

e languages of the Balkan peninsula belong to different families but share an important number of linguistic features. Consequently, the comparison of these languages has become a perennial topic of study in philology and linguistics since the nineteenth century. The long and rich tradition of Balkan comparative studies has by large focused on historical issues dealing with phonology and morphology while with less attention has been directed to the syntax of the languages.

This collection of essays contains chapters by leading and new scholars in the field and an introduction by the editors, which ties their new proposals to parallels in generative Balkan syntax over the last twenty years. The contributors to this volume address issues concerning the comparative syntax of Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, and Romanian from the perspective of recent theoretical frameworks, including the Minimalist Program. Topics addressed include the morphology of negation, appropriate analysis of control, raising, and obviation in the absence of infinitival clauses, the syntax and semantics of clitic pronouns in doubling constructions, the formal structure of noun phrases and the position of adjectives, and distinctions as to typology of different families of verb movement in both synchrony and diachrony. This unique volume will interest comparativists, typologists, students, and professionals working with theoretical syntax, as well as those interested in Balkan, Slavic, and Slavic languages.

ABOUT THE EDITORS

María Luisa Rivero is Professor of Linguistics at the University of Ottawa. She has written *Estudios de gramática generativa del español* (1977), *las construcciones de relativo* (1981), and she co-edited *Negation and Polarity* (1997).

Angela Ralli is Associate Professor of Linguistics at the University of Patras, Greece. She also wrote *Elements de linguistique théorique: la morphologie du français* (1994).

OXFORD STUDIES IN
COMPARATIVE SYNTAX

Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages

Edited by

María Luisa Rivero

Angela Ralli

Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages

DESIGN BY JOY TAYLOR



OXFORD

Principles and Parameters of Syntactic Saturation

Gert Webelhuth

Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages

Sten Vikner

Parameters and Functional Heads: Essays in Comparative Syntax

Edited by Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi

Discourse Configurational Languages

Edited by Katlin É. Kiss

Clause Structure and Language Change

Edited by Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts

Dialect Variation and Parameter Setting: A Study of Belfast English and Standard English

Alison Henry

Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax

Steven Franks

Particles: On the Syntax of Verb-Particle, Triadic and Causative Constructions

Marcel den Dikken

The Polysynthesis Parameter

Mark C. Baker

The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax

Anders Holmberg and Christer Platzack

Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic: An Essay in Comparative Semitic Syntax

Ur Shlonsky

Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages

Raffaella Zanuttini

Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax

Alessandra Giorgi and Fabio Pianesi

Coordination

Janne Bondi Johannessen

Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective

Guglielmo Cinque

The Feature Structure of Functional Categories: A Comparative Study of Arabic Dialects

Elabbas Benmamoun

Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages

EDITED BY

MARÍA LUISA RIVERO
& ANGELA RALLI

Contents

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford New York
Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogotá Buenos Aires Calcutta
Cape Town Chennai Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul
Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai
Nairobi Paris São Paulo Shanghai Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw
and associated companies in
Berlin Ibadan

Copyright © 2001 by Oxford University Press

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Comparative syntax of Balkan languages /
edited by María Luisa Rivero and Angela Ralli
p. cm. — (Oxford studies in comparative syntax)
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-19-512951-2. ISBN 0-19-512952-0 (pbk.)

1. Balkan Peninsula—Languages—Syntax. 2. Balkan Peninsula—
Language—Grammar, Comparative. I. Rivero, María Luisa.
II. Ralli, Angela. III. Series.
P381.L3C657 2000
409.496—dc21 99.27575

- 1 Introduction 3
María Luisa Rivero & Angela Ralli
 - 2 Is Balkan Comparative Syntax Possible? 17
Brian D. Joseph
 - 3 Head-to-Head Merge in Balkan Subjunctives and
Locality 44
Carmen Dăbrovie-Sorin
 - 4 Control and Raising in and out of Subjunctive
Complements 74
Anna Roussou
 - 5 Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek 105
Iliyana Krapova
 - 6 Direct Object Clitic Doubling in Albanian and Greek 127
Daliana Kallulli
 - 7 Adjectival Determiners in Albanian and Greek 161
Antonia Androutsopoulou
 - 8 Last Resort and V Movement in Balkan Languages 200
María Luisa Rivero
- Name Index 225
Subject Index 229

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed in the United States of America
no world price minor

- Roberts, I. 1996. "The Case Against Case." Unpublished ms., University of Stuttgart.
- Roberts, I. 1997. "Restructuring, Head Movement and Locality." *Linguistic Inquiry* 28.423–60.
- Roberts, I., and A. Roussou. 1997. "Interface Interpretation." Unpublished ms., University of Stuttgart and University of Wales, Bangor.
- Roberts, I., and A. Roussou. 1998. "The EPP as a Condition on the Tense Dependency." In P. Svenonius, ed., *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenbaum, P. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Roussou, A. 1994. "The Syntax of Complementizers." Ph.D. diss., UCL.
- Roussou, A. 1998. "Features and Subject Dependencies: That-t Phenomena Revisited." Unpublished ms., University of Wales, Bangor.
- Ruwet, N. 1984. "Je veut partir/*je veut que je parte." *Cahiers de Grammaire*. 7. 74–138. Toulouse: Le Mirail.
- Savioia, L., and M. R. Manzini (In press) *I dialetti italiani*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Sportiche, D. 1994. "Subject Clitics in French and Romance Complex Inversion and Clitic Doubling." Unpublished ms., UCLA.
- Sportiche, D. 1997. "Reconstruction and Constituent Structure." Talk presented at the MIT Linguistics Colloquium.
- Stowell, T. 1982. "The Tense of Infinitives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.561–70.
- Tenny, C. 1994. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Terzi, A. 1992. "PRO in Finite Contexts: A Study of the Inflectional Heads of Balkan languages." Ph.D. diss., CUNY.
- Terzi, A. 1997. "PRO and Null Case in Finite Clauses." *Linguistic Review* 14.335–60.
- Tsimpili, I. M. 1995. "Focusing in Modern Greek." In K. È. Kiss, ed., *Discourse Configurational Languages*, 176–206. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsimpili, I. M. 1997. "Resumptive Strategies and L2A: A Minimalist Account." In E. Hughes, M. Hughes, and A. Greenhill, eds., *BUCLD Proceedings* 21.2.639–55. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadia Press.
- Tsoulas, G. 1995. "The Nature of the Subjunctive and the Formal Grammar of Obviation." In K. Zagana, ed., *Grammatical Theory and Romance Languages*, 293–306. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Turano, G. 1994. "Syntactic Dependencies in Albanian." Ph.D. diss., University of Florence.
- Vartokosta, S. 1994. "Issues on Modern Greek Sentential Complementation." Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland.
- Watanabe, A. 1993. "The Notion of Finite Clauses in AGR Based Case Theory." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19.281–95.

Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek

Iliyana Krapova

1. Introduction

Along with other common properties, Bulgarian (Blg) and Modern Greek (MGrk) exhibit strikingly similar patterns of subjunctive¹ complementation, in terms of both structure and interpretation. Unlike the rest of the Balkan languages which possess special subjunctive morphology and/or subjunctive complementizers,² Blg and MGrk have finite complements with null complementizers that may function either as subjunctives, or as infinitives, depending on the lexical properties of the matrix verb. Thus, complements of, for example, volitionals, as in (1a) below from MGrk, typically correspond to a Romance-type subjunctive (cf. (1b) from French), while complements of, for example, aspectuals and control verbs, as in (2a), typically correspond to an English or Romance-type infinitive (cf. (2b)):

- (1) a. *Øelo na erbo/erbi.*³
 want-1SG na come-1SG/come-3SG
 'I want to come./I want her/him to come.'
- b. *Je veux que *je/il parti.*
- (2) a. *O Janis prospabise na katalavi.*
 the Janis tried-3SG na understand-3SG
 'Janis tried to understand.'
- b. *Jean essaie de PRO comprendre.*

