SUBJUNCTIVE COMPLEMENTS IN SERBIAN/CROATIAN: DISTRIBUTIONAL ISSUES

Tomislav Socanac (tomislav.socanac@unige.ch)

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper I will be dealing with issues related to the subjunctive mood in Serbian/Croatian (SC), which is a subject that has received scarce attention in theoretical literature. The main reason for this lack of interest is the apparent absence of any overt morphological marking for the subjunctive in SC, which is why traditional SC grammars generally do not list subjunctive as one of the grammatical categories present in this language. In Socanac (2011) I went against this traditional view, presenting evidence (some of which will be briefly summarized in this paper as well) that SC contains the same type of subjunctive as some of the languages in its surroundings, such as Greek or Romanian. In this paper, I will study the properties of SC subjunctive in greater detail, focusing in particular on the problems related to the distribution of subjunctive complements in this language.

SC is situated in the Balkan region and belongs to the so-called *Balkan sprachbund* linguistic area.[1] The term *Balkan sprachbund* refers to the fact that languages situated in this region share common features in certain areas of their grammar, even though they belong to several different language families. One grammatical area where this can be observed particularly well is the subjunctive mood: both the syntactic realization and the distribution of subjunctive complements are very similar across Balkan languages (as will be shown in more detail in sections 2. and 3.). This is why the conclusions I will reach on the basis of my analysis of SC subjunctive might have wider relevance for other Balkan languages as well.

Before I focus on the main subject of this paper, i.e. the distributional patterns of subjunctive complements in SC, I will begin the next section by briefly familiarizing the reader with the way in which subjunctive is syntactically realized in Balkan languages, because the realization of Balkan subjunctive is different from the one observed in most other languages. Section 2. will also contain a summary of some of the evidence presented in Socanac (2011), which showed that SC contains the same type of subjunctive mood as other Balkan languages. In section 3., I will introduce the reader with the problems related to subjunctive distribution in SC and other languages of the Balkans. As will be shown, subjunctive complements in these languages exhibit unusual distributional patterns, because the range of predicates which select the subjunctive mood in embedded clauses is much wider than the one typically observed in languages outside of the Balkan region. The result of this is a great degree of semantic diversity between various subjunctive complements in SC and other Balkan languages, which poses problems for the cross-linguistic analysis of the subjunctive mood. In section 4., I will present a comprehensive account of SC subjunctive and its distribution, focusing both on the syntactic and the semantic properties of subjunctive complements in this language, which will allow me to address some of the problems outlined in section 3. I will claim, in particular, that the semantic diversity of subjunctives in SC stems

---

[1] For a more comprehensive description of Balkan sprachbund, see Joseph (1983) or Miseska-Tomic (2006).

from the fact that different types of subjunctive complements in this language exhibit significant differences in their structural make-up once they reach the syntax-semantics interface, resulting in very different semantic inputs depending on which type of predicate selects the subjunctive clause. The analysis I will propose in this context will allow me to put all subjunctive complements in SC on a common semantic mood scale, regardless of the wide variety of meanings that can be associated with them.

2. SUBJUNCTIVE REALIZATION IN BALKAN LANGUAGES

One of the most salient features of the *Balkan sprachbund* phenomenon that I talked about in the introduction is the syntactic realization of subjunctive mood. Cross-linguistically, subjunctive is typically identified through verbal morphology, as we can observe in (1) on the example of some (Western)[2] Romance languages:

(1)   a.   Je veux que tu   **viennes**   demain.   (French)
           I want that you comeSUBJ.2.sg. tomorrow
           'I want you to come tomorrow.'
      b.   Quiero   que   **vengas**   hoy.   (Spanish)
           want1.sg. that comeSUBJ.2.sg. today
           'I want you to come today.'

Balkan languages, however, use a different strategy in this context. They distinguish subjunctives from indicatives through an independent lexical item, which appears on the left periphery of the clause. Observe, for instance, the contrast between indicative and subjunctive complements in Balkan languages such as Greek or Romanian:

(2)   a.   O Pavlos ipe   **oti**   efije   o Janis.   (Greek)
           the Paul said3.sg. IND left3.sg. the John
           'Paul said that John left.'
      b.   O Pavlos dietaxe   **na**   ertheis
           the Paul ordered3.sg. SUBJ come2.sg.
           'Paul ordered you to come.'

(3)   a.   Maria   a   spus   **ca** Ioan   a   venit.   (Romanian)
           Mary past.aux.3.sg. said   IND John past.aux.3.sg. came
           'Mary said that John came.'
      b.   Maria vrea   **sa**   castige   Ioan.
           Mary want3.sg. SUBJ win3.sg. John
           'Mary wants John to win.'

Indicative complements in Greek and Romanian are introduced, respectively, by items *oti* and *ca*, whereas subjunctives are associated with *na* and *sa*. Items such as *oti*, and its equivalents in other Balkan languages, are seen as classical complementizers, whereas *na* and its equivalents are usually analyzed as mood particles (Giannakidou, 2009; Krapova, 1998; Rivero, 1994; Terzi, 1992 a.o.). Such particles can be observed in a wide variety of Balkan

---

[2] In the remainder of the text, whenever I speak of Romance languages, it should be clear that I am referring to the Western Romance group, which excludes Romanian. Romanian is situated in the Balkan region and it contains the same type of subjunctive as other Balkan languages (Dobrovie-Sorin, 1994; Farkas, 1984, a.o.). Therefore, it should not be grouped with other Romance languages in this context, but with Balkan ones.

languages, which is why we speak of *Balkan sprachbund* in this context. In the following section, I will show that SC realizes its subjunctive in the same manner.

2.1. Subjunctive particle *da* in SC

On the surface, SC appears to be different from Greek or Romanian, because both indicative (4a) and subjunctive-type complements (4b) in this language seem to be introduced by the same left-periphery item:

(4) a.   Znam   **da**   je   Ivan dosao.
           know1.sg. that past.aux.3.sg. John came
           'I know that John came.'
    b.   Zelim   **da** Ivan pobijedi
           want1.sg. that John win3.sg.
           'I want John to win.'

However, in Socanac (2011), I demonstrated that, despite surface appearance, the two *da*-items we observe in (4) are not the same syntactic element.[3] Note, for instance, the example below:

(5)   Kaze   **da**   ce   **da**   dodje.
           say3.sg. thatCOMP fut.aux.3.sg. PART come3.sg.
           'He says that he will come.'

The embedded construction in (5) is frequently used to express future tense in SC.[4] It is important for the argument presented here because it allows us to observe that there is more than one element with the overt form *da* in SC. The embedded complement in (5) is introduced by the complementizer *da*, and then we have another *da*-item, which appears in the same embedded clause, but below the embedded CP projection. As a result, this second *da* cannot be seen as a complementizer, but as some type of particle. In Socanac (2011), I demonstrated in some detail that the lower particle *da* in (5) is the same linguistic item as the element *da* we observe in subjunctive complements, such as the one in (4b). Consequently, the subjunctive-related *da* and the indicative-related *da* cannot be seen as the same item, since the example in (5) shows that they are inserted in two distinct positions within the structure.

       Due to space constraints, I am unable to present the argument from Socanac (2011) in much detail here. I will only put forward a couple of striking facts which, when combined, strongly suggest that the particle *da* in SC is the same type of subjunctive mood particle as the ones employed in most other Balkan languages. Observe firstly the Romanian example below:

(6)   Eu ma gandesc ca   o   **sa**   **merg**   maine la munte.
           I   think1.sg. that fut.aux. PART go1.sg. tomorrow to mountain
           'I think that I will go to the mountain tomorrow.'

