SUBJUNCTIVE IN SERBIAN/CROATIAN

Tomislav Sočanac (tomislav.socanac@unige.ch)

1. INTRODUCTION

The focus of this paper will be the subjunctive mood in Serbian/Croatian (SC). This subject has not received much attention in the literature, partly because traditional SC grammars do not consider subjunctive as a separate mood category present in this language. I will argue that this point of view is erroneous and that SC also contains a subjunctive mood, which is realized similarly as in other languages of the Balkan region. The particular area that I will concentrate on will be that of subjunctive complementation- i.e. contexts where the subjunctive is selected in the embedded complement of the matrix predicate. I will deal with the issues related to the syntactic realization and distribution of such complements in SC.

Before fully entering the subject matter, I would first like to briefly outline the theoretical perspective regarding the selection of subjunctive complements that I will be assuming in this text. There have been a number of proposals in the literature aimed at providing a comprehensive definition that would encompass all types of contexts in which subjunctive complements are selected by the matrix predicate.[1] However, this task has proven to be notoriously difficult, because one could always find exceptions to any type of broad rule regarding subjunctive selection that the authors have come up with. In this text, I will not be attempting to come up with an over-arching definition of subjunctive distribution across languages, nor will I try to affirm any of the existing definitions that were already proposed. My primary goal will be simply to show that SC contains a group of complements that share the broadly observed cross-linguistic characteristics of subjunctives. The only theoretical perspective that I will be implicitly assuming in this context is the one outlined in Quer (1998; 2001). Quer considers that subjunctive mood should not be related to any type of rigid meaning (such as irrealis, for instance, or non-veridicality), suggesting instead that subjunctive complements are selected when there is a shift in the evaluative model according to which the embedded proposition is interpreted. More precisely, subjunctive morphology is used to indicate that the embedded proposition is not evaluated in the same world as the matrix proposition. Hence subjunctive selection is related to a type of shift in world semantics between the matrix and the embedded proposition.

---

[1] According to Giannakidou (1998; 1999), subjunctives are associated with non-veridical contexts, whereas indicatives are associated with veridicality. Farkas (1985) relates indicative complements to weak intensional predicates and subjunctive complements to strong ones. In addition to these semantic distinctions, there were also some structure-based proposals that were made to account for subjunctive distribution. Thus, some authors proposed to correlate indicatives with wide scope of clauses and subjunctives with narrow scope (Brugger & D'Angelo (1995); Stowell (1993)). These are only some of the many proposals that were made in the literature.

The next question that needs to be answered before we can turn to the concrete subject of this paper is how this semantic notion of a world shift that underlies subjunctive selection is encoded in syntax. If we follow the standard minimalist analysis (Chomsky, 1995), which views all information relevant for the syntactic structure as encoded in different types of features drawn from the lexicon, then the logical answer would be to relate subjunctive selection to a special type of feature as well. This is what I propose to do in this text. The selection of subjunctive complements will thus be seen as related to a dedicated mood feature, selected by the matrix predicate and introduced in the embedded CP projection. And given that this feature implies a shift in world semantics, I will follow Kempchinsky (2009) terminology and label it the W(orld) feature.

The standard minimalist analysis also divides features into interpretable and uninterpretable pairs, and I will do the same with the W feature that underlies subjunctive selection. The W feature that is introduced by the selecting predicate will be seen as uninterpretable: at the point of selection, this feature is introduced into the CP projection before any concrete proposition that can be interpreted is merged. Being uninterpretable, this W feature must be checked and deleted before the syntactic structure is sent to the conceptual interface to be evaluated. The interpretable instance of this feature, which is necessary to accomplish this checking function, will be seen as situated under the head of a dedicated mood projection- i.e. MoodP-, which is usually analyzed as a left-periphery projection positioned above TP and below CP (Rivero (1994); Roussou (2000); Terzi (1992); Tsimpli (1990) etc.). The uninterpretable W feature is then checked through some type of Agree relationship that it establishes with its interpretable instance situated in Mood.

(1)   [CP…C **W**(u) [MoodP…Mood **W**(i) [TP…]]]-

                             Agree

The feature-checking operation in (1) produces different surface results in different languages, which is why we observe some variation when it comes to subjunctive syntax across languages. One example of this variation is the difference in subjunctive realization between the Romance[2] and the Balkan group of languages, the latter of which contains SC as well. I will briefly describe the difference between these two language groups below, and then I will go on to show that SC realizes its subjunctive mood similarly to other Balkan languages.

Consider the contrast between the Romance examples in (2) and (3) and the Balkan examples in (4) and (5):

(2)   a.   Je pense que Jean   **est**   là.   (French)
            I think that John is-IND. here
            'I think that John is here'
      b.   Je veux que Jean   **soit**   là.

I   want that John be-SUBJ. here
'I want John to be here'

(3)   a.   Creo   que   Juan   **es**   su marido.   (Spanish)
           believe(1.sg.) that   John is-IND. her husband
           'I believe John is her husband'

      b.   Quiero   que Juan   **sea**   mi marido.
           want(1.sg.) that John be-SUBJ. my husband
           'I want John to be my husband'

(4)   a.   Nomizo   **oti**   efije   o Kostas.   (Greek)
           think(1.sg.) that-IND. left(3.sg.)-IND. the Kostas
           'I think that Kostas left'

      b.   Thelo   **na**   fiji   o   Kostas
           want(1.sg.) SUBJ leave(3.sg.)-IND. the Kostas"
           'I want Kostas to leave'

(5)   a.   Mišlja,   **če**   tja otide   (Bulgarian)
           think(1.sg.) that-IND. she left-IND.
           'I think she left'

      b.   Iskam   tja **da**   otida.
           want(1.sg.) she SUBJ leave(3.sg.)-IND.
           'I want her to leave'

In (2) and (3) we can see that Romance languages distinguish subjunctives from indicatives through specialized verbal morphology: each mood is associated with its own dedicated verb form. Balkan languages, however, use a different strategy. Both the indicative and the subjunctive-type complements in (4) and (5) introduce an indicative verb form,[3] but subjunctives are distinguished by a special type of marker (printed in bold), which is separate from the verb and which appears on the left periphery of the subjunctive clause. As we can see from the contrast between (4a) and (5a), on the one hand, and (4b) and (5b), on the other, the element that is used to introduce subjunctive complements into the structure is distinct from the complementizer that is used to introduce indicatives. The subjunctive markers we observe in (4b) and (5b) are analyzed as mood particles (Giannakidou (2009); Krapova (1999); Rivero (1994) etc.).