The only "mark" for the subjunctive in MGrk is the verbal particle *na*, which according to a widely held view in current MGrk studies does not exhibit complementizer properties (Phillipaki-Warbuton 1987; Rivero 1987, 1994; Terzi 1991, 1992, among others). The embedded verb is characterized by tense restrictions (to be discussed in greater detail below) but is otherwise fully inflected for person and number agreement. As far as the referential properties of the embedded subject are concerned, (1a) and (2a) present a curious asymmetry in

terms of binding relations. Complements of, for example, volitionals in MGrk (and Blg, as we shall see) allow but do not require their (null) subjunctive subject to be coreferent with the matrix subject, thus voiding the familiar obviation effect characteristic of Romance subjunctive clauses (1b). On the other hand, verbs like *try* select a control complement in which the (null) embedded subject is strictly anaphoric and may be interpreted only through a local antecedent in the matrix clause.⁴

This contrast in referential behavior, which is reminiscent of the distinction between nonobligatory and obligatory control, as proposed by Williams (1980), is due, but only in part, to the individual lexicosemantic properties of the complement-selecting predicates. I will show that there are syntactic aspects of control that cannot be accounted for by any theory that considers control (and mood selection) to be a purely semantic matter (see Joseph 1992, Farkas 1992a, among others). In this essay, I will try to attain a generalization regarding the syntactic conditions that require a particular null subject in a particular environment and, ultimately, to establish a correlation between types of empty categories (ees) and properties of clauses that license these ees.

Varlokosta and Hornstein (1993) argue on the basis of an earlier proposal by Iatridou (1993) that MGrk subjunctives do not constitute a uniform class but should rather be divided into two subsets, and that each subset can be identified through the type of null subject that it takes—pronominal *pro* versus anaphoric PRO. The discussion of the Bulgarian data (in section 2) will confirm the essential correctness of this proposal. Once the distribution of *pro* and PRO in Blg and MGrk subjunctive clauses is captured, it will be shown that the two types of contexts are mutually exclusive and can be defined through a correlation with the morphological content of subjunctive tense in terms of feature strength (section 3). Thus, my analysis will lead to the conclusion that optional and obligatory control of the null subjunctive subject in cases like (1a) versus (2a) does not result from properties intrinsic to *pro* or PRO⁵ but is rather a consequence of the distribution of tense features and ultimately an instantiation of feature checking in the relevant configurations (section 4).

I will adopt the Minimalist approach of Chomsky (1993) with some insights from Chomsky (1995, chap. 4) concerning the motivation and the conditions of (overt and covert) movement as driven by feature-checking considerations. I will assume the standard view that *pro* has nominative Case, which is checked by the strong features of finite tense. With respect to PRO, I will adopt the Case-theoretic account of its distribution, as proposed by Chomsky and Lasnik (1993), who argue that PRO is the minimal Case-marked DP that checks null Case against a minimal Infl. "Minimal" Infl is identified with the weak feature of nonfinite tense (i.e., [-tense]) typically associated with control infinitivals, for instance, in English. For MGrk and Blg, however, which do not exhibit any finite/nonfinite distinctions in their subjunctive complements, the correct identification of tense features in terms of strength is still not fully understood.

I will assume that the structure that corresponds to MGrk and Blg subjunctive

that agreement features are checked in a Spec-head relation within TP, following adjunction of V (or its tense features) to T and raising of Su to Spec, TP:

$$(3) \quad V^0 \text{ } [_{CP} \text{ } C^0 \text{ } [_{MP} \text{ } M^0 \text{ } [_{TP} \text{ } T^0 \text{ } [_{VP} \text{ } \text{SU} \text{ } V^0 \text{ }]]]]]$$

The idea that finiteness and PRO are not in complementary distribution (at least in the Balkan languages) was originally proposed by Terzi (1991) (cf. also Terzi 1992, 1997). For Terzi, the "task" of licensing PRO is given to the particle *na* which heads a M(ood)P(hrase) (for a similar analysis see also Rivero 1994) and checks null case in all subjunctives as opposed to indicatives. While I adopt the existence of an MP, I do not agree that M is involved in null Case-checking. In my view, M is simply a label for the position occupied by the particle, and as such, it is not responsible for deriving the structural properties of the null subject in MGrk and Blg control complements.

2. Null subjunctive subjects in Bulgarian: Cross-linguistic parallels

In this section, I will briefly discuss the Blg data and show that Blg subjunctives distribute like their MGrk counterparts and exhibit similar structural properties and subject (co)reference effects. Subjunctive complements in Blg are introduced by the particle *da* followed by a finite verb (or a finite auxiliary), which shows tense restrictions but full person and number agreement. Compare (4a) and (4a') with (4b) and (4b'):

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|---|------|
| (4) | a. | <i>Ivani iska ec_{i,j} da sledva.</i> | Blg |
| | | Ivan want-3SG da study-3SG | |
| | | 'Ivan wants to go to college.' | |
| | a'. | <i>O Janis_i elpizi ec_{i,j} na fiji.</i> | MGrk |
| | | the Janis hope-3SG na leave-3SG | |
| | | 'Janis hopes to leave.' | |
| | b. | <i>Ivan moze ec_{i,j}*j da speceli pari.</i> | Blg |
| | | Ivan can-3SG da make-3SG money | |
| | | 'Ivan can make money.' | |
| | b'. | <i>O Janis_i bori ec_{i,j}*j na majirevi.</i> | MGrk |
| | | the Janis can-3SG na cook-3SG | |
| | | 'Janis can cook.' | |

In (4a) which corresponds to (4a') from MGrk the embedded subject may but need not be coreferent with the matrix subject, while in (4b) which corresponds to (4b') from MGrk, it has to be coreferent. Rudin (1986) has argued convincingly that the particle *da* is not a complementizer,⁶ so the subjunctive clauses in (4a/b) are headed by a null complementizer, on a par with their MGrk counterparts.

Extending Varlokosta and Hornstein's (1993) proposal to Blg, I would like

subset (as in (4a) and (4a')) may take a *pro* subject, while the other (as in (4b) and (4b')) may take a PRO subject. These two subsets will be labeled Type I and Type II S(subjunctives), respectively. Since I assume that each subjunctive type is a matter of selection, I propose that epistemic verbs (for example, *nadjavam se/elpizo* 'hope', *vjarvam/pistevo* 'believe', *trjabva/prepi* 'must', etc.) and volitionals/desideratives (for example, *iskam/θelo* 'want', *želajal/epibimo* 'wish', etc.) select a Type I S, while aspectual verbs (for example, *započvam/arvizo* 'begin', *prodūžavam/sinexizo* 'continue', *spiram/stamatao* 'stop', etc.) and (subject) control verbs (for example, *znajal/ksero* 'know', *moga/boro* 'can', *opitvam se/prospašo* 'try', *zabravjam/ksewnao* 'forget', *uspjavam/proffeno* 'succeed', *vūznamerjavam/sxeditazo/skopevo* 'intend', etc.) select a Type II S.⁸

Moreover, in terms of interpretation, I claim that Type I Ss have a prototypically subjunctive function, while Type II Ss have a prototypically infinitival function. In terms of selection, the former type correlates with "true" subjunctives in languages that mark this mood morphologically. It is wellknown that Romance languages consistently select the subjunctive in volitional (the equivalents of *want*), desiderative (the equivalents of *wish, desire*) and epistemic contexts (the equivalents of *it is possible, it is necessary*, etc.), and also with some (epistemic) indicative-taking verbs under negation (e.g., *know, think, believe*) (see Farkas 1992a for an extensive discussion of semantic classes of verbs and mood selection). While I will not be concerned with Balkan-Romance cross-linguistic parallels, such facts might provide additional empirical support for the above generalization.

