Subjunctive in Serbian/Croatian

1. Introduction

The subject of this paper will be the subjunctive mood in Serbian/Croatian (SC). SC is a Slavic language situated in the Balkan region and, as we will see shortly, it realizes its subjunctives very similarly as other Balkan languages, both Slavic and non-Slavic. Therefore the conclusions that I will formulate on the basis of my analysis of SC subjunctive might prove to be relevant for other Balkan languages as well.

Before I fully enter into the subject matter, I would first like to briefly introduce the theoretical framework that I will be assuming in this text, which is that of minimalist syntax, first developed by Chomsky[1]. Minimalism views all phenomena in syntax- including the selection of different syntactic moods- as related to different types of features present in the lexicon. So, when it comes specifically to the subjunctive mood, and the selection of this mood in the embedded complement of the matrix predicate- which is the context that I will be focusing on here- it should also be seen as related to a special type of feature, which I will simply call the *subjunctive feature* (SF). This feature is analyzed as being uninterpretable, in the same way, for instance, as the interrogative wh-feature associated with questions. This means that SF must be checked and deleted before the syntactic structure is sent to the conceptual interface to be interpreted. The interpretable feature which is necessary to accomplish this checking function is found in the Mood projection, which is usually analyzed as being situated above TP and below CP, as we can see in (1):

(1) [**CP**…**C** SF(u) [**MoodP**…**Mood** SF(i) [**TP**…]]]
Agree

The feature-checking operation in (1) is achieved differently across 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 Romance and Balkan languages, which I will briefly describe in the following section. Then I will move on to SC and show that its subjunctive mood is realized very similarly as in other Balkan languages.

2. Balkan Subjunctive

If we look at the examples (2)-(4), we can observe that the subjunctive mood in Balkan languages is realized differently than in most languages situated outside of the Balkans, including those belonging to the Romance family.

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

[1] See Chomsky (1995; 1999) among others

"I think that Kostas left"

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

(3) a. Cred **ca** Ion va veni. (Romanian)
think(1.p.sg.) that-IND John go(3.p.sg,) come
"I think that John is going to come"

b. Vreau Ion **sa** vina.
want(1.p.sg.) John that-SUBJ. come(3.p.sg.)
"I want John to come"

(4) a. Mišljam **če** e takova. (Bulgarian)
think(1.p.sg.) that-IND is like that
"I think she is like that"

b. Iskam **da** budem zaedno.
want(1.p.sg.) that-SUBJ are(1.p.pl.) together
"I want us to be together"

The subjunctives (examples in b.) in languages such as Greek, Romanian and Bulgarian are not distinguished from indicatives (examples in a.) through specialized verbal morphology- as is the case in Romance languages- but through special mood particles (printed in bold), which are separate from the verb and which appear in the left periphery of the clause.

There is some theoretical disagreement as to the exact structural position of these particles and their relation to the subjunctive feature. If we look at the example of the Greek particle *na*, which has been the most studied one in this context, we can say that there are basically two main theoretical perspectives with regards to its position and its syntactic properties. Some authors (Agouraki, 1991; Tsoulas, 1993 etc.) analyze this element as being directly inserted in CP and therefore not related to the lower Mood projection. Under this perspective, the subjunctive feature in C is checked by the verb, which moves up to CP and passes through the Mood projection, picking up the interpretable instance of this feature, and then checking its uninterpretable instance in C. The second approach (Giannakidou, 1998, 2009; Roussou, 2009 etc.) gives a somewhat greater role to the *na*-element in the syntax of subjunctives: under this perspective, the element *na* is inserted in the Mood projection, and then it moves up from there to CP. Hence the mood particle itself is responsible for checking the subjunctive feature, not the verb. In my analysis of SC I will be favouring this latter approach.

Now that I have set the bases for my study, I will move on to the central subject of this paper, which is SC and its own subjunctive mood. My exposition on SC subjunctive will be divided in two parts: the first one will deal with subjunctive realization in SC, while the second one will look at the issues related to subjunctive distribution in this language.