In the following section I will argue that SC contains the same type of particle and that it realizes its subjunctive mood similarly as other Balkan languages, particularly Greek. Once this has been demonstrated, I will move on to the issue of subjunctive distribution in SC, which will be the subject of the third section.

2. SC SUBJUNCTIVE: REALIZATION

On the first glance, SC appears to be different from Balkan languages that we observed earlier on when it comes to the realization of its subjunctive-type complements:

(6)   a.   Nomizo   **oti**   efije   o Kostas.   (Greek)

---

[3] The morphological differences that we observe between verbs in indicative and subjunctive complements in (4) and (5) are not related to mood but to tense and aspect.

> think(1.sg.) that-IND left(3.sg.) the Kostas
> 'I think that Kostas left'
>
> b.   Thelo   **na**   fiji   o   Kostas
>   want(1.sg.) SUBJ leave(3.sg.) the Kostas"
>   'I want Kostas to leave'

(7)   a.   Mislim   **da** je   Ivan otišao.   (SC)
>   think(1.sg.) that past.aux.(3.sg.) John left
>   'I think that John left'
>
>   b.   Želim   **da** Ivan ode.
>   want(1.sg.) that John leave(3.sg.)
>   'I want John to leave"
>
>   c.   Naređujem **da** Ivan dođe.
>   order(1.sg.) that John come(3.sg.)
>   'I order that John come'

Unlike Greek (6), SC does not contain a distinctive subjunctive marker: as we can see in (7), the element *da* can be used to introduce both indicative complements (7a) and complements that are selected by desiderative or directive verbs (7b-c), and that correspond to subjunctives in other languages. I will, however, argue that the difference between (6) and (7) is only superficial and that SC contains the same type of subjunctive particle as Greek. The only difference between the two languages in this context is the fact that the subjunctive particle in SC is homonymous with the indicative complementizer, whereas in Greek the two items are more clearly distinguished.

2.1. SC subjunctive particle

The argument in this section will consist of two main parts: first I will first show that the element *da* that we observed with the indicative complement in (7a) is not the same item as the element *da* associated with subjunctive-type complements in (7b-c); then I will argue that the element *da* associated with subjunctive complements should be analyzed as a specialized mood particle, equivalent to the Greek particle *na*.
      Consider first the example in (8):

(8)   Kaže **da**   će   **da**   dođe.
             says that-COMP fut.aux.(3.sg.) PART come(3.sg.)
             'He says he will come'

Here we can observe right away that there is more than one element with the overt form *da* that can be introduced in a single structure in SC: the higher *da* in (8) is a complementizer, inserted in the CP projection associated with indicative complements, whereas the lower *da* is a particle, inserted somewhere below CP.[4] If we could show that the lower particle *da* in (8), which is used here in a future-tense construction, is the same item as the element *da* we observed earlier on with subjunctive-type complements, then we would be able to claim that

---

[4] For the moment I leave open the issue of the precise place of insertion of this particle. This will be dealt with in the section 2.2.

indicatives and subjunctives are introduced by a different type of element in SC, and hence should be seen as two separate grammatical categories in this language. There are, in fact, a number of indications that point to this conclusion.

The future-tense construction in (8) is in many respects very similar to the subjunctive-type constructions we observed in (7). Semantically, they are both associated with a future-referring meaning, denoting an event that is unrealized with respect to the reference time.[5] They also contain the same verbal form, associated with the perfective aspect. Before focusing more closely on the properties of this aspectual verb form in the two types of constructions, I will first briefly familiarize the reader with the aspectual system of SC, and in particular with the relation between tense and aspect that is observed in this language, since this will be crucial for the argument that will be put forward a bit later on.

2.1.1. *Tense and aspect in SC*

SC distinguishes two morphological aspects: perfective and imperfective. Perfective aspect is typically used to denote single events, whereas imperfective aspect serves to denote ongoing or repetitive events. As for the morphological tense system in this language, it is rather impoverished in the present-day usage. As a result, like in other Slavic languages, aspect has come to play an increasing role in the temporal interpretation of verbs in SC.

The temporal input of aspect is most clearly apparent in the context of past tense. The morphological distinction between aorist and imperfect tense forms, which were previously used to distinguish, respectively, between single events and continuous or repetitive events in the past, has been largely lost (especially in the spoken language) in most SC dialects. Today, all types of past tense expressions tend to be associated with a single, analytical construction consisting of a past auxiliary (shortened form of the verb *be*) and the main verb that appears in the past participle form. The difference between imperfect and aorist meanings is now mostly expressed through aspect: if the main verb (occurring in the past participle) is associated with the imperfective aspect, then it denotes a continuous or repetitive event in the past; if it is associated with the perfective aspect, then it denotes a single event:

(9) a.   Išao   sam   zubaru svaki drugi dan.
          go(past.part.)-IMPERF. past.aux.(1.sg.) dentist every other day
          'I was going to the dentist every other day'
     b.   Otišao   sam   zubaru jučer   u osam ujutro.
          go(past.part.)-PERF. past.aux.(1.sg.) dentist yesterday at eight in-the-morning
          'I went to the dentist yesterday at eight in the morning'

When it comes to present tense, the input of aspect is somewhat less straightforward. Strictly speaking, present-tense meaning can only be conveyed through imperfective aspect. Perfective verbs cannot be used to denote events occurring at the moment of speech.

(10) a.   Sad idem   na posao.
          now go(1.sg.)-IMPERF. to work

---

[5] The term *reference time* is used here in the sense of Stowell (2007), corresponding to the utterance time in matrix contexts and to the time of the matrix predicate in embedded contexts.

'I am going to work now''
b. * Sad odem   na posao.
      now go(1.sg.)-PERF. to work

Instead, as we already saw in (7b-c) and (8), verbs associated with the perfective aspect are typically used to denote future or unrealized events. In this sense, they behave in the same way as their Greek perfective counterparts, which also cannot denote events occurring at the moment of speech (Giannakidou (2009)). Due to this property, such verbs in Greek are not labelled as perfective present but as perfective non past verbs: broadly speaking, they can only denote events that are unrelated to the past. Since the SC equivalents of these Greek verbs exhibit the same type of behaviour, I will also label them as perfective non past (PNP) verbs.