Type II Ss in Blg and MGrk, on the other hand, correlate with (subject) control infinitivals in languages which mark the finite/nonfinite distinction.⁹ For example, they do not allow passivization (5a), ECM (5b), or *wh*-extraction (5c), and they show a lack of WCO effects with scrambling (5d), just like English *try*-class verbs:

- (5) a. **Ivan beše uspjaj* [*e da zamine.*]
 Ivan was-3SG managed da leave-3SG
 b. **Ivan uspjaj* [*Petūr da zamine.*]
 Ivan managed-3SG Peter to leave-3SG
 c. **Koj uspjaj Ivan* [*t da zamine?*]
 who managed-3SG Ivan to leave-3SG
 d. *Njakoji, šefovete mu, ne uspjaja* [*e da go nakažat.*]
 someone bosses his not managed-3PL da him punish-3PL
 'Someone, his bosses did not manage to punish.'

2.1. A brief historical overview

From a historical perspective, it is apparent that Blg *da*-clauses have developed

the biblical texts (ninth and tenth centuries). Interestingly, the *da* + *V* complex, which came to replace the Old Blg infinitive, was originally introduced in clauses that required distinct subjects (6a) or in ECM clauses (6b). Typically, these cases would correspond to an accusativus cum infinitivo construction in the Greek text, as shown under the respective glosses:

- (6) a. *ašte xošton da tū prebondetū*
 if want-1SG da he survive-3SG
 (Cod. Zogr., Io. 21.22)
 ἔαν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν
 b. *ne xoštemū semu da crsuertū* *nadū nami*
 not want-1PL him da rule-3SG above us
 (Cod. Zogr., Lk. 19.14)
 οὐ θέλωμεν τοῦτον βασιλεύσαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς

It is important to note that even after *da*-clauses have gained a much wider distribution and entirely replaced the infinitive in all other contexts, verbs typically expressing deontic modality or some sort of an aspectual meaning continued to function as the only predicate type still compatible with an infinitive (cf. (7)):

- (7) *Ne možeš bo tūj sātūrūjati skrbii pustitiškiavū.*
 not can-2SG moreover you-NOM endure-INF sorrows of-a-hermit
 (Cod. Suptr., 169.27–28)

With respect to subject reference, the contrast between (6a) and (7) is reminiscent of the rivalry between the subjunctive and the infinitive in Romance (cf. (8a) and (8b) from Spanish). Thus, (6a) seems to instantiate the wellknown obviation effect typical for Romance subjunctives but generally lacking in the Balkan languages:¹⁰

- (8) a. *Juan, desea* [*que pro_j/Maria vaya* *con él.*]
 John wish-3SG that *pro*/*Maria* go-3SG.SUBJ with him
 'John wants *Mary* to go with him.'
 b. *Juan desea* [*PRO ir a la playa.*]
 John wish-3SG [*PRO* go-INF to the beach.
 'John wants to go to the beach.'

I will not be concerned with the lack of obviation in Modern Blg; I will simply note that the distinction between Type I and Type II Ss achieves a concrete result in this direction. Farkas (1992b) argues that in Romance and other languages, obviation complements are a subset of the subjunctive complements and appear precisely in those contexts where the infinitive may alternate with the subjunctive. Thus, the obviation effect is closely related to the role played by the infinitive. With the elimination of the Old Blg infinitive, the

strictly differentiated from that of Type I Ss, which presumably had the effect of blocking the possibility for an obviative reading of the null subjunctive subject in the latter.

2.2. *pro* subjects in Type I subjunctives

Now, let us examine some evidence that will reinforce the proposed distinction between the two types of subjunctive clauses in Blg. The issue of systematically differentiating between *pro* and PRO becomes important due to the fact that *da*-complements are finite with strong agreement, and therefore *pro* and PRO will not differ in terms of ϕ features, although, in theory, they will differ in terms of Case.

In this subsection, I will argue that the set of pronominal properties typically associated with *pro* gives the basis for the proper identification of the null subject in subjunctives of Type I in Blg as *pro* (for MGrk see Terzi 1991, 1992; Iatridou 1993; Varlokosta and Hornstein 1993).

First, there is no complementary distribution between null subjunctive subjects and nominative DPs or overt pronouns, a behavior expected of *pro* and not of PRO. As the indices in (9) illustrate, the overt pronoun can refer to the matrix DP or to some other DP, salient in the discourse.¹¹ The same indexing applies to the ec, which points to the fact that it behaves like an empty pronominal by virtue of its specific and free reference:

- (9) *Ivan_i iska* {*brat* *mu/toj_i/ec_i* *da sledva.*]
 Ivan want-3SG brother his/he da study-3SG

'Ivan wants his brother/him to go to college.' / 'Ivan wants to go to college.'

Further, (10a) from Blg and its MGrk parallel (10b) show that embedded agreement can take any person or number value, irrespective of the agreement within the matrix clause. Again, this is to be expected, if the subjunctive subject is *pro* and not PRO: like DPs or overt pronouns (as in (9)), *pro* has nominative Case, which is checked against the embedded Infl (tense, as I have assumed). Besides, the *pro* subject can be referentially free because its content will always be identified by the finite agreement in the embedded clause. The latter therefore defines a complete functional complex (in Chomsky's 1986 terminology):

- (10) a. *Nadjavam se* [*pro da dojdeš/dojdat.*]
 hope-1SG da come-2SG/come-3PL
 'I hope that you/they come.'
 b. *Elpizo* [*pro/na erbis/erbu_n.*]
 hope-1SG na come-2SG/come-3PL
 same as in (10a)

Consequently, (10a) and (10b) are opaque complements, as are their respec-

may also take an indicative complement with the lexical complementizer *če/oti* 'that':

- (11) a. *Nadjavam se* [*če pro šte dojdeš/dojdat.*]
 hope-1SG that will come-2SG/come-3PL
 'I hope that you/they will come.'
 b. *Elpizo* [*oti ōa erbis/erbu_n.*]
 hope-1SG that will come-2SG/come-3PL
 same as (11a)

Further, if *pro* is available in structures like (10), then it should be possible for the null subject to function as an expletive, according to Safir and Jaeggli's (1989) diagnostics. Constructions (12a) and (12b) show that this prediction is borne out:

- (12) a. *Nadjavam se* [*pro ex da e očevidno*] *če toj šte uspee.* Blg
 hope-1SG to be-3SG obvious that he will succeed-3SG
 'I hope it is obvious that he will succeed.'
 b. *Elpizo* [*pro ex na min vrex_i* *avrio.* MGrk
 hope-1SG na NEG rain-3SG tomorrow
 'I hope it will not rain tomorrow.'

Higginbotham (1992:note 84) has noted that a pronoun may receive a co-variant or an invariant interpretation under gapping or VP ellipsis. Under the former interpretation referred to as "sloppy identity" reading, the reference of the pronoun as a bound variable shifts with that of its antecedent, while under the latter interpretation, also known as "strict identity" reading, the reference of the pronoun is invariably associated with that of its original antecedent. Consider (13) from Blg:

- (13) *Ivan iska* [*pro da zamine*], *sūsto i Petur* [*VP ∅*]
 Ivan want-3SG to leave-3SG too and Petur
 'Ivan wants to leave, and so does Peter.'

In (13) the null subject in the elided VP [*iska* [*ec da zamine*]] 'wants to leave' can refer back to the next higher subject *Petur* or to the superordinate subject *Ivan*, that is, it admits both the sloppy and the strict identity readings, which correspond to (13i) and (13ii), respectively:

- (13) i. Peter wants him, Ivan, to leave.
 ii. Peter wants himself, Peter, to leave.

The fact that the null subject in (13) can be invariant (the strict reading in (13ii)) or covariant (the sloppy reading in (13i)) provides further evidence that the null embedded subject in Type I Ss has a *pro* status.