---

[3] Here I will present only a brief overview of some of the evidence put forward in Socanac (2011). The reader is referred to that paper for a much more detailed analysis in this context.

[4] To be more precise, such a construction is more typical of the Serbian variety than of the Croatian one. Croatian speakers tend to use an infinitive after the future auxiliary in such a context instead of a construction containing the item *da* followed by a finite verb. This difference is due to a more general contrast between Croatian and Serbian when it comes to the use of infinitive. See note 7 for more details on this point.

In (6) we can see that Romanian can use the same strategy as SC to express future tense: it also employs a construction consisting of a particle and a finite verb. The crucial fact for the analysis presented here is that the particle *sa* we observe in (6) is the same as the one we saw in the subjunctive complement in (3b). Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that the SC particle *da*, since it is functionally equivalent to the Romanian *sa* in this context, also appears in subjunctive-type complements, such as the one in (4b).[5] This would imply that SC, like Romanian, also introduces indicative and subjunctive complements with different types of left-periphery items.

Another piece of evidence for the claim that SC contains the same type of subjunctive particle as other Balkan languages comes from the distribution of the particle *da* in matrix clauses. SC *da* is similar in this sense to subjunctive particles in other Balkan languages because it is typically used in matrix contexts to denote unrealized events, associated with a mood shift. This is also the case, for instance, with the Greek subjunctive particle *na*.

(7)   a.   **Da**   bar   dodje.   (SC)
           PART only come3.sg.
           'If only he came.'
      b.   **Na**   etrexe.   (Greek)
           PART ran3.sg.
           'If only he were running.'

(8)   a.   **Da**   nisi   ni pomislio na to!   (SC)
           PART not-be2.sg. think   on that
           'Don't even think about it!'
      b.   **Na**   mi   fijis!   (Greek)
           PART not leave2.sg.
            'Don't leave!'

In (7) and (8), we can observe some typical matrix environments where *na* and *da* are employed. They tend to denote optative (7) or imperative (8) meanings in this context, which are the types of meaning usually associated with the subjunctive mood.

Examples in (5)-(8) strongly suggest that SC particle *da* should be seen as functionally equivalent to subjunctive particles in other Balkan languages, which is why it is reasonable to assume that it is also employed in the context of subjunctive complements such as the one in (4b). On the basis of these, and other evidence presented in Socanac (2011), I concluded that SC contains a Balkan-type subjunctive mood, even though its subjunctive complements are not as distinctive on the surface as those in most other Balkan languages. Now that the issue of subjunctive realization in SC has been addressed, I can move on to the problems related to subjunctive distribution in this language, which will be the main focus of this paper.

3. THE PROBLEM OF SUBJUNCTIVE DISTRIBUTION IN BALKAN LANGUAGES

In addition to the particular morpho-syntactic realization of subjunctive complements in Balkan languages, another distinctive characteristic of *Balkan sprachbund* is related to the

---

[5] The fact that Balkan subjunctive particles can be used in future-tense constructions, which is not a type of context where we usually observe subjunctive morphology cross-linguistically, constitutes one example of the wide subjunctive distribution in the Balkans that I talked about in the introduction. However, this particular context will not be discussed in much detail in this paper. I will only focus on the contexts where subjunctive morphology is used to introduce embedded subjunctive-type complements.

distribution of this type of clauses, and the classes of predicates which can select them. The specificity of Balkan languages in this context lies in the fact that their subjunctive complements distribute far more widely than they do in most other languages. Thus, in addition to complements which are cross-linguistically associated with the subjunctive mood, such as those selected by directive or desiderative predicates we saw in (2) and (3), Balkan languages also introduce subjunctive morphology in some atypical contexts, as we can see below:

(9)   O Janos bori **na** odhiji.   (Greek)
      the John can3.sg. SUBJ drive3.sg.
      'John can drive.'

(10)   Ioan a reusit **sa** vina.   (Romanian)
      John past.aux.3.sg. managed SUBJ come3.sg.
      'John managed to come.'

(11)   Zapocvam **da** pisa.   (Bulgarian)
      begin1.sg. SUBJ write1.sg.
      'I begin to write.'

Examples in (9)-(11) correspond to obligatory subject-control structures. Control complements such as these tend to be associated with the infinitive cross-linguistically, but in most Balkan languages they are introduced by the subjunctive particle, which is followed by a finite verb that must share its agreement with the matrix predicate.[6] This is why I will refer to such complements as *control subjunctives* (term taken from Landau, 2004).

      The reason why most languages of the Balkan region introduce subjunctive morphology in control complements such as those in (9)-(11) lies in a particular diachronic development related to *Balkan sprachbund*: languages situated in this area largely lost the capacity to license infinitives and replaced them with finite subjunctive complements (Farkas, 1985; Joseph, 1983; Iatridou, 1988; Philippaki-Warburton, 1987 a.o.). As a result, subjunctive complements in Balkan languages subsume properties of both infinitives and subjunctives in other languages, hence their wide distribution. The same type of development also affected some varieties of SC,[7] which will be the primary focus of this paper.

---

[6] Here I will remain agnostic as to which precise control mechanism is responsible for this configuration, since this is not the primary concern of my paper.

[7] On the whole, it can be said that the examples in (12) are more typical of Serbian than they are of Croatian, whose speakers are more likely to use an infinitive construction in such contexts. Due to its particular geographical position on the western confines of the Balkan Peninsula, SC was not affected by the infinitive-loss phenomenon to the same degree as most other Balkan languages were. It is usually assumed that this phenomenon originated from Greek and then gradually spread on to the languages that surround it, affecting to the greatest degree those languages that are geographically closest to Greek- i.e. languages situated more to the south-east of the Balkans (Joseph, 1983). Since SC spreads through a large geographical area, not all of its varieties were equally affected: the western, Croatian variety, being furthest removed from the south-eastern part of the Balkans, has largely preserved its infinitive and hence, in examples such as the ones in (12), it will more likely use an infinitive than a subjunctive construction. Therefore, the analysis I am presenting here is more pertinent for Serbian than it is for Croatian. For the sake of simplicity, though, I will keep referring to the language as SC. In any case, the difference between Croatian control infinitivals and Serbian control subjunctives is likely only related to surface morphology: the underlying syntactic and semantic properties of these complements are largely the same (Socanac, 2011).

(12) a.   Mogu   **da**   vozim.
            can1.sg. SUBJ drive1.sg.
            'I can drive.'
      b.   Pocinjem **da**   pisem.
            begin1.sg. SUBJ write1.sg.
            'I begin to write.'

In (12), we can see that SC can exhibit the same type of wide subjunctive distribution as other Balkan languages.

     The problem that this peculiar subjunctive distribution in the Balkans poses for the analysis of the subjunctive mood, both in the context of Balkan languages and cross-linguistically, lies in the semantic diversity and heterogeneity of Balkan subjunctive complements which stems from the fact that such a wide array of predicates can select them, and which is not typical for the subjunctive from a cross-linguistic perspective. Coming up with a precise semantic definition of the subjunctive mood which could apply across languages has always been a notoriously difficult proposition,[8] and the atypical subjunctive distribution in Balkan languages compounds the problem even further. The examples that appear especially problematic in this context are the ones where subjunctive complements are selected by predicates such as aspectuals (cf. (11) or (12b)) or implicatives (cf. (10)). Such complements are not associated with any modal overtones, nor do they introduce any type of mood shift. Their meaning is purely indicative, denoting events or actions situated in the actual world of the speaker. This is why the fact that they are associated with subjunctive morphology across Balkan languages appears especially puzzling.