3. SC Subjunctive: Realization

On the first glance, SC appears to be different from other Balkan languages such as Greek when it comes to the realization of its subjunctive-type complements:

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

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

(6) a. Mislim **da** je Ivan otišao. (SC)
think(1.p.sg.) that aux.past(3.p.sg.) John left
"I think that John left"

b. Želim **da** Ivan ode.
want(1.p.sg.) that John leavePNP(3.p.sg.)
"I want John to leave"

c. Naređujem **da** Ivan dođe.
order(1.p.sg.) that John comePNP(3.p.sg.)
"I order that John come"

Unlike Greek- and other Balkan languages that we observed earlier on-, SC does not seem to contain a special subjunctive particle because, as we can see in (6), the element *da* in this language can be used to introduce both indicative complements (6a.) and complements that are selected by directive or desiderative verbs (6b. and c.), and that correspond to subjunctives in other languages. I will nevertheless argue that this difference is only superficial and that SC also contains a specialized subjunctive particle, which is homonymous with the indicative complementizer.

In order to demonstrate this, I will first show that the element *da* that we observed with the indicative complement in (6)a. is not the same as the element *da* associated with subjunctive-type complements in (6)b. and c.., and then I will argue that the latter should be seen as a specialized mood particle, equivalent of the Greek particle *na*.

Consider the example in (7):

(7) Kaže **da** će **da** dođe.
says that-COMP aux.fut.(3.p.sg.) that-PART comePNP(3.p.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 (7) is a complementizer, inserted in the CP projection, whereas the lower *da* is a particle, inserted somewhere bellow CP. The construction associated with the lower *da* in (7) is used to express future tense, but it is syntactically almost identical to the subjunctive-type constructions we observed in (6), because they are all associated with the element *da* and they all typically introduce the perfective non-past (PNP) verbal form, which acquires a future-referring meaning when it appears in these types of constructions.

Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the element *da* in the future-tense construction in (7) is the same as the one we observed in (6)b. and c. with the subjunctive-type complements, given that the syntactic form and the semantic meaning of these constructions is so similar. This would then imply that the element *da* in (6)b. and c. is not the same as the indicative complementizer *da*.

Another piece of evidence that points to this conclusion is related to the fact that the indicative *da* can sometimes be replaced by other complementizers, whereas *da* associated with subjunctive-type complements cannot.

(8) Tvrdi **da/kako** je to bolje rješenje.
claim(3.p.sg.) that is this better solution
"He claims this is a better solution"

(9) a. Želim **da/*kako** dođe.
want(1.p.sg.) that-SUBJ comePNP(3.p.sg.)
"I want him to come"

b. Naređujem **da/*kako** dođe.
order(1.p.sg.) that-SUBJ comePNP(3.p.sg.)
"I order that he come"

As we can see in (8), the indicative *da* can be replaced, for instance, by the complementizer *kako*, whereas the replacement of *da* with another complementizer in the context of subjunctive complements leads to ungrammaticality, as shown in (9). I assume this is because the subjunctive-related *da* accomplishes a specific function in the syntax of SC subjunctives (I will explain it in more detail a bit later on), which cannot be accomplished by any type of complementizer that we observe in indicative contexts.

The facts presented so far point to the conclusion that the element *da* associated with subjunctives is not the same item as the indicative complementizer *da*. Now that this has been demonstrated, I will focus more closely on the syntactic properties of the subjunctive *da*, and argue that it should be analyzed on a par with subjunctive particles in other Balkan languages. If we compare, for instance, the SC particle *da* to the Greek subjunctive particle *na*, we can note that their syntactic characteristics are very similar. One area in which this is evident is the distribution of these particles: both the Greek *na* and the SC *da* are typically associated with subjunctive-type complements, but they can also appear in matrix clauses, as shown in the examples bellow:

(10) a. **Da** bar dođe.
SUBJ if-only comePNP(3.p.sg.)
"If only he came"

b. **Na** etrexe.
SUBJ ran(3.p.sg.)
"If only he were running"

(11) a. **Da** nisi ni pomislio na to!
SUBJ not-be(2.p.sg.) think on that
"Don't even think about it!"

b. **Na** mi fijis!
SUBJ not leave(2.p.sg.)
"Don't leave!"

