the context of the BlkS Subj1 clause type, and then I will use this basic structure as a starting point for my subsequent analysis of the formal and semantic contrasts that can be observed between various types of BlkS complements.

The analysis of BlkS derivation that I proposed in the previous parts of this chapter was done within a relatively simple structural framework, corresponding to the syntactic representation in (244) below, which was sufficient to account for the basic syntactic properties pertaining to the more typical intensional subjunctives in Balkan Slavic languages.

(244)  [CP  C_{\text{uDeo}}  [ModP  Mod_{\text{Deo}}  [TP  T  [vP]]]]^{86}

The most relevant parts of the structure in the context of my previous analysis were the subjunctive C-head and the Mod-head, which introduced the uF and iF instances of the Deo(ntic)-feature, as well as the lower T-head, which was argued to be the locus of insertion of

---

86 Feature-checking and feature-transfer mechanisms involving Deo (see 3.1.3.3 or 3.1.4.3) will be of less relevance for the analysis in 3.3, so I will abstract away from it here.
BlkS markers. The analysis that I will go on to propose in the context of BlkS distribution will require a slight articulation of the basic Subj1 clausal structure in (244).

First of all, I will reintroduce the notion of a hierarchical feature cluster that is associated with the subjunctive/imperative C-head, which I proposed earlier on in 2.4 in order to account for the common clausal properties observed between matrix imperatives and embedded subjunctives. Recall that the C-head in question was claimed to contain an operator consisting of a higher, clause-typing $i$Dir(ective) feature as well as the lower $u$Deo feature that I already used in my analysis:

\[(245) \quad [\text{CP } C_{\text{Dir}}>u\text{Deo}]\]

Another part of the left-periphery structure pertaining to Subj1 clauses where I will apply a slightly more articulated syntactic analysis has to do with the modality-related domain below CP. Instead of viewing the latter as consisting of a single modal projection, as in (244), I will analyze it as consisting of a syntactic layer which contains two separate modal projections: the higher ModP, which encodes deontic modality and contains $i$Deo (thus basically corresponding to the properties of ModP as they were analyzed before), and the lower ModP, which encodes dynamic modality related to notions such as ability or capacity.\(^87\) The latter will also be seen as associated with an interpretable modal feature, labeled $i$Dyn(amic).

\[(246) \quad [\text{CP } [\text{ModP}_{\text{Deontic }} \text{Mod}_{i\text{Deo}} [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic }} \text{Mod}_{i\text{Dyn}} [\text{TP}]]]]\]

The two modal features in (246) should be analyzed in terms of a feature superset-subset relation: the higher Deo structurally dominates and semantically contains the lower Dyn.

The broader theoretical motivation for this type of feature superset-subset analysis pertaining to the modality layer in (246) has to do with some of the more general semantic properties that were observed in relation to clauses that denote deontic modality, such as imperatives. The latter were usually seen as incompatible with counter-factual interpretations, which means that they must entail at least the possibility that the proposition denoted by the directive utterance they involve can be fulfilled at some point (see Jary & Kissine (2014) and the references therein). Therefore, this implies that such utterances entail the ability/capacity on the

\(^87\) See the earlier discussion in 1.2.2 for more detail on these different types of modality.
part of the individual or entity towards whom the deontic-type expression is directed to act in accordance with the latter, as illustrated (247) below:

(247) \textit{You must teach me French.} > \textit{You can (i.e. are able to) teach me French.}

Given the overall syntax-semantics mapping approach I am assuming here, I will argue that this semantic requirement should be encoded at the level of syntax as well, which is achieved through the feature superset-subset relation involving Deo$\triangleright$Dyn, as we saw in (246).

Thus, the full description of the Subj1 clausal structure that I will be using in my subsequent analysis of BlkS corresponds to the representation below:

(248) \[\text{[CP C}_{\text{Dir}}\triangleright \text{aDeo} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Deontic}} \ \text{Mod}_{\text{Deo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}} \ \text{Mod}_{\text{Dyn}} \ [\text{TP T[vP\ldots]]}]]}\]

All of the formal and semantic contrasts that we observed between various BlkS complements, as well as a number of additional ones that we will observe later on, will be explained in light of the syntactic structure in (248). This is where some of the more general syntactic properties that were claimed to be associated with the subjunctive clause type will come into play, most importantly its permeability to structural truncation: different types of BlkS complements will be shown to truncate varying chunks of the basic Subj1 clausal structure in (248) before they reach the interface with semantics, explaining the contrasting properties that they exhibit in various different areas.

The main observation that will be made in this context is that the type of interpretation that a given BlkS complement is associated with is crucially dependent on the size of its underlying structure, particularly as it pertains to the left periphery of the clause. Complements associated with a more articulated left-periphery structure in (248) will also be semantically closer to the types of meaning that we usually observe with intensional subjunctive or imperative clauses, whereas complements whose structure is more truncated will be more semantically atypical in this sense. This correlation will be formally accounted for through feature superset-subset relations: BlkS complements with larger structures also send more features related to the subjunctive/imperative clause structure in (248) to LF, and hence their meaning is more specified and closer to the typical subjunctive/imperative meaning, whereas complements with more truncated structures send less of these features to LF, which is why
their meaning is less specified and further removed from the typical subjunctive/imperative semantics.

In order to apply the general analysis outlined above to concrete BlkS-related data, I will first focus on the syntactic contrasts that can be observed between various BlkS complements (3.3.1-3.3.2) and then I will analyze the semantic repercussions of such contrasts at LF (3.3.3). The ultimate conclusion of this analysis will be that the overall semantics related to the BlkS Subj1 clausal mood should be viewed in terms of a scale of related, hierarchical and structure-dependent meanings, which I will call the subjunctivity scale (as in Socanac, 2012). Then, in Chapter 4, I will assess whether a similar type of analysis can be applied to the Subj1 mood in the context of RusS as well.

3.3.1 Control properties of BlkS complements

The most obvious formal contrast that can be observed between various BlkS complements, which we already touched on in 3.2, is related to their control properties: on the one hand, we have complements that exhibit obligatory co-reference between the matrix and the embedded subject and, on the other, we have those that do not. According to the terminology in Landau (2004), the former are defined as control subjunctives and the latter as free subjunctives. The latter are exemplified in (249) and the former in (250).

(249) a. *Ivan* i *iska da dojde* ij i *j* utre. (Bulgarian)
    John wants SUBJ come3.sg. tomorrow
    ‘John wants (him) to come tomorrow.’

b. Peter i ochekuje da *dodje* ij ij sutra. (Serbian)
    Peter expects SUBJ come3.sg. tomorrow
    ‘Peter expects (him) to come tomorrow.’

c. *Ivan* i *predlaga da dojde* ij utre. (Bulgarian)
    John suggests SUBJ come3.sg. tomorrow
    ‘John suggests (for him) to come tomorrow.’

(250) a. *Marko* može da *dodje* ij i sutra. (Serbian)
    Mark can SUBJ come3.sg. tomorrow
    ‘Mark can (*for him) to come tomorrow.’
b. *Ivan* uspja da *dojdev$^\mathrm{nj}$ navreme.  
John managed SUBJ come3.sg. on-time  
‘John managed (*for him) to come on time.’

c. *Petar* je pocheo da *studirav$^\mathrm{nj}$ pravo.*  
Peter has begun SUBJ study3.sg. law  
‘Peter began (*for him) to study law.’

As I already explained in 3.2., subject control in the context of BlkS is syntactically manifested through obligatory agreement sharing between the matrix and the embedded predicate, which are both finite and inflected for person and number. As we saw in (233-235), the introduction of predicates with distinct $\phi$-features in the context of obligatory-control complements such as those in (250) results in ungrammaticality. On the other hand, clauses that are not associated with obligatory control allow for the predicates to exhibit different $\phi$-features. Moreover, as we can observe in (249), in those cases where the predicates are associated with common $\phi$-features, such clauses allow for both conjoined and disjoined readings between the matrix and the embedded subject, which is why Landau defined them as free subjunctives.

Nevertheless, the differences between various BlkS complements when it comes to control are not as straightforward as suggested by the simple binary distinction between ‘control’ and ‘free’ subjunctives put forward in Landau (2004). This is because not all complements defined by Landau as ‘free subjunctives’ involve simple free reference when it comes to the embedded subject, as the examples in (249) would suggest. Recall in particular the discussion we had earlier on in Chapter 2 (Section 2.4) when we looked at the shared anti-control properties observed between subjunctive and imperative clauses. There we noted that, even though Balkan Slavic languages such as Serbian or Bulgarian do not exhibit the anti-control effect of subject obviation as widely as some of their cross-linguistic counterparts, which would ban conjoined readings in complements such as those in (249) as well, they nonetheless contain some subjunctive complements where subject obviation does obtain. This was shown to be the case in complements selected by directive predicates, such as those in (251):

(251) a. *Ivan* naredjuje da *pro$^{*i/j}$ dodje.*  
John orders SUBJ he come3.sg.
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Therefore, rather than adopting a simple ‘control vs. free subjunctive’ distinction in relation to BlkS control data, we should establish a 3-way split in this context: firstly, we have complements selected by control verbs, which force a conjoined reading between subjects, as in (250); then there are complements, selected by future-referring predicates of the type exemplified in (249), which allow for subject free reference; and finally, we have complements that force subject obviation (i.e. complements to directives), as in (251). Thus, while I will adopt Landau’s terminology in the context of control subjunctives, I will not use his ‘free-subjunctive’ label, because the data in (251) showed that not all BlkS complements that appear outside of obligatory control environments are equally ‘free’ when it comes to embedded subject reference. Rather, I will use the labels ‘Control subjunctive’ and ‘Non-control subjunctive’ in this context (C vs. NC subjunctive from now on), with the latter subsuming both free subjunctives and obviative subjunctives. In the following paragraphs, I will provide a more detailed formal explanation for this 3-way split with respect to control in the context of BlkS, which will then be related to a whole series of other formal differences that will be noticed between various BlkS complements later on.

I will begin by accounting for the differences in the referential properties of the embedded subject that can be observed in the context of NC subjunctives- i.e. the contrast between free subject reference and subject obviation-, which will not require too much development because they were already explained in some detail earlier on in 2.4. Recall that the difference between obviative subjunctives, such as those in (251), and free subjunctives, such as those in (249), were explained in light of the underlying feature make-up of the subjunctive/imperative CP projection. The relevant feature in this context is the clause-typing Dir, i.e. the highest feature within the structure in (248). Dir was claimed to establish an anti-control effect with respect to an external illocutionary point of reference both in the context of simple imperatives and in embedded subjunctives that contain this feature (i.e. with respect to the speaker in the former case, and with respect to the matrix subject in the latter case), explaining why we do not observe imperatives in first person singular, as well as accounting for the effect of subject obviation we observe in subjunctives that contain Dir (which was shown to obtain independently of some of the broader linguistic phenomena, such as the subjunctive-
infinitive competition, as I explained earlier on in 2.4). Given this analysis, the (anti)control contrasts between complements in (249) and those in (251) can be explained in a straightforward manner: the latter type of complements maintain Dir in their CP-structure (which is also why they are semantically associated with embedded-imperative interpretations), whereas the former strip it. The difference is schematized below in (252-253):

(252) Subject obviation: CP\textsubscript{Dir$\triangleright$Deo}

(253) Subject free reference: CP\textsubscript{Deo$\triangleright$Deo}

On the other hand, when it comes to the control-related contrasts that we observed between NC subjunctives and C subjunctives, they will be explained through further structural truncation. The differences that these complements exhibit in this context will be analyzed in light of the phasal approach to syntax (see 1.3.3 or 2.3). As I outlined earlier on in 1.3, the standard phasal analysis (based on Chomsky (2001)) identifies syntactic phases with the projections CP and vP. The relevant phase in the context of the present analysis is CP, given that the control data we are looking at here involve inter-clausal dependencies. Recall, once again, that Chomsky defined phases as syntactically opaque domains, functioning in accordance with the PIC constraint (reproduced below).

(254) In phase $\alpha$ with head $H$, the domain of $H$ is not accessible to operations outside $\alpha$, but only $H$ and its edge.

C subjunctives are potentially problematic when it comes to PIC, given that subject control involves a cross-clausal binding relationship between the subject of the matrix clause and the empty anaphoric subject of the embedded clause (I will refer to the latter as PRO, following the standard terminology that is used in the cross-linguistic literature on control\textsuperscript{88}). Moreover, since

\textsuperscript{88} I should note, however, that there is some disagreement in Balkan literature as to the exact formal properties of the empty anaphoric subject in control subjunctives. Some authors have analyzed the latter as PRO (Iatridou, 1993; Varlokosta, 1994; Krapova, 1998 a.o.); others analyzed it as an obligatorily-coreferential pro (Farkas, 1984; Turano, 1994; Philippaki-Warburton, 1987 a.o.). I will not evaluate these perspectives in much detail here, since control per se is not my main concern, but the analysis I will propose in this section will lead me to the conclusion that both PRO and pro exist as possibilities in the context of control readings in BlkS, the former obtaining in cases of obligatory control, where only the conjoined reading between the matrix and the embedded subject is available, and the latter obtaining in optional control (i.e. with complements to desideratives and other future-referring predicates of the type exemplified in (249)), where both conjoined and disjoined readings are possible.
the control reading in C subjunctives is obligatory and not context-dependent, the binding relationship in question should be seen as syntactic in nature, i.e the matrix and the embedded subject are co-indexed before the structure reaches the interface with semantics, leaving the control reading as the only semantic option in this context. Thus, given that this type of binding involves a syntactic operation that crosses a clausal boundary, it poses some PIC-related issues.

The strict version of PIC in (254) can be salvaged in light of BlkS control data in one of two ways: we can either somehow associate the embedded PRO subject with the CP-phase edge (proposing that it climbs to the embedded SpecCP position, for instance), which would make it accessible to syntactic binding by the matrix subject, or we can propose that C subjunctives constitute non-phasal, non-CP domains, which would render PIC void when it comes to subject control. I will adopt the latter type of approach in this context, because BlkS C complements will be shown to exhibit a number of properties characteristic of non-phasal domains, not just in relation to control but also when it comes to a series of other syntactic phenomena (as we will observe in more detail later on in 3.3.2).

The CP-truncation analysis in relation to BlkS C subjunctives thus allows us to maintain the broader PIC principle in light of BlkS control data, because it accounts for the possibility of a matrix-embedded syntactic control relationship in this context. Nevertheless, it still does not directly account for the obligatory nature of this relationship. In other words, the analysis introduced so far can explain why the anaphoric PRO subject can be introduced in the structure associated with BlkS C complements, but one still needs to explain why no other type of embedded subject (i.e. lexical or pro subject) is possible in this context. In the following paragraphs, I will develop a formal analysis that accounts for this fact as well.

When it comes to some of the more traditional approaches to PRO/control, such as those developed within the GB framework, this phenomenon was usually formally explained by referring to the case requirements of the embedded subject, and the differences in the case-assigning properties associated with different types of clausal heads (Chomsky, 1981; Chomsky&Lasnik, 1993 a.o.). In this sense, obligatory control was usually related to non-finiteness and/or temporal anaphoricity of clauses: the idea was that an anaphoric, non-finite clausal head I (reanalyzed as T later on in minimalism) cannot assign contentful case to the embedded subject, thus precluding the possibility for the independent lexical (or pro) subject to appear in the embedded clause. For instance, Chomsky (1981) claimed that such an anaphoric I cannot assign any case at all, whereas Chomsky&Lasnik (1993) posited that it can only assign null case. In any event, the fact that such an I-head cannot assign contentful case meant that it
cannot license an independent embedded subject, leaving the anaphoric PRO as the only syntactic option.

Non-finiteness as such cannot be used as an explanation for the control data pertaining to BlkS complementation, given that, as we already observed several times, subject control in this context is obtained in finite subjunctive complements via the mechanism of obligatory agreement sharing between the matrix and the embedded predicate. Nevertheless, the link that was established between obligatory control and the temporal anaphoricity of a given complement can be maintained in the context of BlkS as well: as we will observe in more detail in the following section, once I focus more specifically on the issue of tense, even though all BlkS Subj1 complements exhibit more deficient and dependent tense properties than indicatives, C subjunctives are even more temporally anaphoric than NC subjunctives. The structural analysis that I will propose here in order to account for the obligatory control property observed with BlkS C complements will then also subsequently allow me to explain the tense contrasts (as well as a whole host of additional contrasts that we will observe later in) that obtain between different types of BlkS complements.

The contrasts pertaining to BlkS control data will be explained by looking at the way in which the structural make-up of the embedded left periphery (specifically the presence vs. absence of the subjunctive CP projection) can affect subject licensing in a given type of BlkS complement. When it comes to subject syntax more generally, I will not be assuming the traditional, GB-type analysis, which relates the subject to the SpecTP/IP position (Chomsky, 1981). Instead, I will assume a more cartographic-type approach in this context, claiming that the subject is associated with its own functional projection, namely SubjP, which is situated higher up in the left periphery of the clause (as suggested by Rizzi (2006) or Rizzi&Shlonsky (2006), a.o.), as illustrated (in simplified terms) below:89

(255)  [CP  [SubjP  [TP…]]]

Furthermore, I will assume that any type of lexical/pro subject must be associated with SubjP in order to be licensed in a given clause.90 Conversely, the anaphoric PRO, which requires

---

89 I will not be concerned with the exact positioning of SubjP in the context of the articulated CP-structure put forward in Rizzi (1997). For the purposes of the present discussion, it is sufficient to simply relate SubjP to the higher clausal domain (as opposed to some lower EPP-related position).

90 Whether this is related to case assignment or to some other syntactic constraint on the subject, such as the Subject Criterion, as proposed by Rizzi (2006), is less relevant for the purposes of the present analysis, which is why I will remain agnostic in this context. I also remain agnostic as to the question of whether the subject must always be
control by the matrix subject (or some other antecedent), is the result of the absence of SubjP from the structure.

The structural explanation for the contrasts that different types of BlkS complements were shown to exhibit in this context is then more or less straightforward, given the CP-truncation analysis presented earlier on: the truncation of CP that C subjunctives undergo also affects the high left-periphery projection SubjP, which is therefore pruned from the underlying structure associated with these types of clauses as well, as illustrated below in (256):

(256) \[[CP-[SubjP \ [TP]])\]

Hence, no independent lexical/pro subject can be licensed in this type of syntactic environment, and the result is obligatory subject control. On the other hand, NC complements must be analyzed as maintaining the embedded CP, not just because they allow for an independent embedded subject but also, more generally, because they do not typically exhibit the syntactic properties characteristic of non-phasal, non-CP domains (see 2.3.2 or the following section). As a result, given the structure in (255), where we see that SubjP is realized below CP, the fact that such complements maintain CP also implies that SubjP must remain present in their structure, allowing for an independent lexical/pro subject to be introduced in the embedded clause, while excluding PRO as an option.

The structural truncation analysis that I just presented thus allows to provide a full formal account for the 3-way split that was noted at the beginning of this section between various BlkS complements in the context of control (i.e. subject obviation vs. free reference vs. obligatory control). Complements to directive predicates maintain the full structure associated with the subjunctive CP, including the highest anti-control Dir feature contained in C, thus forcing subject obviation; complements to future-referring predicates strip the highest Dir feature but maintain the subjunctive CP in their structure- and hence necessarily maintain SubjP as well-, thus allowing for an independent embedded subject whose reference is free; and finally, the subjunctive complements to remaining verb groups outlined in (243), i.e. C subjunctives, have a truncated left periphery, pruning both CP and SubjP, and hence they

---

situatéd in SubjP (either overtly or at LF) or whether it can also establish some type of long-distance relationship with the Subj-head (when it is in a post-verbal position, for instance). The main claim is that SubjP must be present in the structure in order to license an independent lexical/pro subject.
exhibit obligatory control. The relevant examples and their structural representations are reproduced below in (257-259).\textsuperscript{91}

\[(257)\quad [\text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{Dir} \rightarrow \text{Deo} \quad \text{[SubjP} \quad \text{[TP…]]]\text{]}\]

\[\text{Ivan, je zapovedio da (pro}_{\phi j} \quad \text{dodje}.\quad \text{(Serbian)}\]

\[\text{John has ordered SUBJ *(him) come3.sg.}\]

\[(258)\quad [\text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{Dir} \rightarrow \text{Deo} \quad \text{[SubjP} \quad \text{[TP…]]}\text{]}\]

\[\text{Ivan, iska (pro}_{\phi j} \quad \text{da dojde}.\quad \text{(Bulgarian)}\]

\[\text{John wants (him) SUBJ come3.sg.}\]

\[(259)\quad [\text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{Dir} \rightarrow \text{Deo} \quad \text{[SubjP} \quad \text{[TP…]]}\text{]}\]

\[\text{Ivan, trjabva (PRO}_{\psi \eta} \quad \text{da dojde}.\quad \text{(Bulgarian)}\]

\[\text{John must *(him) SUBJ come3.sg.}\]

The structural account of BlkS control data I just presented also entails some wider implications when it comes to the analysis of empty subjects in Balkan languages. As I briefly hinted earlier on (see n.88), there is no agreement in the Balkan literature as to the exact syntactic nature of BlkS-related empty subjects in cases involving control readings, with some authors analyzing them as PRO and others as pro. The analysis I just presented suggests that both of these options are available in the context of BlkS, with the use of PRO vs. pro dependent on whether the conjoined reading is obligatory or optional. In cases of obligatory subject control in C subjunctives, which correspond to the structure in (259), the subject must be PRO, given that the structural truncation of the left periphery that such complements undergo affects SubjP as well, excluding pro as an option. On the other hand, when it comes to complements of the type exemplified in (258), which allow both for the disjoined and the conjoined reading pertaining to the embedded empty subject, the latter must be analyzed as pro, given that such complements maintain SubjP, which precludes PRO as an option. The referential properties of this pro subject (i.e. conjoined vs. disjoined reading) in cases where the matrix and the

\textsuperscript{91}I discard the modal projections that are not relevant for the present analysis of control.
embedded predicates exhibit common φ-features are then not determined in syntax but on a semantico-pragmatic basis (which explains why the control reading in such cases is context-dependent). Therefore, the conjoined subject readings that we observe with these complements do not violate PIC, since the latter is a syntactic constraint.

We have thus seen how the structural truncation account I proposed in the context of BlkS allows to explain the differences in control properties that can be observed between different types of BlkS complements. In the following section, I will further reinforce this analysis by presenting a number of additional contrasts that various BlkS complements exhibit, all of which will be straightforwardly explained under the syntactic approach proposed here.

3.3.2 C vs. NC BlkS complements: Syntactic transparency and phasehood

The data that will be presented in this section will allow us to observe some additional differences related to the phasal status associated with various types of BlkS complements, specifically C and NC subjunctives, which are predicted by the analysis developed in 3.3.1. In this context, we will see that NC BlkS complements exhibit properties that are typical of recursive CP structures, whereas C subjunctives pattern more closely with simple clausal domains when it comes to their syntax. This is expected given the CP-truncation analysis of C BlkS complements, which implies that such clauses are associated with a single, matrix CP. I will begin by studying the contrasts between NC and C complements that can be observed in the area of clausal tense, which I already alluded to in the previous section, and then I will look at some additional data of a purely formal nature that will further reinforce the present analysis.

3.3.2.1 Tense: Dependence vs. anaphoricity

As I already briefly mentioned in 3.3.1, even though BlkS Subj1 complements in general exhibit more dependent temporal properties than indicatives (or Subj2), one can also observe some additional tense-related contrasts between different types of Subj1 complements themselves. Various authors (Krapova, 1998; Landau, 2004; Varlokosta, 1993 a.o.) have noted that C BlkS complements exhibit even more anaphoric properties than NC subjunctives in this context.92

---

92 The contrasts that we will observe here between NC and C subjunctives are identical to those we observed earlier on in 2.3.2 between intensional-type Subj1 complements and control infinitivals (see (93-95)). The latter exhibited the same types of anaphoric tense properties as those that will be observed here with C BlkS complements. This
For instance, Krapova (1998) showed that Bulgarian NC subjunctive complements differ from their C counterparts in that they exhibit at least some independent temporal content, whereas the latter are entirely anaphoric in this sense. This was demonstrated by the fact that NC subjunctives in this language can introduce an embedded tense marker which conflicts with the matrix tense (as long as the latter is compatible with the future-referring tense interval associated with the subjunctive), whereas C subjunctives cannot, hence the grammaticality contrasts below:

(260) \textit{Iskah} \textit{da} \textit{dojdes} \textit{vchera} / \textit{utre}. \hspace{1cm} \textit{(Bulgarian)}

\hspace{1cm} \text{wanted1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg. yesterday / tomorrow}

\hspace{1cm} ‘I wanted you to come yesterday / tomorrow.’

\hspace{1cm} (Krapova, 1998: 82)

(261) \textit{Ne mozha} \textit{da} \textit{kupja} \textit{knigata} \textit{vchera} / \textit{* utre}.

\hspace{1cm} \text{not could1.sg. SUBJ buy1.sg. book-the yesterday / tomorrow}

\hspace{1cm} ‘I could not buy the book yesterday / *tomorrow.’

\hspace{1cm} (Krapova, 1998: 83)

As we can see in (260), it is possible to insert a future-tense marker in a Bulgarian NC subjunctive complement even though the matrix tense is past, whereas with C subjunctives in (261) this results in ungrammaticality, and the only type of tense marker that is allowed in the embedded clause is the one that corresponds to the matrix tense- i.e. a past adverbial. In (262-263) below, we can observe that the same type of contrast obtains in Serbian as well:

(262) \textit{Naredio} \textit{sam} \textit{da} \textit{dodjesh} \textit{juche} / \textit{sutra}.

\hspace{1cm} \text{ordered have1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg. yesterday / tomorrow}

\hspace{1cm} ‘I ordered you to come yesterday / tomorrow.’

(263) \textit{Pocheo} \textit{sam} \textit{da} \textit{vozim} \textit{auto} \textit{juche} / \textit{* sutra}.

\hspace{1cm} \text{begun have1.sg. SUBJ drive1.sg. car yesterday / tomorrow}

\hspace{1cm} ‘I began to drive the car yesterday / *tomorrow.’

will serve as one of the motivations for the common analysis that will be proposed in relation to these two types of clauses later on in Chapter 4 (see 4.2.3 in particular).
Krapova (1998) used this type of data in order to make a broader temporal distinction between the two types of complements exemplified in (260-263). She argued that NC subjunctives, such as those in (260) or (262), should be seen as associated with dependent tense, which is restricted on the basis of the temporal coordinates associated with the matrix predicate but is not entirely identical to the matrix tense, whereas C subjunctives, such as those in (261) or (263), exhibit entirely anaphoric tense, which is identical to the tense of the matrix clause. In other words, while NC complements are associated with a dependent but a distinct time frame, which is not part of the matrix time frame, C complements are incorporated into the matrix time frame. I will be adopting Krapova’s observations in my analysis as well, but I will propose a different formal explanation in order to account for them.

While Krapova proposed a lexicalist-type account in order to explain the temporal contrasts we observed in (260-263), arguing that the T-heads associated with NC and C subjunctives exhibit different feature content ($T_{\text{nominative}}$ vs. $T_{\text{null}}$, respectively), this additional stipulation is not necessary in the context of my analysis, because the observations we just made are perfectly compatible with the structural CP-truncation account I introduced earlier on. The claim that C subjunctives truncate the embedded CP entails that the entire structure in such cases is syntactically incorporated into the matrix CP clausal domain, and can therefore only be associated with a single, matrix time frame. As a result, C-subjunctives behave in exactly the same way as simple clausal domains in this context, given that we also cannot introduce conflicting tense markers within the confines of a single clause:

(264) a. *Dojdoh vchera / *utre.*
         came1.sg. yesterday / tomorrow
   ‘I came yesterday / *tomorrow.’

b. *Odoshe juche / * sutra.*
      left3.pl. yesterday / tomorrow
   ‘They left yesterday / *tomorrow.’

NC subjunctives, on the other hand, maintain their CP, and are hence interpreted as a separate clause with a distinct time frame, hence the grammaticality contrasts in (260-263). The fact that such complements are nonetheless more temporally dependent on the matrix clause than is the case with indicatives can be accounted for given the broader analysis of the subjunctive CP as a deficient phase, proposed earlier on in 2.3.
In the following several subsections, we will observe some additional data, which are more formal in nature, where C and NC subjunctives will be shown to exhibit similar types of contrasts related to syntactic transparency and their phasal status as the ones we just observed in the context of tense and control, which will thus further confirm the present analysis. The first several sets of syntactic tests that I will use in order to demonstrate the relevant contrasts between these two types of BlkS complements in terms of phasehood will be taken from Todorovic (2012). Given that Todorovic primarily focused on subjunctive complements in Serbian, the following analysis will be mostly based on data pertaining to this language.

3.3.2.2 Negation scope

The tests that I will take from Todorovic (2012) are based on the phenomena of negative polarity item (NPI) binding and negation scope, both of which will be useful to demonstrate the differences between C and NC subjunctives in terms of their phasal status and the structure of their left periphery. I will begin with the test based on negation scope, since I already briefly introduced it earlier on at the end of 3.1.4. Todorovic noticed a contrast in this context between indicative complements, which allow negation to take both wide scope over the matrix clause (265), and control subjunctive complements, which only allow for wide negation scope over the embedded clause (265), and control subjunctive complements, which only allow for wide negation scope over the matrix clause (266):

(265) a. Ne tvrdi da zna francuski.
    not claim3.sg. thatIND know3.sg. French
    ‘He doesn’t claim he knows French.’

b. Tvrdi da ne zna francuski.
    claim3.sg. thatIND not know3.sg. French
    ‘He claims he doesn’t know French.’
    (Todorovic, 2012: 138)

(266) a. Ne moram da napisem zadachu.
    not have-to1.sg. SUBJ write1.sg. homework
    ‘I don’t have to write my homework.’
   have-to1.sg. SUBJ not write1.sg. homework
   (Todorovic, 2012: 139)

Todorovic explained the contrast between (265) and (266) in light of her claim that the subjunctive-related *da* is inserted in a relatively low structural position, where it stays throughout the derivation (see 3.1.4.4). On the other hand, negation was usually analyzed as associated with a functional projection NegP, which is situated higher up in the structure (Kayne, 1989; Laka, 1989; Pollock, 1989; Zanuttini, 1989 a.o.). Todorovic thus claimed that negation also occupies a higher structural position than the subjunctive *da*, explaining why the latter cannot scope over the former, hence the ungrammaticality in (266b).