Another similarity between Greek and SC PNP verbs is that their temporal interpretation is more dependent than the one associated with imperfective verbs. While imperfective verbs can define the tense of the clause on their own, the temporal reference of PNP verbs depends on some other element in the structure, which selects the construction in which PNP appears. This will be explained in more detail in the following section.

2.1.2. *SC subjunctive tense: Da as a temporal operator*

The tense dependency of PNP verbs is most clearly visible when we look at the temporal properties of the embedded clauses in which they appear. The most typical embedded context in which this verb form is used are subjunctive-type complements, such as those we observed in (7b-c). Unlike indicative complements, which are associated with independent tense, subjunctive complements are associated with dependent tense, which is constrained by the matrix predicate. More precisely, the temporal reference of the embedded PNP verb in these contexts is restricted to an interval that begins at the time of the matrix predicate and stretches on into the future. Hence the embedded PNP verb in such cases cannot denote an event that took place prior to the one denoted by the matrix predicate. The same type of dependency is also observed in Greek subjunctive complements (Giannakidou (2009)). According to Giannakidou, the temporal dependency of Greek subjunctives is a result of the syntactic relationship that is established in such cases between the particle *na*, which she analyzes as a type of temporal operator, and the PNP verb. I will briefly introduce Giannakidou's analysis and then show that it can be applied to SC as well. More precisely, it will be shown that the element *da* in SC subjunctives, just like the Greek *na*, can also be analyzed as a tense operator. This will, in turn, serve as an argument to show that the element *da* associated with subjunctives in SC is not the same item as the element *da* that is used to introduce indicative complements.

According to Giannakidou, the main difference, when it comes to tense, between PNP verbs and their imperfective counterparts in Greek is that the latter are associated with an independent temporal variable, whereas the former are associated with a dependent temporal variable. This means that imperfective verbs have direct access to deictic tense and can define the tense of the clause on their own, whereas PNP verbs do not have access to deictic time and function as anaphors in this context. As a result, they must be bound by an operator in order to acquire a precise temporal meaning. In the context of Greek subjunctives, Giannakidou claims that this operator function is accomplished by the particle *na* itself. The

na-item moves into an operator position which encodes the tense coordinates introduced by the matrix predicate. Then, once *na* enters into interaction with the PNP verb, it allows to situate the latter within the temporal interval selected by the matrix predicate. From a semantic point of view, *na* serves to define the left boundary of the temporal interval within which the PNP verb can be interpreted, and this left boundary corresponds to the time of the matrix predicate. Therefore, the PNP verb in Greek subjunctives cannot denote an event that took place before the time of the matrix predicate.

Since the same semantic property is also observed in SC subjunctive complements, it makes sense to attempt to apply Giannakidou's analysis to this language as well. In this context, we can notice that the element *da* in SC appears to function very similarly as the Greek subjunctive particle *na*: whenever it associates itself with the PNP verb form, the latter acquires a future-referring temporal meaning with respect to the selecting element. This is particularly obvious in the context of subjunctive-type complements, such as those we observed in (7b-c). Just like their Greek counterparts, such complements in SC always introduce a future-referring meaning with respect to the time of the matrix predicate. Therefore, just like the Greek *na*, the element *da* in SC subjunctives serves to define the left boundary of the temporal interval within which the embedded PNP verb can be interpreted.

The point that is crucial for the overall argument I am presenting here is that the same temporal function that the element *da* accomplishes in the context of subjunctive-type complements in SC also seems to be at play in the context of future-tense constructions, such as the one in (8): in both cases the element *da* seems to serve in order to situate the PNP verb within the temporal interval determined by the element that selects the construction. The only difference between the two contexts is related to the type of selecting element we have. In the context of subjunctive complements, the construction containing the *da+PNP* complex is selected by the matrix predicate and therefore the temporal reference of the embedded PNP verb is determined with respect to the tense of the matrix predicate. In the context of future-tense constructions, on the other hand, the selecting element is not the matrix verb (such constructions can appear both in matrix and in embedded contexts) but rather the future-tense auxiliary, derived from the shortened form of the verb *htjeti* ('want'). This future auxiliary makes direct reference to the utterance time and hence, when it selects the *da+PNP* construction, the latter acquires a future-referring meaning with respect to the utterance time. Crucially, therefore, the element *da* produces the same semantic effect in both cases, i.e. it defines the left boundary of the temporal interval within which the PNP verb can be situated. Hence it is reasonable to assume that the element *da* we observe in the future-tense construction is the same linguistic item as the one we observe in subjunctive complements. This, in turn, implies that the subjunctive-related *da* is not the same element as the complementizer *da* associated with indicatives: as we could see in (8) (reproduced bellow for convenience), the indicative complementizer *da* and the particle *da* associated with the future-tense construction (which now should be viewed as the same item as the element *da* associated with subjunctives) are inserted in two distinct positions in the structure.

(8)   Kaže **da**   će   **da**   dođe.
         says   that-COMP fut.aux.(3.sg.) PART comePNP(3.sg.)
         'He says he will come'

Therefore, just like in Greek, indicative and subjunctive complements in SC are also introduced by two separate elements, the only difference being that in SC these two elements are homonymous, whereas in Greek they are not.

2.1.3. Da *as a mood particle*

The next question is whether the subjunctive-related *da* in SC can be analyzed as a marker of mood, like subjunctive particles in other Balkan languages. Once again I turn to the comparison with the Greek subjunctive particle *na*. We already saw that the SC particle *da* shares some of the properties of the Greek *na*- i.e. they both seem to function as a type of temporal operator. This, in fact, is not the only property that these two elements have in common. They also largely converge in their distribution: both the Greek *na* and the SC *da* are typically associated with embedded, subjunctive-type complements, but they can also appear in matrix clauses, as shown in the examples below:

(11) a. **Da**   bar   dođe.   (SC)
          PART if-only come(3.sg.)
          'If only he came'
      b. **Na**   etrexe.   (Greek)
          PART ran(3.sg.)
          'If only he were running'
(12) a. **Da**   nisi ni   pomislio na to!   (SC)
          PART not-be(2.sg.) think   on that
          'Don't even think about it!'
      b. **Na**   mi fijis!   (Greek)
          PART not leave(2.sg.)
          'Don't leave!'