2.3. PRO subjects in Type II subjunctives

I claimed above that Type II Ss have an anaphoric PRO subject, which requires a local DP controller in order to be interpreted regardless of the fact that the embedded agreement serves to identify its featural content. This requirement imposes a strict identity condition on the agreement specification of the matrix and the embedded verbs (compare (14) with (10) above) and the same time excludes the possibility of an arbitrary PRO in Blg control structures, as the ungrammaticality of (15a) shows:

(14) *Ivan može* [PRO *da zamine/zaminem/*zamineš.*]

Ivan is-able-3SG *da* leave-3SG/leave-1PL/leave-2SG

(15) a. **Ivan može* [PRO *arb da SE zamine.*]

Ivan is-able-3SG *da SE* leave-3SG

b. *Mary is able PRO to wash herself/*oneself.*

In (15a) the embedded clause contains the impersonalizing particle SE, which generally produces arbitrary effects when added to a third person verb in Blg. It has been noticed (Bouchard 1984, Koster 1984, among others) that the relationship between PRO and its controller is similar to the relationship between an anaphor and its antecedent. Thus, from a binding-theoretic perspective, (15a) will be ruled out for the same reason as (15b) in English is ruled out—lack of an appropriate antecedent to bind the anaphor (but see Lasnik 1992 for arguments that Control cannot be reduced to the principles of binding theory). If *arb* effects in Blg are related to the structural properties of the embedded subject (as Krapova 1996 has argued), then we may expect that the feature *arb* will be compatible only with *pro* subjects. Construction (16), which has a Type I S, confirms this observation:

(16) *Ivan iska* [*pro arb da SE tragne sledobed.*]

Ivan want-3SG *to SE* leave-3SG afternoon

'Ivan wants (for people/one) to leave in the afternoon.'

Given that the null subject in Type II Ss is PRO and not *pro*, it will be in complementary distribution with lexical DPs and with bound or free pronouns, as (17a) and (17b) illustrate:

(17) a. *Ivan_i uspija* [PRO/**toj_{ij}*/**brat mu*]

Ivan succeeded-3SG he/brother his

da spečeli mnogo pari.]

da make-3SG a lot of money

'Ivan succeeded in making a lot of money.'

b. *O Jani* *θα* *profβasi* [PRO *na kani*

the Janis will succeed-3SG *to* make-3SG

mja volta (**o ačeltos tu/*aftos*)

a walk (brother his/he)

MGrk

Since lexical subjects have nominative Case, while PRO has null Case, the contrast between (17) and (9) above yields an explanation in terms of Case (see section 4 for a proposal on how Case-checking operates in subjunctive clauses). Consequently, Type II Ss provide a null Case-checking environment, while Type I Ss provide a nominative Case-checking environment.

Turning to the properties of the possible controllers of PRO in contexts with Type II Ss, it should be noted that the content of PRO is sensitive to the referential properties of its local (pronominal) antecedent (Higginbotham 1992). In (18), which presents a combination of a Type I and a Type II S, PRO may have the same reference as the pronoun in the intermediate clause:

(18) *Ivan_i ne si predstavja* [*pro_{ij}/toj_{ij} da može*]

Ivan not imagine-3SG he *da* can-3SG

[PRO_{ij} *da zamine vednaga.*]

da leave-3SG immediately

Blg

'Ivan does not imagine that he will be able to leave right away.'

In (18) PRO admits two interpretations—it can be either free or coreferent with the superordinate subject *Ivan*. This ambiguity is due to the fact that PRO inherits the referential capacity of its overt or null pronominal antecedent.

In (19) it is shown further that, as expected of PRO, null subjects in Type II Ss admit only a covariant interpretation under VP ellipsis (following Higginbotham's 1992 diagnostics). Thus, PRO in (19) allows only the sloppy identity reading given in (19i) (similar facts hold for MGrk as well, as Varlokosta and Hornstein 1993 report):

(19) a. *Ivan vūznamerjava* [PRO *da započne rabota*], *sūstro i Petūr* [VP \emptyset]

Ivan intend-3SG *da* start-3SG work too and Petūr

'Ivan intends to start work and so does Peter.'

(19) i. 'Ivan intends to start his, Ivan's work and Peter intends to start his, Peter's work.'

Finally, (20) from Blg and (23) from MGrk show that the null subject in Type II Ss is thematically constrained:

(20) a. *Ivan šte se opita* [PRO *da pomaga na Anton.*]

Ivan will try-3SG *da* help-3SG to Anton

Ivan will try to help Anton.'

b. **Ivan šte se opita* [PRO *da napodobjava na Anton.*]

Ivan will try-3SG *to* resemble-3SG to Anton

(21) a. *O Janis* *θα* *stamatisi* [PRO *na voitai ton Andon_i.*]

the Janis will stop-3SG *to* help-3SG the Andonis.

'Janis will stop helping Andonis.'

b. **O Janis* *θα* *stamatisi* [PRO *na mjas_i ston Andon_i.*]

the Janis will stop-3SG *to* resemble-3SG to-the Andonis.

The fact that control complements in Blg and MGrk take agentive subjects is compatible with Lasnik's (1992:240) observation that "for a wide range of obligatory control constructions, the predicate of the complement must be an intentional action, that is one either fully, or partially within the intentional control of the subject."¹² So we would expect that when the matrix predicate selects a Type I S with a *pro* subject, no thematic constraints will be imposed on *pro*. That this expectation is borne out is shown by (22) from Blg:

- (22) a. *Ivan se nadjava [pro da poseštava Petūr.]*
 Ivan hope-3SG da visit-3SG Petūr.
 b. *Ivan se nadjava [pro da napodobjava na Petūr.]*
 Ivan hope-3SG da resemble-3SG to Petūr

Thus, with verbs that permit either *pro* or a lexical DP as the subject of their subjunctive complement, a full range of θ roles is available to that subject. This situation finds a parallel in English for verbs like *want*, which may take a lexical NP as well as PRO, that is, they do not require an obligatorily controlled PRO, as Williams (1980) and Lasnik (1992) have observed:

- (23) a. *John wanted [Sue/PRO to visit Bill.]* (Lasnik's (38) and (41))
 b. *John wanted [Sue/PRO to resemble Bill.]*

To summarize, the above discussion seems to provide strong arguments in favor of an important distinction between Type I and Type II Ss in Blg as well as in MGrk in terms of the empty category of their subjects. Several tests have been used to establish the validity of the distinction on both syntactic and semantic grounds. I have argued that each ec is associated with an array of properties which uniquely identify them as *pro* and PRO, respectively. More concretely, it has been shown that in Type I Ss the null subject has a *pro* status since it may alternate with a lexical DP or an overt pronoun, it may function as an expletive, it permits a covariant and an invariant interpretation, it is compatible with arbitrary effects and it is not thematically constrained. On other hand, Type II Ss should be associated with anaphoric PRO since their null subject instantiates none of the above properties.

3. On the tense properties of subjunctives

In light of the above discussion, we are left with a paradox: if both *pro* and PRO are licensed in the subject position of the embedded *da/na*-clause, then two Cases will have to be checked within the embedded clause—*pro* will check nominative, while PRO will check null Case. Thus, we have to explain how the right type of Case is checked in each configuration. If we manage to do this, then we can go one step further—namely, to claim that the above-enumerated properties of the two types of subjunctives are not inherent to the contrast between *pro* and PRO but can be motivated to follow from or at least to correlate with some other properties of the clauses in which they are licensed.

Although it is generally true that subjunctive tense is defective and usually anaphoric, I will show that Type I and Type II Ss differ with respect to their tense specification. More precisely, I will argue that in terms of tense features, the former has a richer semantic content than the latter. In this section, a more detailed examination of this important distinction is provided.

Turning now to the data, the following generalization obtains: Type I Ss may not appear in the whole range of indicative tenses,¹³ but they nevertheless exhibit fewer tense restrictions than Type II Ss. This seems true for both MGrk (as originally observed by Iatridou 1993) and Blg (as observed by Maldjieva 1989).

Since Type I Ss appear as complements to epistemic and volitional predicates, they have a "possible future" interpretation (Bresnan 1972), that is, they describe something hypothetical or unrealized. Picallo (1984) notes that the value of the tense operator in subjunctive clauses cannot be specified within a given set of points in time, leaving undetermined whether the event in V has occurred or will occur.