However, the grammaticality contrast in (266) only applies to C subjunctives: as we already briefly observed at the end of 3.1.4, NC subjunctives generally allow negation to take both wide scope over the entire sentence as well as narrow scope over the embedded clause, as we can see through some additional examples below:

(267) a. Ne zhelim da Ivan dodje.
   not want1.sg. SUBJ John come3.sg.
   ‘I don’t want John to come.’

   b. Zhelim da Ivan ne dodje.
   want1.sg. SUBJ John not come3.sg.
   ‘I want John not to come.’

(268) a. Ne inzistiram da Ivan dodje.
   not insist1.sg. SUBJ John come3.sg.
   ‘I don’t insist that John comes.’

   b. Inzistiram da Ivan ne dodje.
   insist1.sg. SUBJ John not come3.sg.
   ‘I insist that John not come.’

The contrasts in terms of negation scope between (266), on the one hand, and (267-268), on the other, can once again be straightforwardly accounted for in light of the CP-truncation analysis proposed earlier on. Given that negation is assumed to be associated with a relatively high
functional projection NegP, the structural truncation of the embedded left periphery that I claim
takes place with C subjunctives also affects this high NegP, thus banning negation from
appearing in the embedded clause and taking narrow scope over it. When it comes to NC
subjunctives, on the other hand, which are assumed to maintain their CP, they can license
embedded negation because they can host NegP in their structure, given that the latter is realized
below CP. The structural contrast between the two types of clauses in this context is schematized in (269):93

(269) a. [CP [NegP [TP]]] – NC subjunctives
    b. [CP – [NegP [TP]]] – C subjunctives

Given (269), the grammaticality contrasts we noticed in (266-268) are to be expected.

Moreover, the fact that the negative marker under NegP can appear below the
subjunctive particle *da* in the case of NC complements, as opposed to C subjunctives, further
confirms another aspect of the analysis that was proposed earlier on in 3.1.4 specifically in the
context of Serbian/Croatian, namely the claim that the particle *da* can undergo T-C movement
in this language. Given the structural representations in (269), the fact that *da* precedes negation
in NC subjunctives is in accordance with the analysis claiming that *da* moves up from T to C
in such complements. On the other hand, the fact that *da* cannot precede negation in C
subjunctives, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the example in (266b), suggests that this
item does not exhibit T-C movement in such cases. This is, once again, to be expected: given
the CP-truncation analysis, there is no C-head for *da* to move to in such contexts.

3.3.2.3 NPI binding

The second test that I will borrow from Todorovic (2012) is related to the issue of NPI binding
in different types of clauses. Todorovic based her analysis in this context on the account of
Serbian NPIs put forward in Progovac (1994).94 Progovac noted that Serbian exhibits two
different types of NPIs, with different syntactic properties: both the equivalents of English NPIs
(*anyone, anything*) and the equivalents of English n-words (*no one, nothing*) function as NPIs

---

93 Once again, I ignore the projections that are irrelevant in the context of the present analysis.
94 Progovac refers to the language as Serbian/Croatian, but I will continue to use the label Serbian for ease of
exposition, given that, once again, control subjunctives that I am interested in here are more typical of Serbian
than of Croatian (see 3.1.4 and 3.2).
in Serbian, given that they can both be licensed by negation (Serbian being a negative concord language). Progovac refers to the former as I-NPIs, given that they are prefixed with *i- (iko ‘anyone’, ishta ‘anything’) and to the latter as NI-NPIs, given that they are prefixed by ni- (niko ‘no one’, nishta ‘nothing’). NI-NPIs exhibit locality constraints and are subject to the condition A of binding theory, i.e. they can only be bound by negation clause-internally. I-NPIs, on the other hand, exhibit anti-locality constraints and are subject to condition B: they cannot be bound by negation within the same clause, but only from a higher clausal domain. The contrast is demonstrated below in (270-271):

(270) a. * Ne vjerujem nikome.
    not believe1.sg. no one
b. Ne vjerujem ikome.
    not believe1.sg. anyone
    ‘I don’t believe anyone.’

(271) a. Ne tvrdi da vidi nikoga.
    not claim1.sg. that see3.sg. nobody
(Todorovic, 2012: 144)
b. Ne tvrdi da vidi ikoga.
    not claim1.sg. that see3.sg. anybody
    ‘He does not claim to see anybody.’
(Todorovic, 2012: 147)

The syntactic difference between I-NPIs and NI-NPIs that we observe in (270-271) will be useful for my analysis because the contrasts that NC and C subjunctives will be shown to exhibit in relation to NPI binding as well will further confirm the overall syntactic account I am proposing here.

First of all, when it comes to C subjunctives, the prediction, given the analysis developed so far, is that they should pattern with the simple clause in (270) when it comes to NPI binding, and not with the recursive CP structure in (271). More precisely, they should exhibit local NI-NPI binding by matrix negation, as opposed to anti-local I-NPI binding. Todorovic (2012) showed that this is indeed the case, as we can see in the examples below:
(272) a. *Ne mogu da vidim nishta / *ishta.*
      not can1.sg. SUBJ see1.sg. nothing / anything
      ‘I can’t see anything.’

b. *Ne morash da pozovesh nikoga / *ikoga.*
      not must2.sg. SUBJ invite2.sg. no one / anyone
      ‘You don’t have to invite anyone.’

On the other hand, NC subjunctives would be expected to pattern more closely with indicative-type clauses in this context, given that they both constitute embedded CP domains, i.e. they should exhibit anti-local I-NPI binding by matrix negation, while banning local NI-NPI binding. This is where the picture gets somewhat more complicated, however, because NC subjunctives do not seem to fully pattern either with indicatives or with C subjunctives when it comes to NPI binding. Rather, they exhibit mixed properties in this context, allowing both for I-NPI and for NI-NPI binding from the matrix clause, as we can observe in the examples below:

(273) a. *Ne zhelim da pozovesh nikoga / ikoga.*
      not want1.sg. SUBJ invite2.sg. no one / anyone

b. *Ne zahtijevam da pozovesh nikoga / ikoga.*
      not demand1.sg. SUBJ invite2.sg. no one / anyone
      ‘I don’t want/demand that you invite anyone.’

The data in (273) should not be seen as problematic when it comes to my overall syntactic analysis of the subjunctive, however: similarly as the dependent temporal properties that we observed with NC BlkS complements, the mixed patterns that these complements exhibit with regards to NPI binding can also be explained in light of the more general analysis of the subjunctive CP that was proposed earlier on in 2.3, where the latter was analyzed as a deficient phase, associated with a greater degree of syntactic transparency than the indicative CP. Given this broader analysis, the fact that NC subjunctives exhibit less phasal properties than indicatives when it comes to NPI binding should not be seen as surprising. In fact, it can be seen as a further confirmation of the more general syntactic approach to the subjunctive clause type that I proposed earlier on. In any case, the important observation when it comes to my current analysis of BlkS in terms of structural truncation is that one can still observe a clear
contrast between NC and C subjunctives in the area of NPI binding, with the latter exhibiting entirely non-phasal properties in this context as well.

3.3.2.4 Pronoun vs. anaphor binding

The following test that I will use here, this time taken from Antonenko (2008), is based on the binding of possessive pronouns (e.g. njegov/a) and anaphors (svoj/a), which we already observed a few times in the previous parts of the dissertation (see 2.3.2 for instance). Let us first briefly recall some of the relevant examples that I introduced earlier on in this context, which showed that NC subjunctives pattern with indicative complements in that they exhibit anti-local possessive pronoun binding by the matrix subject (in accordance with condition B), as opposed to the local anaphor binding, which is observed within the confines of a single clause (in accordance with condition A):

(274) a.  *Ivan, tvrdí da je njegova žena najpametnija.
       John claims thatIND is his wife most-smart
       ‘John claims that his wife is the smartest.’

(275) a.  Ivan, hoče da njegova žena bude sretna.
       John wants SUBJ his wife be3.sg. happy
       ‘John wants his wife to be happy.’

b.  * Ivan, hoče da svoja žena bude sretna.
       John wants SUBJ his wife be3.sg. happy

The data of the type exemplified in (274-275) were used earlier on to argue that subjunctives (specifically NC subjunctives) should not be seen as non-phasal domains, given that they exhibit anti-locality constraints characteristic of CP phases in this context.

On the other hand, given the analysis developed so far, C subjunctives would be expected to exhibit local possessive anaphor binding of the type we observe within the confines of a single clause (as in (276) below), as opposed to anti-local pronoun binding we observed in (274-275). As we can see below in (277), this is indeed the case.
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C subjunctives in (277) thus pattern with simple clauses, such as the one in (276), as opposed to NC subjunctive or indicative complements, when it comes to pronoun vs. anaphor binding as well, which is once again predicted by the current analysis: given that such complements truncate the embedded CP and are hence incorporated within the matrix CP clausal domain, they are expected to exhibit syntactic locality constraints in accordance with the condition A in this context as well.

3.3.2.5 Subjunctive complementizers

The final piece of syntactic evidence that I will put forward here in favor of my structural analysis of BlkS complementation no longer concerns Balkan Slavic but pertains to some non-Slavic languages of the Balkan region, specifically Romanian and Albanian. Recall that these languages were shown earlier on in 3.1 to allow for the co-occurrence between a subjunctive marker (te in Albanian and sa in Romanian) and a higher Comp (Albanian qe and Romanian ca) within the same clausal structure, which was used as evidence that subjunctive markers cannot be seen as Comps themselves (the relevant examples are reproduced below):

(278) Une dua qe Brixhida te kendoje.    (Albanian)
I want1.sg. that Brigitte SUBJ sing
‘I want Brigitte to sing.’
(279) \textit{Vreau ca Petru sa citeasca o carte.} \hfill (Romanian)
\begin{itemize}
\item want1.sg. that Peter SUBJ read3.sg. a book
\item ‘I want Peter to read a book.’
\end{itemize}

Even though the analysis I am proposing in this chapter is primarily centered on Balkan Slavic languages, one would expect it to apply to non-Slavic Balkan languages such as Romanian or Albanian as well if it is correct, given the broadly shared patterns that we observed earlier on in 3.1 and 3.2 in the context of BlkS complementation in general. Thus, given the CP truncation account I just developed, one would predict that the higher Comps (\textit{ca} in Romanian and \textit{qe} in Albanian) that can co-occur with the lower subjunctive particle in NC subjunctives, as in (278-279), should not be able to do so in C subjunctives, given that the latter are not expected to contain the CP projection which hosts Comps. Below in (280), we can see that this is indeed the case: the introduction of a higher Comp preceding the BlkS particles in Albanian and Romanian C subjunctives results in ungrammaticality.\footnote{The Albanian data are taken from Terzi (1992).}

(280) a. \textit{Maria perpiqet (*qe) te shkruaje.} \hfill (Albanian)
\begin{itemize}
\item Mary try3.sg. (that) SUBJ write3.sg.
\item ‘Mary is trying to write.’
\end{itemize}
b. \textit{Maria incepe (*ca) sa scrie.} \hfill (Romanian)
\begin{itemize}
\item Mary begin3.sg. (that) SUBJ write3.sg.
\item ‘Mary begins to write.’
\end{itemize}

Hence, given that some of the predictions associated with my CP-truncation analysis of BlkS C complements hold beyond Balkan Slavic, it would not be unreasonable to suggest that this approach may be more broadly relevant in the context of Balkan languages. Nevertheless, a more detailed syntactic analysis of the non-Slavic Balkan languages would be needed before this can be claimed with any degree of certainty, which I will not further pursue here given that my main focus is Slavic. Now that I have provided different types of evidence that favor my structural analysis in the context of Balkan Slavic, I will move on to explore some further implications of the syntactic account developed here. In the following section, I will relate the truncation analysis of BlkS as I just proposed it to the basic clausal structure that was argued to be associated with the subjunctive clause type, given earlier on in (248). The finer structural
distinctions that will be observed between various BlkS complements in this context will allow me to account not only for the differences that such complements exhibit when it comes to their syntactic properties but also, crucially, for the semantic contrasts that can be observed between them as well. The syntax-semantic mapping analysis that I will propose in 3.3.3 will enable me to coherently subsume the less typical cases of BlkS complementation (e.g. those involving aspe-ctual or implicative verbs) alongside the more typical ones (i.e. those involving intensional-type predicates) under the same clause type and the same Subj1 clausal mood analysis.

3.3.3 BlkS complements at the syntax-semantics interface

Here I will fully pursue the implications of my overall view of the subjunctive as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon, because the formal syntactic contrasts that we previously observed between different types of BlkS complements will now be systematically correlated to the semantic differences that such complements exhibit when it comes to the types of modal meanings they denote. The semantic contrasts that we will observe in this context will be explained by establishing a precise connection between the degree of structural truncation that a given BlkS complement undergoes and the type of LF output, associated with the basic subjunctive clause structure (reproduced below in (281)), that it produces at the end of its syntactic derivation.

(281) \[\text{[CP C_{\text{Dir}^*\text{aDeo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Deontic}} \text{ Mod}_{\text{Deo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}} \text{ Mod}_{\text{Dyn}} \ [\text{TP [vP\ldots]]]]]}\]

As I already explained earlier on, those complements that maintain a larger range of projections and features associated with (281) by the time they reach the LF interface will be more specified from a semantic point of view and hence associated with the types of modal interpretations that are more typical of the subjunctive clausal mood as it was defined earlier on in Chapter 2. On the other hand, those complements that truncate varying chunks of the structure in (281) will be less specified in this sense, with their interpretation further removed from the typical subjunctive semantics depending on the degree of truncation that they undergo.

The predictable form-meaning patterns that we will observe in this context will lead to a generalization whereby the range of possible interpretations associated with the subjunctive clause type will be analyzed in terms of a semantic scale of related, hierarchical and structure-dependent meanings, which I will call the subjunctivity scale (Socanac, 2012). The hierarchical
nature of this scale will be formally accounted for through feature superset-subset relations, i.e. if a given complement is associated with some higher modal feature in (281) (e.g. Dir), it will also necessarily be associated with all the lower ones (e.g. Deo and Dyn), but not vice versa. The highest end of this scale will thus be occupied by complements that contain the full feature range associated with (281), which will be defined as the core subjunctive group. As we observed several times earlier on (see 2.4.2.2 or 3.3.1, for instance), complements that correspond to this description are those selected by directive predicates (as in (282a) below), which can be described as embedded imperatives. Other types of BlkS complements will then share a proper subset of the subjunctive-related features in (281) with these core subjunctives, which can be larger or smaller, depending on the complement. The analysis that I will propose in this context will ultimately allow me to place all BlkS complements selected by predicates that were outlined earlier on in 3.2 (reproduced below under (282) for convenience) along different positions within the subjunctivity scale.

(282) a. Directives (e.g. order, command, tell, beg) 
b. Future-referring predicates (e.g. want, prefer, suggest, expect, accept) 
c. Deontic modals: (e.g. must, should) 
d. Dynamic modals (e.g. can, know (how to)) 
e. Implicatives (e.g. succeed, manage, dare) 
f. Aspectuals (e.g. begin, continue)

In the following several subsections, I will develop the analysis that I just broadly sketched out in further detail.

3.3.3.1 NC subjunctives at LF: Dir>Deo feature cluster in C

The structural domain related to (281) that will be relevant in the context of the current analysis is the one situated above TP, i.e. the subjunctive CP and the modality layer below it. The subjunctive CP projection containing the hierarchical Dir>Deo feature cluster in C will be relevant when it comes to accounting for the nuance semantic differences that can be observed.

96 The term ‘core subjunctive’ is taken from Kempchinsky (2009), although the author applied this notion to a larger range of subjunctive complements than I will do in my analysis: while Kempchinsky analyzed all intensional subjunctives as forming the core subjunctive group, I will only analyze a certain type of intensional subjunctives, namely those selected by directive verbs, as belonging to this group.
between the more typical intensional NC complements, which were argued to maintain the subjunctive CP until the end of the derivation, given their observed phasal properties. As for C subjunctives, whose non-phasal properties led to the conclusion that they truncate this CP, the part of structure in (281) that will be more relevant when it comes to accounting for the semantic contrasts that they exhibit is the modality layer below C. First I will focus on the former type of complements, and then I will move on to the latter, which exhibit a much greater degree of semantic diversity in this context.

Some of the semantic contrasts that can be observed between the more typical intensional NC subjunctives were already touched upon earlier on, when I was discussing control-related phenomena pertaining to these complements (see 2.4.2.2, for instance). The relevant feature in this context is Dir, i.e. the highest feature within the subjunctive clausal structure. Recall that this feature was analyzed as associated with both formal and semantic properties: it was seen as syntactically causing the effect of subject obviation and as semantically encoding embedded-imperative-type meanings in the context of subjunctive complementation. Thus, BlkS complements that were shown to be associated with subject obviation, i.e. those selected by directive verbs (283), were claimed to maintain this feature, whereas other intensional BlkS complements (284), which exhibited free subject reference, were claimed to strip it. The relevant structural representations for the two types of complements are given below:

(283) \[
[CP \ C_{i\text{Dir}>u\text{Deo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Deontic}} \ \text{Mod}_{i\text{Deo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}} \ \text{Mod}_{i\text{Dyn}} \ [\text{TP} \ [vP\ldots]]]]]
\]

a. \textit{Ivan\textsubscript{i} naredjuje da (pro\textsubscript{*i/j}) dodje.} (Serbian)
John orders SUBJ he come3.sg.

b. \textit{Ivan\textsubscript{i} zapovjeda (pro\textsubscript{*i/j}) da dojde.} (Bulgarian)
John orders he SUBJ come3.sg.
‘John orders *(him) to come.’

(284) \[
[CP \ C_{i\text{Deo}>u\text{Deo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Deontic}} \ \text{Mod}_{i\text{Deo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}} \ \text{Mod}_{i\text{Dyn}} \ [\text{TP} \ [vP\ldots]]]]]
\]

a. \textit{Toi\textsubscript{i} iska (pro\textsubscript{i/j}) da dojde.} (Bulgarian)
he wants he SUBJ come3.sg.
‘He wants (him) to come.’
b. *Oni očekuje da (prosječno) dodje sutra.*  

‘He expects (him) to come tomorrow.’

Here I will focus in a bit more detail on the semantic consequences of the structural distinction in (283-284).

Even though both groups of complements exemplified above are associated with similar irrealis modal interpretations, denoting deontic-type modality and world-to-word fit direction, they also exhibit some nuance differences in this context. Complements selected by directive predicates are more specified when it comes to the type of deontic modality they exhibit, because they are the only group of subjunctives that can be directly related to imperative-type meanings, given that they denote reported directive speech acts. Other intensional subjunctives, selected by future-referring predicates of the type exemplified in (284), are associated with a broader range of deontic-type interpretations, denoting meanings related to wishes, preferences, expectations, and other irrealis-type meanings that are not as directly related to the prototypical directive function associated with the imperative mood. Nevertheless, given that such complements still maintain the subjunctive CP, the range of modal meanings that they exhibit are still typical of the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective.

The nuance semantic differences that I just described can be straightforwardly explained given the structural analysis in (283-284). What the latter entails is that the two groups of intensional NC subjunctives represented above can be semantically analyzed in terms of feature superset-subset relations pertaining to the Dir>Deo feature cluster. While both types of complements in (283-284) maintain the Deo feature once they reach the LF interface (after the uninterpretable instance of this feature has been checked in C), which is why they both denote deontic-type modality, only complements in (283) maintain the highest Dir feature, which structurally dominates and semantically contains Deo. As a result, the deontic modal meaning associated with such complements is more specified, and more closely related to the prototypical imperative meaning. Once again, given that this type of subjunctives is the only one that contains the full feature range associated with the basic subjunctive clause structure, they should be defined as the core subjunctive group, denoting core subjunctive meaning. The fact that the core subjunctive meaning is the one most closely related to imperative-type semantics is to be expected given the imperative-CP analysis of the subjunctive clause type that was proposed earlier on in 2.4.
3.3.3.2 C subjunctives at LF: Modality layer

BlkS complements we looked at so far were related to syntactic contexts where we typically observe the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective as well, i.e. embedded clauses introduced under intensional predicates. The next structural distinction that we will observe in the context of BlkS, however, represents a cut-off point when it comes to subjunctive distribution between Balkan languages, on the one hand, and most other languages, on the other, i.e. it represents the boundary between NC subjunctives, which are widely observed across languages, and C subjunctives, which are more idiosyncratic to the languages of the Balkan region.

The main structural distinction between these two types of subjunctives, given the syntactic analysis presented earlier on (see 3.3.1 and 3.3.2), is the fact that NC complements maintain the subjunctive CP whereas C subjunctives strip it. This structural distinction allowed me to explain a whole host of formal contrasts that were observed between NC and C subjunctive complements when it came to phenomena related to syntactic opaqueness vs. transparency. At this point, I will focus on the semantic implications of the syntactic account that was proposed earlier on in this context, analyzing how the CP truncation that was claimed to be at play in C subjunctives can be used to account for the interpretative differences that these types of complements exhibit with respect to their NC counterparts as well.

First of all, in a broader sense, the CP truncation analysis that was proposed in relation to C subjunctives can begin to explain the overall semantic diversity that we observed in the context of BlkS distribution in general. The latter is due to the semantic properties of C complements, which are idiosyncratic to Balkan languages, as opposed to NC subjunctives, which exhibit the types of interpretations that are more typical of the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective. The semantic diversity associated with C subjunctives can be explained in light of the syntactic truncation that they undergo. The fact that such complements strip the subjunctive CP, along with, crucially, the featural specifications contained within this CP, implies that the syntactic output they send to LF allows for a broader range of interpretations. As a result, we can have different types of C subjunctives which are associated with diverse semantic properties: some complements of this type can still be related to irrealis-type meanings and deontic modality that we observe with intensional subjunctives and imperatives, this being the case with complements selected by predicates of the type exemplified earlier on in (282c); others have a more realis interpretation but can still be
associated with a type of modality (e.g. 282d); whereas others still cannot be associated with any modality at all, and denote non-modalized meanings which are more characteristic of the indicative mood (e.g. 282f). While this overall semantic diversity that one observes with C subjunctives can be explained in light of the CP-truncation account, some of the more specific semantic differences that we will note between various types of C complements will be explained by referring to the different degrees of structural truncation that can affect the subjunctive clause structure situated below CP, specifically the modality layer.

The group of C subjunctives whose semantic properties are closest to the ones associated with the more typical NC complements are those selected by deontic modal predicates. As a result, given the overall syntax-semantics mapping approach that I am assuming here, I will claim that they are also structurally closest to NC subjunctives, corresponding to the syntactic representation in (285).

\[(285) \quad \text{[CP} \text{C} \text{Deo]} \quad [\text{ModP} \text{Deontic} \quad \text{Mod}_d\text{Deo} \quad [\text{ModP} \text{Dynamic} \quad \text{Mod}_d\text{Dyn} \quad \text{TP} \quad \text{vP...}])))\]

   must3.sg. SUBJ leave3.sg.
   (Serbian)

b. *Trjabva da otide.*
   must3.sg. SUBJ leave3.sg.
   ‘He has to leave.’

As we can see in (285), these complements truncate the subjunctive CP but maintain the entire modality layer situated below it.

The main contrasts that such complements exhibit with respect to NC subjunctives are of a primarily formal nature, related to the fact that, unlike the latter, they constitute non-phasal syntactic domains (see 3.3.1 and 3.3.2). These contrasts are accounted for given the CP-truncation analysis in (285). On the other hand, the semantic modal interpretations associated with these complements do not essentially differ from those we observed with NC subjunctives, given that they all denote irrealis-type meanings and deontic modality. This can, once again, be explained in light of the structural analysis in (285): even though complements to deontic modals such as those in (285a-b) truncate the subjunctive CP projection, they still maintain the modal projection encoding deontic modality, which contains the interpretable instance of the modal feature \(i\)Deo under Mod. As a result, such complements denote similar modal meanings.
and the same type of world-to-word fit as NC subjunctives once their structure reaches the LF interface. On the other hand, the remaining groups of BlkS complements that we will look at here are further removed from the typical NC subjunctives not just when it comes to their formal properties but also when it comes to their interpretation.

The following group of C subjunctives that we will be focusing on are those selected by dynamic modals (including modalized verbs of knowing), which exhibit further structural truncation because they also truncate part of their modality layer, as we can see below:

(286) \[\text{[CP-C}_{\text{Dir}}\text{-Deo}-\text{[ModP}_{\text{Deontic}}-\text{Mod}_{\text{Deo}}\text{]}\text{[ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}}\text{ Mod}_{\text{Dyn}}\text{ [TP [vP...]]}]\]

   can3.sg. SUBJ come3.sg. tomorrow
   ‘He can come tomorrow.’

b. *Zna da pliva.*
   know3.sg. SUBJ swim3.sg.
   ‘He knows how to swim.’

Such complements exhibit significant semantic differences with respect to all BlkS complements we looked at so far (i.e. both NC subjunctives and C subjunctives selected by deontic modals). Most importantly, while the latter are associated with irrealis interpretations, complements of the type exemplified in (286a-b) denote realis-type meanings, grounded in the actual world of the speaker. This semantic contrast can, once again, be explained in light of the truncation analysis of the type proposed in (286). First of all, given that subjunctive complements associated with the structure in (286) truncate the embedded CP domain, this means that they are syntactically incorporated into the matrix CP domain. The syntactic clause union that takes place in this context also implies semantic event unification: once the structure is shipped to the semantic component, both clauses are interpreted as a single event and a single proposition.\(^\text{97}\) As a result, the realis-type interpretations associated with complements such as those in (286a-b) can be explained similarly as the ones we observe in simple matrix assertions:

\(^\text{97}\) A similar type of semantic analysis was already proposed in the context of BlkS by various different authors. For instance, Varlokosta (1993) analyzed Greek C subjunctives as involving semantic event unification, whereas Krapova (1998) applied a similar analysis in the context of Bulgarian subjunctives.
both of these types of clauses are directly world-anchored to the actual world of the speaker through the matrix declarative CP.

The reason why C complements in (286) differ in this sense from those selected by deontic modals in (285), which also truncate the embedded CP, has to do with the different degree of structural truncation that they exhibit in their left periphery, specifically the fact that, while the latter group of complements maintain the deontic modal projection in their structure, the former strip it. Given that this ModP was analyzed as encoding world-to-word direction of fit (see 2.4.1.1 for more on the latter notion), clauses that contain this projection cannot be grounded within the actual world of the speaker, given that their illocutionary point is not a world- hence the irrealis-type interpretation associated with complements such as those in (285). On the other hand, when it comes to complements of the type exemplified in (286), the fact that they truncate Mod\textsubscript{deontic} means that they exhibit the reverse, word-to-world fit, which is the default fit direction in simple matrix assertions. As a result, such complements are grounded in the actual world of the speaker, hence their realis interpretation.

One common semantic property that complements to dynamic modals in (286) nonetheless share with those selected by deontic modals in (285) is the fact that they are both associated with a certain type of modality, which will no longer be the case with the remaining groups of BlkS complements that we will look at shortly. While complements of the type exemplified in (285) exhibit the deontic-type modality that we typically observe with clauses such as imperatives or intensional subjunctives, complements in (286) exhibit dynamic modality related to notions such as ability or capacity. The semantic link that can be established between these two types of complements in this context can, once again, be analyzed in terms of feature superset-subset relations. Recall that deontic-type modality was analyzed as entailing dynamic-type modality, because clauses associated with the former type of modality (e.g. imperatives) are incompatible with counter-factual interpretations.\footnote{See the discussion at the beginning of Section 3.3 for more detail on this analysis.} This semantic requirement is reflected in the basic subjunctive clausal structure that I am assuming here, because the latter implies that complements containing the Deo-feature, which encodes deontic modality, must also contain the lower Dyn-feature, which encodes dynamic modality, given that the former structurally dominates the latter, but the reverse does not hold, i.e. clauses containing the lower Dyn do not necessarily contain the higher Deo. As a result, complements such as those in (285a-b), which maintain the entire subjunctive modal layer, must denote both of these types of modality, whereas complements in (286a-b) only denote dynamic modality, given that they
only contain a subset of features associated with the modality layer, explaining why their meaning is further removed from the core subjunctive meaning than is the case with complements in (285).

Finally, the last group of BlkS complements that we will be dealing with here are those selected by implicative and aspectual predicates, outlined earlier on in (282e-f). These types of subjunctives have always posed particular problems for the semantic analyses of BlkS because, in addition to denoting realis-type interpretations, they are also not associated with any type of modality, which makes them anomalous in light of the typical cross-linguistic semantics of the subjunctive mood. Nevertheless, under the syntax-semantics mapping approach developed here, the atypical semantic properties associated with this type of BlkS complements are no longer problematic but are actually expected. They can be straightforwardly accounted for in light of the syntactic analysis in (287).

(287) \[
\text{[CP} - \text{C}_{\text{Dir}} - \text{Deo}_{\text{Deo}} - [\text{ModP}_{\text{Deontic}} - \text{ModP}_{\text{Dyn}}] [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}} - \text{ModP}_{\text{Dyn}}] \text{[TP [vP…]]]]
\]

a. \textit{Toi uspja da dojde navreme.} (Bulgarian)
   he managed3.sg. SUBJ come3.sg. on-time
   ‘He managed to come on time.’

b. \textit{Pochinje da vozi auto.} (Serbian)
   begin3.sg. SUBJ drive3.sg. car
   ‘He begins to drive the car.’

As we can observe in (287), BlkS complements of this type truncate the entire left-periphery structure that contains projections encoding modality, while only maintaining the lower TP and vP structure, which explains why they do not denote any type of modal meaning at LF.\textsuperscript{99} As a result, the atypical, non-modalized semantic properties associated with such complements should be seen as merely an additional manifestation of their syntactic anaphoricity.

\textsuperscript{99} This is also the point at which the earlier syntactic analysis that was proposed in the context of the subjunctive marker \textit{da} in Balkan Slavic, which viewed the latter as inserted in T (see 3.1.3 and 3.1.4), becomes crucially important, because it allows to explain why such BlkS markers can appear in complements associated with the structure in (287), which do not denote any type of modality.
The observations that were just made in the previous section will now be used to draw a broader generalization with regards to the overall semantic nature of the BlkS mood. Even though the latter exhibits the degree of semantic diversity which makes it impossible to define BlkS in terms of any type of single global semantic notion, such as irrealis or non-veridicality, the fact that complements included under the BlkS Subj1 clausal mood could nonetheless be analyzed through the prism of semantic feature superset-subset relations implies that BlkS as such subsumes a range of related types of interpretations. The latter were shown to be hierarchical and structure-dependent and should thus be analyzed in terms of a semantic scale, which ranges from core subjunctive meaning (i.e. directive, embedded-imperative-type meaning) all the way down to non-modalized meanings, associated with complements of the type we observed in (287). The semantic scale in question will be defined as the subjunctivity scale, and the layers of meaning contained within this scale can be summarized as in (288):

(288) **Subjunctivity scale**

Directivity > Deontic modality/World-to-word fit > Dynamic modality > vP-related lexical meaning

While a finer semantic analysis may further articulate the meaning layers associated with the subjunctivity scale, the illustration in (288) allows to capture the most important semantic distinctions that we observed in the context of BlkS distribution.