     In this paper, I will not attempt to put forward any type of comprehensive cross-linguistic definition of the subjunctive mood: such an endeavor would require much more wide-ranging research than the one I have conducted so far. My goal will be somewhat more modest- to show that all subjunctive complements in SC can be coherently analyzed as part of the same mood category, including those whose meaning seems completely unrelated to the one typically associated with the subjunctive mood. I will focus on the semantic and syntactic properties of these complements, and provide an analysis that will explain their semantic heterogeneity by referring to differences in their structural make-up.

4. SC Subjunctive Complements and the Subjunctivity Scale

In this section, I will attempt to provide a common analysis for all subjunctive-type complements in SC. I intend to show that, despite the wide distribution of such complements, one can analyze them as belonging to the same mood category, without making any ad hoc stipulations in order to incorporate the apparently more problematic examples that were outlined in 3. The semantic diversity of subjunctive complements in SC will be seen as a result of the differences in structural output that they send to the syntax-semantics interface. My main claim in this context will be that all SC subjunctive complements derive the same basic structure, which is why they belong to the same grammatical category, but then, during the merge with the matrix clause, we observe different types of restructuring operations, depending on the type of predicate that selects the subjunctive complement. Such operations

---

[8] Various definitions have been proposed in this context. One could mention, for instance, the one based on (non)veridicality (Giannakidou 1998; 2009; Zwart 1995); the one based on extensionality (Farkas, 1985; 1992b); or on (non)assertivity (Hopper, 1975; Terrel&Hopper, 1974), among many others. However, critical assessments of such proposals have regularly been able to identify some exceptional contexts where the subjunctive appears in a given language, which go against these over-arching definitions.

cause a degree of structural truncation that can affect smaller or larger chunks of structure, which explains why subjunctive complements in SC send different types of structural output to the semantic module, resulting in different types of interpretations.

My analysis will predict that those subjunctive complements that preserve more of their structure by the time they reach the syntax-semantics interface will have their meaning specified to a greater degree, because they will keep more syntactic projections along with the semantic specifications associated with those projections. On the other hand, those complements that have a larger chunk of their structure truncated will have a less specified meaning, because with the loss of syntactic structure, they also lose the semantically relevant information associated with the truncated syntactic projections that could not reach the interface with the semantic module. As a result, the latter type of complements will appear in more diverse semantic contexts. The analysis that I will present in this section will allow me to put subjunctive complements in SC (and potentially in other Balkan languages as well) on a common semantic mood scale, which I will call the *subjunctivity scale*. The position that a given subjunctive complement occupies within this scale will crucially depend on its structural make-up: those complements that preserve more structure upon reaching the interface with semantics will be closer to one end of the scale and their meaning will be closer to the *core subjunctive meaning*,[9] i.e. the type of meaning most widely associated with the subjunctive mood across languages; those complements that had a larger part of their structure truncated will be closer to the other end of the subjunctivity scale, and their meaning will be further removed from the core subjunctive meaning.

The first major claim that I will make in this context is that all subjunctive complements selected by predicates such as those outlined in sections 2. and 3. exhibit the same type of CP projection, which we could call the *subjunctive CP*, and which is different from the CP associated with indicatives. In section 4.1. I will motivate this claim by showing that subjunctives exhibit a cluster of properties that clearly distinguish them from indicative complements. In 4.2. I will focus more closely on the properties of the subjunctive CP and on the syntactic structure associated with it. Once I present the basic structural description of subjunctive complements in SC, I will explore, in section 4.3., how this basic structure can get altered during the merge with matrix clause, resulting in different semantic inputs related to various subjunctive complements in SC. Finally, in 4.4., I will present some additional syntactic evidence which might suggest that my analysis is on the right track.

4.1. Indicative vs. subjunctive CP

There is a series of syntactic and semantic differences that one can observe between indicative and subjunctive complements, both in the context of SC and cross-linguistically. I will claim that all such differences can best be accounted for if we assume that the two types of clauses are associated with two separate CP projections, which exhibit different properties.

One of the differences between indicative and subjunctive clauses that have been most widely discussed in literature concerns the issue of tense (Picallo, 1984; Quer, 2006; Suñer, 1990 a.o.). The tense in subjunctive complements is generally more deficient and dependent on the matrix tense than it is in the context of indicatives, which are associated with a more independent tense. Thus, the predicate in indicative complements can express all types of temporal relationships with respect to the matrix tense, whereas in subjunctives the predicate is typically restricted to a bound interval, denoting a future-referring meaning with respect to matrix tense. As a result, the predicate in a subjunctive complement generally cannot denote

---

[9] The notion of 'core subjunctive meaning' will be defined more closely in sections 4.2. and 4.3.

an event that took place prior to the one denoted by the matrix predicate, whereas in indicatives there is no such restriction, as we can see on the examples of SC and French:

(13) a.   Mislim   da   je   dosao / dolazi /   ce   da   dodje. (SC)
            think1.sg. COMP past.aux.3.sg. came come3.sg. fut.aux3.sg. PART come3.sg.
            'I think he came / is coming / will come.'
      b.   Naredjujem   da   dodjes / * si   dosao.
            order1.sg. SUBJ come2.sg. past.aux.2.sg. came.
            'I order that you come / came.'

(14) a.   Je pense qu 'il   est   venu / vient / viendra.   (French)
            I think that he past.aux.3.sg. came come3.sg. comeFUT3.sg.
            'I think he came / is coming / will come.'
      b.   Je veux qu' il   vienne   / * soit   venu.
            I want that he comeSUBJ3.sg. past.aux.SUBJ3.sg. came
            'I want him to come / have come.'

        One of the ways to explain this temporal contrast between the two types of clauses would be to say that they are introduced by a different type of CP projection. Given that the embedded CP serves as a link between the matrix and the embedded tense, it is reasonable to assume that any type of difference in temporal relations between clauses might be due to some difference in the properties of the CP projection that relates them. If we look at the contrast between indicative and subjunctive complements in this context from a contemporary minimalist point of view (taking Chomsky (2001) as the basis), we could explain it by saying that subjunctive-related CP is more deficient in terms of its phasehood than the indicative CP. If subjunctive CP constitutes a deficient phase, this could explain why it cannot fully define the temporal domain of the embedded clause, thus making the embedded tense more anaphoric, and dependent on the matrix clause. The indicative CP, on the other hand, assuming that it constitutes a full phase, is able to define the temporal domain of the embedded complement, thus rendering the tense in indicatives more independent.
        Another difference between indicative and subjunctive complements which could be explained by this analysis is the fact that the latter tend to be more permeable to outside operations, such as wh-extraction or the binding of negative polarity items between the matrix and the embedded clause. Wh-extraction out of subjunctive complements is generally produced without difficulty :

(15)   Que quieres que   te compre?   (Spanish)
            what want2.sg. that you buy1.sg.
            'What do you want me to buy you?'

(16)   Sto mozes   da   mi pokazes ?   (SC)
            what can2.sg. SUBJ me show2.sg.
            'What can you show me?'

In indicative complements, on the other hand, wh-extraction is not as generally acceptable. Many indicative-selecting predicates, especially those of the cognitive type, such as *know* or *remember*, ban this operation outright:

(17)   * Que   sais - tu   qu' il   a   acheté?   (French)
           what know2.sg. you that he past.aux.3.sg. bought
           'What do you know that he bought?'

(18)   * Sto   pamtis   da   je   napravio ?   (SC)
           what remember2.sg. that past.aux.3.sg. did
           'What do you remember that he did?'