The element *da* that we observe in SC examples in (11a) and (12a) is most plausibly the same linguistic item as the one we observed with the future-tense construction in (8) and with subjunctive-type complements in (7). Recall that this element was analyzed as a particle, inserted in some projection below CP, as opposed to the indicative *da*, which was seen as a classical complementizer. According to Philippaki-Warburton (1994), one of the syntactic differences between complementizers and particles is the fact that the latter are able to appear in matrix contexts, whereas the former are not, since their primary function is to introduce an embedded complement into the structure. Therefore the element *da* that we observe in the matrix clauses above cannot be the same item as the indicative complementizer *da* but instead must be seen as identical to the particle *da* that we observed with subjunctive complements. Hence the SC particle *da* and the Greek particle *na* have a similar distribution.

     The particle *da* in SC thus shares a number of syntactic and semantic properties with the Greek *na*. But before we can claim that the two items are complete functional equivalents, we still need to show that SC *da* can also be analyzed as a mood particle. If we look, once again, at the type of constructions in which this element typically appears, and focus specifically on the semantic characteristics of those constructions, then such analysis would appear to be justified, because in most cases where SC particle *da* is inserted into the structure, whether it be in embedded subjunctive complements or in matrix clauses, it tends to

be associated with a mood shift or a shift in world semantics,[6] in the same way as the Greek particle *na*. In the context of subjunctive complements, as expected, both particles are associated with propositions that are not evaluated in the actual world of the speaker (or of the matrix subject). But this is also the case when these two items appear in matrix clauses. If we look, for instance, at the examples in (11) and (12), we can see that the Greek *na* and SC *da* can appear in matrix clauses which denote an optative meaning (such as the ones in (11)) or an imperative meaning (such as the ones in (12)), neither of which are situated in the actual world. Thus the two items are associated with a mood shift in this context as well. This would strongly indicate that they should both be seen as particles related to mood.

Another piece of evidence indicating that SC particle *da* should be seen as a mood marker is the fact that it can also be used in counter-factual, or subjunctive-type conditional antecedents, where we observe a mood shift as well:

(13)   **Da** si   došao,   vidio bi   me.
         SUBJ past.aux.(2.sg.) come(past.part.) seen   would(2.sg.) me
         'Had you come, you would have seen me'

All of these facts point to the conclusion that SC *da* is a mood particle, functionally equivalent to the Greek particle *na*, as well as to subjunctive mood markers in other Balkan languages. Hence we can conclude that SC realizes its subjunctive complements very similarly as other languages of the Balkan region. The only difference between SC and these other languages in this context is a superficial one - i.e. the fact that the subjunctive particle in SC has the same overt form as the indicative complementizer, whereas in other Balkan languages, such as Greek, the two are more clearly distinguished.

2.2. Syntactic derivation of subjunctive complements in SC

As we noted earlier, SC subjunctive complements are related to a bound temporal interval, which begins at the time of the matrix predicate and stretches on into the future. Therefore, the tense in embedded subjunctive complements is much more related to the matrix tense than it is in indicative complements, where the embedded verb can express all types of temporal relations with respect to the matrix predicate. In the following paragraphs, I will try to determine the precise syntactic mechanism that allows for this relation between the embedded and the matrix tense to be established in the context of SC subjunctives. This will enable me to come up with some more general conclusions regarding the syntactic derivation of subjunctive complements in this language.

The establishment of the relational tense that characterizes subjunctive complements requires that there be some type of feature-matching operation involving the embedded CP projection, which is selected by the matrix predicate and which thus contains the temporal coordinates introduced by the latter, and the embedded TP, which is the locus of embedded tense. In the context of SC subjunctives, this operation is most likely established through the mediation of the mood particle *da*. The argument proposed earlier on (in the section 2.1.2.)

---

[6] The only context we have seen so far where this particle does not seem to be associated with a mood shift is when it appears in a future-tense construction such as the one in (8). This exception will be accounted for in 2.2.

implied that this is the element which is responsible for relating the embedded to the matrix tense in SC subjunctive complements.

The particle *da* thus functions both as a temporal operator and as a mood particle in SC subjunctives. This poses the question of how these two separate functions can be accomplished by a single element in the structure. The syntactic representation proposed below might provide an answer in this context.

(14)   [CP...C **Da**$_i$ W(u) [MoodP...Mood t_i W(i) [TP... T t_i [AspP…Asp [vP…v**V**]]]]]

|_____| |_____| |_____|
        Move   Move   Move

In (14), I attempt to account for the temporal properties of the particle *da* that were observed earlier on by proposing that it is externally merged in the T-head. The insertion of *da* under T takes place both in subjunctive complements and in future-tense constructions such as the one we observed in (8), which explains why this particle accomplishes a similar temporal function in both contexts. The difference between the two types of constructions is related to the subsequent derivational steps that the particle undertakes. In the future-tense construction, the *da*-item is selected by the future auxiliary and not the matrix verb. The tense interpretation in such cases is established through some type of local Agree relationship between the future auxiliary and the particle *da*,[7] and the latter does not undergo T-C movement. As a result, it can co-occur with the complementizer *da* when the future-tense construction is situated in the embedded indicative clauses, as we saw in (8). In subjunctive complements, on the other hand, the particle *da* must move from T to C, and hence it cannot co-occur with any other complementizer in this context. During the course of this movement, the particle must also pass through the head of the Mood projection, given the Head Movement Constraint (Travis, 1984), since MoodP is situated between TP and CP. Hence, unlike in the future-tense constructions, where *da* is unrelated to Mood, in subjunctive complements this element functions as a mood particle as well. When *da* passes through Mood, it acquires the interpretable instance of the W feature (which is situated under the head of the mood projection), which enables it to check the uninterpretable instance of this feature once it lands in C. Thus the representation in (14) accounts for both the temporal and the mood properties of the particle *da* in the context of SC subjunctives.

As for the verb appearing in this type of complements, I suggest that it remains positioned relatively low in the structure. More precisely, I propose that the verb in such contexts moves from its place of insertion inside vP to the aspectual projection situated just bellow TP. At this point, the verb stops its movement, because the head of the TP projection that immediately dominates AspP is already occupied by the temporal variable that was left there when the particle moved up to C. The representation in (14) is consistent with the semantic characteristics of verbs appearing in subjunctive complements in SC. Such verbs, as we saw, are underspecified for tense, but they are fully specified for aspect and can denote either a single event or an event that is progressive or repetitive.