The basic reason why BlkS-related semantics are better analyzed in terms of a semantic scale than in terms of any single semantic notion harkens back to one of the more general cross-linguistic properties that were argued to be associated with the Subj1 clause type as such, namely the structural permeability of such clauses (see 1.2). Even though Subj1 clause type is associated with a specific type of underlying structure in the core cases of subjunctive complementation (i.e. with complements defined as embedded imperatives), which corresponds to the representation given earlier on in (281), this basic underlying structure can undergo varying degrees of truncation, depending on the type of matrix predicate that selects a given Subj1 complement. This, in turn, means that we can have varying LF outputs associated with different types of Subj1 complements, resulting in different types of interpretations. In the
context of BlkS in particular, these subjunctive-related LF outputs were shown to allow for a range of interpretations which is too broad to be subsumed under any single semantic notion.

Before I end the discussion in this chapter, and move on to apply a similar analysis in the context of RusS-type subjunctive (i.e. non-Balkan Slavic subjunctive) in 4, there are still some conceptual issues related to the analysis proposed so far that will need to be addressed. The most important among these has to do with the lexical diversity of predicates that were claimed to select the same BlkS Subj1 clause type as their complement. Given that these BlkS-selecting predicates include verbs which are as diverse as intensional directives, on the one side, and non-modalized aspectuals, on the other, it is difficult to see a priori what type of shared lexical property may allow them to select the same clausal type as their complement. This is where the more general syntactic analysis of the Subj1 clause type as a default, Elsewhere embedded option will come into play. Once this analysis is applied to BlkS-data, it will allow me not only to explain why BlkS Subj1 can be selected by such a diverse range of predicates, but also to provide a more principled explanation for the structural truncation data related to various BlkS complements, which so far we only observed without fully explaining them.

3.3.4 Default Subj1 selection and structural truncation

Recall that the more general analysis of the Subj1 clause type as a default embedded option was based on the world-semantics approaches to the subjunctive put forward in Farkas (1992b) and Portner (1997) (see 1.4.3 for more detail). The most important notion in this context was the distinction between extensional and intensional world-anchoring, established by Farkas (1992b). Farkas argued that indicative complements are selected by extensional-type predicates, which anchor the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base (i.e. the world of the matrix subject), whereas subjunctives are selected by intensional-type predicates, which do not anchor the embedded proposition to any specific world but only to a set of possible worlds. Given that the former type of world-anchoring is more specified from a conceptual point of view, I related it to a specific W(orld)-feature, present in the underlying lexical make-up of indicative-selecting predicates. Subjunctives, on the other hand, were analyzed as selected as a default embedded option by predicates that do not contain W in their lexical make up, which is why such predicates do not ground the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base. In the following paragraphs, we will see that the latter description does not only apply to intensional
verbs, as they were defined by Farkas, but also to control predicates which were argued to select Subj1 in the context of BlkS as well.

The absence of W from the lexical make-up of a given predicate can be related to a specific semantic prediction: predicates in question should never be able to extensionally anchor the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base. This is because the latter type of world-anchoring was argued (earlier on in 2.3.3) to formally obtain thanks to an Agree relationship that is established between the W-feature contained within the lexical make-up of the selecting predicate and the corresponding W-feature contained within the WP projection associated with the embedded CP domain, as shown in (289) below:

\[(289) \quad \text{V}_w \quad \text{CP[WP}_w]\]

Predicates that do not contain W, therefore, should never be able to extensionally anchor the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base via the embedded CP, because the Agree chain in (289) that is necessary for this type of world-anchoring to take place never obtains in such cases.

This prediction can be maintained in light of the full range of semantic data pertaining to BlkS Subj1 complementation, regardless of the semantic contrast between irrealis and realis BlkS complements. In the case of irrealis NC subjunctives, we observe the same type of intensional world-anchoring as the one that obtains with their cross-linguistic counterparts, i.e. the embedded proposition is not anchored to any specific world but to a set of possible worlds associated with the matrix modal base (but not identical to the latter). This is compatible with the non-W analysis of such complements because the world-anchoring in question is not extensional. When it comes to realis C subjunctives (e.g. complements to aspectuals or implicatives), on the other hand, even though they exhibit the realis-type interpretations which are only compatible with extensional world-anchoring as it was defined by Farkas, this does not contradict the claim that such complements are selected in the absence of W, because the extensional world-anchoring in this context is not established with respect to the world of the matrix subject via the embedded CP but with respect to the actual world of the speaker via matrix CP. We observed this thanks to the syntactic clause union and semantic event unification that were shown to obtain with complements of this type, as a result of the structural truncation
that they undergo, which caused them to semantically pattern with simple matrix declarative utterances in this sense.

The lexical diversity of predicates that were argued to select the same Subj1 clause type in the context of BlkS should thus no longer be seen as problematic from a conceptual point of view: first of all, the default analysis of Subj1 selection does not require the selecting predicates to share any type of ‘positive’ lexical property but only a ‘negative’ one, i.e. the absence of W, and hence the fact that the predicates in question are otherwise very semantically diverse is not a problem per se; secondly, all of these predicates were nonetheless shown to exhibit one common semantic pattern, which is a manifestation of the fact that they do not contain W in their lexical make-up, i.e. none of them extensionally anchors the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base. Therefore, the broader default-selection approach to the Subj1 clause type can be seen as fully compatible with BlkS Subj1 complementation as a whole.

Moreover, in addition to accounting for the lexical diversity of predicates selecting BlkS Subj1 complements, the default-selection approach to Subj1 can also be used to explain the syntactic truncation data that we observed with different complements of this type. First of all, given that the Subj1 clause type is not selected by the matrix predicate due to any type of inherent lexical property associated with the latter but simply because the predicate in question does not contain W, this means that the predicate will not necessarily be semantically compatible with all the features contained within the basic Subj1 clausal structure as it appears in the core contexts of subjunctive complementation (i.e. as in (281)). Thus, for instance, non-modalized predicates such as aspectuals will not be compatible with any type of modal feature associated with this Subj1 clausal structure, whereas verbs such as dynamic modals will not be compatible with any type of feature pertaining to deontic modality (i.e. Deo or Dir). As a result, such predicates will truncate any part of Subj1 clausal structure containing features that do not match their own lexical make-up, which thus allows to account for the syntactically anaphoric properties that we observed with their complements.

In the following chapter, we will be looking at some further, cross-linguistic implications related to the analysis of Subj1 clause type as the default embedded option, and its consequences in terms of structural permeability and truncation. One of the main questions that will be posed in this context is whether some other types of syntactic constructions that are generally seen as associated with more syntactically transparent structures, such as infinitives, can be approached through a similar analysis as the one I just proposed in the context of BlkS Subj1. This question will be particularly relevant when it comes to the study of non-Balkan
Slavic languages, because the latter will be shown to exhibit both subjunctive and infinitive-type complementation in the syntactic environments where Balkan Slavic languages generally introduce the subjunctive. Before I move on to that part of the analysis, though, I will first summarize some of the main generalizations that I reached in my study of BlkS.

3.4 Summary

The study of Balkan Slavic that I developed throughout Chapter 3 allowed me to reach a comprehensive account of subjunctive complementation patterns that we observe in these languages, which subsumed a wide range of related formal and semantic phenomena pertaining to BlkS under a common analytical approach. Despite some of the idiosyncratic distributional patterns that were shown to obtain in the context of BlkS clausal mood, I was nonetheless able to include all BlkS complements defined as Subj1 within a larger theoretical framework that was proposed earlier on in Chapters 1 and 2 in the context of a more cross-linguistic analysis of the subjunctive.

The first part of the chapter focused on the morpho-syntactic realization of BlkS. The most important issue in this context was to determine the basic syntactic properties of the left-periphery-related BlkS markers. A more general analysis of BlkS that was proposed at the outset, as well the detailed analysis of Balkan Slavic that was proposed later on, arrived at the conclusion that these subjunctive markers should not be seen as Comps externally merged in C (despite their apparent syntactic similarity with the latter) but as mood particles, inserted lower down in the structure. Once I determined the basic syntactic nature of BlkS markers, I then turned to a closer analysis of the way in which these items contribute to the derivation of BlkS complements.

BlkS particles such as the Balkan Slavic da were analyzed as associated with a dual function in the typical cases of subjunctive complementation, functioning both as tense operators and as modal particles. They were analyzed as tense operators because they syntactically license the temporally deficient subjunctive-related verb forms, as originally noted by Giannakidou (1998; 2009 a.o.) in the context of Greek. The tense-related properties that BlkS markers were shown to exhibit served as one of the main arguments for the claim that such items should be seen as externally merged under the temporal T-head (as opposed to some higher modal head or C). As for the modal properties associated with these items, they were
argued to obtain in those syntactic environments where BlkS particles enter into an Agreement relationship with the higher deontic Mod-head, which allows them to acquire the modal feature Deo through the mechanism of feature transfer. Given that the Agreement mechanism in question does not obtain in all syntactic contexts where BlkS particles can be found, this explains why the latter are not always associated with modal properties, and can also appear in complements that do not denote any type of modality.

The latter types of complements, whose non-modal properties are quite unusual in light of the cross-linguistic semantics that one typically observes with the subjunctive mood, were dealt with in the second part of the chapter, which addressed the distributional issues pertaining to BlkS. Despite the semantic contrasts that such non-modalized subjunctives, selected by verbs such as aspectuals or implicatives, exhibit with respect to the more typical, intensional BlkS complements, selected by predicates such as desideratives or directives, all of these complements were ultimately subsumed under the same Subj1 clausal mood category. In spite of the semantic diversity associated with BlkS Subj1 clauses in general, I showed that the range of interpretations that they exhibit is not random but can be analyzed in terms of semantic feature superset-subset relations. The semantic relations in question were shown to be structure-dependent: BlkS complements associated with more articulated clausal structures shipped more subjunctive-related features to LF, and hence their meaning was more specified and closer to the core subjunctive (i.e. embedded imperative) meaning, whereas complements associated with more truncated structures sent less of these features to LF, which is why their meaning was less specified and further removed from the core subjunctive meaning. The analysis I proposed in this context culminated in the conclusion that the semantics pertaining to the BlkS clausal mood should be defined in terms of a scale of related, hierarchical and structure-dependent meanings, which I called the subjunctivity scale.

The underlying formal explanation for the semantic diversity associated with BlkS was ultimately related to a broader theoretical claim, proposed earlier on in the context of a more cross-linguistic analysis of the subjunctive, according to which Subj1 clause type should be viewed as a default, Elsewhere syntactic option in embedded contexts, selected by predicates which do not contain the world-anchoring W-feature in their lexical make-up. In addition to accounting for the lexical diversity of predicates which select BlkS Subj1 clause type, this analysis also allowed me to provide a more principled explanation for the structural truncation data that we observed in the context of BlkS complementation: given that Subj1 is selected by the matrix predicate as a default embedded strategy, the selecting predicate will not necessarily
agree with all the features contained within the basic Subj1 clausal structure, and will thus truncate any part of structure that contains features it does not agree with.

In the following chapter, I will apply a similar analysis as the one I just developed in the context of BlkS to other, non-Balkan Slavic languages (primarily Russian). The conclusion I will reach there is that, despite the overt morpho-syntactic differences in embedded complementation patterns that will be observed between BlkS and RusS (pertaining primarily to subjunctive distribution in control contexts), the basic underlying properties of the Subj1 clausal mood as such are not essentially different in the two groups of Slavic languages.
CHAPTER 4

SUBJUNCTIVE COMPLEMENTS IN NON-BALKAN SLAVIC (RusS)

As I explained in the introduction, the primary theoretical focus of this dissertation was to be placed on the study of BlkS, because of the specific BlkS complementation patterns we observed in the previous chapter, whereas the study of other Slavic languages, primarily Russian, would serve to determine if the conclusions I reached on the basis of the analysis of BlkS can be extended to the Slavic language family as a whole. The most important objective that I will pursue in this chapter will therefore be to apply the theoretical generalizations I reached in Chapter 3 on the basis of my analysis of BlkS to RusS-type languages.

The analysis of RusS I will put forward here will be organized in a similar manner as the analysis of BlkS in the previous chapter, with the first part of the chapter (Section 4.1) focusing on the morpho-syntactic realization of the more typical RusS complements (i.e. intensional subjunctives), and the second part (4.2) looking at the issue of RusS distribution. Before I turn to a closer analysis of intensional Subj1 complements in 4.1, which will be primarily done in the context of Russian, I will first demonstrate how the morpho-syntactic realization of the subjunctive in Russian is broadly representative of non-Balkan Slavic in general (as was only briefly suggested at the end of the broader Slavic analysis in 2.6), thus justifying the use of RusS label in the context of non-Balkan Slavic. Then, once I turn to a closer analysis of the structural derivation of subjunctive complements in Russian, the basic objective will be to determine whether the same type of syntactic approach that was proposed earlier on in 3.1 in the context of BlkS can apply to Russian as well.

The second part of the chapter, i.e. Section 4.2, will then focus on the distribution of RusS complements, which is the area where we will observe the most important differences between BlkS and RusS. After demonstrating, once again, that Russian is more broadly representative of non-Balkan Slavic languages when it comes to subjunctive distribution as well, I will attempt to determine whether some of the wider theoretical generalizations that I reached on the basis of the analysis of BlkS can be applied to RusS as well, despite the different complementation patterns that we will notice between the two types of Slavic languages in this context. Primarily, I will be interested to see whether the syntactico-semantic continuum that
was observed in relation to different types of BlkS Subj1 complements, which culminated in the semantic analysis of the BlkS Subj1 clausal mood in terms of the subjunctivity scale in (288), can be applied to RusS as well.

The conclusion that I will eventually reach in this context will be that, despite the superficial morpho-syntactic differences one can observe between BlkS and RusS (especially in control environments where Balkan languages introduce the subjunctive and non-Balkan ones the infinitive), the two groups of Slavic languages nonetheless share the bulk of the underlying formal and semantic properties throughout all contexts of Subj1 distribution that we just observed in BlkS. This will ultimately lead to the claim that both control and non-control equivalents of BlkS complements that one observes in non-Balkan Slavic should be analyzed as part of the same Subj1 clause type as their Balkan subjunctive counterparts.

4.1 Morpho-syntactic realization of RusS

As I explained earlier on (Section 2.6), the RusS (i.e. Russian-type subjunctive) label that I am using here does not only apply to Russian but also to other non-Balkan Slavic languages (i.e. Eastern and Western Slavic languages, according to the more traditional typology), such as Polish, Czech or Slovak. Since a detailed study of the subjunctive in each and every individual Slavic language is outside the scope of this dissertation, the representative nature of the Russian subjunctive that I will go on to illustrate here in more detail will be the main basis for the claim that the analysis of Russian subjunctive that will be proposed later on has broader relevance in the context of non-Balkan Slavic.

4.1.1 RusS realization across non-Balkan Slavic languages

Earlier on in Section 2.6, we could observe a number of contrasts pertaining to the morpho-syntactic realization of the subjunctive within the Slavic linguistic family, which allowed me to divide the latter between the Balkan-type subjunctive languages (BlkS) and the Russian-type subjunctive languages (RusS). The differences we observed between the two groups of Slavic languages in this context concerned both the verb form that appears in subjunctive complements, as well as the left-periphery items that serve as primary subjunctive markers in these languages. The main difference when it comes to subjunctive-related verb forms is that
BlkS (290) is associated with a finite verb form, which typically exhibits perfective aspectual morphology, whereas RusS (291) uses a non-finite form, which has morphological past-tense marking and is hence typically used to denote past readings when appearing in simple matrix contexts (as we can see below in (292)).

(290)  
\textit{Iskam Ivan da dojde.}  
\begin{tabular}{lll}
want1.sg & John & SUBJ \ \ 
\end{tabular} 
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\textit{come3.sg.} & \textit{‘I want John to come.’} 
\end{tabular}  
\textbf{Bulgarian}

(291)  
\textit{Ja hochu, chtoby Ivan prishel.}  
\begin{tabular}{lll}
I & want & SUBJ \\
\textit{John} & \textit{come} & \textit{‘I want John to come.’} 
\end{tabular}  
\textbf{Russian}

(292)  
\textit{Ivan prishel vchera.}  
\begin{tabular}{lll}
John & \textit{came yesterday} 
\end{tabular}  
\textbf{Russian}

In addition to the differences in verb forms, another contrast that we can observe between subjunctive complements in (290-291) concerns the properties of subjunctive markers appearing on the left periphery of the clause. BlkS and RusS markers differ, first of all, with regards to their morphological make-up: the former is a morphologically indecomposable unit (e.g. \textit{da}), whereas the latter is a more complex item, consisting of the element \textit{chtoty}, which exhibits the same overt form as the indicative Comp, and the item \textit{-by}, which is usually analyzed as a type of modal particle (Brecht, 1977; Franks&King, 2000 a.o.). In addition to this morphological difference, the two types of Slavic subjunctive markers also exhibit contrasts with regards to their syntax: as we can see on the basis of the difference in positioning between the subjunctive marker and the embedded subject in (290-291), the RusS marker is associated with a higher structural position, appearing above the subject in (291), than the BlkS marker, which appears below the subject in (290).\textsuperscript{100} In fact, the RusS subjunctive marker \textit{chtoby} must appear in a local configuration with the selecting predicate, exhibiting Comp-type properties in

\textsuperscript{100} The Serbian/Croatian equivalent of the Bulgarian particle \textit{da} in (290) actually patterns more closely with the RusS marker in this sense than it does with its BlkS equivalents, which was analyzed as a result of the fact that it undergoes T-C movement in subjunctive complements such as those in (290-291) (see 3.1.4). Nevertheless, as we will observe shortly, the underlying syntax associated with the RusS marker in (291) is not quite the same as the one that was shown to obtain with the subjunctive particle in Croatian and Serbian.
this context. As we can see in the examples below, even fronted topics cannot intervene between the RusS marker and the predicate in this context:

(293) a.  * _Ja velel, chtoby ty uekhal v Minsk odin._
    I ordered SUBJ you go to Minsk alone
b.  _Ja velel, v Minsk chtoby ty uekhal odin._
    I ordered to Minsk-top. SUBJ you go alone
c.  * _Ja velel, ty chtoby uekhal v Minsk odin._
    I ordered you-top. SUBJ go to Minsk alone
    ‘I ordered that you leave for Minsk alone.’

As a result, unlike BlkS markers, which were analyzed as particles, RusS marker _chtoby_ should be seen as a Comp, which is a standard assumption in Russian subjunctive literature (Antonenko, 2008; Brecht, 1977 a.o.).

In the following paragraphs, we will observe how other non-Balkan Slavic languages pattern with Russian when it comes to the basic morpho-syntactic properties of their subjunctive complements, which will allow me to justify the use of the RusS label in this context. In (294) below, we can see some typical examples of subjunctive complementation in languages such as Polish, Czech or Slovak:

(294) a.  _Chce, zeby Jan przyszed._
    want1.sg. SUBJ John come
b.  _Chci, aby Jan prishel._
    want1.sg. SUBJ John come
c.  _Chcem, aby Jan prishiel._
    want1.sg. SUBJ John come
    ‘I want John to come.’

The subjunctive construction in all these non-Balkan Slavic languages involves the same type of morpho-syntactic configuration as the one we just observed in the Russian example in (291), which consists of the left-periphery subjunctive marker and a non-finite verb appearing lower

---

101 The examples in (203) are taken from the abstract written by Federico Damonte, which can be found on http://www.philol.msu.ru/~otipl/new/fdsl/abstracts/damonte.pdf
down in the structure. Once again, the latter is morphologically marked for past tense, and used to denote past-tense readings in simple matrix clauses, such as the ones below:

(295) a.  *Jan przyszedł wczoraj.*  
          John came yesterday  

b.  *Jan přišel včera.*  
          John came yesterday  

c.  *Jan príšiel včera.*  
          John came yesterday

As for the left-periphery subjunctive markers in (294), even though they are associated with different morphological forms on the surface, they exhibit the same basic morpho-syntactic properties as their Russian counterpart as well. First of all, unlike BlkS particles, they are morphologically complex: just like the Russian chtoby, the Polish, Czech and Slovak subjunctive markers are composed of two separate morphological items (i.e. ze-by and a-by, respectively). They also exhibit the same type of syntactic positioning as the one we just observed with the Russian subjunctive marker: unlike BlkS particles, which typically appear lower down in the structure, Polish zeby or Czech/Slovak aby are situated higher up in the clause, as evidenced by the fact that they must appear above the embedded subject in (294). In fact, we can observe the same type of local relationship between these subjunctive markers and the matrix predicate as the one we previously noted in the context of Russian in (293). If we look, for instance, at the Polish example in (296), we can observe, once again, that no embedded item, not even fronted topicalized constituents, can intervene between the matrix predicate and the subjunctive marker in this language either:

(296) a.  *Chce, zeby Jan zaprosił Julie.*  
          want1.sg. SUBJ John invite Julie  

b.  *Chce, Julie zeby Jan zaprosił.*  
          want1.sg. Julie-top. SUBJ John invite  
          ‘I want John to invite Julie.’
As a result, all of these RusS markers should be analyzed as Comps, which are locally selected by the matrix predicate under $C$, differing in this sense from their BlkS counterparts, which are inserted lower down in the structure.

The Comp-type properties associated with these RusS markers should be seen as related to the first morphological item that appears within them (i.e. Russian $chto$- or Polish $ze$-, for instance), to which the element $by$ attaches, producing surface forms such as $chtoby$ or $zeby$. The lower modal item $by$ constitutes a distinct syntactic element, which does not in and of itself exhibit the properties of Comps, because it is neither restricted to subjunctive complementation, nor is it always attached to C-items such as $chto$- or $ze$-. In fact, $by$ can often appear on its own in different types of syntactic environments, such as in matrix clauses exemplified below in (297), where it accomplishes a semantic function roughly equivalent to the one associated with the English modal $would$ (Franks & King, 2000; Tomaszewicz, 2012).

(297) a. *On by s udovol’stvijem poshel s toboi.* (Russian)
he would with pleasure go with you
‘He would gladly go with you.’

b. *Chialby pojsc z toba.* (Polish)
want-would3.sg. goINF with you
‘He would want to go with you.’

The surface form associated with RusS markers should thus be seen as a result of morpho-syntactic merger between a higher C-item, such as the Russian $chto$- or the Polish $ze$-, and the lower modal $by$. The exact morpho-syntactic mechanism whereby this is obtained will be studied in more detail a bit later on, once I focus more closely on the syntactic derivation of Russian subjunctives.

All of the basic properties pertaining to RusS that I outlined so far are broadly shared across a wide array of non-Balkan Slavic languages. Before I move on with the analysis, though, I will first need to briefly address some of the nuance contrasts that can be observed in this context as well, which will not be seen as reflective of any type of essential difference in the basic properties of the RusS as such. The first contrast has to do with the mood item $by$ that attaches to the Comp in subjunctives, specifically its inflectional morphology: in Russian, the item $by$ is uninflected, whereas in a language such as Polish (as well as in most other RusS-type
languages), it exhibits φ-features which agree in person and number with the subject. We can observe this contrast by looking at the matrix clauses below:

\[(298)\]
\[a. \quad \text{Ja by s udovol’stvijem poshel s toboi.} \quad \text{(Russian)}
\]
I would with pleasure go with you
‘I would gladly go with you.’

\[b. \quad \text{On by s udovol’stvijem poshel s toboi.}
\]
he would with pleasure go with you
‘He would gladly go with you.’

\[(299)\]
\[a. \quad \text{Chcialbym pojsc z toba.} \quad \text{(Polish)}
\]
want would1.sg. goINF with you
‘I would want to go with you.’

\[b. \quad \text{Chialby pojsc z toba.}
\]
want would3.sg. goINF with you
‘He would want to go with you.’

As a result, we can also notice the same type of morphological contrast when the item by attaches to the Comp in subjunctive complements in these languages:

\[(300)\]
\[a. \quad \text{Ja hochu chtoby on prishel.} \quad \text{(Russian)}
\]
I want thatSUBJ he come
‘I want him/you to come.’

\[b. \quad \text{Ja hochu chtoby ty prishel.}
\]
I want thatSUBJ you come
‘I want him/you to come.’

\[(301)\]
\[a. \quad \text{Chce, zemy przyszedl.} \quad \text{(Polish)}
\]
want1.sg. thatSUBJ3.sg. come

\[b. \quad \text{Chce, zebys przyszedl.}
\]
want1.sg. thatSUBJ2.sg. come
‘I want him/you to come.’
Nevertheless, given that the item by exhibits the same type of morphological properties in languages such as Russian or Polish regardless of the syntactic environment it appears in, the contrasts in (300-301) should not be seen as reflective of any real difference in the inherent properties of Russian and Polish subjunctive constructions as such.

In fact, the morphological contrasts we just observed are not even related to any type of intrinsic property of the modal item by itself, but stem from some broader grammatical differences between Russian and Polish. The relevant difference in this context has to do with the pro-drop phenomenon, which is much more restricted in Russian than it is in Polish. We could already observe this contrast in the examples in (298-301) above, where we could see that the pro subject in Polish can be left empty, as in (299) or (301), while in Russian it is overtly realized, as in (298) or (300). As a result, the φ-features of the empty pro subject are incorporated within the modal by in the case of Polish, while in Russian they must be overtly realized on the pro subject itself and cannot be reflected on the modal by. Hence the morphological contrasts in (298-301) should neither be seen as related to any type of property that is intrinsic to by, nor do they constitute any essential difference when it comes to the morpho-syntactic realization of RusS as such in different Slavic languages.

Another nuance morphological contrast that can be noticed in the context of RusS realization is the one that opposes languages such as Russian and Polish, on the one hand, and languages such as Czech and Slovak, on the other. It is illustrated on the basis of Russian and Czech examples below:

(302) a.   *Ja dumaju, chto Ivan prikhodit.*
    I think that John is-coming

b.   *Ja hochu, chtoby Ivan prishel.*
    I want thatSUBJ John come

(303) a.   *Myslim, zhe Jan prichazi.*
    think1.sg. that John is-coming

b.   *Chci, aby Jan prishel.*
    want1.sg. thatSUBJ John come

---

102 See McShane (2009) for a more detailed analysis of different pro-drop patterns in Russian and Polish.

As we can observe in (302-303), the left-periphery subjunctive marker in Russian involves the item *by* attaching to the Comp which shares the same overt form as the Comp that is used to introduce indicative-type complements (i.e. *chtō*), whereas in Czech subjunctives, the modal *by* is merged with the C-item which is morphologically distinct from the indicative-related Comp (the former realized as *a* and the latter as *zhe*). Nevertheless, a closer analysis of the Russian subjunctive, which I will turn to in the following section, will reach the conclusion that the difference in (302-303) is only related to surface morphology (i.e. the overt morphological make-up of the subjunctive-related Comp), because the Russian subjunctive and indicative Comps will be shown to constitute two distinct syntactic items as well, as would be expected given the overall clausal-mood approach to the subjunctive that I am proposing in this dissertation.

4.1.2 Intensional subjunctives in Russian

Now that I have demonstrated the broadly representative nature of the Russian subjunctive in the context of non-Balkan Slavic subjunctive realization, I will turn to a closer study of the syntactic derivation of subjunctive complements in Russian. Once again, the analysis that I will propose here will be focused on the more typical cases of RusS complementation, involving intensional subjunctives, whereas a broader study of RusS distribution will be left for Section 4.2. The analysis that I will develop in the following paragraphs will primarily focus on the syntactic properties of the left-periphery item *chtoby* which, along with its equivalents in other non-Balkan Slavic languages, is the primary subjunctive mood marker in the context of RusS. We have already observed that, unlike its BlkS counterparts, the RusS marker should not be seen as an indecomposable morphological unit but as a more complex morphological item, consisting of the Comp-type element *chtō* and the modal item *by* in the case of Russian. In order to reach a more precise syntactic account in relation to this RusS marker, I will first look into the syntax of the subjunctive-related Comp *chtō*, and then I will analyze its relation with the modal *by*.
The first question that needs to be answered in relation to the subjunctive Comp chto, given the fact that it shares a common morphological form with the indicative Comp (as we observed in (302)), is whether these two Comps constitute the same syntactic item, which would then imply that the subjunctive construction involves the item by attaching to the indicative-type Comp, or whether the indicative and the subjunctive chto constitute two separate syntactic items. The solution that is more plausible a priori, given the theoretical framework developed in the previous parts of this dissertation, is the latter one: if indicatives and subjunctives should be seen as corresponding to two separate embedded clause types, selected under two formally distinct CP projections, then it would be implausible to claim that these projections can host the same type of Comp in C. The Russian data that I will introduce in the following paragraphs will further reinforce this conclusion.

Recall, first of all, that the bulk of semantic and syntactic contrasts that we observed between indicative and subjunctive complements across languages earlier on in Chapters 1 and 2 were analyzed as the result of different selection mechanisms that underlie the introduction of these two types of clauses in embedded syntactic environments. Once again, the indicative CP was analyzed as selected through the mediation of a special W(orld)-feature, under the mechanism illustrated in (304), whereas the subjunctive CP was seen as a default embedded option, selected in the absence of W.

\[(304) \quad V_W \quad \text{CP}[WP_W] \]

\underline{Select/Agree}

In the following paragraphs, we will observe that the main semantic and syntactic contrasts between indicatives and subjunctives that were explained on the basis of this analysis obtain in Russian as well. This will, in turn, force the conclusion that Russian indicative and subjunctive Comps cannot be seen as the same formal item, because they are selected under two different types of CPs, and occupy a different head position within the embedded left periphery.

Let us first focus on the main semantic contrasts between indicatives and subjunctives that were accounted for by the analysis I just summarized. The analysis in question explained, first of all, the different types of world-anchoring mechanisms associated with these two types of clauses, in the sense of Farkas (1992b). The Agree relation in (304) was seen as responsible
for the extensional world-anchoring that one observes in the context of indicative complements, which is more specified from a conceptual point of view because it grounds the embedded proposition to a specific world (i.e. the world of the matrix subject). Intensional world-anchoring that one observes with subjunctives, on the other hand, was analyzed as a result of the absence of the Agree mechanism in (304). This type of world-anchoring constitutes a less specified conceptual option, given that it only anchors the embedded proposition to a set of possible worlds (as opposed to any specific world), so it does not require any type of special anchoring mechanism such as the one in (304). A more concrete semantic manifestation of this difference in world-anchoring between indicatives and subjunctives was related to the type of propositional content they denote, in the sense of Portner (1997), i.e. that fact that indicatives denote persistent proposition which can be judged as true or false, whereas subjunctives denote nonpersistent propositions that cannot receive a truth value. This contrast was explained under the assumption that truth vs. falsity only obtain within specific worlds, and subjunctive propositions, unlike indicative ones, are not grounded in any specific world. Let us now look at how this general semantic analysis applies to Russian in particular.