Bulgarian and Modern Greek subjunctives are incompatible with the morphological past (aorist) tense and the future tense, implicating that the [\pm past] features in embedded tense do not have an independent status. Besides, the aorist in Blg conveys a modalized meaning, called "event-witnessing" (Kucarov 1994), which is incompatible with a hypothetical/irrealis interpretation and also with the fact that subjunctives cannot be assigned a truth value as far as the speaker is concerned (Farkas 1992a). With respect to other tense restrictions, however, Type I and Type II Ss behave differently. With the exception of the future and the aorist, Type I Ss permit all of the indicative tenses: present (the unmarked case), imperfect, present perfect and past perfect. Consider first present tense subjunctives ((24a) and (24b)) from Blg and their MGrk parallels ((24a') and (24b')):

- (24) a. *Nadjavam se da dojdeš.* a'. *Elpizo na erθis.*
 hope-1SG da come-2SG hope-1SG na come-2SG
 b. *Nadjavax se da dojdeš.* b'. *Ipiza na erθis.*
 hope-past-1SG da come-2SG hope-past-1SG na come-2SG

With present tense matrix verbs (as in (24a) and (24a')), the "unrealized" future reading of the present tense subjunctive is readily available, since the time of the evaluation coincides with the speech time. With past tense verbs (as in (24b/b')), the present tense subjunctive has a "future-relative-to-past" value, since the time of the evaluation coincides with the matrix clause event time. This is confirmed by the possibility of having different temporal adverbs in the higher and lower clauses, as in (25):

- (25) *Včera si mislex [Ivan utre da me zavede na kino.]*
 yesterday think-IMPF.1SG Ivan tomorrow da me take-3SG to cinema
 'I was thinking yesterday that Ivan could take me to the cinema tomorrow.'

We see in (25) that the future-oriented adverb *utre* 'tomorrow' has narrow

adverb *včera* 'yesterday' that modifies the higher clause. Such facts seem to show that Type I S clauses may denote an independent event and have a distinct time frame, although a specific temporal interpretation is imposed by the tense features of the matrix predicate (see Varlokosta and Hornstein 1993 for a discussion of relevant facts from MGrk).

This conjecture is confirmed by some additional facts concerning the interpretation of perfect tense subjunctives illustrated in (26):

- (26) a. *Nadžavam se da e došul veče.* Blg
 hope-1SG da be-3SG come-PRT already
 'I hope that he has come already.'
- b. *Nadžavam se da e došul/beshe došul.*
 hope-PAST.1SG da be-3SG come-PRT/was-3SG come-PRT
 'I hoped that you have/had come.'
- a'. *Elpizo na exi erbi pja.* MGrk
 hope-1SG na have-3SG come-PRT already
 same as (26a)
- b'. *Ilpiza na exi erbi/ixe erbi.*
 hope-PAST.1SG na have-3SG come-PRT/had-3SG come-PRT
 same as (26b)

In all the cases in (26) the perfect cannot be interpreted as a true past—that is, even if the action has taken place in the past, the embedded tense is still unrealized with respect to the time of the action of the matrix verb (Stowell 1982). This, however, does not imply that the perfect has no semantic contribution of its own. Rather, it still functions as a resultative tense relative to some reference point R and, depending on the matrix tense, may yield a hypothetical (26a') or a counterfactual (26b/b') interpretation. In (26), R coincides with the speech time by default, but R can be established by any time indicator, such as the temporal adverbials in (27) from Blg referring to the future ((27a)) or to the past ((27b)):

- (27) a. *Nadžavam se da si zaminal do utrel*
 hope-PAST.1SG da be-2SG left by tomorrow/
predi Ivan da se obadi.
 before Ivan da call-3SG
 'I hoped you would have left by tomorrow/before Ivan calls.'
- b. *Nadžavam se da si zaminal predi tri godini.*
 hope-past-1SG da be-2SG left before three years
 'I hoped you had left three years ago.'

All temporal adverbials have a narrow scope and serve to fix the time reference of the perfect relative to R, without conflicting with the (past) tense of the matrix verb, as predicted. Note that even if the subjunctive has a past perfect

mechanism (like the Sequence of tenses rule), because the embedded verb expresses much the same temporal relation (nonpast) with respect to matrix tense, as its present perfect counterpart. In other words, the +/–past distinction between the present perfect and the past perfect is neutralized in subjunctive contexts, and it is for this reason that past perfect subjunctives are relatively rare, at least in Blg.

The significant distinctions discussed above are hard to reconcile with the proposal put forward for MGrk that subjunctive tense should be specified with [–T], due to the restriction on the usage of the aorist (Iatridou 1993, Varlokosta and Hornstein 1993). On the other hand, if we allow the [+T] specification only for those Type I Ss, which can appear in the past tense (and with a limited number of verbs in MGrk such as *elpizo* 'hope', *pistevo* 'hope', *fandazome* 'imagine', etc.), we will be missing a generalization regarding the unitary behavior of the null subject, as established in the previous section. Since Type I Ss in both Blg and MGrk nevertheless exhibit tense distinctions, albeit fewer than the respective indicative complements, I will propose that their tense is uniformly specified with [+T]. Apparently, tense in Type I Ss lacks [±Past] features, but it contains other tense features, such as, for example, [±Resultative], which act in combination with the matrix tense features and yield the "unrealized future" interpretation invariably associated with this type of complement. In other words, the tense features of Type I Ss are not necessarily anaphoric upon matrix tense, although they depend on the latter in order to be interpreted (see note 13 and Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 for a similar interpretation of the Romanian subjunctives).

Consider now Type II Ss. First, compare (25) with the ungrammatical (28). Structures (28a) and (28a') have the matrix control verb *znani/ksero* 'know', and (28b) and (28b') have the matrix aspectual verb *započevam/arxizo* 'begin':

- (28) a. **Sega znaja da pluvam utre.* Blg
 now know-1SG da swim-1SG tomorrow
- a'. **Tora o Janis kseri na kolimbai avrio.* MGrk
 now Janis know-3SG na swim-3SG tomorrow
- b. **Sega započevam da pluvam utre.* Blg
 now begin-1SG da swim-1SG tomorrow
- b'. **Tora o Janis arxizi na kolimbai avrio.* MGrk
 now Janis begin-3SG na swim-3SG tomorrow

The authors explain the ungrammaticality of the MGrk examples in (28a') and (28b'), borrowed from Varlokosta and Hornstein (1993), by pointing out that each of these sentences denotes one event aspectually, namely that of "knowing an activity" or "beginning an activity". The same explanation can be extended to the Blg examples (28a) and (28b). Since there is only one event, the temporal specification of the embedded event is identical to that of the main predicate.

But there are other cases to consider, because some Type II Ss can denote an independent event, this property being a matter of selection. One such case is

illustrated in (29) from Blg. In (29), however, the embedded event is necessarily interpreted as being simultaneous with the matrix event:

- (29) *Šte zabravja da kupja luk utre.*
 will forget-1SG da buy-1SG onions tomorrow
 'I will forget to buy onions tomorrow.'

The temporal adverb *utre* 'tomorrow' in the embedded clause can serve to modify the whole expression, that is, it has wide scope. Thus, in (29) the adverb has a future time reference, and so does the whole expression.

Judging from the above facts, we have to expect that an embedded temporal adverb may be ungrammatical if it conflicts with matrix tense. This expectation is indeed borne out. In (30) it is shown that a matrix past tense is compatible only with past time indicators:

- (30) *Ne možax da kupja knjiga včera/*utre.*
 not could-1SG to buy book-the yesterday/tomorrow
 'I could not buy the book yesterday/*tomorrow.'

Finally, control complements in both Blg and MGrk can appear only in the present tense, irrespective of the matrix tense. All other tenses are excluded, as the ungrammaticality of the examples in (31) from Blg show:

- (31) a. **Ivan može da e pročel pismo.*¹⁴
 Ivan can-3SG da be-3SG read-PRT letter-the
 b. **Ivan može da pročeteš/beše pročel pismo.*
 Ivan could-3SG da read-IMPF.3SG/was-3SG read-PRT letter-the

I conclude, therefore, that control complements in Blg and MGrk, which correspond to Type II Ss, do not possess tense features at all. In (35) the present tense is tenseless or tense zero, which points to the fact that morphologically, tense in Type II Ss is more impoverished than in Type I Ss in terms of both formal (morphological) features and semantic content. Therefore, I will suggest that tense in Type II Ss is specified with [-T]. This specification will allow us to capture the strict anaphoric relation which exists between matrix and embedded tense.