---

[7] More needs to be said on the exact syntactic nature of this relationship in the context of future-tense constructions but, since the latter are not the primary concern of this paper, I leave the issue open for future research.

2.3. Summary

The facts presented in this section warrant the conclusion that SC contains a subjunctive mood, which belongs to the Balkan subjunctive family. All Balkan languages, including SC, employ mood particles, which accomplish a specific function in the syntax of subjunctive complements. Now that the issue of subjunctive realization in SC has been dealt with, I will shift my focus to the problem of subjunctive distribution in this language.

3. SC SUBJUNCTIVE: DISTRIBUTION

3.1. Problem

If we look at the issue of subjunctive distribution in Balkan languages more generally, it presents us with some problems because subjunctive complements seem to appear in far wider contexts in these languages than in languages situated outside of the Balkans. This is due to the fact that most Balkan languages- particularly those situated more to the south-east of this region- have lost the capacity to license infinitives and replaced them with finite complements that have the same overt form as subjunctives (Farkas (1985); Iatridou (1988); Joseph (1983); Philippaki-Warburton (1987); Roussou (2009) etc.). As we can see from the examples below, a number of Balkan languages, including SC,[8] realize complements that correspond to non-Balkan infinitives by using the same type of particle as the one associated with subjunctives.

(15) a.　Arxizo　　**na**　grafo　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Greek)
　　　　begin(1.sg.) PART write(1.sg.)
　　　　'I begin to write'
　　b.　O　Janos bori **na**　odhiji
　　　　the John　can　PART drive(3.sg.)
　　　　'John can drive'

(16) a.　Započvam　**da**　piša.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Bulgarian)
　　　　begin(1.sg.) PART write(1.sg.)
　　　　'I begin to write'
　　b.　Ivan može **da**　upravljava
　　　　John can　　PART drive(3.sg.)
　　　　'John can drive'

(17) a.　Počinjem　**da**　pišem　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(SC)
　　　　begin(1.sg.) PART write(1.sg.)
　　　　'I begin to write'
　　b.　Ivan može **da**　vozi
　　　　John can　PART　drive(3.sg.)
　　　　'John can drive'

These Balkan languages thus appear to distribute their subjunctive very widely.

---

[8] In fact, SC is slightly different here, because it can still use both infinitives and their subjunctive-like finite equivalents in the same contexts, as we will see a bit later on.

The question that I will be addressing through the remainder of this section is whether the loss of infinitive really affected the distribution of subjunctive mood in SC (and, by extension, in other Balkan languages as well), or whether it should be analyzed as a more superficial morpho-syntactic phenomenon which did not affect deeper mood distinctions. I will be arguing that this latter point of view is correct and that the wide subjunctive distribution in SC is only apparent.

3.2. "Disguised Infinitives" vs. "True Subjunctives"

3.2.1. *Semantic evidence*

There are several reasons that warrant the conclusion that complements such as those in (17), which I will refer to as *disguised infinitives*, are not true subjunctives. First of all, if we assumed that such complements were part of a separate subjunctive mood in SC, alongside the more typical subjunctive complements such as those selected by desiderative or directive verbs, this would make a coherent semantic account of subjunctive distribution in SC almost impossible due to the great diversity of semantic contexts that would then have to be associated with the selection of the subjunctive mood. Consider, for instance, the examples below:

(18) a.   Počeo je   da   trči.
                began past.aux.(3.sg.) PART run(3.sg.)
                'He began to run'
      b.   Uspio   je   da   dođe.
                managed past.aux.(3.sg.) PART come(3.sg.)
                'He managed to come'
      c.   Zna   da   računa
                know(3.sg.) PART calculate(3.sg.)
                'He knows how to calculate'
      d.   Može   da   dođe   sutra.
                can(3.sg.) PART come(3.sg.) tomorrow
                'He can come tomorrow'
      e.   Mora   da   dođe   sutra.
                must(3.sg.) PART come(3.sg.) tomorrow
                'He must come tomorrow'

The examples in (18) are meant to illustrate that the predicates selecting for these disguised infinitives are very diverse when it comes to their semantic characteristics. If we look, for instance, at the mood properties of such verbs, we notice that they cover more or less the entire spectrum of different interpretations. Some of these verbs, such as the aspectual in (18a), do not seem to introduce any shift in world semantics at all, while others, such as the modal verbs in (18d-e), can be related to a type of mood shift. The semantic diversity of these predicates is not surprising, given that their complements were derived from infinitives, and infinitives across languages are selected in very diverse linguistic contexts. However, this fact would present a serious problem if we wanted to analyze these complements as subjunctives, because subjunctive mood is a much more coherent category cross-linguistically. Hence this

is one reason why I believe that disguised infinitives such as those in (18) should not be considered as true subjunctives.

Another piece of evidence that points to this conclusion can be obtained if we compare the semantic properties of these subjunctive-like disguised infinitives with those of simple infinitives. SC allows for this possibility because it is still able to use both infinitives and their finite equivalents in the same contexts,[9] as we can see below:

(19) a. Počeo je   da   trči.
          began past.aux.(3.sg.) PART run(3.sg.)
          'He began to run'

      b. Počeo je   trčati.
          began past.aux.(3.sg.) run-INF
          'He began to run'

(20) a. Može   da   dođe   sutra.
          can(3.sg.) PART come(3.sg.) tomorrow
          'He can come tomorrow'

      b. Može   doći   sutra
          can(3.sg.) come-INF tomorrow
          'He can come tomorrow'

The relevant fact here is that no speaker that I consulted found any interpretative difference between the two options- i.e. the infinitive and its subjunctive-like finite equivalent - in (19) and (20). This would suggest that the replacement of infinitives with their finite equivalents in SC was only a surface phenomenon, which did not involve any shift in the mood properties of such expressions.