In addition to wh-extraction, one can also observe a contrast between indicative and subjunctive complements when it comes to the binding of negative polarity items (NPIs) (Landau, 2004; Progovac, 1993). In SC, which is a negative-concord language, a matrix negation can bind an embedded NPI in subjunctive complements but not in indicative ones.

(19) a.   Ne zelim   da   vidim nikoga.
           no want1.sg. SUBJ see1.sg. nobody
           'I don't want to see anyone.'
     b. * Ne   pamtim   da   sam   vidio nikoga.
           no remember1.sg. that past.aux.1.sg. saw nobody
           'I don't remember that I saw anyone.'

All of these differences between indicative and subjunctive complements can be most easily accounted for if we assume that the two types of clauses are introduced by two separate CP projections, with subjunctive-related CP representing a more defective and transparent phase than the CP associated with indicatives. Both the temporal contrast between the two types of clauses, and the fact that subjunctive complements are more transparent to external operations than indicatives, follow naturally from this assumption.

In addition to the syntactic differences between indicative and subjunctive complements, the two types of clauses also differ cross-linguistically when it comes to their interpretation. Even though one can observe a large degree of semantic diversity between various indicative and subjunctive complements themselves (the latter especially in the context of Balkan languages), there is nonetheless a more general semantic contrast that can be established between the two. Subjunctive complements, on the whole, introduce propositions that are more anchored to the matrix proposition when it comes to their interpretation than they are with indicatives. This is why indicative complements can be more easily reanalyzed as simple matrix clauses than subjunctives. Some authors, such as Farkas (1992b), have analyzed this interaction between the matrix and the embedded proposition in the context of subjunctives in terms of a *World dependency*. This term is used to refer to the fact that subjunctive complements typically introduce a proposition associated with a set of possible worlds,[10] which can only receive an interpretation if these worlds are anchored to the world of the matrix subject. In other words, subjunctive complements constitute more open propositions, semantically more dependent on the matrix clause than indicatives. This semantic difference can, once again, be seen as a consequence of the syntactic contrast between the subjunctive and the indicative CP that I talked about earlier. If we assume that indicative complements are introduced by a CP projection which constitutes a full phase, while subjunctives are introduced by a more transparent CP, then it is not surprising that the latter are more dependent on the matrix clause when it comes to their interpretation.

---

[10] See Farkas (1992b) for a more detailed analysis of the contrast between propositions associated with a set of worlds and those associated with a single world. In brief, Farkas makes a distinction between *extensional predicates* (such as *know* or *say*), which select indicative complements related to a single world, and *intensional predicates* (such as *want* or *order*), which select subjunctive complements related to a set of worlds.

On the basis of all the evidence presented in this section, I conclude that indicative and subjunctive complements are introduced by a different type of CP projection. In the next section I will look more closely at the properties of the subjunctive CP.

4.2. The underlying structure of the subjunctive CP

I will begin this section by attempting to identify the features that underlie the subjunctive CP.[11] I will focus, in particular, on those features that specify the interpretation of subjunctive complements once they reach the semantic module. Let us return once again to the main semantic contrast that was observed between indicative and subjunctive complements in 4.1., i.e. the one related to the notion of 'world dependency'. Kempchinsky (2009) proposed that the phenomenon of subjunctive world dependency should be encoded in syntax by a special type of feature, which she defines simply as the World feature. This feature specifies the world-relationship between the matrix and the embedded clause in subjunctive contexts. More precisely, it serves to indicate a shift in the modal base[12]- or a *world shift*, as I will call it- between the matrix and the embedded proposition: even though the embedded proposition contained in the subjunctive complement must be anchored to the world of the matrix clause, the two propositions cannot be interpreted in the same world.[13] I will also assume that subjunctive CP contains this W(orld) feature.

In addition to W, there is (at least) one more feature that is relevant in the context of the subjunctive CP. In order to identify this feature, we should look more closely at different types of subjunctive clauses. So far, I have dealt with various contrasts that could be observed between indicative complements, on the one hand, and subjunctives, on the other, which justified the analysis according to which they are introduced by a different type of CP. At this point, I need to introduce an additional distinction, which concerns subjunctive complements themselves. This distinction is related to the phenomenon of *subject obviation*, which is one of the most widely-observed syntactic properties associated with subjunctive complements (Farkas, 1992a; Kempchinsky, 1986; Picallo, 1985 a.o.). Subject obviation implies a ban on conjoined reference between the matrix and the embedded subject, and it appears to be a nearly universal property associated with the subjunctive mood, because it is observed in a wide variety of languages belonging to different families:

---

[11] In order to simplify my presentation due to space constraints, here I will refer to the subjunctive CP as a simple projection, which contains a cluster of features that specify the meaning of the complement that it c-commands. It might well be the case, though, that a more fine-grained, cartographic-type analysis (à la Rizzi, 1997) will be necessary in order to describe the properties of the subjunctive CP in more precise syntactic terms.

[12] The notion of 'shift in modal base' is used to describe the introduction of a new set of possible worlds in the embedded complement (Kempchinsky, 2009: 1799)

[13] Some subjunctive complements that can be observed cross-linguistically do not quite fit into this generalization. The best-known exception in this context are complements to factive-emotive predicates.

(i)   Je suis content que tu   sois   là.   (French)
             I am   glad that you beSUBJ.2.sg. here
              'I am glad that you are here.'

These complements, despite being interpreted in the same world as the matrix proposition, still introduce the subjunctive in some languages, such as those belonging to the Romance group. Here I will not be dealing with this particular problem, because SC does not introduce the subjunctive construction in such contexts, nor do other Balkan languages, but see Kempchinsky (2009) for an attempt to incorporate factive emotive complements into the same type of analysis based on world semantics.

(20)   J' ordonne que tu   partes / * je parte.   (French)
            I order   that you leaveSUBJ2.sg. I leaveSUBJ1.sg.
            'I order you/me to leave.'

(21)   Janos$_i$ (azt) akarja, hogy e$_{j/*i}$ jojjon.   (Hungarian)
            John   (it) wants   that he$_{j/*i}$ comeSUBJ3.sg.
            'John wants him to come.'

(22)   Ivan$_i$ je   naredio   da on$_{j/*i}$ dodje.   (SC)
            John past.aux.3.sg. ordered SUBJ he$_{j/*i}$ come3.sg.
            'John ordered him to come.'

This phenomenon constitutes yet another contrast between indicative and subjunctive complements, because it is not observed in indicatives.

Nevertheless, if we look at various subjunctive complements more closely, we can notice that the phenomenon of subject obviation is not associated with all of them. This is especially obvious in Balkan languages, which, as we could see in (9)-(12), introduce subjunctive complements in control contexts (subject control being the opposite of obviation since it forces co-reference between the matrix and the embedded subject). But there are also other languages which contain subjunctive complements that are not associated with subject obviation, as we can see on the example of French (23) and Hungarian (24):

(23)   Il   a   fait en sorte qu' il$_{i/j}$ arrive   à l'heure.
            he past.aux.3.sg. made it so   that he$_{i/j}$ arriveSUBJ3.sg. on time
            'He made sure that he arrives on time.'

(24)   János$_i$ lemondott arrol, hogy *pro$_i$* / Mari idöben   fejezze   be a feladatot
            John   give-up   that he /Mary on-time finishSUBJ3.sg. the task
            'John gave up (on the idea) that he / Mary would finish the task on time.'