If we look at the typical range of indicative and subjunctive complementation in Russian (as in (305-306) below) through this more general prism, we will observe that the semantic contrasts predicted by the analysis outlined above obtain in this language as well.

(305) a.  
*On znaet, chto Ivan ljubit Mashu.*
he knows thatIND John loves Mary

b.  
*On dumaet, chto Ivan ljubit Mashu.*
he thinks thatIND John loves Mary

c.  
*On govorit, chto Ivan ljubit Mashu.*
he says thatIND John loves Mary

‘He knows/thinks/says that John loves Mary.’

(306) a.  
*On hochet, chtoby Ivan ljubil Mashu.*
he wants thatSUBJ John love Mary

b.  
*On velel, chtoby Ivan ljubil Mashu.*
he ordered thatSUBJ John love Mary

‘He wants/ordered John to love Mary.’
All indicative complements in (305) involve extensional world-anchoring: the embedded proposition in such cases (i.e. “John loves Mary”) is grounded within the matrix modal base, which is why it can receive a truth value. The proposition in question will be judged as necessarily true when introduced under a factive predicate such as know in (305a), while in complements to epistemic (305b) or assertive (305c) predicates it can be judged as either true or false, depending on context. As expected, such truth-related considerations do not obtain in complements to subjunctive-selecting predicates such as desideratives or directives in (306), as shown by the semantically awkward nature of the example below:

(307) # On hochet/prikazal, chtoby Ivan ljubil Mashu i to chto on hochet/prikazal, verno.
he wants /ordered thatSUBJ John love Mary and that what he wants/ordered true

Once again, the absence of truth-value judgments in such cases should be seen as related to the type of world-anchoring that the complements in question are associated with: all RusS complements that we looked at so far involve intensional world-anchoring, meaning that the embedded proposition is not grounded in any specific world, which thus explains why it cannot be judged as true or false. The fact that the subjunctive clausal marking is systematically associated with intensional world-anchoring, while indicative marking appears under extensional predicates, is the first indication that the overall selection approach to embedded clausal mood distributions that was proposed earlier on can be seen as valid in Russian as well.

The reason why this broader analysis is relevant in the context of the current argument on the syntax of the subjunctive and the indicative Comp chto in Russian is because it argues against the idea that these two elements can constitute the same type of syntactic C-item. Given the locality constraints on selection, the indicative Comp that is selected by extensional-type predicates under the mechanism in (304) should be seen as inserted under the head of the WP projection, which was analyzed as the highest projection within the indicative CP domain (a type of syntactic equivalent of Rizzi’s ForceP), immediately adjacent to the higher selecting predicate. On the other hand, given that the syntactic mechanism in (304) does not obtain in the context of Russian subjunctive complementation, as evidenced by the semantic contrasts that were observed between indicative and subjunctive complements in (305-307), the same type of W-head under which the indicative Comp is inserted cannot be present within the subjunctive CP structure, which therefore argues against the idea that the indicative chto and the subjunctive chto can be seen as associated with the same type of C-head position.
This analysis is further reinforced if we look at some more formal phenomena related to Russian subjunctive complementation. Recall, first of all, that the WP projection in (304), in addition to providing extensional world-anchoring from a semantic point of view, was also analyzed as encoding phase closure from a syntactic point of view, establishing the CP-domain where it obtains as a full-fledged phase, functioning in full accordance with the PIC constraint (see 2.3). This allowed me to account for some cross-linguistic contrasts that were observed between indicatives and subjunctives in terms of their phasal status, whereby subjunctives were shown to exhibit less phasal properties than indicatives, which was analyzed as the result of the fact that such clauses do not project WP within their CP domain, leaving them more open to syntactic binding relationships from the matrix clause (although not as open as entirely non-phasal, non-CP structures).

One indication that a similar type of relative syntactic transparency is at play in the context of RusS as well is the fact that RusS complements allow for a control relationship to be established between the embedded subject and a matrix object, as in (308) below:  

(308) Volodja ugovoril Nadju, chtoby ona poehala v Evropu.  
Volodja convinced Nadia thatSUBJ she go to Europe  
‘Volodja convinced Nadia to go to Europe.’  
(Antonenko, 2008: 4)

The object-control reading in (308) is obligatory, which implies that the co-indexing between the matrix object and the embedded subject obtains in syntax, before the structure reaches LF. This would be unexpected if Russian subjunctives were analyzed as fully phasal domains (i.e. WP-type domains, given the analysis proposed here), because such a matrix-embedded binding relationship goes against the PIC constraint. On the other hand, the same type of obligatory syntactic control configuration is not observed in the context of Russian indicative complementation, which is in accordance with the phasal status of the latter type of clauses. This, in turn, implies that the indicative Comp chto, unlike its subjunctive counterpart,

---

103 Even though the syntactic configuration in (308), whereby the matrix object intervenes between the predicate and the embedded CP, might appear problematic in light of the locality constraints on CP selection, this is not necessarily the case, given that the predicate in such cases syntactically selects both the embedded CP complement as well as the matrix object. A more detailed analysis of how the locality constraint on CP-selection is preserved in such configurations will be left for some future study.
establishes a full phasal boundary between clauses (having been inserted under WP), thus further confirming that these two types of C-items are not the same.

The final type of evidence that I will advance here in order to show the different syntactic status of the indicative and the subjunctive Comp is related to long-distance movements over different types of embedded clauses. In this context, indicative complements present stronger island effects than their subjunctive counterparts, which can be observed on the basis of examples involving wh-extractions or long-distance scrambling of elements such as topics, for instance (Antonenko, 2008). Even though these types of movements are generally more degraded in Russian than is typically the case across languages (for reasons that I will not get into here, since they are not directly related to my subject), the important observation is that they are more acceptable in the context of subjunctive than they are in the context of indicative complementation. In (309) we can observe the relevant contrast in relation to wh-extractions, while in (310) we can observe it in the case of topicalization.

(309) a. * Kto, ty dumaesh chto ti vypil vsjo pivo?
   who you think thatIND drank all beer
   ‘Who do you think drank all the beer?’
   
   b. ? Kto, ty hoches chtoby ti napisal stat’ju?
   who you want thatSUBJ write paper
   ‘Who do you want to write a paper?’
   (Antonenko, 2008: 10)

(310) a. * Ja doktor, videl chto ti pod’ezzhal.
   I doctor saw thatIND arrived
   ‘I saw that the doctor arrived.’
   
   b. ? Ja doktor, hochu chtoby ti cashche priezzhal.
   I doctor want thatSUBJ more-often arrive
   ‘I want the doctor to arrive more often.’
   (Antonenko, 2008: 7)

As shown by the grammaticality contrasts in (309-310), these types of long-distance movements are completely out in the case of indicative-type complements, while in the case of subjunctives they are only somewhat degraded, which demonstrates that indicative Comp
presents a greater barrier to extractions than the subjunctive Comp. This contrast is, once again, predicted by the overall analysis presented here, which views the indicative chto and its subjunctive counterpart as distinct syntactic items, associated with different parts of the embedded left-periphery structure.

The conclusion, given all the observations we just made, must therefore be that, despite the overt morphological similarity between the indicative Comp chto and its subjunctive counterpart, the two do not constitute the same syntactic element. Rather, they correspond to separate Comp-items, inserted under different positions within the CP domain: while the indicative Comp chto is merged within the highest W-head selected by the (extensional) matrix predicate, the subjunctive chto cannot be merged under the same type of head position because the latter does not obtain in the context of subjunctive complementation. The C-head under which the subjunctive Comp is merged, given the analysis presented earlier on (see 2.4 in particular), should be seen as the one that contains the imperative operator associated with the subjunctive/imperative CP projection. The subjunctive chto as such can thus be viewed as the overt realization of this operator, which was analyzed as empty in the context of BlkS earlier on. In addition to explaining the differences between the indicative and the subjunctive Comps that we just observed, this analysis will also allow me to account for the surface form chtoby associated with the RusS marker, because it will explain the formal motivation for the attachment of the modal element by to the subjunctive Comp. This issue will be addressed in the following section.

4.1.2.2 Syntax of the modal item by

There are several types of analyses that can be advanced in order to account for the exact syntactic mechanism whereby by attaches to chto in Russian subjunctives, producing the overt morphological form of the RusS marker. The most obvious one would be to claim that by is externally merged with chto under C, which would straightforwardly explain the systematic co-occurrence of these two items, as well as their morpho-syntactic contiguity in the context of RusS complementation. Nevertheless, there are several different reasons which argue against such an analysis.

First of all, even though by is generally inseparable from chto in the context of subjunctive complementation, we have already observed earlier on that by can appear independently from chto in other syntactic environments, such as in matrix clauses of the type
exemplified in (298-299). In such cases, by cannot be seen as inserted under any type of C-head because it appears lower down in the structure, typically below the subject. Therefore, the only way in which this type of data can be reconciled with the C-insertion analysis of by in subjunctives would be to claim that the subjunctive-related by is not the same type of syntactic item as the element by that appears in non-subjunctive contexts. One observation that could favor such an analysis is the fact that the item by is not associated with the same syntactic properties in the two types of environments. As we can observe below in (311), when by is used in non-subjunctive contexts, it can appear in several different positions within the clause:

(311) a. *Ja s udovol’stvijem poshel by zavtra v teatr.
   I with pleasure go would tomorrow to theater
b. Ja by s udovol’stvijem poshel zavtra v teatr.
   I would with pleasure go tomorrow to theater
   ‘I would happily go to the theater tomorrow.’
   (Franks&King, 2000: 191)

On the other hand, when appearing in a subjunctive complement, by must be attached to chto and cannot occur anywhere else in the clause, as evidenced by the grammaticality contrast in (312):

(312) a. *Ja hochu chtoby Ivan prishel.
   I want thatSUBJ John come
b. Ja hochu chto Ivan by prishel.
   I want that John would come
   ‘I want John to come.’

Thus, even though by is not associated with the subjunctive C-head in all contexts of its use, the fact that it nonetheless obligatorily appears under this position in RusS complements of the type we looked at so far can be used in order to advance the C-insertion approach to by in the context of subjunctive complementation in particular.

Nevertheless, there are several different reasons why this analysis cannot be maintained even in relation to subjunctives, despite the observation in (312). The first reason is not related to Russian subjunctive per se but rather to the Polish subjunctive data we observed earlier on,
which showed that the item *by* exhibits the same morphological properties regardless of whether it appears in the context of subjunctive complementation or in some other type of syntactic environment. In all of these cases, *by* was shown to function as a verbal (auxiliary) item, agreeing in person and number with the clausal subject (the subjunctive-related data are reproduced below):

(313) a. *Chce, zeb**y** przyszéd**ł**.* (Polish)
    want1.sg. SUBJ3.sg. come

    b. *Chce, zeb**ys** przyszęd**ł**.*
    want1.sg. SUBJ2.sg. come
    ‘I want him/you to come.’

The fact that *by* in Polish subjunctives functions as a verbal item, agreeing in φ-features with the embedded subject, is difficult to reconcile with the analysis which would view this item as inserted in C. This also makes such an analysis unlikely in the context of Russian: even though the Russian *by* does not exhibit the same type of morphological properties as its Polish counterpart, the contrast that we observed between the two languages in this context was shown to be related to some broader grammatical differences between Russian and Polish (with regards to the pro-drop phenomenon in particular) and not to any difference pertaining to the inherent properties of the modal item *by* per se or to the subjunctive construction where the latter appears. Thus, given the broadly shared patterns that we observed between Russian and Polish subjunctives earlier on in 4.1.1, the Polish facts in (313), which argue against the C-insertion analysis of *by* in Polish subjunctives, also make it unlikely that the same analysis can apply to their Russian counterparts.

Another piece of data which argues against the idea that *by* is inserted under C pertains to Russian subjunctive itself. Brecht (1997) noted that, when two subjunctive clauses appear in a coordinated structure in Russian, the item *by* attaches to *chtö* only in the higher subjunctive clause, but not in the lower one, where *by* occurs on its own, as we can observe below:

(314) *Ty veleł, chtoby ja u**e**khal v Minsk odin, a Vasja by ostalsja s**ę** toboi?*
    you ordered thatSUBJ I go to Minsk alone and Vasja mod. stay with you
    ‘Did you order that I leave for Minsk alone and Vasja remain with you?’
    (Brecht, 1977: 35-36)
The item *by* that appears in the lower coordinated clause in (314) should be seen as associated with a relatively low structural position, given that it occurs beneath the subject (*Vasja*). As a result, *by* cannot be analyzed as externally merged alongside the subjunctive Comp *cht* in C.

The fact that *cht* and *by* nonetheless generally do appear together in the context of Russian subjunctive complementation (modulo some exceptional cases such as the one in (314)) is therefore not a result of external merge of *by* under C but rather of internal merge, i.e. movement. The surface form *chtoby* associated with the RusS marker should thus be accounted for by referring to some type of formal constraint that obliges the item *by* to move from its original place of insertion and to subsequently head-adjoin to the subjunctive Comp *cht* under C. Before I focus more closely on the formal motivation behind this movement, I will first try to determine the exact position under which the element *by* is first inserted into the structure, in order to get a more complete formal picture pertaining to the syntax of RusS complements. The analysis that I will put forward in this context will allow me to relate the syntactic approach that was proposed earlier on in the context of BlkS to the current study of RusS, because we will observe that the modal item *by* is associated with very similar formal properties as those that were noted earlier on in relation to BlkS markers. More specifically, the element *by* will be shown to exhibit the same type of dual temporal and modal properties as the ones we observed with BlkS particles earlier on in 3.1.

The tense-related properties of the item *by* have more concrete manifestations than those pertaining to BlkS markers, because this item directly affects the temporal interpretation of the non-finite verb that it is associated with. As we already noted earlier on (see (292) or (295), for instance), the default temporal reading associated with these types of verbs when they appear on their own is the one involving past tense. However, when such non-finite verbs appear alongside *by*, this default reading is reversed, and the verb acquires a futurate interpretation. The contrast in question can be observed both in matrix clauses, depending on whether the non-finite verb appears along with *by* or not, as well as in the context of indicative vs. subjunctive complementation, as shown in the examples below:

(315) a. *On poshel s toboi vchera / *zavtra.*

he went with you yesterday / *tomorrow

‘He went with you yesterday / *tomorrow.’
b.  *On*  by  *poshel s toboi*  *vchera / zavtra.*  
He would  go with you yesterday / tomorrow  
‘He would like to go with you tomorrow / *yesterday.’

(316)  a.  *Ja dumaju, chto Ivan prishel vchera / *zavtra.*  
I  think  thatIND  John  came  yesterday / tomorrow  
‘I think that John came yesterday / *tomorrow.’

b.  *Ja hochu, chtoby Ivan prishel *vchera / zavtra.*  
I  want  thatSUBJ  John  come  yesterday / tomorrow  
‘I want John to come tomorrow / *yesterday.’

The grammaticality contrasts in (315-316), which stem from the use of past vs. future tense markers in clauses containing non-finite verbs such as *prishel* (‘come’), clearly show that the verbs in question, even though they are associated with the same morphological form, change their temporal interpretation depending on whether or not they are associated with the item *by.*

This is the first observation that will allow me to relate the latter to the BlkS particles we studied previously in 3.1.

The semantic effect associated with the use of *by* in (315-316) is very similar to the one we observed in the context of BlkS particles earlier on: all of these items ban anterior temporal readings in relation to verbs that they are associated with. Thus, just like BlkS particles, the item *by* can also be seen as providing a type of temporal anchor for the interval within which these verbs can be interpreted, which corresponds to the utterance time in the context of matrix clauses (as in (315b)) and to the reference time of the matrix predicate in the context of subjunctive complementation (as in (316b)). In each case, when the reading associated with the verb does not correspond to the interval defined by the item *by,* the result is ungrammatical.

Thus, given that the semantic relation that is established in such cases between *by* and the verb is equivalent to the one that we observed earlier on in the context of BlkS particles and the verbs they are associated with, it is not implausible to claim that the same type of syntactic tense-operator analysis that was applied to BlkS markers in 3.1 (based on Giannakidou (2009)) may be relevant when it comes to the item *by* as well.

Recall that BlkS-related verbs were claimed to contain a dependent temporal $t$ variable which needed to be bound by a separate tense operator in syntax, and that this operator function was then claimed to be accomplished by BlkS particles such as the Greek *na* or Slavic *da* in the
context of subjunctive complementation. A similar claim (although in the context of a different type of syntactic analysis) was made by Antonenko (2008) in relation to non-finite verbs that appear in RusS complements, which the author defined as under-specified temporal forms associated with an unvalued tense feature. As such, unlike their indicative counterparts which contain a valued tense feature, these verbs cannot provide valuation for the unvalued tense feature associated with the T-head, which therefore needs to be valued by some other structural item. Even though the notion of feature valuation is not relevant in the context of my analysis (see 1.3, n.18), Antonenko’s observation is compatible with the approach that I am proposing here, because it implies that subjunctive-related verbs are associated with some type of tense-related insufficiency, which needs to be repaired by some other element in syntax.

The temporal insufficiency in question will not be analyzed here through the prism of feature valuation, but through the same type of analysis as the one that was proposed earlier on in the context of BlkS, i.e. I will claim that RusS-related verbs, just like their BlkS counterparts, contain a dependent $t$ variable which needs to be bound by a separate operator in syntax. While this operator function was provided by subjunctive particles in the context of BlkS, in RusS it is provided by the element $by$. Moreover, given that we observe the same temporal effect whenever $by$ is associated with non-finite verbs such as those in (315-316) (i.e. switching the tense interpretation from past to future), one must conclude that the same type of dependent tense relationship obtains regardless of the exact syntactic environment where these items appear together.

The item $by$ should therefore be seen as essentially the same type of syntactic tense operator as BlkS particles, given that they all accomplish an equivalent tense-related function and produce similar semantic effects with regards to the temporal interpretation of a given clause. As a result, I will apply the same syntactic analysis to the Russian $by$ as the one that was proposed earlier on for BlkS particles in languages such as Bulgarian or Croatian. Just like the latter, the Russian $by$ will also be analyzed as inserted under the T-head, regardless of the surface position that it ends up occupying within a given structure. In addition to accounting for the temporal properties associated with this item, this analysis can also be used to account for the fact that the latter can occur in a relatively low structural position when it is not attached to the subjunctive Comp $chto$, either in matrix clauses or (more exceptionally) in RusS structures of the type exemplified in (314).

104 See Antonenko (2008), specifically Section 3, for more detail on this analysis, which I will not provide here.
The overt form of the RusS marker—i.e. *chtoby*—should therefore be analyzed as the result of two separate syntactic operations: the external merge of the subjunctive Comp *chto* under C and the subsequent internal merge and head adjunction of the item *by* under the same head position, the latter resulting from T-C movement. The final question that still needs to be answered before we have a more complete picture related to the syntactic derivation of RusS complements is what type of formal constraint motivates this T-C movement of *by*. This is where another aspect of the common syntactic approach to BlkS and RusS will emerge. Given that the intensional RusS complements of the type we are looking at here share the same basic semantic properties as their BlkS counterparts, not just when it comes to their future-referring temporal interpretations but also when it comes to the type of modal meaning they denote (i.e. all of these complements are associated with deontic-type modality), they will be seen as syntactically projecting the same types of modal projections as their BlkS counterparts as well. Most importantly, RusS complements of this type will also be analyzed as projecting the deontic ModP which introduces the Deo(ntic) modal feature into the structure. The latter will be shown to have similar syntactic repercussions when it comes to the derivation of RusS complements as it did in the context of BlkS derivation (especially the one we observed in Croatian, which was also shown to exhibit T-C movements in this context). In order to demonstrate this in more detail, I will now briefly illustrate the step-by-step derivation of RusS complements.

### 4.1.2.3 Syntactic derivation of RusS complements

As indicated above, I will use the same basic structural make-up pertaining to the Subj1 clause type in my analysis of RusS derivation as the one that was applied earlier on in the context of BlkS. The relevant structural description is reproduced (in a simplified form that is pertinent for the current analysis) below in (317):

\[(317) \quad \text{[CP } C_{[a\text{Deo]}} \text{chto\text{-}[ModP Mod}_{[\text{Deo]}} \text{[TP T by \text{[vP]]}]}}\]

The syntactic items that will be most important in the context of the present analysis are those marked out in bold, i.e. the *by*-item externally merged under T, and the Deo-feature that will be seen as responsible for the T-C movement that this item undergoes, which results in the surface form *chtoby* exhibited by the RusS marker. Let us now briefly focus on the derivational build-
up of RusS complements in relation to the structure in (317), which will allow me to summarize the most important aspects pertaining to RusS syntax.

The first derivational step that is relevant in the context of my current analysis of RusS syntax is the one whereby the T-head is merged on top of vP (vP-internal Merge operations are once again ignored). As we can see in (318) below, this is the point at which the item *by* is externally merged within the structure under T:

(318) 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
\text{by} \\
\text{vP}
\end{array}
\]

At this point, *by* is only endowed with the temporal properties that we discussed before, i.e. it functions as a tense operator which binds the dependent *t* variable contained within non-finite, subjunctive-related verbs.

As for the modal properties of the *by*-item, they are acquired during the next derivational step in the structural build-up of RusS complements, when the deontic modal head Mod, containing *i*Deo, is merged on top of TP. Just as I claimed earlier on in the context of my analysis of BlkS particles, this is the point at which the item *by* enters into an Agree relation with the Mod-head, which allows it to acquire the Deo feature contained within this head through the mechanism of feature transfer, as illustrated below in (319):

(319) 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ModP} \\
\text{Mod}[	ext{iDeo}] \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{by}[	ext{iDeo}] \\
\text{vP}
\end{array}
\]

This now enables *by* to function as a potential checker for the uninterpretable *u*Deo associated with the subjunctive Comp *cht*o under C, which will be inserted at the latter derivational stage in the build-up of RusS complements.

Before we look at the subjunctive CP-insertion and its syntactic consequences, I should just briefly note that the derivational step in (319) is not just limited to RusS complementation. It also takes place in most of the matrix clauses where *by* can appear as well, including those
we observed here earlier on (see (311) or (315), for instance). Such clauses typically denote optative-type meanings pertaining to wishes or preferences, so they are associated with a similar type of deontic modality as the one we observe in the context of RusS complementation, which is why it makes sense to claim that they project the same type of ModP as the one that obtains in subjunctive complements as well. The difference between these two types of syntactic environments, however, is the fact that matrix clauses where by appears do not project the subjunctive CP, the latter being restricted to RusS complementation. As a result, such matrix clauses do not impose the same type of syntactic constraint on the modal item by as the one that is imposed upon it in RusS complements, which forces it to move up to C in the latter type of clauses. Thus, as we already observed earlier on, by has more syntactic freedom with regards to the structural position it can occupy when it appears in matrix clauses than it does in the context of RusS (the relevant examples are reproduced below).

(320) a.  
I with pleasure go would tomorrow to theater

Ja s udovol’stvijem poshel by zavtra v teatr.

b.  
I would with pleasure go tomorrow to theater

‘I would happily go to the theater tomorrow.’

(321) a.  
I want thatSUBJ John come

Ja hochu, chtoby Ivan prishel.

b. *  
I want that John would come

‘I want John to come.’

The grammaticality contrast in (321) should thus be seen as resulting from the last derivational step in the build-up of RusS complements, whereby the subjunctive C-head, containing the Comp chto and the uDeo feature, is merged on top of ModP. Just like its Croatian counterpart, the Russian uDeo feature must be seen as strong. As a result, it can only be checked in a local configuration with its interpretable instance iDeo under C. Given that the only element that can carry this feature to C is the item by, which acquired iDeo during the derivational step in (319), the latter is required to move and head-adjoin to C in the context of RusS complementation, as illustrated below in (322):
In addition to explaining the grammaticality contrasts observed in (320-321), this analysis also explains why the surface form *chtoby* obtains throughout RusS complementation.

The derivational analysis I just presented thus allows to account for the most relevant syntactic properties that we observed in relation to RusS so far: it can explain the dual temporal and modal nature associated with the item *by* (the former explained through T-insertion, the latter through agreement with Mod and the resulting feature transfer of Deo); it can account for the surface morphological form related to the RusS marker; and it can also explain the fact that, despite being a complex morphological item which combines two separate elements originally inserted under two different positions within the structure, the subjunctive marker *chtoby* exhibits this same form throughout RusS complementation. Finally, from a broader perspective, the analysis I just proposed also demonstrated that the same basic syntactic approach that was put forward earlier on in order to account for BlkS derivation also applies to RusS, despite the surface differences that the two groups of Slavic languages exhibit when it comes to the morpho-syntactic realization of their subjunctives. In Section 4.2, I will attempt to determine whether a common analysis can also be applied to BlkS and RusS in relation to subjunctive distribution, despite the contrasts that the two groups of languages exhibit in this context as well.
4.2 RusS vs. BlkS distribution: Surface differences and underlying similarities

Before I turn to a more detailed comparative study of BlkS and RusS distribution, I will first begin the analysis in this section in a similar way as I did earlier on in 4.1, i.e. by demonstrating how Russian is more broadly representative of non-Balkan Slavic languages when it comes to subjunctive distribution as well. Once again, given that my subsequent analysis of RusS distribution will be primarily centered on Russian (and to a lesser extent Polish), the fact that the latter will be shown as representative of non-Balkan Slavic in general when it comes to the range of predicates that introduce subjunctive-type complements in these languages will serve as the main basis for the claim that the analysis I will propose has broader relevance in the context of Slavic subjunctive.

4.2.1 RusS distribution across non-Balkan Slavic languages

Before looking at the cases of subjunctive distribution where we will observe contrasting patterns between Balkan and non-Balkan Slavic languages, let us first focus on those syntactic environments where the subjunctive can be found across Slavic. The environments in question involve (non-control) complements to intensional predicates, where RusS distributes in the same way as its BlkS counterpart. Thus, in addition to complements selected by desiderative verbs, which were the primary focus of my previous analysis in 4.1, RusS markers, such as the Russian chtoby, can also be found in clauses introduced under directive predicates, as in (323), as well as in complements to other intensional verbs that were subsumed under the group of future-referring predicates in the context of my earlier analysis of BlkS (324):

(323)  

| a. | Ja velel, chtoby ty prishel zavtra. | (Russian) |
| --- | --- | |
|   | I ordered thatSUBJ you come tomorrow |
| b. | Ja prosil, chtoby ty prishel zavtra. |
|   | I asked thatSUBJ you come tomorrow |
|   | ‘I ordered/asked you to come tomorrow.’ |

(324)  

| a. | Ja predlagaju, chtoby ty prishel zavtra. | (Russian) |
| --- | --- | |
|   | I suggest thatSUBJ you come tomorrow |
|   | ‘I suggest that you come tomorrow.’ |
b.  *Ja ozhidaju, chtoby ty prishel zavtra.*
   I expect thatSUBJ you come tomorrow
   ‘I expect you to come tomorrow.’

The same distributional pattern obtains in other RusS-type languages, such as Polish or Czech, as well. As we can see in the examples below, the latter also introduce subjunctive markers (i.e. *zeby* or *aby*) with the entire range of intensional predicates that we observed in Russian:

(325)

a.  *Rozkazuje, zeby przyszedl jutro.*  (Polish)
   order3.sg. thatSUBJ2.sg. come tomorrow
   ‘He orders you to come tomorrow.’

b.  *Chci, aby Jan prishel zitra.*  (Czech)
   want1.sg. thatSUBJ3.sg. John come tomorrow
   ‘I want John to come tomorrow.’

c.  *Sugeruje, zeby przyszedl jutro.*  (Polish)
   suggest1.sg. thatSUBJ2.sg. come tomorrow
   ‘I suggest that you come tomorrow.’

d.  *Ochekavam, aby Jan prishel zitra.*  (Czech)
   expect1.sg. thatSUBJ3.sg. John come tomorrow
   ‘I expect John to come tomorrow.’

Once again, all complements in (323-325) exhibit subjunctive marking in BlkS-type languages as well, as we saw earlier on in 3.2 and 3.3.

Where the distributional contrasts between RusS and BlkS set in is in relation to those BlkS complements that were previously defined as control subjunctives, i.e. complements that exhibit obligatory subject control from the matrix clause. As I explained earlier on in 3.2, the introduction of subjunctive morphology in control environments of this type is a more idiosyncratic phenomenon specific to BlkS, which is not typically observed from a cross-linguistic perspective. As a result, non-Balkan Slavic languages (e.g. Russian, Polish, Czech or Slovak) do not introduce the subjunctive construction in these types of syntactic environments either. Instead, as we can observe in the examples below, they employ the infinitive in this context:
This leads us to the most important difference between BlkS and RusS subjunctive complementation in general: the former is much more widely distributed than the latter. As a result, BlkS is also much more semantically diverse than RusS, because the most diverse interpretations that we observed in the context of BlkS distribution were those associated with control subjunctives, which are not present in RusS. The semantic difficulties that such complements posed for the study of the subjunctive mood as such were one of the main reasons why the bulk of my analysis of Slavic subjunctive centered on BlkS.

The basic question that I will be faced with in light of the differences in subjunctive distribution that we just observed in the context of Slavic is to what extent the analysis that was proposed earlier on in relation to BlkS can be applied to RusS. The most important issue in this context will be to determine whether the morpho-syntactic contrasts that non-Balkan Slavic control complements of the type exemplified in (326-328) exhibit with respect to their BlkS counterparts (i.e. the fact that the former introduce an infinitive construction and the latter a subjunctive construction in such control environments) are reflective of any essential difference in the properties of BlkS and RusS Subj1 clausal mood as such, or whether they are the result
of some broader grammatical contrasts between the two types of Slavic languages when it comes to the syntax of control, which are not specifically related to mood. If the latter proved to be the case, then this would provide an avenue for a common analysis of BlkS and RusS Subj1 mood in general.

The latter solution would be more desirable in light of my overall approach to the subjunctive, not just because it would allow me to subsume all cases of Slavic Subj1 complementation under a common analysis, but also because it is more compatible with the broader default-selection approach to the subjunctive clause type that I proposed in the previous chapters. This approach would predict that complements subsumed under the Subj1 label should be associated with relatively diverse semantics, given that they are not selected due to any shared lexical property inherent to the matrix predicates that introduce this clause type, but are simply selected as a default, Elsewhere option in embedded contexts. Thus, if RusS Subj1 complementation was to be restricted only to intensional subjunctives of the type exemplified in (323-325), this would be less expected in light of my broader selection approach to Subj1 than the diverse properties we observed in relation to BlkS complements earlier on. On the other hand, if we could apply the same Subj1 analysis to both control and non-control complements throughout Slavic, then the fact that non-Balkan Slavic languages differ from their Balkan counterparts when it comes to the way in which they establish control in the context of Subj1 complementation (i.e. the fact that they use the infinitive as opposed to the subjunctive construction in this context) could be seen as merely an additional manifestation of the formal diversity that the Subj1 clause type exhibits across languages, which would be entirely compatible with the default-selection analysis of the latter.