The above discussion can be summarized with the following generalization about the nonuniform characteristics of the two types, based on the correlation between their temporal specification and the type of null subject they may take. Blg and MGrk have two types of subjunctive complements, one that licenses *pro* and another that licenses *PRO*. *Da/na*-complements with a *PRO* subject show some tense restrictions, but nevertheless, their tense features may not be anaphoric upon the matrix tense; hence, embedded tense is specified with [+T], although it lacks the [\pm Past] features. *Da/na*-clauses that have a *PRO* subject show very strict tense restrictions, and their tense features are anaphoric; hence, embedded tense is specified with [-T].¹⁵

4. Subjunctives, Case-checking, and V movement

In this section, I will offer an account of how nominative and null Case is checked in Blg and MGrk subjunctives.

I will adopt the proposal of Rivero (1994) and Terzi (1991, 1997) that the subjunctive particle *da/na* heads a projection of its own, *M(ood)P*(hrase). In view of my assumption that subjunctive complements are TPs, the strict adjacency requirement that holds between *da/na* and the verb cluster can be taken to indicate that the particle selects a TP, as shown in the configuration below:

- (32) $[_{CP} C [_{MP} M^0 da/na [_{TP} T^0 [_{VP} SUBJ [_{V'} OB]]]]]$

Assuming that the verb is selected from the lexicon with tense and agreement on it, the V feature of T will check the tense on the verb, while its D feature will check the Case of the subject DP that raises to its specifier position. The DP carries along its ϕ features which will be checked against the Agr features of V in the Spec head relation established within-TP.

Let us assume that the V feature of T is strong if T has the specification [+T]. On the other hand, the V feature of T is weak if T is specified as [-T]. Let us further assume (following Watanabe 1993) that strong T will check nominative Case, while weak T checks null Case. If feature strength is the motivation behind overt versus covert V movement, then in (32) strong T will trigger adjunction of V to T, since V has strong tense features that have to be checked against [+T]. Weak T, on the other hand, will trigger only covert raising, so only the tense features of V will adjoin to T, to be checked by [-T] (through Procrastinate). These two options correspond to the two possible choices of subjunctive subjects—*pro*/lexical DP in a Type I S and *PRO* in a Type II S. The former type will be chosen whenever the strong value of T is chosen, and the latter type is chosen whenever the weak value of T is chosen. This ensures that *pro*/lexical DP will move from Spec, VP to Spec, TP for nominative Case-checking in case T is occupied by the V+T complex. *PRO*, on the other hand, will move from Spec, VP to Spec, TP for Null Case-checking against the raised tense features of V. The opposite choice—namely the one by which *PRO* instead of *pro* moves to Spec, TP—is barred because strong T will not have satisfied its nominative Case feature and the derivation will crash. Alternatively, if *pro* rather than *PRO* raises to Spec, TP for Null Case-checking, the derivation will crash again, since in this case weak T will not have satisfied its Null Case feature.

As a result of this discussion, we obtain the representations in (33) for Type I and Type II Ss, respectively:

- (33) a. $[_{CP} [_{MP} da/na [_{TP} pro/lexical DP V+T [_{VP} t_v]]]]$
 b. $[_{CP} [_{MP} da/na [_{TP} PRO T [_{VP} V]]]]]$

Unfortunately, (33) predicts that a lexical DP should be able to intervene between *da/na* and the verbal complex, contrary to fact, as (34) shows:

- (34) a. *Iskam decata/visički da (*decata/*visički) otiđat na kino*
 want-1SG children-the/all da children-the/all go-3PL to cinema
 'I want the children/all to go to the cinema.'
- b. *Ōelo na (*ta peđja/*oli) palle taksiđi.*
 want-1SG na the children/all go-3PL trip

In order to account for the strict adjacency that holds between *da/na* and the following verb, I will propose that in (33) V moves on to adjoin to the particle, overtly in (33a) and covertly in (33b). The reason for this movement, I assume, lies in the fact that V has to check its categorial feature against the V feature of the particle. Indeed, the particles *da/na* are compatible only with finite verbs; they cannot co-occur with participles or gerunds. This will account for the desirable word order in (34a), since the subject will be left behind in Spec, TP. In (33a) the categorial feature of the raised V is still accessible to the computation and remains visible at LF by virtue of being interpretable (Chomsky 1995:chap. 4), although it has been checked by T as a free-rider (via the adjunction operation). The same applies to (33b), but in this case the categorial feature raises along together with V's tense features.

One final note concerns the distribution of lexical subjects in Type I Ss. In Blg, the lexical subject can appear either preverbally (as in (34a) above and (35a) below) or postverbally (as in (35b)). In MGrk the word order is constrained and subjects appear postverbally (the unmarked case, as in (36)) unless proposed for focusing (the marked case):

- (35) a. *Iskam [Ivan da zamine.*
 want-1SG Ivan da leave-3SG Ivan
- b. *Iskam [da zamine Ivan.*
 want-1SG da leave-3SG Ivan
- (36) *Ōelo [na erθoun ta peđja.*
 want-1SG na come-3PL the children

To account for the unmarked word order in (36), Terzi (1992, 1997) proposes that the complex *na+V* has moved overtly to C, thereby licensing nominative Case on the embedded subject, in a way that is reminiscent of Aux-to-Comp movement in Italian (Rizzi 1982). In fact, Terzi proposes that *want*-class verbs in MGrk have a double subcategorization frame—one with PRO (an obligatory control structure) and another with *pro*/lexical subject, as in (37) and (38), respectively, which correspond to Terzi's (67) and (68):

- (37) $V_{\text{want/hope}} [_{\text{CP}} [_{\text{C}} \emptyset] [_{\text{MP}} \text{PRO}] [_{\text{M}} \text{M}] [_{\text{IP}} [_{\text{I}} \text{V} \dots]]]$
- (38) $V_{\text{want/hope}} [_{\text{CP}} [_{\text{C}} \text{M}+\text{V}] [_{\text{MP}} \text{M}^e] [_{\text{IP}} \text{pro/lexical}_{\text{DP}} [_{\text{I}} \text{e} \dots]]]$

Building on an earlier proposal by Terzi (1992), Watanabe (1993a) argues that there is a systematic correlation between the shape of Comp and the Case of the embedded subject: only lexically filled C can be associated with nominative Case. Empty C, on the other hand, is compatible with a control configuration

and therefore it is legitimate for the embedded subject in (37) to be PRO (see also Kayne 1991 who claims this to be true for English and Romance control infinitivals).

However, the fact that the preverbal subject in (35a) from Blg is nominative does not allow us to posit a *da+V-to-C* movement for (35b), comparable to the one in (38), for the purpose of licensing nominative Case on the subject. If nominative subjects can be licensed *in situ*, this type of movement will lack motivation and will thus create a problem for Watanabe's theory. More important, though, the pair in (35) raises the question about the specification of the empty C in both Blg and MGrk subjunctive clauses.

With respect to the lexical content of C, I will assume that C in Blg and MGrk subjunctives contains the feature [+finite], as do all indicative complements (Rizzi 1997). Suppose that V's tense features in Type I Ss raise (by Move F) to the embedded C¹⁶ to check off [+finite]. This movement will allow for the proper relation to be established between the matrix and embedded T, in view of the tense dependency that we observed in section 3. Suppose further that C in Type II Ss has an additional abstract (null) tense feature in addition to the [+finite] one. In this case, raising of embedded V's tense features to C will ensure the strict matching of the specification in C and T (otherwise the derivation will not succeed). If a null tense feature can be interpreted as signaling a lack of (independent) tense or as yielding a simultaneous construal (Stowell 1996), then the strict anaphoric temporal relation between the matrix tense and the present tense of the subjunctive clause will follow.¹⁷ What type of specification C has will depend on the selectional properties of the higher V, possibly along the lines of Rivero's (1987) proposal about the index-sharing mechanism between V and its th-marked CP complement.