Another piece of evidence that favours this analysis comes from the comparison between Serbian and Croatian subjunctive mood. Given the close linguistic proximity of these two language varieties, one would not expect them to exhibit any major differences when it comes to their subjunctive distribution. Since mood distinctions are related to deep grammatical factors, those languages that have similar grammars should also presumably make a similar cut between different mood categories. This expectation, however, would not hold if we analyzed disguised infinitives such as those in (17) and (18) as part of a separate subjunctive mood, because complements of this type are used fairly regularly in Serbian but not in Croatian, which prefers to employ infinitives in these contexts.[10] Such an analysis would thus force us to conclude that Serbian subjunctive mood is far more extensive than the Croatian one, which would be awkward given the close linguistic proximity of these two varieties in most other areas of grammar. If, on the other hand, disguised infinitives were not analyzed as true subjunctives, then this anomaly would be avoided, because both Serbian and Croatian use the subjunctive construction in complements selected by verbs that are typically associated with the subjunctive mood, such as the desiderative or directive verbs that we observed earlier on in (7b-c). Thus, under this perspective, the difference that the two varieties exhibit in this context would no longer be seen as related to deep grammatical

---

[9] SC is situated in the western part of the Balkans and hence it was not as affected by the loss of infinitive phenomenon as those languages situated more to the south-east of this region.

[10] Croatian was less affected by the loss of infinitive than Serbian, given that it is situated more to the west of the Balkans.

factors that underlie mood distinctions, but to more superficial structural causes linked to the different regional distribution of the loss of infinitive phenomenon in the Balkans.

3.2.2. *Syntactic evidence*

So far, I have based my analysis of subjunctive distribution in SC on semantic type of evidence, which pointed towards the conclusion that disguised infinitives do not have the same status as true subjunctives[11] in this language. I will now present some syntactic arguments in favour of this idea, which will be based on the possible difference in positioning of the particle *da* depending on whether it appears in true subjunctives or in disguised infinitives. Earlier on, it was claimed that this particle moves up to CP in subjunctive complements in order to check the uninterpretable W feature in C, as well as to situate the embedded event within the temporal coordinates selected by the matrix predicate. In the paragraphs below, it will be shown that neither of these two motivations is relevant in the context of disguised infinitives.

If we look at the temporal properties of disguised infinitives such as those in (17) and (18), it can be noticed that they are not exactly the same as those observed with true subjunctive complements, such as those in (7b-c). The latter are associated with a dependent tense, which is constrained by the selecting predicate, but they nonetheless appear to contain at least some independent temporal content in the embedded clause. One indication for this is the fact that they can introduce a temporal marker that conflicts with the one present in the matrix clause, as we can see below:

(21)   Jučer   sam   naredio da   dođeš   sljedeći tjedan.
            Yesterday past.aux.(1.sg.) ordered PART come(2.sg.) next   week
            'Yesterday, I ordered that you come next week'

The matrix clause in (21) is associated with past tense, whereas the embedded subjunctive complement introduces a future-referring temporal marker. Given that the latter conflicts with the tense of the main clause, it cannot fall within the matrix tense domain. This means that the embedded complement in such cases must define its own tense domain. In other words, there must be some temporal anchor in the embedded CP that allows to bind the future-tense marker in (21) within the subordinate clause. Given the analysis in section 2, I assume that this function is accomplished by the particle *da*, which is able to function as a temporal operator as a result of the T-C movement that it undergoes in subjunctive complements. Thus it can bind a temporal adverbial within the tense domain of the embedded clause, as long as this adverbial is situated within the future-referring temporal interval selected by the matrix predicate. This is the reason why the tense in subjunctive complements is not analyzed as entirely anaphoric but only as dependent on the matrix tense (Krapova (1998); Landau (2004)).

When it comes to disguised infinitives, on the other hand, the option presented in (21) is ungrammatical.

---

[11] For the moment, I leave the notion of "true subjunctive" in SC somewhat vague. The primary concern at this point in the argument is to show that disguised infinitives do not belong to the subjunctive mood. The group of complements that can be considered as true subjunctives in SC will be formally defined in the section 3.2.3.

(22) a. * Jučer   sam   počeo da   vozim   sljedeći tjedan.
         yesterday past.aux.(1.sg.) began PART drive(1.sg.) next   week
      * 'Yesterday I began to drive next week"
   b. * Jučer   sam   morao da   vozim   sljedeći tjedan.
         yesterday past.aux.(1.sg.) must   PART drive(1.sg.) next   week
      * 'Yesterday I had to drive next week"

The tense in complements of this type is identical to the matrix tense (as opposed to just being dependent on it) and entirely anaphoric. The syntactic explanation that I would like to advance for the temporal anaphoricity of such clauses is to say that the embedded CP projection is absent in structures of this type. The matrix and the embedded predicates in (22) are not aspectually independent in the sense that they do not denote two separate events but only a single event (Iatrodiou (1988); Varlokosta (1993)). Hence it makes sense to consider that such structures are associated with a single, matrix CP.

If the embedded CP projection is indeed absent in disguised infinitives, this would have an additional consequence related to the mood properties of such clauses. As was claimed earlier, selection of subjunctive complements is related to a special feature- i.e. W feature - introduced by the matrix predicate in the embedded CP projection. Given the analysis just proposed, we must conclude that subjunctive-like disguised infinitives lack this feature, since they lack the CP projection altogether. Therefore they do not have the same syntactic status as true subjunctives in SC. The absence of the W feature in disguised infinitives would explain the problem that was observed in (18), i.e. the semantic diversity of this type of complements in SC. If disguised infinitives are not associated with the same lexical feature as true subjunctives, then it is not surprising that they are less specified with regards to their meaning and hence able to appear in more diverse semantic contexts.

This hypothesis has one concrete syntactic consequence that can be tested: if disguised infinitives, as opposed to true subjunctives, do not project CP and hence lack the W feature, this means that the particle *da* in such cases will not observe T-C movement. On the contrary, this particle should remain in its place of insertion (i.e. the T-head) in complements of this type, since there is no constraint, either related to tense or to mood, that would motivate its movement. The prediction, therefore, is that the particle and the verb will remain much more structurally contiguous in disguised infinitives than in true subjunctive complements. As a result, the two structures should exhibit differences when it comes to possibilities of inserting different types of elements between the particle and the verb. As we will see bellow, such differences are indeed attested.