In the following several sections, I will provide a number of arguments in favor of such a common approach to BlkS and RusS Subj1 complementation. On the one hand, I will show that infinitive and subjunctive in general are closely related categories, and that the cross-linguistic differences related to the use of one or the other construction in a given type of syntactic environment do not affect the modal properties of the clause in which they are used, but are simply reflective of the different types of strategies that languages employ in order to establish control. On the other hand, I will demonstrate, more specifically, that RusS Subj1 clause type can be analyzed on a par with its BlkS counterpart, because non-Balkan equivalents of BlkS complements will be shown to share the bulk of the structural and semantic properties that we observed with the latter, regardless of whether a given type of complement is associated with subjunctive or with infinitive morphology on the surface. In order to introduce this
argument, I will first focus on those syntactic contexts where RusS and BlkS languages exhibit more common morpho-syntactic patterns (i.e. complements selected by intensional, non-control predicates), and then I will turn to the analysis of those environments where the two groups of Slavic languages appear more different on the surface (i.e. complements exhibiting obligatory subject control).

4.2.2 RusS and BlkS in non-control contexts

The more general analysis of Slavic subjunctive that was proposed earlier on in Chapter 2 already allowed us to compare some aspects related to BlkS and RusS complementation in non-obligatory-control (NC) syntactic environments. In this context, we noted both some common as well as some contrasting patterns that NC subjunctive complements exhibit across Slavic. The most obvious property that Slavic languages were shown to share in relation to such clauses had to do with their overt morphological marking, i.e. the fact that Slavic subjunctives are distinguished from indicatives via left-periphery mood markers (as opposed to verbal morphology, for instance), as we can recall once again by looking at the examples below:

(329) a. *Ivan mislja che shte dojdeshe utre.*  
John thinks thatIND will come2.sg. tomorrow  
‘John thinks that you will come tomorrow.’

b. *Ivan iska da dojdeshe utre.*  
John wants SUBJ come2.sg. tomorrow  
‘John wants you to come tomorrow.’

(330) a. *Ja dumaju, chto Ivan prishel.*  
I think thatIND John came  
‘I think that John came.’

b. *Ja hochu, chtoby Ivan prishel.*  
I want thatSUBJ John come  
‘I want John to come.’
On the other hand, the most important difference that we observed in relation to these subjunctive complements in Slavic had to do with their (anti)control properties: while RusS complements such as the one in (330b) were shown to be associated with the phenomenon of subject obviation, BlkS complements of this type were shown to allow for subject free reference, as we can see in (332) and (331), respectively:

(331) a. \textit{Ivan\textsubscript{i} iska (pro\textsubscript{u}) da dojde.} \\
John wants he SUBJ come3.sg. \\
\textit{Bulgarian}

b. \textit{Ivan\textsubscript{i} hoche da (pro\textsubscript{u}) dodje.} \\
John wants SUBJ he come3.sg. \\
‘John wants (him) to come.’ \\
\textit{Serbian}

(332) a. \textit{Ivan\textsubscript{i} hochet, chtoby on\textsubscript{u} prishel zavtra.} \\
John wants thatSUBJ he come tomorrow \\
\textit{Russian}

b. \textit{Jan\textsubscript{i} chce, zeby (pro\textsubscript{u}) przyszedl jutro.} \\
John wants thatSUBJ3.sg. he come tomorrow \\
‘John wants *(him) to come tomorrow.’ \\
\textit{Polish}

Nevertheless, the formal contrasts in (331-332) were not seen as reflective of any type of fundamental difference related to the underlying properties of the BlkS and RusS Subj1 clausal mood as such, but were analyzed as the result of some broader grammatical contrasts between the two types of Slavic languages represented above.

The contrasts in question had to do with the grammar of infinitive, specifically the fact that Balkan languages such as those in (331) progressively lost their infinitives (to a greater or lesser extent) and replaced them with subjunctives, while non-Balkan ones in (332) still productively use both of these categories. The differences that the two groups of Slavic languages exhibit with regards to subject obviation were then explained in light of the cross-linguistic phenomenon of subjunctive-infinitive competition:105 in non-Balkan Slavic languages such as Russian or Polish, subjunctives and infinitives compete for similar types of syntactic environments (including those in (332)), whereas in Balkan languages such as Serbian or Bulgarian, the two categories no longer compete because the subjunctive has largely

---

105 See Section 2.4.1.5 or authors such as Bouchard (1983) or Farkas (1992a) for more on the notion of subjunctive-infinitive competition.
taken the infinitive.\textsuperscript{106} As a result, subjunctive in Balkan languages is used in both control as well as in non-control environments, explaining the lack of subject obviation in (331), whereas in non-Balkan Slavic it is restricted to non-control contexts, explaining why the control reading in (332) is banned. The control reading in the latter group of languages requires the use of the infinitive, as we can observe below:

\begin{align*}
(333) \quad &a. \quad \text{Ja, } \textit{hochu przyjti} \text{ zavtra.} \quad \text{(Russian)} \\
&b. \quad \text{Ja, } \textit{chce przyjsci} \text{ jutro.} \quad \text{(Polish)} \\
& \text{I want comeINF tomorrow} \\
& \text{I want comeINF tomorrow} \\
& \text{‘I want to come tomorrow.’}
\end{align*}

Nevertheless, other than the control-related contrasts depending on the availability of the infinitive in a given language, most of the remaining properties of complements in (331-333), particularly those pertaining to mood and modality, are essentially the same across Slavic. Regardless of whether we have the subjunctive or the infinitive construction in a given complement, they all denote the same type of irrealis meanings, deontic modality and world-to-word fit. This, therefore, provides the first indication that the cross-linguistic contrasts related to the use of infinitive or subjunctive in a given type of embedded syntactic environment should not be seen as reflective of any type of essential difference in the inherent underlying properties of the Subj1 mood as such.

This conclusion is even further reinforced if we turn our attention to those types of syntactic environments where the anti-control effect of subject obviation was shown to obtain throughout Slavic, i.e. subjunctive complements selected by directive predicates, which were defined as embedded imperatives. As we can see below in (334-335), the control reading in this type of complements is banned across all Slavic languages:

\begin{align*}
(334) \quad &a. \quad \text{Ivan, } \textit{velel, chtoby on-u,} \text{ prishel zavtra.} \quad \text{(Russian)} \\
& \text{John ordered thatSUBJ he come tomorrow}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{106} The infinitive loss was more pervasive in Bulgarian than in Serbian, for the reasons that were explained earlier on in 3.2. Nevertheless, the subjunctive-infinitive competition was sufficiently relaxed in both of these languages so as to cause them to lose the subject-obviation effects in syntactic contexts such as those in (331).
Unlike the subject obviation we observed with RusS complements to desiderative predicates in (332), which was related to the broader linguistic phenomenon of subjunctive-infinitive competition, the anti-control effects in (334-335) stem from the inherent properties of the Subj1 clausal mood as such. More precisely, they are caused by the Dir(ective) feature contained within the C-head associated with the subjunctive clause type, which was argued to establish similar anti-control effects both in matrix imperatives and in embedded subjunctives selected by directive predicates, banning subject co-reference in the latter case and precluding imperatives from appearing in first person singular in the former case (see 2.4.1.5 for more detail). We can thus conclude that the anti-control properties which are inherent to Subj1 clause type as such obtain across different groups of Slavic languages regardless of some of the broader grammatical differences that can be observed between them, including those which are specifically related to the syntax of control.

In fact, the anti-control manifestations related to Dir are observed in complements to directive predicates even if the latter do not feature subjunctive morphology. For instance, as we already noted earlier on in 2.4, the English equivalent of Slavic subjunctives in (334-335) bans subject-control readings despite the fact that English typically employs the infinitive, not the subjunctive in this context (the relevant example is reproduced below):

(336) \textit{He ordered *(him)j to come.}

A similar observation can also be made in the context of some non-Balkan Slavic languages: even though speakers vary as to whether they accept the use of the infinitive in the syntactic
environments such as those in (334-336), the general consensus is that subject-control readings are out even if the infinitive is used in such cases.

(337) a. *Ivanивелеприйтизавтра.* (Russian)
   John ordered comeINF tomorrow
b. *Janrozkazalприйтижутро.* (Polish)
   ‘John ordered to come tomorrow.’

The data in (336-337) thus show us that the inherent anti-control properties related to Subj1 clause type manifest themselves independently of the overt morpho-syntactic construction (i.e. subjunctive vs. infinitive) that is used in the clause.

The observations we made so far already suggest the possibility of a broader common approach to RusS and BlkS Subj1 complementation. First of all, the fact that the anti-control effects related to Dir (i.e. the ban on subject-control readings associated with a given complement regardless of whether the latter features the subjunctive or the infinitive construction) were shown to obtain in the same type of syntactic environments across Slavic means that both RusS and BlkS contain the same group of complements that can be defined as core subjunctives. Recall that the notion of ‘core subjunctive’ was applied earlier on in 3.3 to those BlkS complements which were shown to exhibit the full feature range associated with the basic Subj1 clausal structure (reproduced below).

(338) [CP C\(\text{Dir}^{>aDeo}\) [Mod\(\text{P}_{\text{Deontic}}\) Mod\(\text{i}_{\text{Deo}}\) [Mod\(\text{P}_{\text{Dynamic}}\) Mod\(\text{i}_{\text{Dyn}}\) [TP [vP...]]]]]

Given that Dir is the highest feature within the subjunctive clause structure, this means that any complement that contains Dir must also contain all the other subjunctive-related features in (338) within its underlying structural make-up. Therefore, the fact that the anti-control properties related to Dir were shown to obtain in the same embedded complementation environments in both BlkS and RusS means that all of these Slavic languages contain the same group of complements which exhibit the full feature range in (338) and which can thus be defined as core subjunctives, i.e. complements to directive predicates or embedded imperatives.

Another broader observation that can be drawn from the analysis proposed so far, which may point towards a common approach to BlkS and RusS more generally, is that the surface
use of either subjunctive or infinitive constructions in a given Subj1-related syntactic environment does not seem to affect the inherent underlying properties of the Subj1 clausal mood as such: as we observed in (334-337), for instance, the anti-control effects related to the Dir-feature contained within the subjunctive C-head obtain regardless of whether the embedded complement exhibits subjunctive morphology (334-335) or infinitive morphology (336-337) on the surface. The analysis that I will propose in the remaining parts of this chapter will show that the same observation can be maintained when it comes to other formal and semantic properties that were argued to be inherent to Subj1 as well. This will ultimately result in the conclusion that the basic nature of the subjunctive clausal mood as such is the same across Slavic.

4.2.3 RusS and BlkS in control contexts

The analysis I will propose from this point onwards will develop a common approach to RusS and BlkS complementation as a whole, which will include the same range of complements under the Subj1 clause type in both groups of Slavic languages, regardless of the morpho-syntactic contrasts related to control that they were shown to exhibit in this context (i.e. the use of infinitive vs. subjunctive construction in a given complement). In order to introduce the argument that I will be presenting here, I will first provide some additional cross-linguistic evidence of the close relation between the categories of infinitive and subjunctive in general, and then I will look at how this relation is manifested in the context of RusS and BlkS Subj1 complementation in particular. Here in 4.2.3, I will primarily focus on the formal syntactic properties related to RusS and BlkS complements in different types of control environments, which will allow me to argue that the analysis in terms of structural truncation that I proposed earlier on in 3.3 in the context of BlkS Subj1 complementation applies to RusS as well. Then, in Section 4.2.4, I will show that this truncation mechanism leads to the same types of semantic consequences at LF in both RusS and BlkS. All of this will ultimately allow me to claim that RusS subjunctives/infinitives should be subsumed under the same clausal Subj1-mood category as their BlkS subjunctive counterparts.

Some of the cross-linguistic analyses that suggest a common approach to infinitives and subjunctives in general were already presented in the previous parts of this dissertation. For instance, the idea of subjunctive-infinitive competition that I used earlier on in order to account for the control-related contrasts observed in the context of Slavic subjunctive complementation suggests that these two types of constructions could be subsumed under the same clausal
analysis, given that they compete for the same types of syntactic environments, with the infinitive corresponding to the control variant and the subjunctive to the non-control variant of the same type of clause. Such an analysis is entirely plausible when it comes to complements introduced under desiderative verbs (as well as other types of intensional verbs that were subsumed under the group of future-referring predicates earlier on in 3.3), because these verbs systematically select both subjunctives and infinitives across languages (provided that both of these categories are still productively used in a given language). The same goes for complements selected by directive predicates, which also typically exhibit both infinitive and subjunctive morphology across languages (especially in Romance), with the use of one or the other construction usually dependent on the presence or absence of a matrix controller (object-controller in this case\(^{107}\)), as we can observe on the basis of French examples below:

(339)  
\[\begin{align*}
a. \quad & \text{Il ordonne que tu viennes.} \\
& \text{he orders that you come} \text{SUBJ} \\

b. \quad & \text{Il t’ordonne de venir.} \\
& \text{he you orders to come} \text{INF} \\
& \text{‘He orders you to come.’}
\end{align*}\]

As we already noted in the previous section, the use of infinitive vs. subjunctive constructions in these types of embedded syntactic environments has no direct impact on the modal properties of the clause, because complements introduced under verbs such as desideratives or directives exhibit the same types of irrealis modal meanings regardless of whether they are associated with the subjunctive of with the infinitive morphology on the surface. One can thus plausibly argue that, at least when it comes to these types of syntactic environments, both infinitives and subjunctives should be subsumed under the same clausal-mood category.

This analysis becomes even more plausible if we look at languages where infinitives and subjunctives no longer compete for the same types of syntactic environments because either one or the other was lost from productive use. When such a loss occurs in a given language, one of these categories is often replaced by the other (i.e. infinitive by the subjunctive or vice versa). The first obvious example that comes to mind in this context involves Balkan languages:

\(^{107}\) The object-control mechanism observed in clauses such as the one in (339b) does not contradict the claim that complements of this type (i.e. embedded imperatives) contain the anti-control Dir-feature in C, because the anti-control effects associated with this feature are subject-, not object-oriented. See the analysis in Section 2.4 for a more detailed explanation as to why this is the case.
as we observed throughout Chapter 3 (Sections 3.2 and 3.3 in particular), languages situated in the Balkan region have largely lost their infinitives and replaced them with subjunctives in control environments. A similar phenomenon was also noted in some South-Italian varieties, such as Calabrian or Salentino, which were shown to closely pattern with Balkan languages in that they also replaced their infinitives with finite subjunctive-type complements, which exhibit similar types of distinctive mood markers (situated in the left periphery of the clause) as their Balkan counterparts (Calabrese, 1993; Ledgeway, 1998; Lombardi, 1997; Rohlfs, 1972 a.o.).

And then, of course, on the other end of the subjunctive-infinitive complementation spectrum, we have a language such as English, which has replaced most of its subjunctives with infinitives, as we could observe throughout this dissertation by simply looking at the English translations of subjunctive examples from other languages.

The observations we made so far, which demonstrated the cross-linguistic link between infinitives and subjunctives, are relevant for my analysis because they suggest a possible common approach to these two categories in the context of Slavic Subj1 complementation as well. In particular, the fact that the alterations in use between subjunctive and infinitive constructions in Subj1-type environments (e.g. in complements to intensional predicates such as desideratives or directives) were shown to have no observable impact on the modal properties of the clause in which they are used would suggest that both subjunctives as well as infinitives should be analyzed through the prism of the same basic Subj1 clausal structure in these contexts, i.e. the structure in (338). This is because the overall syntax-semantics mapping approach that I am adopting here assumes that the modal interpretation of a given clause is crucially determined by the type of syntactic feature output it sends to LF, so the fact that infinitives and subjunctives exhibit the same types of modal properties in Subj1 environments implies that they also send the same structural outputs to the semantic component in such cases. This strongly suggests that both subjunctives and infinitives should be subsumed under the same Subj1 clause type, at least when it comes to the syntactic environments we looked at so far. Given that Subj1 was analyzed as the embedded instance of the matrix imperative clause type (see 2.4), if the analysis I just proposed is correct, then we can predict that both infinitives and subjunctives

\[108\] In fact, the subjunctive complementation patterns that one observes in these South-Italian varieties were often seen as part of the larger range of phenomena related to *Balkan sprachbund*, given the close geographical proximity of these varieties to the Balkan region, as well as the presence of some Greek dialects in Southern Italy (Joseph, 1983; Rohlfs, 1972 a.o.). Nevertheless, there are also some controversies related to this claim (see Ledgeway, 1998). I will leave this issue to the side here, since I am only interested in the common complementation patterns that can be observed between infinitives and subjunctives across languages.
should exhibit some properties that relate them to imperatives from a cross-linguistic perspective. In the following paragraphs, we will see that this is indeed the case.

Earlier on in Chapter 2 (Section 2.4.1 in particular), we already observed a number of common patterns that relate subjunctives to imperatives across languages, which served as the original motivation for the analysis of the subjunctive CP as the embedded instance of the matrix imperative CP. Here we will see that some of the observations that were made in that context apply to infinitives as well. For instance, Portner (1997) noted that infinitives pattern with subjunctives and imperatives, while differing from clauses such as indicative or declaratives, from a semantic point of view: unlike indicative/declarative clauses, which are associated with whole worlds and can therefore be judged as true or false (truth vs. falsity only obtaining in situations that correspond to whole worlds, according to the situational-semantics perspective outlined in Portner (1997)), infinitive/subjunctive/imperative clauses cannot be related to whole worlds and are thus inaccessible to truth-value judgments.\(^{109}\) In this sense, the latter types of clauses can all be analyzed as associated with more deficient semantic propositional content than the one we observe with with their indicative/declarative counterparts.

Another author that noted a cross-linguistic link between infinitives and subjunctives, on the one hand, and imperatives, on the other, was Han (1998). One of the common patterns that Han observed in relation to these clauses is the fact that they exhibit a number of distributional overlaps across languages. For instance, subjunctives and infinitives are often used as suppletives for the imperative, usually because the latter is banned in a certain type of matrix syntactic environment. One context in which this can be clearly observed involves negative orders in Spanish, where the imperative function is achieved either by the subjunctive (340b) or by the infinitive construction (340c), because Spanish disallows the use of imperative verbal morphology in the presence of negation,\(^{110}\) as shown in the examples below:

\[(340)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad * \text{ No leelo.} & \text{(Spanish)} \\
& \quad \text{not read2.sg.IMP-it} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{No lo leas.} \\
& \quad \text{not it read2.sg.SUBL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{109}\) See 1.4.3.2 for a more detailed presentation of Portner’s overall semantic analysis.

\(^{110}\) See Han (1998) or Rivero&Terzi (1995) for a more detailed analysis of this particular syntactic constraint, which I will not present here.
c. *No leerlo.*
not readINF-it
‘Don’t read it.’
(Han, 1998: 14)

In addition to syntactic contexts such as those exemplified in (340), where subjunctives and infinitives serve as suppletives for the imperative, one can also observe a number of syntactic environments across languages where these constructions are used more or less interchangeably, as shown in (341-342):

(341) a. *Ne touchez pas aux fils.*
    neg. touch2.pl.IMP not the wires
    (French)
b. *Ne pas toucher aux fils.*
    neg. not touchINF the wires
    ‘Don’t touch the wires.’

(342) a. *Ne hranite ptice.*
    not feed2.pl.IMP birds
    (Serb/Cro)
b. *Nemojte da hranite ptice.*
    neg. SUBJ feed2.pl. birds
    (Serbian)
c. *Ne hraniti ptice.*
    not feedINF birds
    (Croatian)
    ‘Don’t feed the birds.’

Data such as those in (340-342) motivated Han to propose a common syntactic approach to imperative, subjunctive and infinitive clauses in general. She argued that all of these clauses should be analyzed as introduced under CP projections associated with similar feature contents, with the subjunctive/infinitive CP sharing a subset of features contained within the matrix imperative CP.\(^\text{111}\) This is a similar type of analysis as the one I previously proposed in the context of BlkS complementation, where different types of subjunctive complements were analyzed in terms of varying feature subsets that they share with imperative clauses (either

\(^\text{111}\) See Section 2.4.2 for a more detailed presentation of Han’s analysis in this context, which I used as one of the bases for my own syntactic approach to the subjunctive/imperative CP structure.
matrix or embedded), which can be larger or smaller, depending on the degree of structural truncation that a given complement undergoes. In the remaining parts of this chapter, I will apply the same type of syntactic approach to subjunctive and infinitive complements in the context of RusS as well.

Once both infinitives and subjunctives are related to the same basic Subj1 clause structure in the context of RusS complementation, this will allow me to account for the wide range of common patterns that will be observed in relation to RusS and BlkS Subj1 clausal mood in general, where different types of complements will be shown to exhibit common formal and semantic properties regardless of whether they are associated with subjunctive or with infinitive morphology on the surface. This analysis will be particularly relevant once I focus on complements selected by obligatory-control predicates, where non-Balkan infinitives will be shown to systematically pattern with Balkan subjunctives in terms of their underlying structural properties and in terms of their interpretation, which will warrant a common syntactic approach to all of these clauses. Before I move on to that part of the analysis, though, I will first need to account for the formal, control-related contrasts that we noted in the previous section in relation to RusS and BlkS complements selected by NC intensional predicates such as desideratives, which will be explained through the prism of the same Subj1 clausal structure as well.

Recall that the most important difference we noted between RusS and BlkS complements selected by NC predicates of this type had to do with the referential properties of the embedded subject: BlkS languages were shown to exhibit free subject reference in this context, allowing for both conjoined and disjoined readings in subjunctives, whereas RusS languages restricted the former type of readings to infinitives and the latter to subjunctives, as we can observe once again in the examples below:

(343)  
\[ \text{\textit{Ivan}i iska (pro\textsubscript{v}) da dojde.} \]  
(344) a. \[ \text{\textit{Ivan}i hochet, chtoby on\textsubscript{v} prishel zavtra.} \]  

(Bulgarian)  

John wants he SUBJ come3.sg.  
‘John wants (him) to come.’

(Russian)  

John wants thatSUBJ he come tomorrow  
‘John wants *(him) to come tomorrow.’
b.  *Ivan* hochet (*PRO*/i) prijti zavtra.

John wants comeINF tomorrow

‘John wants (*him) to come tomorrow.’

The control data pertaining to BlkS complements such as the one in (343) were accounted for earlier on in Chapter 3 (see 3.3.1 in particular) on a semantic basis: the empty embedded subject in such cases was analyzed as *pro*, whose reference is determined post-syntactically, which is why it is context-dependent. The same analysis cannot apply to RusS control data in (344), however, given that the conjoined vs. disjoined readings are related to two different morphosyntactic constructions in this context, so the basic control properties associated with a given complement must already be determined in syntax, before the structure gets shipped to LF.

The syntactic analysis of RusS complements of the type exemplified in (344) needs to account for the fact that the infinitive variant in (344b) exhibits more anaphoric syntactic properties when it comes to control than the subjunctive variant in (344a), which suggests a clear difference in the underlying structural make-up of the two clauses. Nevertheless, the analysis of the structural contrast in question should not lose sight of the fact that the two clausal variants in (344) do not essentially differ when it comes to their semantic modal properties, which means that their underlying structures should not be entirely different either, given the overall syntax-semantics mapping approach that I am assuming here. The best way to reach an adequate analysis in this context is to assume that both subjunctives and infinitives are associated with the same basic Subj1 clause structure in the context of RusS complementation, which can be subject to varying degrees of truncation, depending on the complement.

Given this assumption, the anaphoric control property associated with infinitive clauses such as the one in (344b) can be accounted for through the same type of syntactic approach as the one that was proposed earlier on in relation to BlkS control subjunctives. Recall the analysis in 3.3.1, where I suggested that the best way to reconcile the mechanism of obligatory subject control, which requires a syntactic binding relationship between the subjects of the matrix and the embedded clauses, with the broader phasal approach to syntax and the PIC constraint, which states that the CP phase is impenetrable to outside syntactic operations, is to claim that clauses which exhibit this type of control relationship strip the embedded CP from their structure. Given that infinitive complements such as the one in (344b) exhibit obligatory subject control as well, they should thus also be seen as associated with a truncated CP domain, as illustrated below:
As we can see in (345), the CP truncation that takes place with this type of complements also affects the subject-related SubjP projection, which was analyzed as a high functional projection situated in the left periphery of the clause (Rizzi, 2006; Rizzi & Shlonsky, 2006). Recall that this SubjP was seen as necessary in order to license any type of independent subject (i.e. either nominal or pro subject) in the clause, whereas its absence meant that the only remaining syntactic option was the anaphoric PRO, which must be bound by some antecedent in the structure (typically the matrix subject). The fact that complements associated with the structure in (345) truncate SubjP thus explains why they exhibit obligatory subject control.

As for the NC subjunctive variants appearing in these types of syntactic environments, such as the one we observed in (344a), they should be seen as associated with the same left-periphery structure as their BlkS counterparts, i.e. they maintain the embedded CP until the end of the derivation, and thus correspond to the structure below:

(346)  
\[
[\text{CP} \ [\text{SubjP} \ [\text{TP}]]]
\]

\textbf{Ivan$_i$ hochet, chtoby on$_{ij}$ prishel zavtra.}

John wants thatSUBJ he come tomorrow

‘John wants *(him) to come tomorrow.’

As we can see in (346), the fact that complements of this type maintain CP means that they also preserve SubjP, given that the former structurally dominates the latter. As a result, they license an independent embedded subject, explaining why we do not observe PRO/control in this context.

The structural analysis in (345-346) thus allows to account for the control contrasts that we observed in the context of RusS complements selected by intensional predicates such as desideratives, i.e. the fact that the infinitive variants introduced under such verbs exhibit obligatory subject control and subjunctives do not. Nevertheless, a more comprehensive
syntactic approach to this area of RusS complementation would also need to account for the fact that, despite their structural differences, subjunctives and infinitives exhibit very similar semantic properties in this context, i.e. they all denote the same types of irrealis meanings, deontic modality and world-to-word direction of fit. What this implies, given the syntax-semantics mapping perspective assumed here, is that the structural contrasts that such complements exhibit should not affect the feature output that they send to LF, which should be basically the same. This requirement can be met if we map the syntactic analysis in (345-346) onto the basic Subj1 clause structure. In this context, subjunctive complements such as the one in (346) should be seen as associated with the structure in (347), whereas infinitives of the type exemplified in (345) should be related to the structure in (348), i.e. a more truncated version of the same Subj1 structure:

(347)      [CP [ModP_{Deontic} ModP_{Deo} [ModP_{Dynamic} [TP [vP...]]]]]

(348)      [CP [ModP_{Deontic} ModP_{Deo} [ModP_{Dynamic} [TP [vP...]]]]]

As we can see in the illustrations above, the syntactic contrast between the two types of complements corresponding to the structural descriptions in (347-348) only affects the subjunctive CP projection, while the modality layer below it remains the same in both cases. Most importantly, the higher ModP projection, which encodes deontic modality and world-to-word fit via the interpretable iDeo feature in Mod, remains presents in the underlying structural make-up of both types of complements we observed earlier on in (345-346), which can therefore explain why their semantic modal interpretations are essentially the same once the structure gets shipped to LF.

The analysis in (347-348) also has some wider implications for my study of RusS complementation, because it provides the first concrete example of how the same syntactic structure that was proposed earlier on in relation to the subjunctive clausal mood can be applied to infinitives as well, which therefore suggests the possibility of a broader common approach to subjunctives and infinitives in the context of RusS. If we are to apply the same type of Subj1 structure to RusS control complements in general, then we would first need to explain why such complements can only be associated with the infinitive, as opposed to the subjunctive construction, even though they belong to the same Subj1 clause type as RusS subjunctive complements. The broader generalization that can be advanced in this context, given the
analysis in (347-348), is that the use of subjunctive vs. infinitive constructions in RusS Subj1 environments is contingent on the degree of truncation that the basic Subj1 clause structure undergoes in a given syntactic context. More precisely, we can propose that the use of subjunctive morphology is excluded when the Subj1 CP projection is truncated from the structure (along with SubjP), which then requires the introduction of the control infinitive construction in the embedded clause.¹¹² In the following paragraphs, I will assess whether this generalization can be maintained in light of the syntactic data related to infinitive complements selected by predicates that require obligatory subject control, such as those we observed earlier on in (326-328).

The first argument in favor of the common syntactic approach to subjunctive and infinitive complements in obligatory-control contexts does not come from RusS but from BlkS. Earlier on in 3.2, we observed that most languages situated in the so-called Balkan sprachbund linguistic area lost their infinitives and replaced them with finite subjunctive complements in control environments, which is why subjunctive morphology is more widely distributed in the context of BlkS than is typically the case from a cross-linguistic perspective. Nevertheless, we also noted that the infinitive-loss phenomenon did not equally affect all Balkan languages, but was subject to some regional variation, i.e. languages situated more to the South-East of this region lost their infinitive to a greater degree than those situated more to the North or to the West of the Balkans (Joseph, 1983; Miseska-Tomic, 2006). This regional variation will be useful in the context of my current argument because it will allow me to compare the properties of infinitives and subjunctives appearing in the same types of syntactic environments in closely related linguistic varieties. The comparative analysis that I will put forward in this context will center on Balkan Slavic, specifically Serbian and Croatian.

As we observed earlier on in 3.2, Serbian lost its infinitive to a greater degree than Croatian, due to their different geographical positions, which is why Serbian speakers tend to use the subjunctive in obligatory-control environments, whereas Croatian speakers prefer the infinitive in this context, as we can observe in the examples below.¹¹³

¹¹² The reverse restriction, i.e. the ban on the use of infinitives when Subj1 CP remains present in the structure, does not seem to apply in the same way, because we saw earlier on that the infinitive can be used in complements to directive predicates, which must be analyzed as CP-domains, given that they contain the highest Dir-feature associated with the Subj1 CP structure. For the moment, I have no more to say on this issue.