In fact, subject obviation is observed only with a limited group of subjunctives, which appears to be the same cross-linguistically. This group is mostly comprised of complements selected by directive or desiderative verbs.[14] Therefore, it would appear that complements of

---

[14]A slight precision needs to be made here concerning desiderative verbs and subject obviation. Unlike directive predicates (e.g. *order, request, command* etc.), which always ban co-reference between the matrix and the embedded subject (modulo some particular syntactic configurations that can relax this constraint, such as passivization, which I will not get into here), desiderative verbs contain a subject-control variant cross-linguistically. They are nonetheless usually grouped together with directive verbs when it comes to subject obviation in subjunctives because their control variant generally selects the infinitive, not the subjunctive, and therefore whenever desideratives select for subjunctive complements they are always associated with subject obviation, as we could already see in (21) on the example of Hungarian. The situation is a bit more complicated in Balkan languages, though: since these languages largely lost their infinitives and replaced them with subjunctives, desiderative verbs employ the subjunctive construction regardless of whether we have conjoined or disjoined reference between the subject of the matrix and the subject of the embedded clause.

(i)   O Pavlos$_i$ theli na *pro$_{i/j}$* odhiji.   (Greek)
           the Paul$_i$ wants SUBJ he$_{i/j}$ drive3.sg.
           'Paul wants (him) to drive.'

(ii)   Ivan$_i$ hoce da *pro$_{i/j}$* dodje.   (SC)
           John$_i$ wants SUBJ he$_{i/j}$ come3.sg.
           'John wants (him) to come.'

this type contain something more in their underlying structure, i.e. an additional specification which is responsible for the ban on subject co-reference. Once again, I assume that this specification is encoded through a special type of feature, which is present with some subjunctive complements and not with others.

We can gauge the precise nature of this feature by looking more closely at the type of semantic contexts where subject obviation occurs. Complements that exhibit this phenomenon are selected essentially by directive predicates (obviative desiderative verbs will be subsumed under directives as well, cf. n.14), and their meaning is close to the one associated with imperatives. In fact, such complements can be analyzed as *embedded imperatives* (Kempchinsky, 2009), which is why I will assume that their CP is structurally similar to the one present in simple imperatives. According to Han (1998), imperative CP contains a special type of feature- the so-called Dir(ective)-, which accomplishes a clause-typing function in the context of matrix imperatives. I will extend Han's analysis to subjunctive complements which correspond to embedded imperatives as well, and claim that their CP also contains Dir. In addition to explaining the semantic properties of this type of subjunctives, this proposal can also help us to account for the phenomenon of subject obviation that we observe with them.

In the context of simple imperatives, the directive feature could be seen as responsible for the addressee-oriented interpretation associated with such clauses: as its label suggests, it *directs* the interpretation away from the agent that made the request, i.e. the speaker, towards some outside entity. This would explain a general ban on imperatives occurring in 1.p.sg. A similar mechanism could be behind the effect of subject obviation in subjunctive complements that correspond to embedded imperatives as well. If these complements contain Dir in their CP, then this feature would once again inform the semantic component that the request contained in the embedded subjunctive complement cannot be interpreted as directed towards the agent that made the request. The only difference with respect to simple imperatives in this context is that the agent in question is not the speaker but the matrix subject. So, given that the referent for the order expressed by the matrix subject in such cases

---

As a result, Balkan desideratives do not appear to be associated with subject obviation in subjunctive contexts in the same way as their non-Balkan equivalents are. However, on the basis of my study of SC desideratives, I was able to conclude that they are not essentially different in this sense from their counterparts in non-Balkan languages, such as those belonging to the Romance group: the only difference between Romance languages and SC in this context is related to surface morphology (i.e. the use of infinitive vs. subjunctive), while the underlying properties of complements selected by desiderative verbs seem to be the same. For instance, the desiderative variant which introduces conjoined reference between the matrix and the embedded subject in SC, despite being associated with subjunctive morphology, exhibits the same syntactic properties typical of control structures, such as anaphoricity, as its infinitive-selecting counterparts in non-Balkan languages do. Moreover, there is an important semantic difference between desiderative predicates that select control complements and those that select non-control/obviative complements, which is once again equally observed both in SC and in non-Balkan languages: the meaning associated with non-control/obviative desideratives is more directive and closer to the one observed in simple imperatives, whereas control desiderative complements have a purely optative meaning without this additional imperative dimension (regardless of whether they are associated with infinitive or subjunctive morphology on the surface). In Socanac (2011), I analyzed these two desiderative variants in SC as corresponding to two separate lexical items. The non-control desiderative item or, more precisely, the one that forces obviation, is associated with an additional lexical specification that it shares with directive predicates (in Socanac (2011), I defined the latter as the *imperative operator*; here I will reanalyze it as the *directive feature*), which relates the meaning of the complement to the one associated with simple imperatives, and which is not present with control desideratives. Because of this property, obviative desiderative predicates should be grouped together with other directive verbs, since their meaning and their syntactic behavior is not essentially different, whereas control desideratives should not be seen as belonging to the same group. In order to simplify my presentation, I will only talk of directive verbs, which contain no (subject) control variant, when I discuss SC subjunctive complements in this context, but it should be clear that obviative desideratives belong to the same group.

is the embedded subject, this means that the matrix and the embedded subject cannot be the same entity, because the matrix subject cannot direct an order to himself. Hence the effect of subject obviation.

At this point, I can claim to have a more complete featural description of the subjunctive CP. In its basic form, this projection is composed of a feature cluster consisting of Dir and of W, which I will assume is contained in the C-head.[15] This feature cluster should be seen as organized hierarchically, with Dir dominating W. This is because all subjunctive complements that contain Dir also contain W, because embedded imperatives are always associated with a world shift, but not all complements that exhibit W contain Dir as well. One example of the latter type of complements are those selected by purposive verbs (e.g. *strive, ensure* etc.), which will be dealt with in greater detail in section 4.3. Purposive predicates introduce a world shift in their complement, i.e. their complement is not interpreted in the same world as the matrix clause, but they do not contain the additional directive dimension associated with predicates that select embedded imperatives, nor do they force subject obviation in their complements (as we could already see on the example of French in (23)).

Before I move on to apply the analysis just presented to various types of subjunctive complements in SC, I will first put forward the representation of syntactic structure that I assume underlies all SC subjunctive complements before they merge with the matrix clause and undergo different types of restructuring. It is given below:

(25) $[CP…C(_{Dir}…_{W})… [MP…M…[TP…[AspP…[vP…]]]]]$

In (25), I assume that Dir is situated in the hierarchically highest position within C, followed by W. As a result, whenever we have some structural truncation or feature stripping operations, Dir is the first feature that gets lost. Immediately below the subjunctive CP, I situate the so-called MP projection, which is related to mood. Authors dealing with Balkan languages usually postulate the presence of this projection in the structure underlying subjunctive complements (Roussou, 2000; Terzi, 1992; Tsimpli, 1990 a.o.).[16] MP is assumed to function as the center of mood and modality in the clause[17] (its function is thus comparable to that of TP, which is analyzed as the locus of clausal tense) and it is usually seen as the projection that hosts the Balkan subjunctive mood particles that I talked about in 2. (Philippaki-Warburton, 1992; 1998; Rivero 1994 a.o.). In Kempchinsky (2009) and Socanac (2011), the presence of this projection in the structure was motivated by claiming that it contains the interpretable instance of W, which enters into a checking relationship with its uninterpretable instance in C. The MP projection will also prove important for the analysis I

---

[15] I am not particularly wedded to this analysis, though. It may well be the case that these features project their own dedicated projections in the left periphery. In this paper I assume that the subjunctive CP is a single projection mostly for the sake of simplifying the argument, since this issue is not crucial for me here.