Turning back to the contrast in (35), we find that, interestingly, (35a) and (35b) have different interpretations: (35b) can be roughly paraphrased as *I want the act of leaving to be performed by John*, while (35a) can be paraphrased as *I want John's leaving*. In other words, in (35b) the focus of the desire is on the event of leaving, while in (35a) the concentration is on the participant (namely *Ivan*) in the event of leaving. Construction (35a) is reminiscent of a pseudorelative structure. It thus seems that when the subject is preverbal, the subjunctive tends to have nominal-like properties.

Suppose it is not the shape of C but rather the D feature of M that is responsible for the difference between (35a) and (35b)/(36). Suppose further that the D feature of M can be parametrized in terms of strength (as suggested to me by M. Rivero, private communication), so that one or the other value is involved in each interpretation. Thus, when the D feature is strong, it will trigger movement of the subjunctive subject from Spec, TP to Spec, MP. This will account for the SV order in (35a). On the other hand, if the D feature of M is weak, the subject will not have to raise to Spec, MP and the VS order of (35b) will follow. Consequently, lexical subjects in Blg can raise higher than Spec, TP but are not obliged to do so. In view of this proposal, it can be argued that in (36) the lexical subject does not move to Spec, MP because M in MGrk has a

movement of $\mu\alpha+V$ to C but is rather due to a weak D feature of M that does not attract the subjunctive subject to Spec, MP.

5. Conclusion

In this essay, I have argued that there are two types of subjunctive clauses in MGrk and Blg. I have labeled them Type I and Type II and have tried to show that each type displays uniform behavior in terms of subject reference and semantic (tense-related) properties. Further, I have tried to correlate the tense dependencies typical for all subjunctive and infinitive complements with the Case possibilities for the subject in these clauses by showing that strong tense features are compatible only with *pro* (and nominative) subjects, while weak tense features are compatible only with PRO subjects. Thus, I established that the properties of null subjunctive subjects are not inherent to the contrast between *pro* and PRO but follow from the tense properties of the clauses that license these empty categories. I argued that Case (nominative versus null) is checked in the domain of the embedded clause, with a follow-up process of checking the featural specification of C. Such an analysis obviates the need for an overt V movement to account for the word order restriction in MGrk and thus complies with last resort and the spirit of the Minimalist framework in general.

Notes

I would like to thank Peggy Spears for her comments on an earlier version of this paper. María Luisa Rivero and Ronnie Cann for a stimulating discussion, Arhonto Terzi for her help with the Greek data, and the audience of the 1996 GLOW workshop for their valuable suggestions.

1. Throughout the paper I will be using the term *subjunctive* as a cover term for all *da/na*-clauses, irrespective of their functions or interpretation as subjunctives or infinitives.
2. Romanian has subjunctive morphology (although "reserved" for third person forms), a subjunctive complementizer *ca* and a subjunctive particle *să* (but see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 for an account of the ambiguous status of *să* as a Comp/Infl element). Albanian has no subjunctive morphology but does have a subjunctive complementizer (*që*) and a special subjunctive particle (*rë*) (Turano 1995). Serbo-Croatian (insofar as it is a Balkan language) has no subjunctive morphology but has the subjunctive particle *da* which functions as a complementizer (Zec 1987, among others).
3. Throughout the essay, the subjunctive particles in MGrk and Blg will be glossed "na" for Greek and "da" for Bulgarian.
4. In this essay, I will be concerned with subject control only, and the conclusions will apply only to subject control complements. The structural and referential properties of object control subjunctives and ECM complements remain outside the scope of the present investigation.
5. Such a line of reasoning brings my proposal closer to the spirit of Huang's (1984) and Borer's (1989) theories regarding the possibility for a unifying description

agreement as a way to achieve the control properties of *pro*, since agreement is rich in all subjunctive complements in Blg, irrespective of whether they take *pro* or PRO subjects.

6. The adjacency restriction between the particle and the following verb is a characteristic property of all Balkan subjunctives. Apart from this restriction, which is generally not typical for complementizers, Rudin (1986) gives three more arguments for the noncomplementizer status of *da*: (1) *da* can co-occur with complementizers like *če* 'that', *dali* 'whether', or *deto* 'that/which'; (2) *wh*-words can co-occur with *da* but not with complementizers; and (3) focused constituents are placed between the complementizer and *da*, separating *da* from Comp.

7. Within this semantically defined categorization, the term *control verb* can be correlated with the semantic property of control in its broadest sense, i.e., as referring to verbs which take in any non-freely interpreted empty category (Joseph 1992).

8. Semantically, it is difficult to determine what differentiates the two sets of verbs that may select one or the other subjunctive type. A discussion of their semantic properties, however, will lead me too far afield and it is for this reason that I will not undertake it here. Arguably, verbs that take a Type II S subcategorize for either a proposition (in this way they resemble their English counterparts, such as *intend*, *succeed*, and *expect*) or an object DP. In the latter case the DP may be interpreted as one with an elliptical propositional reading, such as, for example, as actuals: *I begin something = I begin to do something* (Hornstein and Lightfoot 1987; Rivero, to appear). In this respect, control verbs share a lot of similarities with ECM verbs like *očakivam* 'expect' (in its predictive reading) and perception verbs like *viždam* 'see', *čuvam* 'hear', etc. (which could possibly fall under control theory as well). Negation plays an important role in that it seems to interfere with the selection of a Type I rather than a Type II S, on the one hand, and of a subjunctive rather than an indicative, on the other. Sometimes the restriction on the indicative is tied to a specific reading of the predicate (for example, when *know* denotes ability, it is used with a subjunctive, but in its epistemic sense it requires an indicative).

9. This generalization predicts that if a language has nonfinite complements as well as subjunctive ones, it will tend to use the infinitive in cases of obligatory control. This does not seem to be universally true for all Balkan languages. For example, Romanian allows control with subjunctives, even though it has infinitives as well. Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) has argued, however, that *a* infinitives in Romanian have an exclusively DP distribution (due to the nominal properties of the infinitive marker *a*), although they have the same categorial status as *să* subjunctives.

10. See Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) for a binding-theoretic explanation of the lack of obviation effects in Romanian subjunctives and Terzi (1991) for a discussion of relevant structures in MGrk.

11. With unstressed pronouns some speakers prefer the noncoreferent interpretation.

12. Interestingly, the contrast between the (a) and (b) sentences in (20) and (21) is comparable to that in (i) from English and is due to the fact that the embedded predicate does not allow a nonagentive PRO subject:

- (i) a. *John tried [PRO to visit Bill.]* (Lasnik's (36))
 b. **John tried [PRO to resemble Bill.]*

Lasnik (1992:241) notes that "these thematic constraints on Control tend to obtain only in configurations where PRO is demanded (rather than simply allowed)".

13. It has been noted (for example, Picallo 1984; Stowell 1982; Borer 1989; etc.) that tense in subjunctives is defective (or degenerate) in comparison to indicative clauses and that it is anaphoric upon the tense of the matrix clause. To account for the latter fact, one might argue that subjunctives lack a TP altogether (as proposed by Tsimpli 1990). However, as noted by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:105), when it comes to temporal reference, anaphoricity does not imply lack of tense, but should rather be interpreted in terms of a referential dependency of the embedded tense features upon the matrix tense features. Thus, properties 1 and 2 are not independent but should rather be taken to correlate.

14. Note that (31a) in the text can be grammatical under an epistemic reading of the matrix verb *može* 'it is probable', since the verb *moga* 'can', when used in the third person is ambiguous between a root ('*be able*') and an epistemic interpretation. This contrast confirms my proposal that the verb *moga* can and in fact should be associated simultaneously with both subjunctive types, under the respective readings (see also note 8).