¹¹³ The use of subjunctive vs. infinitive constructions in such contexts is subject to some regional variation within Serbian and Croatian as well, as I also briefly explained earlier on (see 3.1.4 or 3.2), but here I will abstract away from such variations and only focus on the more standard control variants that can be observed in the two languages, which are those exemplified in (349-351).
Given the close linguistic proximity between Serbian and Croatian in general, examples such as those in (349-351) provide a useful case study in the context of my current argument, because they will allow us to clearly observe whether the alterations in use between subjunctive and infinitive constructions in control environments of this type lead to any significant shift in the underlying properties of the embedded clause. If subjunctives and infinitives should be subsumed under the same Subj1 clausal-mood category in these types of contexts as well, then complement pairs such as those in (349-351) would be expected to exhibit basically identical syntactic and semantic properties, while only differing in their surface morphological make-up (i.e. the use of subjunctive vs. infinitive morphology). In the following paragraphs, I will determine whether this is indeed the case.

The syntactic prediction that can be made in this context is that the infinitive variants appearing under control predicates should be associated with equally anaphoric properties as their subjunctive counterparts, which were shown to exhibit the type of syntactic transparency that is characteristic of non-phrasal domains and were thus analyzed earlier on in 3.3 as involving
truncated CP structures. Some of the syntactic tests that were used in order to demonstrate the non-phasal status of the latter type of complements are reintroduced below in (352):

(352) a. * Pocheo sam da studiram pravo sutra. (Serbian)  
   began have1.sg. SUBJ study1.sg. law tomorrow  
   ‘I began to study law (*tomorrow).’

b. Ivan, mozhe da vidi svoju kuchu odavde.  
   John can3.sg. SUBJ see3.sg. his house from-here  
   ‘John can see his house from here.’

c. (Ne) morash da (*ne) dodjesh.  
   not must2.sg. SUBJ not come2.sg.  
   ‘You don’t have to come.’

In (352a), we can see that control subjunctives of this type ban the use of conflicting tense marking in the matrix and the embedded clause; in (352b), we can note that they exhibit local anaphor binding from the matrix clause; and in (352c), we can see that they ban narrow negation scope over the embedded clause. All of these properties should be seen as indicative of the non-phasal, non-CP status of the complements in question because, as we observed earlier on in 3.3, phasal CP domains exhibit opposite patterns in this context.114

If the Croatian infinitive complements selected by control predicates should be seen as associated with the same type of underlying structure as their Serbian subjunctive counterparts, then they would be expected to exhibit equally anaphoric syntactic properties as the latter when it comes to the phenomena exemplified in (352). Below in (353), we can see that this is indeed the case:

(353) a. * Pocheo sam studirati pravo sutra. (Croatian)  
   began have1.sg. studyINF law tomorrow  

b. Ivan, mozhe vidjeti svoju kuchu odavde.  
   John can3sg. seeINF his house from-here

c. (Ne) morash (*ne) dochi.  
   not must2.sg. not comeINF

114 I will explain why the syntactic phenomena in (352) are relevant when it comes to phasehood once again a bit later on, when I apply the same types of syntactic tests in the context of RusS complementation.
As we can observe in the examples above, Croatian obligatory-control infinitivals exhibit the same types of non-phasal properties as their Serbian subjunctive counterparts when it comes to areas such as tense (353a), anaphor binding (353b), or negation scope (353c), among others. As a result, we can conclude that a common syntactic approach in terms of CP truncation can be applied to all of these types of complements. Nevertheless, the observations we made so far do not necessarily prove that the CP truncation that such complements undergo takes place within the same structural framework related to the Subj1 clause type. This can be proved if we focus on the semantic properties associated with these complements, and the type of feature output they send to LF.

From a semantic point of view, each complement pair of the type we observed earlier on in (349-351) is associated with identical interpretations, regardless of whether the subjunctive or the infinitive construction is used in the embedded clause, which already suggests that they should all be seen as related to the same type of Subj1 structure, given the broader syntax-semantics mapping approach I am assuming here. This conclusion is further reinforced if we analyze the semantic contrasts that can be observed between different complement pairs in this context: while complements such as those in (349) denote similar types of irrealis modal meanings as intensional subjunctives or imperatives, those in (350) denote more realis, dynamic-type modal interpretations, whereas those in (351) denote non-modalized meanings. If we recall the analysis put forward earlier on in 3.3, these types of semantic modal contrasts were explained by referring to the different degrees of truncation that can affect the syntactic modality layer situated below the subjunctive CP projection, which implies that different types of control complements send different modal-feature outputs to LF. Given that both the infinitives and the subjunctives of the type exemplified in (349-351) exhibit the same kinds of semantic contrasts in this context, they should thus all be seen as associated with the same type of modality layer, and hence the same Subj1 clause structure in general, which can be subject to varying degrees of truncation, depending on the complement and its selecting predicate.

In the remaining parts of this chapter, I will assess whether the same type of syntactic approach as the one that was developed in relation to BlkS control complements can be applied to their RusS counterparts as well. First of all, I will focus on the structural properties related to such complements, in order to determine whether RusS infinitives selected by control predicates can be analyzed in the same way as their BlkS equivalents in this context, i.e. as non-phasal, non-CP domains. Then, in Section 4.2.4, I will analyze the LF feature outputs associated
with different types of RusS complements, in order to find out whether the structural contrasts we will observe between them lead to the same types of interpretative differences once the structure is shipped to LF as those we previously noted in the context of BlkS. The ultimate conclusion of this analysis will be that the same form-meaning patterns that we observed in relation to BlkS Subj1 complementation earlier on in 3.3 obtain in RusS as well, regardless of the surface-related morphological differences that the two groups of Slavic languages exhibit in this context.

The argument that I will put forward in the following paragraphs will thus first focus on the formal properties related to RusS infinitives, in order to determine whether both RusS and BlkS complements selected by obligatory-control predicates (C complements from now on) can be approached through a common syntactic analysis in terms of CP truncation. If this were to be the case, then RusS C infinitives would be expected to exhibit the same types of syntactic contrasts with respect to their non-control (NC) subjunctive counterparts as those we previously observed between C and NC complements in the context of BlkS. In other words, while RusS NC subjunctives should exhibit more phasal syntactic properties characteristic of CP domains, C infinitives should exhibit more anaphoric and transparent syntactic properties characteristic of non-phasal, non-CP domains. The first syntactic area that may point towards such a difference in the phasal status related to the two types of complements in question is control itself: given that the phenomenon of obligatory subject control was previously analyzed as a result of the truncation of CP/SubjP projections from a given clause structure (see 3.3.1 or (345-348)), the fact that C infinitives exhibit this property whereas NC subjunctives do not can thus already be seen as an indication that the latter constitute phasal domains whereas the former do not. In the following paragraphs, I will introduce a number of additional pieces of evidence that will further reinforce this conclusion.

The grammatical areas that I will be focusing on in this context are the same as those we just briefly observed in relation to BlkS C complements in (352-353), i.e. tense, pronoun vs. anaphor binding, and negation scope. For each of these areas, I will first briefly reintroduce the analysis that was previously proposed in relation to BlkS complementation and then I will see whether the same type of approach can be applied to RusS as well. If we look at the issue of tense, first of all, we can recall that the analysis I proposed with regards to BlkS in this context established a 3-way distinction between different types of embedded clausal domains on the basis of their temporal properties. On the one end, we had indicative complements, which were shown to exhibit independent tense, because the embedded predicate in such cases could denote
all types of temporal relations with respect to the matrix tense. Then there were NC subjunctives, whose tense was less independent than the one associated with indicatives, because it was restricted to a future-oriented temporal interval with respect to the reference time of the matrix predicate. Nevertheless, such complements were shown to denote at least some independent temporal content, because they allowed for embedded temporal markers which conflicted with the matrix tense (as long as the tense markers in question were future-referring), so the tense in NC subjunctives was not seen as entirely anaphoric. Finally, on the other end of the embedded temporal spectrum, there were C subjunctives, which were shown to be completely anaphoric in this sense because they banned the introduction of any type of tense markers that conflicted with the matrix tense. We can briefly recall the relevant contrasts that were noted in relation to Balkan Slavic in this context on the basis of Bulgarian examples below:

(354) a. Misija che dojde vchera / shte dojde utre.
   think1.sg. thatIND came3.sg. yesterday will come3.sg. tomorrow
   ‘I think he came yesterday/ will come tomorrow.’

   b. Iskam da dojdesh utre / * dojde vchera.
   want1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg. tomorrow came2.sg. yesterday
   ‘I want you to come tomorrow (* yesterday).’

(355) a. Iskah da dojdesht utre.
   wanted1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg. tomorrow
   ‘I wanted you to come tomorrow.’

   managed3.sg. SUBJ come3.sg. tomorrow
   ‘He managed to come (*tomorrow).’

In (354), we can see that, unlike indicatives, subjunctives are incompatible with anterior tense readings, whereas in (355), we can observe that, unlike NC subjunctives, C subjunctives cannot introduce a future-referring adverbial in the embedded clause if the matrix tense is past.

Below in (356-357), we can see that the exact same temporal contrasts obtain in a language such as Russian as well:
The most relevant examples are those in (357), because they show us that RusS NC and C complements that are the focus of my current argument exhibit the same type of temporal contrast as their BlkS counterparts in (355): in both cases, NC complements introduce an embedded tense domain that is dependent on the one associated with the matrix clause, but not completely anaphoric to it (hence the possibility of conflicting temporal marking in the matrix and the embedded clauses in (357a) or (355a)), whereas the temporal domain in C complements is entirely anaphoric to the matrix tense (hence the ban on conflicting temporal marking between clauses). The same anaphoric tense property can also be observed with other types of C infinitives across various different RusS-type languages, as shown in (358) below:

(358) a. * On ne smog prijti zavtra. (Russian)
   he not could comeINF tomorrow
   ‘He could not come (*tomorrow).’

b. * Udało mu sie przyjsci jutro. (Polish)
   managed to-him has comeINF tomorrow
   ‘He managed to come (*tomorrow).’

c. * On zachal ridit auto zitra. (Czech)
   he began driveINF car tomorrow
   ‘He began to drive the car (*tomorrow).’
In all of these cases, the introduction of an embedded temporal marker that conflicts with the matrix tense results in ungrammaticality, which thus demonstrates the temporal anaphoricity of the C complements in question.

The reason why these tense-related observations are relevant in the context of my current argument, which is primarily interested in the phasal distinctions between different types of RusS complements, is because the temporal contrasts such as those in (354-358) were analyzed earlier on in 3.3 as reflective of the differences in the phasal status related to different types of embedded complements: the fact that indicatives exhibit independent tense was seen as one of the manifestations of the full phasal status of the indicative CP; the fact that NC subjunctives are not entirely anaphoric from a temporal standpoint indicated that they contain a CP projection, which is why they establish a separate embedded time frame which is not identical to the matrix time frame, but they are more temporally deficient than indicatives because the subjunctive CP was seen as less phasal than the indicative CP; and finally, the temporal anaphoricity related to C complements was seen as indicative of the fact that such clauses are associated with transparent, non-phasal structures, where the embedded CP is truncated, which is why they pattern with simple clausal domains in this context, i.e. conflicting temporal markers are banned both in simple matrix clauses and in C subjunctives/infinitives because the entire structure is associated with a single, matrix CP, and therefore constitutes a single time frame. The fact that both BlkS and RusS C complements were shown to exhibit the same type of anaphoric properties in this context is thus an indication that they should all be analyzed as non-phasal, non-CP domains.

Another syntactic area where complements of this type will be shown to exhibit non-phasal properties and pattern with simple clausal domains has to do with the binding of possessive pronouns vs. anaphors. Recall that some Slavic languages were shown to exhibit two different possessive variants in this context, one of which behaved as an anaphor because its binding was local, subject to the condition A of GB theory, while the other behaved as a pronoun, because it was bound in accordance with the anti-local condition B (see 1.3.3 for more on these GB conditions). The binding contrasts in question were observed both in a BlkS-type language such as Croatian/Serbian, as well as in a RusS-type language such as Russian (see 2.3.2): both of these languages were shown to contain a possessive anaphor variant (svoj/a), which had to be bound within the confines of a single clause (as in (359) below), as well as a

\footnote{See Section 2.3 for a more detailed formal analysis of the phasal contrasts between indicative and subjunctive complements across languages.}
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possessive pronoun variant (Russian ego and Serbian/Croatian njegov/a), which had to be bound from a higher clausal domain (as in (360)):

(359)  a.  Volodja, provodil svoju, zhenu v Evropu.  
Volodja saw-off his wife to Europe  
‘Volodja saw off his wife to Europe.’  
(Arvutin&Babyonyshev, 1997: 4)

b.  Ivan, voli svoju, zhenu.  
John loves his wife  
‘John loves his wife.’

(360)  a.  Ivan, dumaet, chto ego, zhena krasiva.  
John thinks that his wife beautiful

b.  Ivan, misli da je njegov, zhena lijepa.  
John thinks that is his wife beautiful

The binding contrasts in (359-360) were then also used as one of the diagnostics of the phasal status related to a given clause.

The expectation was that the embedded domains associated with a phasal CP status should pattern with indicative complements in (360), i.e. they should exhibit anti-local possessive pronoun binding from the matrix clause, whereas non-phasal embedded domains were expected to pattern with simple clauses in (359), i.e. they were expected to exhibit local anaphor binding from the matrix clause. These expectations were confirmed in the context of BlkS: as we can observe in the Serbian/Croatian examples below, NC subjunctives, which were analyzed as CP domains, display anti-local pronoun binding in this context (361), whereas C complements, which were seen as associated with truncated CP structures, exhibit local anaphor binding from the matrix clause, regardless of whether they are associated with the subjunctive (362a) or with the infinitive morphology on the surface (362b).

(361)  Ivan, hoche da njegov, prijatelj dodje.  
John wants SUBJ his friend comes

‘John wants his friend to come.’
The data in (362) were thus seen as an additional piece of evidence in favor of the CP-truncation analysis of BlkS C subjunctives/infinitives.

If the same analysis were to apply to RusS C infinitives, then they would be expected to pattern with their BlkS C counterparts in this area as well. In the examples below, we can see that this is indeed the case: unlike RusS NC subjunctives, which exhibit anti-local pronoun binding from the matrix clause (363), C infinitives exhibit local anaphor binding in this context (364).

(363)  
Ivanı  hôchet  chtoby  ego,  zena  poehala v  Evrapu.  
John wants that SUBJ his wife go to Europe  
‘John wants his wife to go to Europe.’

(364)  
a.  Ivanı  dolzhen  prodat’  svoj,  avtomobil.  
John must sell INF his car  
b.  Ivanı  nachal  vodit’  svoj,  avtomobil.  
John began drive INF his car

The binding phenomena in (364) thus represent yet another syntactic property where RusS C infinitives pattern with simple clausal domains, given that we observed the same type of local anaphor binding within the confines of a single clause earlier on in (359a). This is, once again, expected under the CP-truncation analysis of RusS C complements, which implies that such complements are associated with a single, matrix CP, just like simple matrix clauses.

The final piece of evidence that I will put forward here in favor of this type of syntactic approach to RusS C complements concerns the syntax of negation and, more specifically, the differences in scope that negative markers can take in relation to different types of embedded clausal domains. Recall that negation scope constituted another area where C and NC complements were shown to exhibit opposing syntactic properties in the context of BlkS: while
NC subjunctives allowed the negation to take narrow scope over the embedded clause, C subjunctives/infinitives banned narrow negation scope, as we can observe once again thanks to the grammaticality contrasts in (365-366).

(365) \textit{Naredio je da ne odes}. \hspace{1cm} (Serb/Cro)

ordered has SUBJ not leave2.sg.
‘He ordered you not to leave.’

(366) a. \textit{Mora da ne dodje}. \hspace{1cm} (Serbian)

must3.sg. SUBJ not come3.sg.
‘He must (*not) come.’

b. \textit{Pocheo je ne voziti}. \hspace{1cm} (Croatian)

begun has not driveINF
‘He began (*not) to drive.’

The ungrammaticality in (366) was presented as one more piece of evidence which pointed towards the non-phasal status of the C complements in question, because the ban on narrow negation scope in this context was seen as an additional manifestation of the structural deficiency of this type of clauses. Recall the analysis put forward earlier on in Section 3.3.2.2, where negation was claimed to be syntactically licensed under a functional NegP projection, which was analyzed as situated in a relatively high position within the clause structure. The CP truncation that complements such as those in (366) undergo was then argued to also affect this high NegP, explaining why negative markers cannot be realized within the embedded clause in such cases.

If the same type of CP-truncation analysis should apply to RusS C complements, then they would be expected to exhibit similar grammaticality contrasts with respect to NC subjunctives in relation to negation scope as well. Once again, this expectation is confirmed, as we can see in (367-368) below:

(367) \textit{Ja skazal vam, chtoby vy ne soblaznilis’}. \hspace{1cm} (Russian)

I told you SUBJ you not be-offended
‘I told you not to be offended.’
The grammaticality contrasts in the examples above, in addition to the data we observed earlier on in (354-366), thus clearly suggest that both RusS and BlkS C complements should be analyzed in terms of CP truncation.

This conclusion has broader relevance in the context of my overall analysis of the Slavic subjunctive, because it argues in favor of a common syntactic approach to both control and non-control complements throughout Slavic, regardless of the surface-related morpho-syntactic contrasts that we observed in relation to these clauses in different Slavic languages (i.e. the use of subjunctive vs. infinitive constructions in control environments). The fact that RusS C complements only feature infinitive morphological marking, while banning the use of subjunctive markers, should not be seen as a reason to exclude them from my broader Subj1 analysis, because the CP-truncation that such complements were shown to undergo can be used to account for this fact as well. Recall the generalization that I put forward earlier on when I was analyzing the control data pertaining to RusS complements selected by intensional predicates such as desideratives (see (345-348)), which stated that only those RusS Subj1 complements that maintain the subjunctive CP projection can introduce the subjunctive construction in the embedded clause, while others must employ the infinitive. The fact that RusS C complements were shown to truncate this projection thus explains why they only allow for the use of the infinitive, despite the fact that they belong to the same Subj1 clausal mood category as their NC subjunctive counterparts.

The syntactic contrasts we observed between RusS NC and C complements can also be used in order to draw some broader conclusions with regards to the overall syntactic nature of the RusS Subj1 clausal mood as such, which will once again allow me to relate the latter with its BlkS counterpart. Recall that the first, and most basic cross-linguistic syntactic property that I identified in relation to the Subj1 clause type at the very beginning of this dissertation (see 1.2) was its structural permeability, i.e. the fact that Subj1 contains a range of clauses that can be subject to varying degrees of truncation. Given that this overall syntactic property was shown
to obtain in the context of the same range of complements in both BlkS and RusS thus provides a further argument to include all such complements under the same Subj1 clause-type analysis, regardless of the surface-related morpho-syntactic differences that they exhibit in the context of control.

Recall, moreover, that this general syntactic property of structural permeability that was claimed to characterize Subj1 complementation across languages was seen as crucially related to the selection mechanism that is used in order to introduce Subj1-type clauses into the structure, i.e. the fact that the latter are not selected due to any type of specific feature inherent to the matrix predicate, but as a default embedded option. This implies that the selecting predicates will not always be semantically compatible with all the features contained within the basic Subj1 clause structure, and will thus delete all projections containing features that do not match their own lexical make-up. The fact that we observed the same types of structural truncations along the same groups of complements in both BlkS and RusS thus points towards the conclusion that the Subj1 clause type in both of these groups of Slavic languages is compatible with my broader default-selection approach to the subjunctive. This conclusion will be further reinforced in the following section, where I will show how the default-selection analysis of Subj1 can also be used in order to account for the semantic contrasts that obtain between different types of RusS complements.

4.2.4 Subjunctivity scale in RusS

The semantic analysis that I will apply to RusS complementation in this section will further confirm the idea that the basic nature of the Subj1 clausal mood as such is the same across Slavic, because we will observe that RusS exhibits the same types of related form-meaning patterns that we previously noted in the context of BlkS. The shared properties that we will observe between the two groups of Slavic languages in this context will, once again, be shown to obtain independently of the surface-related morpho-syntactic differences that they exhibit when it comes to the use of infinitive vs. subjunctive constructions in control environments. Once we observe all of the areas in which RusS complements semantically pattern with their BlkS counterparts, this will ultimately lead to the conclusion that the overall semantics related to the Subj1 mood in all of these Slavic languages should be analyzed on a common basis. More precisely, Slavic Subj1 mood as a whole should be viewed through the prism of the same type
of semantic subjunctivity scale, which I proposed earlier on in 3.3.3 in the context of my analysis of BlkS.

The first broad form-meaning pattern that can be equally observed in relation to both RusS and BlkS Subj1 complementation concerns the correlation between the degree of structural articulation associated with a given complement or group of complements and the degree of semantic specificity related to their meaning. To be more precise, those complements that contain more articulated underlying structures are also more specified from a semantic point of view, because they send a greater amount of features related to the basic Subj1 clause structure to LF, whereas complements that are associated with more truncated structures are less specified in this sense, because they send less of these features to LF. In this context, we noted that NC subjunctives, which maintain the Subj1 CP projection, denote a relatively coherent range of meanings in both BlkS and RusS, i.e. they exhibit irrealis-type interpretations and deontic modality, all of which are typically observed with the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective as well. On the other hand, C complements in RusS and BlkS are associated with much more diverse semantics because, given the fact that they truncate the subjunctive CP, along with the featural specifications contained within it, the syntactic output they send to LF allows for a broader range of interpretations. Thus, for instance, some RusS C complements that we looked at here in 4.2 still exhibit the type of meaning that we usually observe with the subjunctive or the imperative mood (e.g. complements selected by deontic modal predicates, such as the one in (364a), for instance), while others are completely removed from such meanings because they denote entirely realis, non-modalized interpretations, which are more typical of the indicative mood (e.g. complements to aspectual verbs such as the one in (364b)). The same type of semantic diversity was also observed in relation to BlkS C complements earlier on in 3.3.

This leads us to the second common form-meaning pattern that can be observed in both BlkS and RusS, which can be used in order to predict whether a given complement will denote more realis or more irrealis interpretations on the basis of its structural size. The generalization that can be proposed in this context is that complements associated with more articulated underlying structures also denote more irrealis-type meanings, i.e. meanings which are more typical of the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective, whereas complements that denote more realis-type interpretations are associated with more impoverished structures. Thus, for instance, NC subjunctives in RusS, which are all associated with irrealis interpretations, also contain relatively rich underlying structures, which is why they were shown to exhibit phasal
properties with regards to the syntactic phenomena we looked at earlier on in 4.2.3, as we can observe once again in the examples below:

(369) a. *Ivan hotel, chtoby vy prishli zavtra.* (Russian)
John wanted thatSUBJ you come tomorrow
‘John wanted you to come tomorrow.’

b. Ivan, hochet chtoby ego, zhena poehala v Evropu.
John wants thatSUBJ his wife go to Europe
‘John wants his wife to go to Europe.’

c. Ja skazal vam, chtoby vy ne soblaznilis’.
I told you thatSUBJ you not be-offended
‘I told you not to be offended.’

In (369), we can see that irrealis NC complements exhibit phasal properties in relation to grammatical areas such as tense (369a), pronoun binding (369b) or negation scope (369c), all of which points to the fact that they are associated with relatively articulated structural make-up. As a result, once again, they also send more subjunctive-related features to LF, explaining why they exhibit the irrealis-type semantics that we usually observe with the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective.

On the other hand, RusS or BlkS complements that denote realis-type meanings, which are more anomalous in light of the typical subjunctive semantics, were shown to be systematically associated with more truncated structures. As we can observe in (370) below, all RusS complements associated with realis interpretations that we looked at earlier on in 4.2.3 exhibit non-phasal properties with regards to the syntactic phenomena of the type exemplified in (369).

(370) a. *Mne udalos’ zakonchit’ zadanie zavtra.* (Russian)
to-me managed-has finishINF task tomorrow
‘I managed to finish the task (*tomorrow).’

b. Ivan nachal vodit’ svoj avtomobil.
John began driveINF his car

c. *On nachal ne vodit’ avtomobil.
he began not driveINF car
Unlike their NC subjunctive counterparts, RusS C complements in (370) exhibit non-phrasal properties in relation to tense (370a), anaphor binding (370b) and negation scope (370c), which demonstrates that they are associated with more impoverished structures than RusS NC complements. As a result, the atypical semantics that we observe with RusS C complements can, once again, be explained through the prism of feature superset-subset relations that obtain in the context of Subj1 complementation: given that C complements such as those in (370) contain smaller underlying structures than NC subjunctives, they also send less Subj1-related features to LF, which therefore explains why the interpretations they denote are further removed from the typical subjunctive semantics.

The formal and semantic contrasts that we observed in relation to complements such as those in (369-370) also have wider relevance in the context of my overall analysis of the subjunctive clause type, because they can be used to reconcile the semantic data pertaining to RusS complementation with my broader default-selection approach to Subj1. Recall, once again, that the basic claim in the context of my analysis of embedded mood selection was that the indicative CP should be seen as a marked embedded option, selected through the mediation of a special W(orld)-feature present in the lexical make-up of the selecting predicate, whereas subjunctive clause type is selected in the absence of W, as a default embedded strategy. Given that the semantic function of W was seen as related to extensional world-anchoring to the matrix modal base (i.e. the world of the matrix subject), the fact that this feature is absent in the context of subjunctive CP selection led me to propose a specific semantic prediction in relation to Subj1 complementation: the embedded proposition associated with Subj1 complements should never involve extensional world-anchoring to the matrix modal base via embedded CP. Earlier on in 3.3.4, we saw that this prediction could be maintained in light of BlkS data. Here we will see that it is also valid when it comes to RusS.

The reason why RusS data of the type exemplified in (369-370) are relevant in the context of the semantic prediction I just outlined has to do with the fact that the structural contrasts we observed between realis and irrealis complements in these examples have a direct impact on the type of semantic world-anchoring that a given complement undergoes. The relevant observation in this context is that all RusS complements that denote realis-type interpretations, which are only compatible with extensional world-anchoring in the sense of Farkas (1992b), also truncate the embedded CP projection, which means that the world-anchoring that they undergo is not established with respect to the world of the matrix subject via embedded CP but with respect to the actual world of the speaker via matrix CP. On the other
hand, all RusS complements that maintain the embedded CP are associated with irrealis interpretations, which are compatible with intensional world-anchoring as it was defined by Farkas, meaning that the embedded proposition in such cases is not grounded within the matrix modal base (i.e. the world of the matrix subject) but is only anchored to a set of possible worlds compatible with the matrix modal base. As a result, the semantic prediction stemming from the default-selection analysis of Subj1, which stated that embedded Subj1 complements should never be extensionally anchored to the matrix modal base, can be maintained in light of RusS semantic data as well, because whenever the embedded subjunctive proposition is anchored to the matrix modal base, the world-anchoring in question is intensional, and whenever a given RusS complement undergoes extensional world-anchoring, the latter is not established with respect to the matrix modal base but with respect to the actual world of the speaker.

Given that the same basic form-meaning patterns related to Subj1 clausal mood that we observed so far were shown to equally obtain in both BlkS and RusS, this implies that RusS should be approached through the same type of semantic analysis as the one I previously proposed in relation to BlkS. In other words, rather than analyzing the overall semantics related to RusS complementation in terms of any single global semantic notion (e.g. irrealis, non-veridicality etc.), RusS Subj1 should also be analyzed through the prism of a semantic scale of related and structure-dependent meanings, i.e. the subjunctivity scale. Recall that the semantic scale in question was claimed to involve different feature superset-subset relations, which were established on the basis of the amount of features contained within the Subj1 clause structure (reproduced below once again) that a given complement sends to LF at the end of its syntactic derivation.

(371) \[ \text{CP} \ C_{Du>\alpha Deo} \ [\text{ModP}_{Deontic} \ Mod_{Deo} \ [\text{ModP}_{Dynamic} \ Mod_{Dyn} \ [TP \ [vP\ldots]]]]] \]

In the following paragraphs, we will see that the same types of feature superset-subset relations that were observed earlier on in relation to BlkS obtain in the context of RusS Subj1 complementation as well.

As we already noted earlier on in 4.2.2, the group of complements that maintains the full range of features associated with the structure in (371), and which can thus be defined as the core subjunctive group, is the same in both BlkS and RusS: it involves complements selected by directive predicates, which can be defined as embedded imperatives. Some complements of
this type are reproduced below in (372) (along with the representation of their underlying structure):

(372) \[\text{[CP} \ C_{\text{Dir} \supset \text{Deo}} \ \text{[ModP}_{\text{Deontic}} \ \text{Mod}_{\text{Deo}} \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}} \ \text{Mod}_{\text{Dyn}} \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{vP} \ldots ]])]\]

\[\begin{align*}
a. \ & \text{Ja prosil, chtoby ty prishel zavtra.} \\
& \text{I asked thatSUBJ you come tomorrow} \\
& \text{‘I asked you to come tomorrow.’} \\
\ \& \\
\[\begin{align*}
b. \ & \text{Jan, kazal, zeby (pro}_{\text{obj}} \) przyszedl jutro.} \\
& \text{John ordered thatSUBJ he come tomorrow} \\
& \text{‘John ordered him to come tomorrow.’}
\end{align*}\]

The fact that complements of the type exemplified in (372) maintain the highest Dir-feature associated with the Subj1 clause structure can account for the formal and semantic properties that distinguish them from other RusS complements. It can explain, first of all, the distinctive properties that such complements were shown to exhibit in the area of control: given that they maintain the anti-control Dir-feature, complements in (372) ban control readings independently of any type of broader linguistic phenomenon, such as the subjunctive-infinitive competition, and regardless of the type of morpho-syntactic construction that is used in the embedded complement (e.g. subjunctive vs. infinitive) (see 4.2.2 for more detail). This will no longer be the case with the remaining groups of RusS complements that we will look at a bit later on.

The syntactic analysis in (372) can also explain why complements exemplified above differ from all other Subj1 clauses from a semantic point of view, in that they are the only ones that can be directly related to the prototypical directive function associated with the imperative mood, given that they denote reported directive speech acts. Once again, this should be seen as a function of Dir, which was claimed to encode prototypical imperative meanings in both matrix and embedded environments. The fact that the core context of subjunctive complementation in both RusS and BlkS involves complements that can be described as embedded imperatives is to be expected given my broader syntactic analysis of the subjunctive clause type as introduced under the embedded instance of the matrix imperative CP.

The next type of RusS complements that we will look at here are those selected by intensional verbs which were subsumed under the group of ‘future-referring predicates’ earlier on in 3.2 (e.g. want, prefer, expect, suggest etc.). The main formal difference that such
complements exhibit with respect to the core subjunctives in (372) is the fact that they strip the highest Dir-feature from their structure, while maintaining the lower modal Deo-feature. As a result, the complements in question are no longer associated with the same type of anti-control properties as those in (372), i.e. they no longer ban subject-control regardless of the type of morpho-syntactic construction that appears in the embedded clause. Rather, as we noted earlier on in 4.2.2, they involve non-control readings when they introduce the subjunctive, and control readings when they introduce the infinitive in the embedded clause. In this sense, such complements also differ from their BlkS counterparts, which were shown earlier on in 3.3 to allow both for non-control as well as for control readings in subjunctives. Nevertheless, the control contrasts that these complements exhibit in the two groups of Slavic languages should not be seen as related to any type of essential difference between RusS and BlkS complementation when it comes to the feature superset-subset relations that characterize Subj1 clausal mood, which will be shown to equally obtain across Slavic.