The first difference between the two types of structures in this context concerns the positioning of the embedded subject. In true subjunctive complements in SC, the subject typically appears between the particle *da* and the verb, since the movement of the particle to C leaves enough place for the subject to appear between the two. In the case of disguised infinitives, however, this possibility does not exist:

(23)   Želim   da   **Ivan** pobijedi.
            want(1.sg.) PART John win(3.sg.)
            'I want John to win'
(24) a.   (Ivan) počinje (Ivan) <u>da *(**Ivan**) trči</u> (Ivan)

'John is beginning to run"

b.   (Ivan) zna (Ivan) <u>da *(**Ivan**) računa</u> (Ivan)
        'John knows how to calculate'

The examples in (24) are meant to show that, even though there is significant freedom with regards to subject positioning in SC disguised infinitives (SC, in general, is a language that allows great possibilities of scrambling), the subject cannot appear between the particle *da* and the verb in clauses of this type, which might be seen as an indication that these two elements are positioned very close in the structure. Nevertheless, this fact cannot be considered as sufficient evidence for the analysis proposed above, because the ungrammaticality in (24) could also be explained independently of the argument presented here, by referring to Control theory.[12] There is, nonetheless, some additional evidence in favour of the theoretical perspective I just outlined.

The idea that the particle *da* and the verb are much more contiguous in disguised infinitives than in true subjunctives, due to the differences related to T-C movement of the particle, is also supported by some additional contrasts between the two types of structures. For instance, one can insert adverbs or topics between the particle and the verb in true subjunctives, whereas this is generally unacceptable in disguised infinitives.

(25) a.   Hoćeš   **da**   **brže**   **dođem**?
              want(2.sg.) PART quicker come(1.sg.)
              'You want me to come quicker?'

      b.   Hoću   **da**   **Ivana**   **pozoveš**.
              want(1.sg.) PART John-TOP invite(2.sg.)
              'I want you to invite John.'

(26) a. * Možeš   **da**   **brže**   **dođeš**?
              can(2.sg.) PART quicker come(2.sg.)
              'Can you come quicker?'

      b. * Moraš   **da**   **Ivana**   **pozoveš**.
              must(2.sg.) PART   John-TOP invite(2.sg.)
              'You must invite John'

All of these facts point to the conclusion that disguised infinitives are structurally different from true subjunctives. They do not observe particle movement to C because they lack the subjunctive-related W feature. Therefore they should not be considered as subjunctives.

3.2.3. *True subjunctive complements in SC: Formal definition*

If the analysis proposed so far is correct, and if subjunctive-like disguised infinitives do not form part of a separate subjunctive mood in SC, then the next question that naturally poses itself is how one can identify a group of complements that do constitute the subjunctive mood in this language. So far, I have only mentioned the notion of "true subjunctives" in a vague

---

[12] Given that, unlike subjunctive complements selected by desiderative and directive verbs, complements in (24) are Control structures, it can be claimed that the lexical subject simply cannot appear in its EPP position in such clauses because this position is occupied by PRO.

sense, without clearly defining what type of complements should be considered as belonging to this group. In order to provide a more formal definition of the true subjunctive group, I would like to briefly introduce the argument that was proposed in Kempchinsky (2009).

The central idea that Kempchinsky puts forward is that the core group of subjunctive complements, which she claims is the same across languages, should be analyzed as embedded equivalents of simple imperatives.[13] According to her analysis, both simple imperatives and subjunctive complements - or embedded imperatives - are associated with a common, UG-provided element that determines their interpretation: the so-called *imperative operator*. In the context of simple imperatives, which involve interaction between the speaker and the addressee, the semantic effect of this operator is to direct the interpretation away from the speaker, so that the order contained in the imperative clause can never be interpreted as referring to the speaker himself. Hence we observe no imperatives in 1.p.sg. In the case of subjunctives, or embedded imperatives, the linguistic context is somewhat different but the functioning of this operator is largely equivalent. Given that subjunctives do not involve the interaction between the speaker and the addressee, but rather between the matrix and the embedded subject, the semantic effect of the imperative operator, in this context, is to direct the interpretation away from the matrix subject, so that the proposition contained in the subjunctive complement cannot be interpreted as referring to the matrix subject. As a result, the co-reference between the matrix and the embedded subject is banned in such cases, i.e. the matrix and the embedded subject cannot be the same. This is how Kempchinsky explains the widely observed effect of subject obviation associated with subjunctive complements across languages.

If Kempchinsky is correct, then her analysis should apply to SC as well. In other words, SC should also contain a core group of subjunctive complements that are associated with the imperative operator, hence banning co-reference between the matrix and the embedded subject. In (27), we can see that such a group of complements does indeed exist in SC:

(27) a.   Naređujem da   to napraviš / *napravim
            order(1.sg.) PART it do(2.sg.) do(1.sg.)
            'I order that you/*I do it'
      b.   Inzistiram da   dođeš   /   *dođem
            insist(1.sg.) PART come(2.sg.) come(1.sg.)
            'I insist that you/*I come'
      c.   Molio bih   da   odeš   /   *odem.
            ask   would(1.sg.) PART leave(2.sg.) leave(1.sg.)
            'I would ask that you/*I leave'

Moreover, unlike the disguised infinitives that we saw in (18), the complements that we observe here have very coherent semantic characteristics because they can only be selected by directive verbs. These are the type of verbs that always introduce a mood shift in the clauses they select, moving the interpretation away from the world of the matrix subject. The complements in (27) can thus normally be analyzed as true subjunctives, given that they exhibit the semantic characteristics that are cross-linguistically associated with the subjunctive mood. Therefore, the phenomenon of subject obviation can serve us to formally

---

[13] Due to space constraints, I will not mention here all of the arguments that the author puts forward in favour of this idea. For more details, see Kempchinsky (2009).

distinguish true subjunctive complements from those that only share the surface form of subjunctives in SC. The disguised infinitives that we claimed earlier on are not true subjunctives do not exhibit this phenomenon. On the contrary, they observe subject control, forcing subject co-reference between the matrix and the embedded clause.

Before concluding the argument in this section, there is still one group of complements that needs to be addressed, namely complements to desiderative verbs. Cross-linguistically, desiderative verbs robustly select the subjunctive mood and their subjunctive complements exhibit subject obviation. Complements to desideratives behave as subjunctives in SC as well: they appear to be associated with the W feature and observe particle movement from T to C (see (25), for instance). However, the problem with this type of complements in SC (and in Balkan languages more widely) is that they do not appear to exhibit subject obviation. They allow both conjoined and disjoined reference between the embedded and the matrix subject, which seemingly distinguishes them from their equivalents in non-Balkan languages.