15. The contrast between the two subjunctive types in terms of the *pro/PRO* distinction is reminiscent of the wellknown contrast in (i), which illustrates that control structures prohibit an overt subject, while ECM structures require one:

- (i) a. *John tries PRO/*Mary to finish his thesis*
 b. *John believes *PRO/Mary to be pregnant.*

Martin (1992), following Stowell (1982), proposes that this property correlates with tense: control tense is specified for [+T], while ECM tense is specified for [-T], hence ECM complements do not have an independent temporal interpretation. In terms of tense specification, it seems that Type I Ss (the nonobligatory control subjunctives) pattern with English Control tense, while Type II Ss (the obligatory control subjunctives) pattern with English ECM tense. I do not have an explanation for these "mirror-image" effects. Note however, that I do not accept that anaphoric tense dependencies (at least in Big and MGrk) amount to lack of tense altogether. Instead, I suggest that control subjunctives have a tense node which is specified as [-T]. The assumption that [-T] specification should replace lack of tense will be shown to have important consequences for the minimalist account of null Case-checking of *PRO*.

16. This movement could also be due to a requirement on Case validation, as proposed by Watanabe (1993b).

17. Note that this proposal allows us to account for the tense dependencies exhibited in subjunctive clauses, making it irrelevant to posit different types of projections (CP or IP) for the various subjunctive complements based on co-occurrence with complementizers and *wh*-words (as in Vartokosta and Hornstein's 1993 analysis). The present proposal also obviates the need for positing different subcategorization frames for verbs like *want* and *hope*, for the purpose of capturing the word order restrictions in MGrk and the distribution of *pro/PRO* subjects (as in Terzi's analysis).

References

- Borer, H. 1989. "Anaphoric AGR." In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir, eds., *The Null Subject Parameter*, 69–109. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bouchard, D. 1984. *On the Content of Empty Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bresnan, J. 1972. "Theory of Complementation in English Syntax." Ph.D. diss., University of Connecticut.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1993. "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory." In K. Hale and S.-J. Keyser, eds., *The View from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N., and H. Lasnik. 1993. "Principles and Parameters Theory." In J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, and T. Vennemann, eds., *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, 506–69. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian: Comparative Studies in Romance (Studies in Generative Grammar 40)*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Farkas, D. 1992a. "On the Semantics of Subjunctive Complements." In P. Hirschbühler and K. Koerner, eds., *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory*, 67–104. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Farkas, D. 1992b. "On Obviation." In I. Sag and A. Szabolcsi, eds., *Lexical Matters*, 85–109. Stanford: CSLI.
- Higginbotham, J. 1992. "Reference and Control." In R. Larson, S. Iatridou, U. Lahiri, and J. Higginbotham, eds., *Control and Grammar*, 79–108. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hornstein, N., and D. Lightfoot. 1987. "Predication and PRO." *Language*, 63.1.23–52.
- Huang, C. T. J. 1984. "On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns." *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.531–74.
- Iatridou, S. 1993. "On Nominative Case Assignment and a Few Related Things." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19.174–95.
- Jaeggli, O., and K. Safir, eds. 1999. *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Joseph, B. D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, B. D. 1992. "Diachronic Perspectives in Control." In R. Larson, S. Iatridou, U. Lahiri, and J. Higginbotham, eds., *Control and Grammatical Theory*, 195–234. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kayne, R. 1991. "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.647–86.
- Koster, J. 1984. "On Binding and Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.3.417–59.
- Krapova, I. 1996. "The Category of Person in Modern Bulgarian." Ph.D. diss., University of Sofia/University of Plovdiv.
- Kucarov, I. 1994. *Edno ekzotichno naklonenie na bulgarskija glagol* [One exotic mood of the Bulgarian verb]. Sofia.
- Lasnik, H. 1992. "Two Notes on Control and Binding." In R. Larson, S. Iatridou, U. Lahiri, and J. Higginbotham, eds., *Control and Grammar*, 235–52. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Maldjieva, V. 1989. "Gramatyczne sposoby wyrazania znaczenia 'mozliweści' w języku polskim i bulgarskim." Ph.D. diss., University of Wrocław.
- Martin, R. 1992. "On the Distribution of Case-Features and PRO." Unpublished ms., University of Connecticut.
- Phillipaki-Warbuton, I. 1987. "The Theory of Empty Categories and the *pro*-Drop Parameter in Modern Greek." *Journal of Linguistics* 23.289–318.
- Picallo, C. 1984. "The Infl Node and the Null Subject Parameter." *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.175–107.

- Rivero, M. L. 1987. "Barriers and the Null Subject Parameter in Modern Greek." *Proceedings of NELS* 18.412–25.
- Rivero, M. L. 1994. "Clause Structure and V-movement in the Languages of the Balkans." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12.63–120.
- Rivero, M. L. to appear. "Balkan Complementation." In N. Vincent and K. Borjars, eds., *Complementation: Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, L. 1995. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." In L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rudin, C. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and wh-Constructions*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Stowell, T. 1982. "The Tense of Infinitives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.561–570.
- Stowell, T. 1996. "The Phrase Structure of Tense." In J. Rooryck and L. Zaring, eds., *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 277–291. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Terzi, A. 1991. "PRO and Obviation in Modern Greek." *Proceedings of WCCOL* 10.471–82.
- Terzi, A. 1992. "PRO in Finite Clauses: A Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages." Ph.D. diss., CUNY.
- Terzi, A. 1997. "PRO and Null Case in Finite Clauses." *Linguistic Review* 14.335–60.
- Tsimplii, I. M. 1990. "The Clause Structure and Word Order in Modern Greek." *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2.226–55.
- Turano, G. 1995. *Dipendenza sintattiche in Albanese*. Padua: Unipress.
- Vartokosta, S., and N. Hornstein. 1993. "Control Complements in Modern Greek." *Proceedings of NELS* 23.507–521.
- Watanabe, A. 1993a. "The Notion of Finite Clauses in Agr-Based Case Theory." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19.281–295.
- Watanabe, A. 1993b. "Agr-Based Case Theory and Its Interaction with the A-bar System." Ph.D. diss., MIT.
- Williams, E. 1980. "Predication." *Linguistic Inquiry* 11.208–38.
- Zec, D. 1987. "On Obligatory Control in Clausal Complements." In M. Iida, St. Wechsler, and D. Zec, eds., *Working Papers in Grammatical Theory and Discourse Structure*, 136–68. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Direct Object Clitic Doubling in Albanian and Greek

Dalina Kallulli

1. Introduction

A pervasive phenomenon in the languages of the Balkan is that of clitic doubling. This study investigates clitic doubling of direct objects in two of these languages: Albanian and Greek (MGrk). This undertaking is motivated by the need to gain deeper insight into the nature of clitic doubling constructions and in turn contributes to the general question of why clitic doubling appears at all. Doubling constructions are by their nature strongly reminiscent of object agreement constructions. Yet, there are essential differences between the two that beg for explanation. The Albanian and Greek patterns confirm the idea that in spite of certain similarities between clitic doubling and object agreement phenomena, the two cannot be equated. For instance, unlike object agreement markers, direct object clitics in Albanian and Greek have restricted distribution and operatorlike properties. It will be shown that the factors that determine clitic doubling of direct object DPs in both languages are by and large identical and can be captured by a uniform syntactic analysis. Crucially, I argue that direct object clitics in both languages unequivocally mark the DPs they double as [–Focus], which, in analogy with the [+Focus] feature on phrases (cf. Jackendoff 1972, Horvath 1986, Rochement 1986, Brody 1990, among others), will be defined as a syntactic feature on phrases interpretable at both the LF and PF interfaces. Consequently, clitic doubling of direct object DPs does not induce specificity on these DPs, as has been claimed for Romance (cf. Sportiche 1992, Uriagereka (1995, among others). It will be argued instead that the locus of specificity is the D position (cf. Abney 1987), which for noun phrases underlies argumenthood (cf. Longobardi 1994). The view that direct object clitics in Albanian and Greek mark the DPs they double as unambiguously [–Focus] may be implemented successfully within the minimalist framework (cf. Chomsky 1995) by preserving Sportiche's (1992) basic assumption that clitics head their own maximal projections and that direct object clitics in particular are heads with operatorlike properties. Importantly, it will be argued that argument clitics carry a D-feature, which is why they may double only DPs, not NPs,¹ and that specificity,