Given that the use of the infinitive in RusS Subj1 environments was related to CP-truncation (see 4.2.3), we will need to make a structural distinction between two types of complements selected by future-referring predicates in the context of RusS: on the one hand, we have those that maintain the Subj1 CP and introduce the subjunctive in the embedded clause, as in (373) below; on the other hand, there are those that strip the subjunctive CP and introduce the infinitive, as in (374). The latter should be grouped alongside complements selected by deontic modals, because they all introduce infinitive clauses associated with similar modal meanings, which should be seen as a result of the fact that such complements strip the subjunctive CP but maintain the full modality layer below it, as shown below in (374).

\[(373) \quad [\text{CP} \ C_{\text{Subj}3} \ Deo \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Deontic}} \ Deo \ [\text{ModP}_{\text{Dynamic}} \ Deo \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{vP} \ldots]]]]]]\]

a. \textit{Jan, chce, zeby (pro+i) przyszedl jutro.} \\
John wants thatSUBJ3.sg. he come tomorrow \\
‘John wants *(him) to come tomorrow.’ \\

b. \textit{Ivan, predlagajet, chtoby on+i prishel zavtra.} \\
John suggests thatSUBJ he come tomorrow \\
‘John suggests *(for him) to come tomorrow.’
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The structural distinction in (373-374) does not crucially affect the semantic modal properties associated with the complements exemplified above (as we also noted earlier on in 4.2.2-4.2.3), because they all denote similar types of irrealis interpretations, deontic modality and world-to-word fit, i.e. the types of meanings that one usually observes with the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective. This should be seen as a result of the fact that all complements in (373-374) maintain the Deo feature introduced under the Mod_{deontic} projection, which is not affected by the subjunctive CP truncation in this context. In this sense, RusS complements in question fully pattern with their BlkS counterparts from a semantic point of view: regardless of whether a given complement exhibits subjunctive or infinitive morphology on the surface, they all denote similar types of modal meanings once they reach LF, as a result of the fact that they maintain the Deo-feature in their structure. This is what I meant when I said that the feature superset-subset relations that characterize Subj1 clausal mood equally obtain in both RusS and BlkS, regardless of some of the broader syntactic differences that the two groups of Slavic languages exhibit in the area of control. The same observation will also hold when it comes to the remaining types of RusS complements that we will look at here.

The next group of RusS complements that will be shown to exhibit common patterns with their BlkS counterparts are those selected by dynamic modals (including modalized verbs of knowing). As we can see in (375) below, such complements undergo further structural truncation because they also strip a part of the modality layer situated below the subjunctive CP projection:

(374) \[ [\text{CP} \rightarrow \text{Dynamic} \ [\text{vP}]]] \]

(a) Ivan_{i} hochet prijti{r}/zavtra. (Russian)
John wants comeINF tomorrow
‘John wants (*him) to come tomorrow.’

(b) Musi przyjsc jutro. (Polish)
must3.sg. comeINF tomorrow
‘He must come tomorrow.’
The truncation in (375) can be used to explain why the modal meaning denoted by control complements of this type (i.e. dynamic modality) is more realis and therefore less closely related to the typical subjunctive semantics than was the case with complements in (373-374). This can, once again, be accounted for through the prism of feature superset-subset relations. Given that complements in (375) truncate a chunk of their modality layer, the range of Subj1-related modal features that they send to LF is smaller than the one we observed with complements in (373-374), which maintained the full modality layer below CP: while the latter sent both the higher Deo and the lower Dyn to the semantic component, the former only send the lower Dyn to LF, explaining why their meaning is further removed from typical subjunctive semantics. Once again, the exact same type of feature superset-subset analysis was also shown to apply in the context of BlkS counterparts of the RusS complements in (373-375) (see 3.3.3).

The remaining group of RusS complements are those selected by aspectual (376a) or implicative predicates (376b). As we can see in (376) below, such complements are associated with most truncated structures out of all RusS clauses because they strip the entire modality layer below CP:

(376) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a. } \text{Ivan nachal vodit' svoj avtomobil.} \\
\text{John began driveINF his car}
\end{array}
\]

(376) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{b. } \text{Udało mu sie przyjesc na czas.} \\
\text{managed to-him has comeINF on time}
\end{array}
\]

‘He managed to come on time.’

As a result, complements of the type exemplified in (376) do not send any modal feature related to the Subj1 structure to LF, explaining why they denote entirely realis, non-modalized
interpretations, which are more typical of the indicative than they are of the subjunctive mood. This constitutes yet another common form-meaning pattern that we can observe between BlkS and RusS, because the atypical semantic properties associated with complements of this type were accounted for through the same type of syntactic analysis in both groups of Slavic languages.

Given all the observations we just made, the conclusion must be that the overall semantics related to the RusS Subj1 mood should be approached through the same type of analysis as the one that was previously applied in the context of BlkS: in both cases, the range of meanings associated with this mood category should be described in terms of the same scale of related, hierarchical and structure-dependent meanings, i.e. the subjunctivity scale (reproduced in (377) below).

(377) **Subjunctivity scale**

Directivity > World-to-word fit / Deontic modality > Dynamic modality > vP-related lexical meaning

Once again, a finer semantic study of RusS complementation may allow to further articulate the meaning layers contained within the subjunctivity scale in (377), but the analysis proposed here is already sufficient to capture the main semantic distinctions that we observed in the context of Subj1 complementation in both RusS and BlkS.

The broader conclusion that can be drawn on the basis of the entire analysis put forward here in Chapter 4 is that the basic nature of the Subj1 clausal mood as such is the same throughout all Slavic languages that we looked at in this dissertation, regardless of the surface-related morpho-syntactic contrasts that we observed between different languages in this context (i.e. the use of subjunctive vs. infinitive morphology in control environments). The common approach to Slavic Subj1 complementation can be justified in light of the fact that RusS and BlkS were shown to exhibit the same basic properties which were claimed to be the hallmark of the Subj1 clausal mood. Most importantly, they were shown to be associated with the same type of structural permeability from a syntactic point of view and the same degree of semantic diversity from an interpretative point of view, all of which was argued to directly follow from my broader syntactic analysis of Subj1 clause type as the default embedded option. The fact that RusS and BlkS differ on the surface in that the former employs the infinitive while the latter uses the subjunctive in control Subj1 environments can then be seen as merely an
additional manifestation of the formal diversity associated with the Subj1 clause type across languages, which is entirely compatible with the default-selection analysis of the latter.

At this point, therefore, I claim to have reached a comprehensive theoretical account related to Slavic subjunctive complementation, which allowed me to subsume the full range of Subj1-type clauses in BlkS and RusS under a common analytical framework, regardless of the apparent differences that the two groups of Slavic languages were shown to exhibit in this context. The primary objective that I will pursue in my future study of the subjunctive, and of mood distinctions in general, will be to determine whether the main generalizations I reached in this thesis can also be claimed to have broader cross-linguistic applicability, which extends beyond the Slavic languages that were the primary focus of my analysis here. As for the remainder of the present study, I will use it, first of all, to recap the most important findings that I reached on the basis of my analysis of Slavic subjunctive so far (Chapter 5), and then to briefly address some theoretical issues related to subjunctive complements previously defined as Subj2 (Chapter 6), which did not feature prominently in this dissertation because they were shown to be less productive in Slavic than in other language groups, such as Romance.
CHAPTER 5
SLAVIC SUBJUNCTIVE: SUMMARY

As I explained in the introductory chapter, Slavic subjunctive constitutes a particularly challenging subject for study because it presents several different types of broad theoretical difficulties, some of which are more general to the study of the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective, while others are more specific to the Slavic language group itself. The more general problems that one is faced with in this context are related to subjunctive distribution, which often makes it difficult to analyze the subjunctive as a coherent mood category, whether it be in Slavic or in other groups of languages (although the most problematic instances of subjunctive distribution may differ from language to language). On the other hand, the problems that are more specific to the analysis of the Slavic subjunctive in particular, which one is not typically faced with when studying the same mood category in other languages, are related to subjunctive realization, i.e. the fact that Slavic languages do not feature dedicated subjunctive verb forms. This makes it difficult to incorporate Slavic subjunctive into any type of broader, cross-linguistic theoretical framework related to this mood, because most languages where the subjunctive can be found use dedicated verbal morphology in order to distinguish the subjunctive from other mood categories, such as the indicative.

The problem of subjunctive realization was addressed as soon as I turned to the study of Slavic subjunctive in Chapter 2. The first question that I was faced with in this context was to determine whether Slavic subjunctive can be analyzed on a par with its Romance counterpart, despite the morphological differences that the two groups of languages exhibit in relation to subjunctive marking (i.e. the fact that Romance languages feature dedicated subjunctive verb forms whereas Slavic languages identify the subjunctive through separate mood markers situated in the left periphery of the clause). The common approach to Romance and Slavic subjunctive was justified on the basis of the claim that the subjunctive should not only be seen as a verbal mood but also as a clausal mood, defined in terms of a cluster of common formal and semantic clausal properties that are shared across languages. In this context, Romance and Slavic subjunctive complements were shown to exhibit a whole range of common clausal patterns, in areas such as modality, tense, (anti)control, or syntactic phasehood, among others.
This eventually resulted in the conclusion that subjunctives in these languages should be seen as selected under the same CP clause type.

The CP projection under which subjunctive complements are introduced into the structure was then subsequently analyzed as the embedded instance of the matrix imperative CP, similarly as in Han (1998) or Kempchinsky (2009), among others. This analysis was justified by showing that subjunctives share a wide range of common clausal properties with imperatives across languages, in areas such as world semantics, tense, or syntactic distribution, where the two exhibit a number of cross-linguistic overlaps. As a result, I argued that the imperative and the subjunctive CP are associated with the same underlying formal make-up, containing a feature cluster which consists of a higher, clause-typing Directive feature and a lower modal Deontic feature. The main difference between subjunctives and imperatives in this context is that the feature cluster in question always reaches the LF component when it appears under a matrix imperative CP, whereas the embedded subjunctive CP structure can be subject to varying degrees of truncation, which explains why subjunctives exhibit more diverse formal and semantic properties than imperatives, as we would go on to observe in the subsequent parts of the dissertation.

Another important aspect of the analysis that was proposed in relation to the imperative/subjunctive CP was the claim that the latter should be seen as formally distinct from the CP projection used to introduce indicative complements into the structure, which corresponds to the embedded instance of the matrix declarative CP. The formal distinction that I established in relation to these two types of CP projections allowed me to account for the systematic cluster of syntactic and semantic contrasts that we observed between indicative and subjunctive complements across languages. From a semantic point of view, these two types of complements were shown to differ when it comes to their propositional content (in the sense of Portner (1997)) and the type of world-anchoring they involve (in the sense of Farkas (1992b)): while indicatives denote extensionally anchored persistent propositions, which can be judged as true or false, subjunctives denote nonpersistent propositions, which are not extensionally anchored to the matrix modal base, and which cannot receive a truth value (see 1.4.3 for more detail). From a syntactic point of view, subjunctives and indicatives were shown to differ when it comes to their phasal status: while the latter exhibited fully phasal properties when it came to areas such as tense, control or binding, the former were shown to be associated with more mixed phasal properties in this context.
All of these different types of cross-linguistic contrasts that we observed between indicative and subjunctive complements were ultimately explained by referring to a single formal distinction with regards to their underlying CP structure. The distinction in question was seen as related to the different selection mechanisms that are used to introduce indicatives and subjunctives into the structure, i.e. the fact that indicatives are selected as a marked embedded option, via a special W(orld) feature contained in the lexical make-up of the matrix predicate, which agrees with the corresponding feature contained within the high WP projection associated with the indicative CP domain, whereas subjunctives are selected in the absence of W, as a default embedded option. Given that the W-feature was related both to extensional world anchoring from a semantic point of view as well as to phase closure from a syntactic point of view (see 2.3.3 for more detail), the claim that W is present in the indicative CP structure while absent from the subjunctive CP allowed me to explain the full range of semantic and formal contrasts that we observed between these two types of clauses.

The default-selection approach proposed in relation to the subjunctive CP was subsequently used in Chapters 3 and 4 in order to address the problematic aspects related to subjunctive distribution in different Slavic languages. The problem of subjunctive distribution was particularly salient in BlkS-type languages (i.e. Balkan Slavic languages), which I studied in Chapter 3, because subjunctives in these languages were shown to distribute across a wider range of embedded syntactic environments than is typically the case from a cross-linguistic perspective. The reason for this is the fact that BlkS complements are selected both by control and by non-control predicates (due to the infinitive-loss phenomenon that affected languages of the Balkan region, which was explained in 3.2), whereas their cross-linguistic counterparts are typically restricted to non-control contexts. This means that the predicates which select the subjunctive in the context of BlkS are very diverse from the point of view of lexical semantics, ranging from intensional directives, on the one side, to non-modalized aspectuals, on the other, so the fact that they all introduce the same Subj1 clause type as their embedded complement is difficult to relate to any type of inherent lexical property that they all might share. This is where my broader default-selection approach to the subjunctive came in handy.

The analysis which views Subj1 selection as the default syntactic option in embedded environments does not require that matrix predicates share any type of common lexical feature in order to select this clause type as their complement, so the fact that Subj1-selecting predicates are associated with very diverse lexical properties is not surprising or problematic in light of this perspective. The only restriction on Subj1 selection that my analysis entails is that the
selecting predicate cannot contain the indicative-related W-feature, which provides extensional world-anchoring to the matrix modal base. This restriction was shown to apply throughout all contexts of BlkS Subj1 distribution because, despite the general lexical diversity of Subj1-selecting predicates, one common semantic pattern that they were all shown to exhibit was that none of them involved extensional world-anchoring of the embedded subjunctive proposition to the matrix modal base.

In addition to accounting for the diverse lexical range of Subj1-selecting predicates, the broader default-selection analysis of Subj1 was also used to provide a principled explanation for the formal and semantic diversity that we observed in relation to various BlkS complements subsumed under this clause type. The main observation that was made in this context is that the type of meaning that a given BlkS Subj1 complement denotes is contingent on the size of its underlying structure: complements associated with more articulated structures were shown to denote meanings which are more typical of the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective (i.e. irrealis deontic modal meanings), whereas complements associated with smaller and more truncated structures denote meanings which are less typical of the subjunctive (i.e. realis-type meanings). This is because complements associated with larger underlying structures also send a greater amount of Subj1-related features to LF, whereas complements whose structure is more truncated send less of these features to the interface with semantics, which explains why the meanings they denote are further removed from those we typically observe with the subjunctive mood across languages. The structural truncations that we noted in relation to different types of BlkS complements, and the resulting differences in LF outputs that such complements send to semantics, were all ultimately explained in light of my broader default-selection approach to Subj1. Given that Subj1 clause type is not selected by the matrix predicate due to any type of inherent lexical property associated with the latter but as a default embedded option, the predicate in question will not always be semantically compatible with all the features contained within the basic Subj1 clause structure. As a result, when a given feature does not match the selecting predicate’s lexical make-up, it will be truncated from the structure, along with the projection that contains it. This broader analysis thus provided a principled explanation for the form-meaning patterns we observed in the context of BlkS distribution, specifically the observation that predicates which are more compatible with typical subjunctive semantics (e.g. intensional verbs) truncate a smaller chunk of Subj1 structure than predicates which are less compatible with the core subjunctive meaning (e.g. aspectuals or implicatives).
Once I shifted the focus of my study towards the subjunctive in RusS-type languages (i.e. non-Balkan Slavic languages) in Chapter 4, the main issue I was faced with was to determine the degree to which the analysis that was previously proposed in relation to BlkS could be applied to RusS. The key problem that stood in the way of a common approach to the subjunctive across Slavic was, once again, related to subjunctive distribution, because RusS and BlkS were shown to exhibit very different patterns in this context: unlike BlkS languages, which distributed the subjunctive in both control and non-control complements, RusS languages restricted the use of subjunctive marking to non-control environments, whereas control complements were associated with the infinitive constructions. Even though such a narrow subjunctive distribution made it easier to provide a coherent semantic analysis of the RusS mood as such, it was problematic in light of my own approach to the subjunctive. This is because the default-selection analysis of Subj1 that I proposed in the previous parts of this dissertation implied that this clause type should be selected by a wider array of predicates, which exhibit a greater degree of semantic diversity than the one we observe with verbs that introduce embedded subjunctive marking in the context of RusS, all of which correspond to the definition of intensional predicates in the sense of Farkas (1992b).

The only way in which my broader default-selection approach to Subj1 could be maintained in the context of RusS was to suggest that RusS Subj1 clausal mood as such distributes beyond those complements that feature subjunctive morphological marking on the surface. The hypothesis I advanced in this context was that both subjunctives as well as infinitives in non-Balkan Slavic should be subsumed under the same Subj1 clause type as their BlkS subjunctive counterparts. The argument that was put forward in Section 4.2 allowed me to demonstrate the validity of this hypothesis, because RusS infinitives were shown to closely pattern with BlkS control subjunctives in a number of different areas. From a syntactic point of view, all of these control complements were shown to exhibit the same types of anaphoric, non-phrasal properties, which equally distinguished them from non-control subjunctives in both RusS and BlkS. They were also shown to pattern from a semantic point of view, because we observed the same types of modal contrasts across different groups of control complements in BlkS and RusS regardless of whether a given complement was associated with subjunctive or with infinitive morphology on the surface. All of this led to the conclusion that RusS subjunctives/infinitives should be included under the same Subj1 mood category as BlkS subjunctives.
This conclusion, in turn, allowed me to show that Slavic Subj1 clausal mood as such can be related to a number of broader common patterns that obtain both in BlkS and in RusS. Most importantly, we observed that RusS complementation exhibits the same types of form-meaning correlations that were previously noted in the context of BlkS. Once again, the type of meaning that a given Subj1 complement denotes was shown to be crucially dependent on its underlying structural make-up: complements associated with more articulated structures denoted a relatively coherent range of meanings, which are more typical of the subjunctive mood across languages, whereas complements whose structure was more truncated were associated with more diverse semantics, which is further removed from the typical subjunctive meaning. The semantic contrasts that we observed in this context were analyzed in light of the same feature superset-subset relations in both BlkS and RusS, which ultimately resulted in the conclusion that the overall semantics related to Subj1 clausal mood should be viewed through the prism of the same type of subjunctivity scale across Slavic.

All the generalizations summarized here in 5 concern subjunctive complements which were subsumed under the Subj1 label at the beginning of this study, i.e. complements selected by the matrix predicate under a separate subjunctive clause type. Nevertheless, as I made it clear from the outset, Subj1-type complementation does not subsume all instances of subjunctive distribution that one can observe in embedded clausal environments across languages, because the subjunctive can also be found in some complements that are not associated with the Subj1 clause type. The latter types of subjunctive complements are primarily those grouped under the Subj2 label, which were not studied in detail up until now because Subj2 was shown to be less productive in Slavic than in some other languages, such as those belonging to the Romance group. Nevertheless, before I conclude the present study, I will briefly address some of the more salient issues related to Subj2 complementation as well. The account of Subj2 that I will propose in the following chapter will mostly focus on the contrasts that such complements exhibit with respect to their Subj1 counterparts across languages, both when it comes to their clausal properties and when it comes to their cross-linguistic distribution. The contrasts that we will observe in this context will be accounted for by claiming that Subj1 and Subj2-type complements should be seen as introduced through different syntactic mechanisms under different embedded clause types.
CHAPTER 6

SUBJ2: SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD IN INDICATIVE-TYPE COMPLEMENTATION

Let us begin by briefly recalling some of the more typical instances of Subj2 complementation that we can observe across languages. Subj2 complements are usually introduced under predicates of the epistemic or of the factive type, such as the ones exemplified below:

(378)  *Ne vjarvjam da dojde.*  (Bulgarian)

not believe1.sg. SUBJ came3.sg.
‘I don’t believe he came.’

(379)  *Il semble qu’il ne veuille pas venir.*  (French)

it seems that he neg. wantsSUBJ not comeINF
‘It seems that he doesn’t want to come.’

(380)  *Pistevo na elise to provlima.*  (Greek)

believe1.sg. SUBJ solved3.sg. the problem
‘I believe he solved the problem.’
(Roussou, 2010: 4)

(381)  *Lamento que Juan no viniera.*  (Spanish)

regret1.sg. that John not came3.sg.SUBJ
‘I regret that John did not come.’

(382)  *Je comprends qu’il ne veuille pas le faire.*  (French)

I understand that he neg. wantsSUBJ not it doINF
‘I understand that he doesn’t want to do it.’

Subjunctive complements of the type exemplified in (378-382) exhibit a number of contrasting patterns when compared to their Subj1 counterparts (some of which we have already noted,
while others will be observed a bit later on), which is why they should be subsumed under a different clausal label, i.e. Subj2. The analysis that I will propose in this chapter will attempt to account for the contrasting sets of properties that can be observed between these two types of subjunctive complements.

As I already explained in the introductory chapter (see Section 1.2.1 in particular), the basic distinction between Subj1 and Subj2-type complementation across languages should be related to selection: while Subj1 complements are lexically selected by the matrix predicate under a separate subjunctive clause type, Subj2 clauses introduce subjunctive morphology through a different syntactic mechanism under a different CP type. This broader theoretical distinction raises a couple of important questions, which are yet to be fully addressed: first of all, I will need to identify the exact syntactic clause type under which subjunctive morphology is introduced in Subj2 complements, and then determine the basic properties of the syntactic mechanism that is used to introduce subjunctive marking under this clause type, which is different from the selection mechanism that we observe in Subj1 environments. The analysis that I will propose in the remainder of this chapter will provide some tentative answers to these questions.

6.1 Subj1 vs. Subj2: Selection vs. mood concord

Recall that the original motivation for the distinction between Subj1 and Subj2 complementation in terms of selection had to do with the degree of stability related to the use of subjunctive mood morphology in a given type of complement. The basic observation in this context was that complements where the subjunctive is selected by the matrix predicate (i.e. Subj1) exhibit stable subjunctive use in the embedded clause, whereas complements where the subjunctive per se is not lexically selected (i.e. Subj2) exhibit a greater degree of variability in this context, because they often allow the subjunctive to be replaced by some other mood category, such as the indicative. The contrast in question is illustrated in the examples below:

(383) a.  *Ja hochu, chtoby / chto Ivan prishel.
        \(\text{Russian}\)
        I want thatSUBJ / IND John come
        ‘I want John to come.’
b. *Je demande que vous soyez / *êtes ici à l’heure.* (French)
I demand that you be2.pl.SUBJ / IND here on time
‘I demand that you be here on time.’

c. *Thelo na / *oti liso to provlima.* (Greek)
want1.sg. SUBJ / IND solve1.sg. the problem
‘I want to solve the problem.’
(Roussou, 2010: 3)

(384) a. *Ne vjaryjam da dojde / che shte dojde.* (Bulgarian)
not believe1.sg. SUBJ came3.sg. / IND will come
‘I don’t believe he came / will come.’

b. *Pistevo na / oti elise to provlima.* (Greek)
believe1.sg. SUBJ / IND solved3.sg. the problem
‘I believe that he solved the problem.’
(Roussou, 2010: 4)

c. *Je comprend qu’il veuille / veut garder ses amis.* (French)
I understand that he wantsSUBJ / IND keepINF his friends
‘I understand that he wants to keep his friends.’

In (383), we can observe that the use of subjunctive morphology is obligatory in Subj1 environments, which is why the introduction of indicative mood markers under Subj1-selecting predicates produces ungrammaticality, whereas the examples in (384) show us that Subj2 complements allow for the alterations between the use of subjunctive and indicative mood markers in the embedded clause. These types of grammaticality contrasts are expected given the proposed distinction between Subj1 and Subj2 complementation in terms of selection: the fact that Subj1 complements, such as those in (383), are lexically selected by the matrix predicate implies that the introduction of any other mood category in the embedded clause produces a clash with the selectional requirements of this predicate, and thus results in ungrammaticality. On the other hand, Subj2 complements of the type exemplified in (384) involve matrix predicates which are not associated with the same type of selectional requirements, given that they do not select a separate subjunctive CP clause type. As a result, the introduction of indicative mood markers in the embedded clause is not excluded in this context.
Given that Subj2 complements should not be seen as selected under a separate subjunctive CP, the question then becomes what is the syntactic clause type under which subjunctive mood morphology is introduced in such cases. Some of the observations we made in the previous parts of this study already point towards the most plausible answer in this context: as suggested in the title of the present chapter, the CP projection associated with Subj2 clauses should be seen as the same one that is used to introduce indicative complements into the structure. The idea that Subj2 complements are associated with the indicative CP can account, first of all, for the variations that we observed between the use of the subjunctive and the indicative mood marking in this context. It can also account for the data related to languages where Subj2-type complementation is not productive, including those belonging to the Slavic group. As we can observe in the examples below, such languages systematically introduce the indicative in these types of embedded syntactic environments, while banning the use of subjunctive:

(385) a. Kazhetsja, chto / *chtoby on prishel vchera. (Russian)
    possible thatIND / SUBJ he came yesterday
    ‘It is possible that he came yesterday.’

    b. Zaluje, ze / *zeby odszedl. (Polish)
    regret1.sg. thatIND / SUBJ left
    ‘I regret that he left.’

If we assume that complements of this type are selected under the indicative CP, this can account for the observation that they are more systematically associated with the indicative mood than they are with the subjunctive across languages. As for those languages which do allow for the use of subjunctive marking in Subj2 complements, they will be analyzed as involving a different type of syntactic mechanism, which allows to introduce subjunctive morphology in the embedded clause after the latter has been selected under an indicative-type CP (more on that a bit later).

Another reason why Subj2-type complements should be seen as introduced under the indicative CP is the fact that they share a series of common clausal properties with indicatives. As we will observe in the following paragraphs, Subj2 complements pattern with indicatives, while differing from their Subj1 counterparts, in a number of different grammatical areas, which is a further reason why Subj1 and Subj2 should be analyzed as corresponding to two different
embedded clause types (i.e. subjunctive vs. indicative CP). The analysis that I will propose in this context will primarily center on Romance languages, because this is where Subj2 complements have been most extensively studied.

The first common clausal pattern that Subj2 complements will be shown to share with indicatives has to do with their basic semantic properties, namely the type of propositional content they denote and the type of world-anchoring they involve. Recall, first of all, that the most important distinction I previously established between indicatives and Subj1 complements in this context, based on the theoretical perspectives outlined in Farkas (1992b) and Portner (1997), had to do with the types of world-relations that these complements established between the embedded proposition and the matrix modal base, i.e. the world of the matrix subject: indicative complements were shown to exhibit extensional world-anchoring in this context, grounding the embedded proposition within the matrix modal base, whereas the only type of world relation that Subj1 complements could establish with respect to the matrix modal base was the one involving intensional anchoring, i.e. the type of world-anchoring which does not ground the embedded proposition within any specific world but only to a set of possible worlds compatible with the world of the matrix subject. This, in turn, explained why only indicatives could be seen as compatible with truth-value judgements (given that truth vs. falsity of a given proposition only obtains within specific worlds116), whereas Subj1 complements could not receive a truth value. If we now look at Subj2-type clauses through the same world-semantics prism, we can notice that they pattern with indicatives, while differing from Subj1 complements in this context, because they are compatible with truth-value judgements as well: Subj2 clauses introduced under epistemic predicates, such as those in (379-380), can be judged as either true or false, depending on context, whereas Subj2 complements introduced under factive predicates, as in (381-382), will be judged as true by default. This means that Subj2 clauses exhibit the same basic propositional content and the same type of world-anchoring as indicatives: all of these complements should be seen as denoting persistent propositions (in the sense of Portner (1997)), which are extensionally anchored to the matrix modal base.

The reason why this semantic observation is particularly relevant in the context of my current analysis of Subj2 complementation is because the extensional world-anchoring, which both indicatives and Subj2 complements were shown to undergo, was seen as crucially related to the selection mechanism whereby indicative CP is introduced into the structure. Recall, once again, that the CP in question was analyzed as selected as a marked embedded option, through

---

116 See Section 1.4.3 for a more detailed theoretical explanation as to why this is the case.
the mediation of a special W(orld)-feature contained within the lexical make-up of the matrix predicate, which extensionally anchors the embedded proposition to the matrix modal base thanks to the binding relationship that it establishes with the corresponding W-feature contained within the embedded indicative CP structure. The relevant binding mechanism is reintroduced once again below:

(386) \[ \text{V}_W \quad \text{CP[WP}_W] \]

Select/Agree

The fact that Subj2 complements exhibit the same type of extensional world-anchoring as indicatives thus implies that the clause type under which they are introduced should also be seen as selected under the mechanism in (386). The simplest way to account for this is to claim that Subj2 clauses and indicatives are introduced under the same type of CP projection, i.e. the indicative CP. This conclusion will be further reinforced in the following paragraphs, once we observe that Subj2 complements also share a number of additional clausal properties with indicatives.

Another clausal area where Subj2 clauses pattern with indicatives is tense. Unlike Subj1 complements, which were shown to be associated with dependent tense (see 2.2.2.2, for instance), Subj2 clauses exhibit more independent temporal properties, which are closer to those we observe in indicative complements. This is manifested by the fact that Subj2 complements, just like indicatives, can denote all types of temporal relations with respect to the reference time of the matrix predicate, including anteriority, as we can observe in the French (387) and Spanish (388) examples below:

(387) a. \textit{Je regrette qu’il soit pas venu hier / qu’il vienne pas demain.}
I regret that he hasSUBJ not come yesterday that he comesSUBJ not tomorrow
‘I regret that he didn’t come yesterday / will not come tomorrow.’

b. \textit{Je sais qu’il est venu hier / qu’il viendra demain.}
I know that he hasIND come yesterday that he will-come tomorrow
‘I know that he came yesterday / will come tomorrow.’
(388) a. *No creo que haya venido ayer / que venga mañana.*
   ‘I don’t believe he came yesterday / will come tomorrow.’

b. Creo que vinió ayer / vendrá mañana.
   ‘I believe that he came yesterday / will come tomorrow.’

Subj1 complements, on the other hand, exhibit more deficient temporal properties, which is why they cannot denote temporal readings that are anterior to the reference time of the matrix predicate, as we can observe once again thanks to the ungrammatical nature of the examples below:

(389) a. *Je veux qu’il soit venu hier.*
   I want that he hasSUBJ come yesterday
b. *Quiero que haya venido ayer.*
   ‘I want him to come (*yesterday).’