(28) a.   Hoću   da   dođeš   sutra
            want(1.sg.) PART come(2.sg.) tomorrow
            'I want you to come tomorrow'
     b.   Hoću   da   idem   na plažu.
            want(1.sg.) PART go(1.sg.) to the beach
            'I want to go to the beach'
(29) a.   Je veux que tu   viennes   demain.
            I   want that you come-SUBJ tomorrow
     b. * Je veux que j' aille   sur la plage.
            I   want that I go-SUBJ on the beach

It is therefore not entirely clear how complements to desiderative verbs in SC should be classified from the point of view of Kempchinsky's analysis.

The argument that was put forward in 3.2.1. might serve to resolve this apparent problem. Recall the examples in (19) and (20), where we saw that subjunctive-like disguised infinitives can be reanalyzed as simple infinitives in SC without any type of shift in their interpretative properties. This served as one of the arguments for the claim that such complements are not true subjunctives. In fact, the same can also be done with the subjunctive-like complements to desideratives that observe conjoined reference between the matrix and the embedded subject:

(30) a.   Hoću   da   idem   na plažu.
            want(1.sg.) PART go(1.sg.) to the beach
     b.   Hoću   ići   na plažu.
            want(1.sg.) go-INF to the beach
            'I want to go to the beach'

Once again, there is no interpretative difference between the subjunctive-like complement in (30a) and the simple infinitive in (30b). Such a reanalysis, on the other hand, is impossible with desiderative complements that observe disjoined reference between subjects:

(31) a.   Hoću   da   Ivan dođe.

       want(1.sg.) PART John come(3.sg.)
  b. * Hoću   Ivan doći
       want(1.sg.) John come-INF.
       'I want John to come'

The proposal I put forward in this context is simple: the desiderative verb selecting the complement in (30a) and the one selecting the complement in (31a) are not the same lexical item. Rather, we have two separate items, one of which selects disguised infinitives, which observe subject control and can be reanalyzed as simple infinitives, while the other selects true subjunctives, which observe subject obviation. Therefore, the phenomenon of subject obviation can serve us to formally distinguish true subjunctives from disguised infinitives in the context of desiderative predicates as well. In this sense, desideratives in SC are not essentially different from their Romance counterparts, which contain an infinitive-selecting and a subjunctive-selecting variant:

(32) a.   Je veux venir.
           I   want come-INF
           'I want to come'
     b.   Je veux que tu   viennes.
           I   want that you come-SUBJ(2.sg.)
           'I want you to come'
(33) a.   Quiero   venir.
           want(1.sg.) come-INF
           'I want to come'
     b.   Quiero   que vengas.
           want(1.sg.) that come-SUBJ(2.sg.)
           'I want you to come'

If we applied Kempchinsky's analysis to this type of complements in SC, then we would say that only those desiderative complements that observe subject obviation contain the imperative operator, while the complements that observe subject control do not. This idea becomes plausible if we look at the semantics of such expressions, because obviative desiderative complements are generally used to express some type of command or request and have a more directive feel to them than control complements in this context, which express a simple wish with no directive connotations.

3.3. Summary

There is good evidence, both from a semantic and from a syntactic perspective, for the idea that not all complements that share the overt form of subjunctives in SC belong to the subjunctive mood. In particular, the subjunctive-like finite equivalents of infinitives were found to have a number of properties that disqualify them from being considered as true subjunctives. Only the complements that observe subject obviation can straightforwardly be considered as such. These are the type of complements that correspond to core subjunctives in non-Balkan languages. Therefore, the distribution of the subjunctive mood in SC, despite appearances, is not wider than the one observed, for instance, in Romance languages.

If the analysis proposed in this chapter could apply to subjunctive distribution in other Balkan languages as well, then it would make it much easier to integrate the Balkan subjunctive mood as a whole into any kind of cross-linguistic definition of subjunctive distribution. The idea seems plausible, given the observed similarities between different Balkan languages in the area of subjunctive syntax, but further research still needs to be carried out in other Balkan languages before it can be claimed with certainty that the analysis of SC presented in this paper is relevant for the Balkan group of languages as a whole.

4. CONCLUSION

All of the facts presented in this paper point to a two-fold conclusion: firstly, SC contains a subjunctive mood, which is realized similarly as in other Balkan languages, such as Greek; secondly, the distribution of this mood in SC (and possibly other Balkan languages as well) is not as wide as it might appear at first glance because a number of complements overtook the overt morpho-syntactic form associated with subjunctives without overtaking the formal and semantic properties that characterize the subjunctive mood.

The data presented in the text also open up some issues that still need to be addressed more thoroughly. Certainly the most salient among these concerns the relation between subjunctive complements and infinitives. It is clear that these two types of constructions are closely related and share a number of structural and semantic properties. The issue of closeness and permeability of the two types of structures is particularly relevant in the context of Balkan languages, which have largely replaced their infinitives with complements that resemble subjunctives, but the problem is much broader and concerns languages outside of the Balkans as well. English, for instance, has undergone a process that could be seen as a reverse from the one observed in Balkan languages, replacing most of its subjunctive complements with infinitives. Moreover, Romance languages contain a number of expressions in which these two constructions can appear interchangeably, without any obvious shift in the semantic interpretation. Therefore, the structures underlying infinitives and subjunctives present a great degree of permeability cross-linguistically. This fact, which was not sufficiently dealt with in the present paper, still needs to be properly accounted for. Here I chose to neatly separate the two categories - i.e. disguised infinitives and true subjunctives - in order to emphasize the idea that not all complements that overtly resemble subjunctives in SC have the same formal status. But there is certainly a need for a more integrating theory that would take greater account of the closeness and permeability of subjunctives and infinitives across languages.

5. REFERENCES

Brugger, G., D'Angelo,M. (1995) "Movement at LF triggered by mood and tense", *Folia Linguistica*, 3-4, 195-221.

Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

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

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

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

Giannakidou, A. (1999) "Affective dependencies", *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 22, 367-421.

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

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

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

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.

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. (1994) "The subjunctive mood and the syntactic status of the particle *na* in Modern Greek", *Folia Linguistica*, 28, 297-328.

Quer, J. (1998) *Mood at the Interface*, Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.

Quer, J. (2001) "Interpreting mood", *Probus* 13, 81-111.

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

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

Roussou, A. (2009) "In the mood for control", *Lingua*, 119, 1811-1836.

Stowell, T. (1993) "Syntax of tense", Manuscript, UCLA, Los Angeles.

Stowell, T. (2007) "The syntactic expression of tense", *Lingua*, 117, 437-463.

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

Travis, L. (1984) *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*, Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

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.