[16] They only differ in the labels that they assign to this projection, some defining it as MoodP (Tsimpli, 1990; Terzi, 1992 a.o.), some as ModalP (Rivero, 1994). In this paper, I chose to label it simply as MP because, in order to simplify my presentation, I will assume that this projection subsumes both the mood and the modal properties of the clause. However, this analysis will need to be refined (cf. n.17).

[17] In fact, MP, which is usually presented in the literature on Balkan subjunctive as a simple projection, more likely constitutes a field, consisting of various projections (along the lines of the analysis presented in Cinque, 1999; 2004). One motivation for such an analysis is the fact that mood and modality, while related, are not quite the same notion, and therefore it is unlikely that the same projection serves both as the locus of mood and of modality in the clause. We are more likely to have a mood/modality-related field situated below CP, which consists of several projections associated with different nuances of modal meaning. The projection related specifically to mood would then likely be situated in the highest position within this field, in order to be able to enter into a local Agree relationship with the subjunctive CP. Unfortunately, due to space constraints, I cannot pursue such a fine-grained analysis in this paper and will continue to treat MP as a projection, which represents the locus of phrasal mood and modality.

will put forward in the following section, because it will allow me to make a distinction between different types of control subjunctive complements in SC, i.e. between those that contain some type of modal meaning and those that do not. At this point, I am in a position to put all the major classes of subjunctive complements in SC on the common semantic mood scale.

4.3. Subjunctivity scale

In this section I will attempt to provide a unifying analysis of subjunctive complements in SC. I will claim that all such complements, despite their wide distribution and the resulting semantic diversity between them, can be put on a common semantic mood scale, which I will call the *subjunctivity scale*.[18] The analysis I will put forward will crucially rely on the claim that different types of subjunctive complements in SC lose more or less of their basic structural make-up during the merge with matrix clause, resulting in different types of output at the syntax-semantics interface. In this context, I will establish a structural continuum between various subjunctive complements, which parallels the semantic subjunctivity scale. Those complements that preserve more of their structure will be seen as closer to one end of this scale, with their meaning being more specified and closer to core subjunctive meaning, whereas those that lost more structure will be closer to the other end of the scale, with their meaning less specified and further removed from the meaning typically associated with the subjunctive mood.

   In this paper, I will limit my account to major classes of subjunctive-selecting predicates in SC- directives[19] (e.g. *order, request, insist*), purposives (e.g. *strive, ensure*), modals (e.g. *can, must*), implicatives (e.g. *manage, succeed*) and aspectuals (e.g. *begin, continue, finish*)- but if the analysis I will present is correct, then any type of predicate associated with the subjunctive mood in SC should find its place on the subjunctivity scale.

   One end of the subjunctivity scale is occupied by those subjunctive complements whose basic structure remained intact at the point of reaching the interface with semantics. These are the complements to directive verbs, which I already introduced in 4.2. when talking about the phenomenon of subject obviation (cf. 20-22). I assume that they retain the full structure associated with the subjunctive CP that was presented in (25) (reproduced below):

(25) $[CP\ldots C(_{Dir}\ldots W)\ldots [MP\ldots M\ldots [TP\ldots [AspP\ldots [vP\ldots]]]]]$

As a result, the meaning of such complements is specified to the greatest degree: they can appear only in directive environments, denoting orders, requests, pleas and similar meanings typically associated with simple imperatives in matrix contexts. Since they contain all semantic specifications associated with the subjunctive CP, these complements should be seen as core subjunctives.[20] One of the stronger pieces of evidence in favor of this claim is the wide cross-linguistic distribution of the subjunctive mood with complements of this type. All languages I came across that productively use the subjunctive employ this mood in

---

[18] The term is taken from a lecture on SC subjunctive given by Boban Arsenijevic at the Geneva University in 2011. However, our analyses in this context are unrelated.

[19] Once again, this group also subsumes desiderative verbs which exhibit subject obviation in their complements.

[20] The same conclusion is reached independently in Kempchinsky (2009) on the basis of her analysis of Romance subjunctive.

complements to directive predicates. Even English, where the subjunctive mood has largely disappeared,[21] tends to use it in such contexts:

(26)   I request that he **come**. / I insist that he **come**.

All other groups of subjunctive complements in SC underwent some structural loss. As a result, their meaning is less specified and further removed from the core subjunctive meaning. The group of complements that is closest to core subjunctives on the subjunctivity scale are those that had their Dir-feature stripped during the derivation but maintained W. They correspond to the representation below:

(27) $[CP…C(\underline{\quad}w)…[MP…M…[TP…[AspP…[vP…]]]]]$.

As a result, the distribution of such complements is no longer restricted to purely directive contexts but to any type of semantic context where we observe a world shift between the matrix and the embedded proposition. They will thus typically denote objectives, preferences, suggestions and similar types of unrealized meanings. The most important group of predicates which select for this type of complements in SC are *purposive* verbs. They can be most easily distinguished from the core subjunctive group because of the fact that, due to the absence of Dir, they no longer exhibit subject obviation:

(28) $Ivan_i$ se   potrudio   da pro_i stigne   na vrijeme.
           $John_i$ past.aux.3.sg. made-effort SUBJ he_i arrive3.sg. on time
           'John made the effort to arrive on time.'

Nevertheless, since predicates of this type retain the subjunctive-related W-feature, they are still widely associated with the subjunctive mood, not just in Balkan languages such as SC but also in many languages outside of the Balkans, as we could already see in (23)-(24) on the examples of French and Hungarian.

The split between Balkan languages such as SC and non-Balkan languages when it comes to subjunctive distribution sets in with the remaining groups of complements on the subjunctivity scale. These groups of complements, which were introduced earlier on in section 3, fall under the category of control subjunctives. Languages outside of the Balkans generally use the infinitive in control complements of this type, not the subjunctive, hence the contrast with SC (or, more precisely, with those varieties of SC where infinitive fell into disuse, cf.n.7) and other Balkan languages.

I claim that control subjunctive complements in SC lost their entire CP projection during the merge with matrix clause, along with all the featural specifications contained in this projection. One piece of evidence which suggests that this might be the case is the fact that, unlike the more typical subjunctive complements, control subjunctives are not associated with double-event readings, but with single-event readings (Landau, 2004; Varlokosta, 1993). In other words, they do not encode two separate propositions, but only a single proposition, which is why it makes sense to postulate that they are associated with a single, matrix CP. This would allow to account for the fact that the meaning associated with control subjunctives in SC (and other Balkan languages) is not typical for the subjunctive mood from a cross-linguistic perspective: since these complements stripped the subjunctive CP before reaching the syntax-semantics interface, their interpretation, unlike the one associated with subjunctive

---

[21] Interestingly, subjunctives in English were largely replaced by infinitives, in a process that could be seen as reverse from the one that occurred in languages of *Balkan sprachbund*. This infinitive-subjunctive relation will be briefly addressed in my concluding remarks.

complements in most other languages, is not defined by the subjunctive-related features contained in this projection. The lack of CP would also explain the semantic diversity of control subjunctives, i.e. the fact that they can appear both in various modal environments but also in semantic contexts that are not related to any type of modality. Due to the loss of featural specifications contained in the subjunctive CP, the meaning of such complements becomes less specified and, as a result, they can appear in more diverse semantic contexts.

Before concluding this section, I still have to address the main semantic distinction between various control subjunctives, i.e. the one that opposes those complements that have some modal dimension to their meaning and those that do not. This is the point at which the MP projection I introduced in 4.2. becomes relevant.