Clausal tense thus provides a further argument in favor of the analysis that views Subj2 complements as introduced under the indicative CP, as opposed to the subjunctive (i.e. Subj1) CP.

Another grammatical area in which Subj2 complements pattern with indicatives while differing from their Subj1 counterparts is related to anti-control. Recall that Romance Subj1 complements selected by intensional predicates such as desideratives or directives were shown to exhibit the anti-control effect of subject obviation, i.e. the ban on conjoined readings between the matrix and the embedded subject:

(390) a. Ellos quieren que (pro-i/j) vengan mañana.
   ‘They want *(them) to come tomorrow.’

b. Il ordonne qu’il/i/j vienne demain.
   ‘He orders *(him) to come tomorrow.’
Subj2 complements, on the other hand, do not exhibit the same type of anti-control effect, because they are compatible both with disjoined and with conjoined readings in relation to the embedded subject, as we can observe in the examples below:

(391) a. *Juan no cree que* (*pro_{i0}*) *sea capaz de hacerlo.* (Spanish)

John not believe that he isSUBJ capable to doINF-it
‘John doesn’t believe that he is capable of doing it.’

b. *Il i regrette qu’il ne soit pas venu hier.* (French)

he regrets that he neg. hasSUBJ not come yesterday
‘He regrets that he didn’t come yesterday.’

Once again, the free reference associated with the embedded subject in Subj2 complements in (391) is more typical of the indicative than it is of Subj1-type complementation in Romance.

The final piece of evidence that I will put forward here in favor of the analysis that subsumes Subj2 complements under the indicative CP clause type has to do with a different type of matrix-embedded binding relationship, specifically the one involving long-distance anaphor (LDA) binding. Earlier on in Chapter 2, we already observed some contrasts between indicative and subjunctive (i.e. Subj1) complements in relation to LDA binding of possessive anaphors in Italian: indicatives were shown to ban this type of anaphor binding, which was seen as one of the manifestations of their full phasal status, whereas subjunctives allowed it, which was analyzed as a result of the mixed phasal properties associated with the subjunctive CP (see the analysis in 2.3 for more detail). Giannakidou&Quer (1997) noted similar types of contrasts in relation to LDA binding of negative indefinites in Catalan. In this context, Subj1 complements were shown to pattern with infinitives, in that they allow this type of LDA binding (392), whereas Subj2 complements, once again, pattern with indicatives, in that they disallow it (393):

(392) a. *No vull que saludis ningú.* (Catalan)

not want1.sg. that salute2.sg.SUBJ nobody
‘I don’t want you to say hello to anyone.’

b. *No vull saludar ningú.*

not want1.sg. saluteINF nobody
‘I don’t want to say hello to anyone.’
The grammaticality data in (292-293) suggest that indicatives and Subj2 complements, on the one hand, and infinitives and Subj1 complements, on the other, differ when it comes to their phasal status.

The fact that Subj1 complements allow the type of LDA binding we observe in (392-393) whereas both Subj2 and indicative complements disallow it shows us that the CP projections under which these clauses are introduced are not equally phasal: while Subj1 CP is associated with a mixed phasal status, indicative/Subj2 CP exhibits fully phasal properties. Recall that the full phasal status we observed with indicative complements earlier on in Chapter 2 was also seen as crucially related to the selection mechanism which introduces the indicative CP into the structure (see 2.3.3 for more detail). First of all, the W-feature contained within the lexical make-up of the indicative-selecting predicate was claimed to enter into an Agreement relationship with the corresponding W contained in the high WP projection associated with the indicative CP domain, as we observed once again a bit earlier on in (386). This high WP was then argued to encode phase closure, establishing the clausal domain where it obtains as fully phasal. The fact that Subj2 complements were shown to exhibit equally phasal properties as indicatives (not just in relation to LDA binding but also in relation to tense, for instance) should thus be seen as an indication that they project the same type of WP within their structure, and hence involve the same type of selection mechanism as the one we observe in the context of indicative CP selection, i.e. the mechanism in (386).

All the observations we made so far argue in favor of the claim that Subj2 complements should be analyzed as introduced under the indicative-type CP: given the assumption that both the indicative and the subjunctive (i.e. Subj1) constitute clausal moods, which are associated with a cluster of distinctive formal and semantic properties, the fact that Subj2 complements were shown to share more clausal properties with indicatives than they do with Subj1 complements thus strongly suggests that they should be subsumed under the indicative clause.
type, as opposed to Subj1. This leads us to the next relevant theoretical problem related to Subj2 complementation that will need to be addressed: if subjunctive mood marking we observe in Subj2 clauses is not the result of subjunctive CP selection by the matrix predicate, this means that it must be introduced within the embedded clause through some alternative syntactic mechanism, which is yet to be defined. In the following paragraphs, I will propose a tentative analysis that may account for the nature of the syntactic mechanism in question.

The main theoretical claims that were made on the basis of the analysis proposed so far can already be used to argue that the syntactic mechanism whereby subjunctive morphology is introduced within Subj2 complements must differ from the lexical selection we observed in relation to Subj1 complementation in several ways. First of all, given that subjunctive markers in Subj2 clauses appear under the indicative-type CP, this means that the syntactic mechanism which governs the use of subjunctive in such cases cannot be seen as local in nature, because the presence of the indicative CP breaks any type of locality between the matrix predicate (or some other matrix item that can license the subjunctive, such as negation in the case of polarity subjunctives) and the embedded subjunctive clause. This means that the syntactic relationship which licenses the introduction of the subjunctive in Subj2 clauses differs from the selection mechanism that we observe in the context of Subj1 complementation in that it is not subject to the locality constraint. The contrast between these two types of syntactic mechanisms in terms of (non)locality can be clearly observed if we compare Subj1 and Subj2 complements in the Spanish examples below:

(394) a. *Quieres que creamos que tienes / * tengas razón.*
  want2.sg. that believe1.pl SUBJ that have2.sg.IND / SUBJ right
  ‘You want us to believe that you are right.’
  
b. *No piensa que creas que tienes / tengas razón.*
  not think3.sg. that believe2.sg.SUBJ that have2.sg.IND / SUBJ right
  ‘She doesn’t think that you believe that you are right.’
  (Quer, 2009: 1781)

In (394a), we can observe that a Subj1-selecting predicate such as the intensional verb *querer* ('want’) can only introduce the subjunctive in the subordinate clause which is immediately adjacent to it, whereas the introduction of the subjunctive in a lower embedded clause produces ungrammaticality in this context. This makes sense given the assumption that the use of
subjunctive in such cases is licensed thanks to the local selection relationship that is established between the matrix predicate and the subjunctive CP projection that is adjacent to it. On the other hand, Subj2 complements such as the polarity subjunctive in (394b) allow for the introduction of the subjunctive in the embedded clause which is separated from the matrix licensor (in this case negation) by another embedded clause. This clearly shows us that the syntactic mechanism which licenses the use of the subjunctive in Subj2 environments of this type is non-local in nature.

In addition to being non-local, another way in which the syntactic mechanism that is used to introduce the subjunctive markers in Subj2 complements differs from the lexical selection that obtains in the context of Subj1 complementation can be determined if we compare the semantic properties related to these two types of mechanisms. Recall, first of all, that selection in general was claimed to involve an asymmetric semantic relationship, where the selector determines the relevant semantic properties of the selectee, but the selectee cannot have a meaningful impact on the interpretation of the selector (see 1.3.2 for more detail). Thus, when it comes to Subj1 selection in particular, this means that the basic semantic modal properties associated with the embedded subjunctive clause are fully determined by the selecting predicate, which renders subjunctive mood morphology per se semantically vacuous in this context, and unable to have a meaningful impact on the interpretation of the matrix predicate or of the sentence as a whole. This will no longer be the case with Subj2 complements, however.

Subj2-type complementation exhibits different semantic properties in this context, because the introduction of subjunctive mood morphology in embedded Subj2 clauses often produces a meaningful semantic contribution, which can affect the interpretation of the matrix predicate and of the sentence as such. The semantic shifts resulting from the introduction of the subjunctive in Subj2 complements tend to be quite nuanced and are not always easy to notice, but one type of Subj2 environment where the semantic contribution of the subjunctive is more clearly observable involves complements introduced under epistemic predicates such as the Spanish verb parecer (‘seem’). Note the semantic contrasts between the examples below:

(395) a. Parece que llueve. (Spanish)

seem3.sg. that rain3.sg.IND
‘It seems that it is raining.’
b. *Parece que llueve.*

seem3.sg. that rain3.sg.SUBJ

‘It looks as if it were raining.’

(Quer, 2009: 1781)

As we can observe by looking at the glosses beneath the two examples in (395), the interpretation associated with the matrix predicate varies depending on which mood category appears in the embedded clause: when the embedded clause features indicative mood marking, as in (395a), the matrix predicate entails a weak epistemic commitment, which can be seen as the default reading in this context, but the introduction of the subjunctive marker in the Subj2 clause in (395b) removes this epistemic commitment, shifting the interpretation associated with the matrix predicate towards a non-factual reading (Quer, 2009). Therefore, it is clear that the syntactic mechanism whereby the subjunctive is introduced in the embedded clause in such cases is more symmetric in nature than selection, because it allows the embedded subjunctive marker to have a meaningful impact on the interpretation of the matrix predicate. Some additional semantic shifts that obtain in the context of Subj2 complementation will be observed a bit later on, once we focus more closely on the formal properties of the syntactic mechanism that licenses the use of the subjunctive in such cases.

The mechanism in question thus differs from selection in at least two important ways: first of all, it is not subject to the locality constraint and, secondly, it is more symmetric in nature. One broader type of syntactic relationship that can be seen as compatible with these properties is *concord.* For instance, *negative concord* often involves a non-local relation between the matrix negation and the embedded negative item (see the examples in (392), for instance), and both of these items also meaningfully contribute to the interpretation of the sentence. I will thus tentatively propose that a similar type of concord mechanism obtains in the context of Subj2 complementation as well. Given that the relevant syntactic mechanism in this context is related to mood, I will define it as *mood concord.*\(^{117}\) The latter will be analyzed as licensing the use of subjunctive in Subj2 complements by establishing a syntactic relation between the embedded subjunctive marker and a mood operator situated in the matrix clause.

\(^{117}\) The notion of ‘mood concord’ was already put forward by authors such as Rivero (1988) or Damonte (2010), although in the context of a different type of analysis.
A more precise analysis of the exact properties of the mood-concord mechanism I just outlined can be obtained by looking at the types of semantic shifts that stem from the introduction of subjunctive markers in Subj2 complements. The semantic shift we already observed in (395) can be described in terms of (non)veridicality: when the embedded clause introduced under an epistemic predicate such as parecer (‘seem’) features the indicative mood, as in (395a), the predicate in question is associated with a veridical interpretation (i.e. it entails a degree of epistemic commitment towards the truth of the embedded proposition), but when we introduce the subjunctive marker in the embedded clause, as in the Subj2 complement in (395b), the interpretation associated with the matrix predicate becomes non-veridical, because the latter no longer entails any type of truth commitment. Let us then propose that the introduction of the subjunctive in the embedded clause in such cases is licensed by a non-veridical matrix mood operator, which enters into a mood-concord relationship with the embedded subjunctive marker, producing the semantic shift we just observed. A similar situation likely obtains in other Subj2 complements introduced under epistemic-type predicates as well, such as the polarity subjunctives in (396) for instance.

(396) a. *Je ne crois pas que ça soit une bonne idée.* (French)
   ‘I don’t think it’s a good idea.’

   b. *No pienso que sea el culpable.* (Spanish)
   ‘I don’t think he is the culprit.’

The only difference is that the non-veridical matrix mood operator that licenses the use of subjunctive marking in Subj2 complements such as those in (396) has an overt manifestation, i.e. it is realized via matrix negation, whereas the same type of mood operator is likely absorbed by the matrix predicate in the case of Subj2 complements such as the one in (395b), which explains why the predicate in question loses its default veridical interpretation in this context.

The mood-concord approach I just briefly outlined can be used to account for the properties of epistemic-type Subj2 complements, such as those in (395-396), but it cannot yet be fully extended to all instances of Subj2 distribution that we observed here in 6. The reason for this is the fact that Subj2 complements introduced under factive-type predicates, a few examples of which we could note earlier on in (381-382), are not amenable to the semantic
analysis in terms of non-veridicality, because they maintain a veridical reading independently of the type of mood marking that they exhibit. As a result, Subj2 complements of this type cannot be seen as associated with a non-veridical mood operator.

Nevertheless, the introduction of the subjunctive mood in complements to factive predicates can also be related to a certain type of semantic contribution, although the latter is not the same as the one we observed in relation to epistemic-type Subj2 clauses. Baunaz&Puskas (2014) have argued that the semantic contribution of the subjunctive in factive-type complements, such as those in (397) below, should be described in terms of emotivity.

(397) a. Andy comprend que Nole veut redevenir numéro 1.
Andy understands that Nole wants be-again number 1

b. Andy comprend que Nole veuille redevenir numéro 1.
Andy understands that Nole wantSUBJ be-again number 1
‘Andy understands that Nole wants to become number one again.’

The mood alteration in (397) produces a meaningful shift when it comes to the interpretation of the matrix predicate comprendre (‘understand’): when the embedded clause features indicative mood marking, as in (397a), the predicate in question is associated with its default cognitive reading (i.e. “Andy is aware of the fact that Nole wants to be n.1 again”), but when we introduce the subjunctive in the embedded complement, as in (397b), the matrix verb acquires an additional emotive dimension, which Baunaz&Puskas (2014) described in terms of empathy (i.e. “Andy understands that Nole wants to be n.1 again and he feels for him”). Another type of Subj2 environment where we can clearly observe emotive-type readings is related to complements such as those exemplified in (398) below, which are introduced under factive-emotive predicates.

(398) a. Je suis content qu’il soit venu. (French)
I am glad that he hasSUBJ come
‘I am glad that he came.’

b. Lamento que Juan no viniera. (Spanish)
regret1.sg. that John not came3.sg.SUBJ
‘I regret that John did not come.’
Given that factive-type Subj2 clauses seem to systematically denote an additional emotive reading, let us then propose that the use of subjunctive mood marking in such cases is licensed by an emotive mood operator, which is syntactically incorporated within Subj2-selecting predicates of the type exemplified in (397-398).

Therefore, we have identified at least two relevant types of mood-concord relationships that can be argued to license the subjunctive in the context of Subj2 complementation: the first one obtains in epistemic-type Subj2 complements, where the embedded subjunctive marker is licensed by a non-veridical matrix mood operator; the second one obtains in factive-type Subj2 complements, where the subjunctive marker in the embedded clause is licensed by a matrix mood operator of the emotive type. Even though the analysis I proposed in this context remains admittedly tentative, and will need to be developed in more formal detail, it may at least provide a theoretical avenue that brings us closer to accounting for the type of syntactic mechanism that is used to introduce Subj2 complements into the structure.

The syntactic approach I just developed also has broader relevance in the context of my study, because the idea that Subj1 and Subj2 complements should be seen as associated with different types of licensing mechanisms can account for the fact that they exhibit different clausal properties: first of all, the fact that Subj1 complements are introduced via lexical selection under a separate subjunctive CP can explain why they exhibit the distinctive clausal properties characteristic of the subjunctive clausal mood; on the other hand, if we assume that Subj2 complements are introduced via mood concord under an indicative-type CP, this can explain why they are associated with clausal properties which are more typical of the indicative than of the subjunctive clause type. In the following section, I will show that, in addition to accounting for the distinct clausal properties exhibited by Subj1 and Subj2 complements, the analysis I proposed in this context can also be used to explain some of the variations that one observes in relation to the cross-linguistic distribution of such complements.

6.2 Subj2: Variations in cross-linguistic distribution

The broader claim that Subj1 and Subj2 complements should be seen as introduced through different syntactic mechanisms under different embedded clause types already allowed me to propose an explanation for the cross-linguistic contrasts that we observed in relation to the distribution of such clauses: the idea that Subj1 complements are selected by a group of
predicates whose lexical properties, which are shared across languages, require them to introduce a separate subjunctive CP into the structure can explain why the subjunctive exhibits a more robust cross-linguistic distribution in this context; on the other hand, the idea that Subj2 complements are introduced through a different type of syntactic mechanism (i.e. mood concord) under an indicative-type CP can explain why the cross-linguistic distribution of the subjunctive is less robust in these types of environments, and why many languages (including those belonging to the Slavic group) only allow for the use of the indicative in this context. The analysis I will propose in the remaining parts of this chapter will provide a tentative explanation for the differences that can be observed in relation to the cross-linguistic distribution of Subj2 complements in particular.

The most important contrast that we observed with regards to the cross-linguistic distribution of Subj2 was the one between Romance languages, where Subj2 complements are used quite productively, and Slavic languages, where they are much less productive. This is the main reason why the primary theoretical focus of this study was placed on Subj1 complementation, which is more relevant in the context of Slavic. Here I will advance a possible formal explanation for this type of variation in the cross-linguistic distribution of Subj2 complements, which will be accounted for in light of the analysis proposed earlier on in 6.1. The basic idea behind the account I will put forward in this context was already briefly suggested in Quer (1998), who noted that certain types of subjunctive complements defined here as Subj2 (e.g. polarity subjunctives) are more productive in languages which mark the subjunctive through verbal morphology (e.g. Romance) than they are in languages where the subjunctive is marked through separate left-periphery mood markers (e.g. Balkan or Slavic). Here I will propose a more precise formal explanation for this observation.

So far, we only made a relatively simple distinction with regards to the cross-linguistic distribution of Subj2 complements, noting that they are more productive in languages such as Romance than they are in languages such as Slavic. Nevertheless, if we focus more closely on the distributional contrasts that can be observed in relation to the use of different types of Subj2 complements across languages, the picture becomes a bit more nuanced. What we appear to observe in this context is a type of 3-way split between languages with regards to Subj2 distribution: on the one end, we have Romance languages, which productively employ the subjunctive throughout all syntactic contexts involving Subj2 complementation; then there are Balkan languages (including Balkan Slavic), which employ the subjunctive in certain types of Subj2 environments but not in all of them; and finally, there are non-Balkan Slavic languages,
which generally only use the indicative in syntactic contexts related to Subj2. The relevant cross-linguistic contrasts that can be noted in this context are illustrated in the examples below:

(399) a.  *Je ne crois pas qu’il soit venu hier.*  
I neg. believe not that he hasSUBJ come yesterday
‘I don’t believe he came yesterday.’

b.  *Je regrette qu’il soit parti.*
I regret that he hasSUBJ left
‘I regret that he left.’

(400) a.  *No creo que viniera ayer.*  
not believe1.sg. that came3.sg.SUBJ yesterday

b.  *Lamento que se fuera.*
regret1.sg. that left3.sg.SUBJ

(401) a.  *Ne vjarvjam da dojde vhera.*  
not believe1.sg. SUBJ came3.sg. yesterday

b.  *Suzhaljavam che toi otide.*
regret1.sg. thatIND he left3.sg

(402) a.  *Den pistevo na irthe echtes.*  
not believe1.sg. SUBJ came3.sg. yesterday

b.  *Lypamai pou efyge.*
regret1.sg. thatIND left3.sg

(403) a.  *Ja ne verju, chto on prishel vchera.*  
I not believe thatIND he came yesterday

b.  *Ja sozhaleju, chto on ushel.*
I regret thatIND he left
In (399-400) we can observe that Romance languages such as French or Spanish employ subjunctive marking both in epistemic and in factive-type Subj2 complements; in (401-402) we can note that Balkan languages such as Greek or Bulgarian introduce the subjunctive under epistemic predicates but not under factive ones; and in (403-404) we can see that non-Balkan Slavic languages such as Russian and Polish employ the indicative mood marking throughout all of these Subj2-related environments. In the following paragraphs, I will account for these contrasts in light of the analysis proposed earlier on in 6.1.

The basic claim that I will advance in this context can be summarized as follows: the higher the subjunctive is marked within the clausal structure, the less likely it is that subjunctive marking will appear in Subj2-type environments in a given language. The formal reasoning behind this claim is related to the syntactic analysis I previously proposed in 6.1, specifically the idea that Subj2 clauses should be seen as introduced under an indicative-type CP. This proposal can be used to explain why Subj2 complements are less productive in languages that mark the subjunctive on the left periphery of the clause than in those where the subjunctive is marked via verbal morphology: the introduction of subjunctive mood markers under an indicative-type syntactic clause is less problematic from a formal standpoint if it occurs lower down in the clausal structure (e.g. within the embedded verb) than it is if it occurs within the indicative CP itself, in which case it produces a formal clash with the selectional requirements of the matrix predicate, which selected the indicative CP-type clause as its complement. This can explain why Subj2 complements are much more productive in Romance languages, which mark the subjunctive under a lower verbal head, than they are in Slavic languages, especially those where the subjunctive is marked through a separate C-related item (i.e. non-Balkan Slavic languages).

As for the contrasts we observed between the examples in (401-404), which showed us that Balkan languages (including Balkan Slavic) exhibit more productive Subj2-type complementation than non-Balkan Slavic languages, even though they all mark the subjunctive through separate syntactic items situated higher up in the clause, they can be explained by looking at the exact positioning of these mood markers within the clausal structure. Recall that
the analysis I put forward in Chapters 3 and 4 (Sections 3.1 and 4.1 in particular) reached the conclusion that the main syntactic difference between BlkS and RusS has to do with the fact that RusS markers are situated under the C-head, whereas BlkS markers are inserted under a lower head position within the structure, i.e. the T-head. This analysis can be used to explain why Balkan languages such as Bulgarian or Greek (401-402) allow Subj2 complements to be used more productively than non-Balkan Slavic languages such as Russian or Polish (403-404): the introduction of RusS markers in Subj2 contexts would require them to be inserted directly under the indicative C-head, which would produce a formal clash with the selectional requirements of the matrix predicate, whereas BlkS markers can be introduced under the lower T-head even if the matrix predicate locally selects the indicative CP. The use of subjunctive marking in the latter type of syntactic environment is still more formally constrained than it is when the subjunctive is marked under a lower verbal head (for reasons that are still left to be determined), which is why Subj2 complements are more productive in Romance than they are in Balkan languages, but it is less constrained than in those syntactic contexts where the subjunctive is marked under the C-head, which is why Subj2 complements are more productive in Balkan than they are in non-Balkan Slavic languages.

The syntactic account I just developed (both here in 6.2 and in Chapter 6 more generally) should not be seen as definitive, because its main claims still need to be fully confirmed through a more detailed cross-linguistic analysis of Subj2 complementation in different types of syntactic environments, which was outside the scope of this dissertation (especially given that Subj2 was never the main focus of my study, due to its relatively unproductive use in Slavic). Nevertheless, the approach proposed here in 6 is useful because it provides some plausible theoretical avenues towards a more definitive analysis of Subj2 complements, their clausal properties, as well as the contrasts they exhibit with respect to their Subj1 counterparts, which are clearly observable across languages. A more detailed study of these issues will be left for future research.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

The analysis developed in the previous chapters covered all the relevant theoretical areas related to the study of Slavic subjunctive, addressed the most difficult issues that one is faced with when dealing with this subject, and reached the bulk of the objectives that I set out in the introduction. The central thread that guided my analysis throughout this dissertation was the idea that subjunctive should be seen as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon, whose basic properties cannot be fully accounted for without taking into consideration both the formal and the semantic data pertaining to subjunctive complementation. The account that I developed under this broader theoretical assumption allowed me, first of all, to explain why no purely semantic definition could fully account for the nature and the distribution of the subjunctive mood, and then to provide an integrative syntax-semantics mapping approach that subsumed the less typical instances of subjunctive complementation alongside the more typical ones under the same broad analytical framework. The analysis I developed in this context, which showed that the semantic properties of a given subjunctive complement are crucially influenced by its underlying structural make-up and the type of syntactic derivation it undergoes, not only confirmed my basic view of the subjunctive as a syntax-semantics interface phenomenon, but it also lends further support for the overall minimalist view of the architecture of grammar, proposed in Chomsky (1995), according to which the syntactic derivation feeds the semantic component, and is thus expected to have a meaningful impact on the interpretation of the clause.

The more specific conclusions and generalizations that I reached on the basis of my study of Slavic subjunctive were already summarized in detail earlier on in Chapter 5, so I will not repeat them here. Instead, I will use the remainder of this chapter to outline some theoretical aspects related to the analysis proposed in this dissertation that will require further attention. As we will see in the following paragraphs, even though the approach developed in the previous chapters addressed the most important issues and difficulties related to the study of Slavic subjunctive, the complex nature of this subject meant that the analysis I proposed in this context could not be entirely comprehensive and definitive in all aspects. We are thus still left with
some open questions that will need to be dealt with in future research, both in relation to complements defined here as Subj1 and those defined as Subj2.

The part of the analysis that will require the greatest deal of further attention has to do with the theoretical account I proposed in relation to Subj2 complementation, which was not the main focus of my study, so the claims I made in this context still need to be hashed out in more detail. The first claim that will require further scrutiny is the one related to the syntactic mechanism that was argued to introduce subjunctive marking in the embedded Subj2 clause. The mechanism in question was defined here as mood concord, which is established between some type of matrix mood operator and the embedded subjunctive marker. The primary motivation behind this analysis was the observation that the subjunctive does not seem to be lexically selected by the matrix predicate when it occurs in embedded Subj2 environments, but instead appears to be licensed through some other type of syntactic relationship, which was shown to exhibit certain properties that are characteristic of concord. Nevertheless, before this analysis can be fully adopted, I will need to put forward a much more detailed study of the formal properties related to the syntactic mechanism that licenses the subjunctive in the context of Subj2 complementation, in order to determine whether the mechanism in question can indeed be analyzed as mood concord, and whether it functions in the way that I described.

If the mood-concord analysis I proposed in Chapter 6 were to be confirmed, then this would bring forth some additional theoretical issues that would need to be addressed as well. For instance, one would need to explain how the syntactic mechanism in question can be incorporated within the broader minimalist conceptual framework upon which the analysis in this dissertation was based. In particular, the fact that the approach to mood concord I developed earlier on suggested that the latter involves a non-local syntactic relationship, which can sometimes cross several clausal boundaries (see (394) for instance), presents some potential difficulties related to the PIC constraint, and the phasal approach to syntax more generally. The idea that Subj2 complements are syntactically licensed through a concord mechanism that is established between some type of matrix operator and the embedded subjunctive marker situated below the indicative CP projection implies that such complements involve a syntactic relationship that crosses a phasal CP boundary, which can only be reconciled with PIC if we assume that the relationship in question is subject to some type of anti-locality constraint, such as the condition B. The exact nature of the anti-locality constraint that may obtain in this context is still left to be determined.
Another theoretical aspect related to my analysis of Subj2 complementation which requires further study has to do with the formal explanation that I proposed in order to account for the observed differences in the cross-linguistic distribution of Subj2 complements, i.e. the idea that Subj2 distribution is determined on the basis of the structural position where subjunctive markers can be found across languages. In order to assess the validity of the main generalization that I put forward on the basis of this analysis, i.e. the claim that Subj2 complementation is more productive in languages which mark the subjunctive in a lower clausal domain (e.g. on the verb situated within vP) than those that mark it higher up within the clause structure, I will need to develop a more expansive comparative study of different languages that exhibit different types of subjunctive-marking strategies. Such a broad typological study was outside the scope of the present dissertation, but it will be one of the subjects of my future research.

In addition to the theoretical questions I raised so far, which pertained to Subj2-type clauses, there are also some open issues related to my analysis of Subj1 complementation which will require further attention and scrutiny. Perhaps the most wide-ranging among these has to do with my general approach to Subj1 selection, which claimed that the latter should be seen as the default syntactic option in embedded clausal environments. One of the questions that this analysis raises is how other types of embedded clauses, such as interrogative complements, can be incorporated within the broader approach to embedded CP selection I proposed in this study. If subjunctive CP truly corresponds to the default embedded option, then embedded interrogatives would be expected to pattern with indicatives when it comes to their selection, i.e. both of them should be seen as introduced under a marked selection strategy, but the problem is that interrogative complements do not pattern with indicatives in the context of world semantics, i.e. they do not exhibit extensional world-anchoring, so they cannot be seen as selected through the mediation of the W-feature. This means that embedded clause selection probably cannot be reduced to a simple binary option (i.e. W vs. non-W selection), but requires a more articulated syntactic analysis.

Another theoretical aspect related to my analysis of Subj1 complementation that can be developed in more detail has to do with the common Subj1 clausal approach I proposed in relation to subjunctive and infinitive complements, which was done in the context of my study of non-Balkan Slavic (see 4.2). The first open question that stems from this analysis is whether a similar syntactic approach can also be applied to other languages that productively use both infinitives and subjunctives, such as those belonging to the Romance family. Then there is the
question of why certain languages only feature the subjunctive in Subj1-type syntactic environments (e.g. Balkan languages) while others only feature the infinitive in this context (e.g. English), which was only answered on a descriptive level in this study, without providing a deeper formal explanation for these types of data (the latter would likely require a more detailed diachronic study of infinitive vs. subjunctive complementation patterns in the relevant languages, which was outside the scope of this dissertation). Finally, the last open issue related to my analysis of infinitives that I will mention here has to do with the question of whether such complements should only be seen as associated with subjunctive clausal mood environments or whether some of them can also be introduced under the indicative clause type. If the latter proved to be the case, then one would need to provide a more precise formal account that distinguishes between these different types of infinitive uses across languages.

The last question that I will outline here has to do with the basic nature of the subjunctive mood itself, independently of the type of syntactic environment it appears in. There seems to be some type of underlying grammatical property that is associated with subjunctive mood markers which allows them to be used in various different types of syntactic contexts across languages, some of which can be related to the more typical meanings that one usually observes with the subjunctive, while others are more surprising from a semantic standpoint. The analysis in this dissertation primarily focused on the differences in subjunctive use that can be observed in subordinated environments (i.e. Subj1 vs. Subj2), which represent the most typical context where this mood category is found across languages, but subjunctive morphology can be used in a number of other syntactic environments as well. Some of these subjunctive uses are more predictable on semantic grounds (e.g. when the subjunctive is used in matrix clauses as a suppletive for the imperative or to express optative-type meanings) but others are less expected in this context (e.g. when subjunctive appears in relative clauses that modify an indefinite noun, such as the one we observed at the beginning in (5)). In the opening parts of the dissertation, I suggested that such a broad variation in subjunctive distribution should be seen as a result of certain underlying syntactic properties that are inherent to this mood category, but the analysis I proposed there did not go beyond this surface observation. A more precise formal account of the relevant properties which lead to the observed flexibility in subjunctive use will need to be left for future research as well.
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