(29) [_____[MP…M…[TP…[AspP…[vP…]]]]]

Complements that correspond to the representation in (29), i.e. those that stripped their CP but kept their MP projection at the point of reaching the syntax-semantics interface, will exhibit various shades of modal meaning. For instance, the complement in (30a) will be associated with deontic modality, and the one in (30b) with dynamic modality:

(30) a.   Ivan   mora   da   uci.
            John must3.sg. SUBJ study3.sg.
            'John must study.'
      b.   Marija moze   da   vozi   kamion.
            Mary can3.sg. SUBJ drive3.sg. truck
            'Mary can drive a truck.'

This is not the case, however, with the last group of subjunctive complements that I will deal with here, which occupy the other end of the subjunctivity scale in SC. Those are the complements that have stripped all projections related to mood and modality during their merge with the matrix clause, only maintaining TP and the structure below it:[22]

(31) [_____[_____[TP…[AspP…[vP…]]]]].

As a result, complements of this type contain no modal information. They can only denote meaning associated with the lower parts of syntactic structure (e.g. information pertaining to aspect, which is encoded in AspP). The largest groups of predicates corresponding to this structural description are implicatives (32a) and aspectuals (32b):

(32) a.   Uspio   je   da   dodje.
            managed past.aux.3.sg. SUBJ come3.sg.
            'He managed to come.'
      b.   Pocinje   da   trci.
            begin3.sg. SUBJ run3.sg.
            'He begins to run.'

---

[22] Such complements, nonetheless, still exhibit the subjunctive mood particle *da*, which might appear surprising given that, according to my analysis, they no longer contain the MP projection which is usually assumed to be the host for such particles in Balkan languages (cf. section 4.2.). However, in Socanac (2011), I argued that the particle *da* is inserted under T, not under M, which allowed me to explain its observed temporal properties (cf. Socanac (2011), section 2. for more details on this). As a result, it can still occur with those complements that have stripped their MP projection.

Complements such as the ones in (32) were presented earlier on in 3. as the most problematic examples of subjunctive distribution in SC (and other Balkan languages), because their meaning appears to be purely indicative. However, given the analysis just presented, the fact that such complements exhibit subjunctive morphology while being associated with indicative-type meaning is no longer surprising. They originally derive the same basic structure as other subjunctives in SC, which is why they belong on the same subjunctivity scale, but during their merge with the matrix clause they lose all the higher parts of structure which encode information related to mood and modality, and the remaining structure they preserve (from TP downwards) is the same as the one we observe in indicatives.

At this point, I can claim to have at least a rough account of subjunctive distribution in SC, which, as I will suggest in the conclusion, might apply to other Balkan languages as well. Nevertheless, the analysis presented so far, even though it is syntactic at its core, has largely relied on semantic notions in order to distinguish between various types of SC subjunctive complements. In the following section, I will provide some basic syntactic evidence that also supports the main claims defended in this paper.

4.4. Topic/Focus fronting in SC subjunctive complements

The main assumption that underlies the analysis presented in this paper is the idea that those complements which are further removed from core subjunctive meaning end up being structurally smaller than those that are closer to it. While more detailed syntactic tests will need to be conducted if this idea is to be completely affirmed, here I will put forward some rudimentary syntactic evidence, based on the acceptability of topic and focus fronting in various subjunctive complements in SC, which suggest that the analysis is on the right track.

SC is a language in which focalization and topicalisation are syntactically related to the left periphery of the clause. Thus, a typical complement which exhibits both topic and focus fronting will look like the one below:

(33)   Mislim   da   Ivanu   SUTRA   Marko upoznaje.
         think1.sg.   that   JoannaTOP TOMORROW Mark meet3.sg.
         'I think that, Joanna, TOMORROW Mark meets.'

Both topic and focus fronting occur relatively freely in clauses of the indicative type, such as the one in (33). In subjunctives, however, these operations are more restricted, depending on the type of predicate that selects the subjunctive complement.

The prediction based on the analysis in 4.3. is that topic and focus fronting should occur more freely in those complements that are closer to the core subjunctive meaning, because they are supposed to have a richer left periphery. When it comes to core subjunctive complements themselves, i.e. those selected by directive predicates, the prediction seems to hold, because both topic and focus can front to the left periphery of such clauses:

(34)   Trazio   sam   da   Ivana   SUTRA   Marko upozna.
         requested past.aux.1.sg. SUBJ JohnTOP TOMORROW Mark meet3.sg.
         'I requested that, John, TOMORROW Mark meets.'

When it comes to complements such as those selected by purposive verbs, which are meant to be structurally closest to the core subjunctive group, judgments become a bit more subtle. On the whole, focalization is still acceptable in clauses of this type, but it becomes a bit more difficult to front both the topic and the focus constituents together.

(35) a.   Uredio   sam   da   SUTRA   Ivan dobije   dokumente.
             arranged past.aux.1.sg. SUBJ TOMORROW   John get3.sg. documents
             'I arranged that TOMORROW John gets the documents.'
      b. ?? Uredio   sam   da   one dokumente   SUTRA   Ivan dobije.
             arranged past.aux.1.sg. SUBJ those documentsTOP TOMORROW John get3.sg.
             'I arranged that, those documents, TOMMOROW John gets.'

The contrast between (35b) and (34) would seem to suggest a fine-grained distinction between the left peripheries associated with the two types of complements. This fact does not go against the analysis presented in 4.3.- on the contrary, it supports the idea of a structural continuum between different types of subjunctive complements-, but its explanation would require a more detailed cartographical analysis, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

If the analysis in 4.3. is correct, then the most important contrast should be observed between complements such as those in (34) and (35), which have maintained their CP (even though in a slightly truncated form in the latter case) and control subjunctive complements, which are assumed to have lost their CP by the end of the syntactic derivation. This means that the latter types of complements should have extremely impoverished left peripheries and hence disallow topic and focus fronting. In (36), we can see that this prediction is confirmed:

(36) a. * Moras   da   onog covjeka pozoves.
              must2.sg. SUBJ that manTOP invite2.sg.
              'You must, that man, invite.'
      b. * Pocinje   da   PRAVO studira.
              begin3.sg. SUBJ LAW study3.sg.
              'He begins LAW to study.'

The syntactic tests presented in this section, even though they are rather simple and rudimentary, still broadly confirm the existence of a structural continuum between different types of subjunctive complements in SC, which reflects different types of interpretations on the semantic subjunctivity scale. A more detailed syntactic analysis, based on subtler tests, should hopefully be able to establish more fine-grained distinctions between various subjunctive complements (both in SC and beyond), without contradicting the overall logic of the account presented here.

5. CONCLUSION

The goal of this paper was to address the problems related to subjunctive distribution in SC, which are reflected in other Balkan languages as well. I chose to focus on this issue because, despite the existence of a growing body of literature on the Balkan subjunctive, I failed to come across a satisfying explanation for the peculiar distributional patterns of this mood category, either in a single Balkan language or in the Balkan group of languages as a whole. The main reason for this is the fact that most authors dealing with Balkan subjunctive approached the subject from a somewhat limited theoretical perspective: either they addressed it from a purely syntactic point of view, focusing on questions such as which mechanism can best account for the control/obviation patterns one observes in subjunctive complements in Balkan languages; or they approached it from a semantic perspective, trying to provide a characterization of Balkan subjunctive simply by looking at the types of semantic contexts where it appears, which is a particularly difficult mission given the semantic heterogeneity of subjunctive complements in the languages of *Balkan sprachbund*. The objective of this paper

was to look at the issue from a somewhat broader perspective (even if this sometimes implied lesser attention to detail), incorporating both the syntactic and the semantic types of insight that can be gauged from the observation of subjunctive complements in a Balkan language such as SC. As a result, my solution for the problems related to subjunctive distribution in this language was crucially related to the area of syntax-semantics interface: I proposed that the semantic heterogeneity of SC subjunctive complements which results from their wide distribution can be explained if we assume that these complements send different types of structural outputs to the semantic module, resulting in different types of interpretations.

If the account presented in this paper is correct, then it should apply to other Balkan languages as well, since the problems related to subjunctive distribution are largely the same throughout Balkans. Initial inquiries that I conducted into some other languages of this region, both Slavic and non-Slavic, suggest that my analysis might have broader relevance. For instance, languages such as Bulgarian and Romanian exhibit similar contrasts between different types of subjunctive complements when it comes to topic/focus fronting as the ones that were observed in the context of SC. This might suggest that the subjunctive complements in these languages can also be analyzed through the prism of a structural continuum, which results in predictable types of interpretation within the subjunctivity scale. Nevertheless, more detailed study into other languages of *Balkan sprachbund* still needs to be conducted before I can claim that my analysis is relevant for the Balkan group of languages as a whole.

Finally, it should be noted that the account developed in this paper also opens up some new problems of its own, as well as avenues that need to be further explored. One of these pertains to the relation between subjunctive and infinitive complements, which was touched upon in the text but not addressed in any detail. The history of Balkan languages would suggest that subjunctive and infinitive are two very closely related and permeable categories, if they should even be considered as separate grammatical categories at all. The example of SC is especially telling in this context because one of its main varieties, Croatian, tends to use infinitive complements in the same contexts where its other main variety, Serbian, predominantly uses control subjunctives (cf.n.7). In my studies of this language (as well as on the basis of my intuitions as a native speaker of Croatian), I was unable to find any real underlying difference between Serbian control subjunctives and Croatian control infinitives, which would suggest that these two types of complements are essentially the same, differing only in their surface morphology. If this conclusion can be generalized cross-linguistically, then it would imply, provided my analysis is correct, that control infinitives also belong on the subjunctivity scale, and that they share the same basic structural make-up with subjunctive complements, which then gets altered during the processes of selection and merge with the matrix clause.

This brings us to the second, even more wide-ranging problem that still needs to be addressed, with which I will conclude my paper. This problem is related to the question of which selection mechanism the matrix predicate uses when it selects these subjunctive-type (and infinitive) clauses. A particular difficulty in this context is posed by the issue of control subjunctive/infinitive selection. When it comes to complements that are closer to what was defined as the core subjunctive meaning, one could more easily conceptualize their selection as being related, for instance, to the Directive feature or, as was argued in Kempchinsky (2009), to the World feature, since the meaning of such complements is closely defined by these features. What is much more difficult to conceptualize, however, is how control predicates, whose meaning is not related to Dir or to W, can select for the subjunctive CP containing both these features and then strip them during the derivation. One possible solution for this conceptual difficulty would involve reintroducing the traditional distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative mood, going back to Ancient Greek and Latin, according to which subjunctive is basically seen as the mood of subordination (*hypotaxis*) and

indicative as the mood related to the lack of subordination (*parataxis*) (cf. San Martin, 2007). The subjunctive CP would then be selected by control predicates simply because it is the default option in embedded clauses. The structural truncation and feature stripping that follows selection could then be seen as a type of repair strategy employed by the selecting predicate in order to delete those parts of structure which contain features that are not instantiated in the lexical make-up of the predicate itself. This idea is interesting and potentially promising but it also brings along a whole host of new problems. It is not clear, for instance, if the view of subjunctive as the default mood of subordination is compatible with the idea of a core subjunctive meaning, which is crucial for my analysis. These are only some of the problems that will need to be addressed in my subsequent work.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, N. (2001) "Derivation by Phase", in M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Cinque, G. (2004) " 'Restructuring' and functional structure", in A. Belletti (ed.) *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3, 132-191.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994) *The Syntax of Romanian: Comparative Studies in Romance*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.

Farkas, D. (1984) "Subjunctive complements in Romanian", *Papers from the XIIth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, John Benjamins, Philadelphia, 355-372.

Farkas, D. (1985) *Intensional Descriptions and the Romance Subjunctive Mood*, Garland, New York.

Farkas, D. (1992a) "On obviation", in I. Sag, A. Szabolsci (eds.) *Lexical Matters*, CSLI, Stanford, CA, 85-109.

Farkas, D. (1992b) "On the semantics of subjunctive complements", in P. Hirschbühler (ed.) *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory*, John Benjamins, Philadelphia, 69-104.

Giannakidou, A. (1998) *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)veridical Dependency*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Giannakidou, A. (2009) "The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: Temporal semantics and polarity", *Lingua*, 119, 1883-1908.

Han, C. (1998) *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar*, Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics, Garland, New York.

Hopper, J. (1975) "On assertive predicates", *Syntax and Semantics*, 4, Academic Press, New York.

Hopper, J., Terrel, T. (1974) "A semantically based analysis of mood in Spanish", *Hispania*, 57, 484-494.

Iatridou, S. (1988) "On nominative case assignment and a few related things", Manuscript, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Joseph, B. (1983) *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kempchinsky, P. (1986) *Romance Subjunctive Clauses and Logical Form*, Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.

Kempchinsky, P. (2009) "What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive", *Lingua*, 119, 1788-1810.

Krapova, I. (1998) "Subjunctive complements, null subjects and case checking in Bulgarian", *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8.2., 73-93.

Landau, I. (2004) "The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control", *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 22, 811-877.

Miseska-Tomic (2006) *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic Features*, Springer, New York.

Philippaki-Warburton, I. (1987) "The theory of empty categories and the *pro*-drop parameter in Modern Greek", *Journal of Linguistics*, 23, 289-318.

Philippaki-Warburton, I. (1992) "On mood and complementizers in Modern Greek", *Reading University Working Papers in Linguistics,* 1, 5-41.

Philippaki-Warburton, I. (1998) "Functional categories and Modern Greek syntax", *The Linguistic Review*, 15, 159-186.

Picallo, C. (1984) "The Infl node and the null subject parameter", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 15, 75-102.

Picallo, C. (1985) *Opaque Domains*, Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York.

Progovac, Lj. (1993) "Subjunctive: The (mis)behavior of anaphors and negative polarity", *The Linguistic Review*, 10, 37-59.

Quer, J. (2006) "Subjunctives", in Everaert, M., van Riemsdijk, H. (eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. 4., Blackwell, Oxford, 660-684.

Rivero, M.L. (1994) "Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans", *Journal of Linguistics*, 31, 63-120.

Rizzi, L. (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery", in L.Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.

Roussou, A. (2000) "On the left periphery: Modal particles and complementizers", *Journal of Greek Linguistics*, 1, 65-94.

San Martin, I. (2007) "Beyond the infinitive vs. subjunctive rivalry: Surviving changes in Mood", in L. Eguren, O. Fernandez Soriano (eds.) *Coreference, Modality, and Focus: Studies on the Syntax Semantics Interface*, John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam, 171-190.

Socanac, T. (2011) "Subjunctive in Serbian/Croatian", *Generative Grammar in Geneva*, 7, 49-71.

Suñer, M. (1990) "El tiempo en las subordinadas", in I. Bosque (ed.) *Tiempo y aspecto en español*, Catedra, Madrid, 77-105.

Terzi, A. (1992) *PRO in Finite Clauses: A Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages*, Doctoral Dissertation, City University of New York.

Tsimpli, I.M. (1990) "Clause structure and word order in Modern Greek", *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2, 226-255.

Varlokosta, S. (1993) "Control in Modern Greek", *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics*, 1, 144-163.

Zwart, F. (1995) "Nonveridical contexts", *Linguistic Analysis*, 25, 286-312.