Therefore, they appear in similar linguistic contexts in both languages.

Moreover, whenever these particles appear in matrix clauses, they are always associated with different types of irrealis interpretations. In the examples above, we could see, for instance, that they can be used in optative constructions (10) or in negative imperative constructions (11), which both belong to the irrealis mood. Therefore, whenever the Greek or the SC subjunctive particle appears in matrix clauses, it introduces a mood shift- moving the interpretation away from the actual world of the speaker-, just like it does in subjunctive complements. This leads me to the conclusion that both the Greek *na* and the SC *da* should be seen as mood particles, accomplishing a very similar function in the syntax of their respective languages. The only difference between SC and Greek 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 Greek the two are more clearly distinguished.

Another context where SC subjunctives behave similarly as their Greek counterparts is with regards to their tense properties. More generally, the tense in subjunctive complements is distinguished from indicative tense across languages because the latter is independent, whereas the former is more constrained by the matrix predicate that selects for the subjunctive complement. The same contrast between indicatives and subjunctives is observed in Greek and SC as well:

(12) a. Nomizo oti kerdise / kerdisei / tha kerdisi o Janos
think(1.p.sg.) that win(past) win(present) win(future) John
"I think John won / is winning / will win"

b. Mislim da je Ivan pobijedio / pobjeđuje / će pobijediti.
think(1.p.sg.) that John win(past) win(present) win(future)
"I think John won / is winning / will win"

(13) a. Thelo na kerdisi / * kerdise o Janos
want(1.p.sg) that-SUBJ win(non-past) win(past) the John
"I want John to win"

b. Želim da Ivan pobijedi / * je pobijedio
want(1.p.sg.) that-SUBJ John win(non-past) win(past)
"I want John to win"

In both of these languages, indicatives are associated with independent tense, and therefore the predicate that appears in this type of complement can denote all types of temporal relationships with respect to the matrix predicate, as shown in (12). Subjunctive complements, on the other hand, are more constrained in their tense because they are associated with a bound temporal interval, which begins at the time of the matrix predicate and stretches on into the future. As a result, the predicates appearing in complements of this type cannot denote an event that took place prior to the one denoted by the matrix predicate: as we can see in (13), the introduction of past tense in SC or Greek subjunctive complements leads to ungrammaticality. Therefore,

temporal semantics represents one more area where SC and Greek subjunctive complements behave in the same way.

In (12) and (13), we could see that the tense in indicatives is different from the tense in subjunctives because the former is independent whereas the latter is related to the matrix tense. In the following paragraphs, I will try to determine which syntactic mechanism is responsible for relating the embedded tense to the matrix tense in Greek and SC subjunctive complements. The analysis that I will propose in this context will allow me to come up later on with some more general conclusions regarding the syntax of SC subjunctives.

First of all, we should note that the tense in any kind of embedded complement can only be related to matrix tense through the CP projection, because this is the projection that links the two clauses. When it comes to Greek subjunctives, it is usually presumed that the temporal relation between the matrix and the embedded clause is established through verb movement to C. The strongest piece of evidence in favour of this analysis is the fact that the subject in Greek subjunctive complements cannot appear between the particle *na* and the verb:

(14) *Thelo na **o Janos** kerdisi.
"I want John to win"

This is because both the particle and the verb in Greek subjunctives are presumably situated in the CP projection, so there is no place for the subject to appear between these two elements. If we look at SC, though, we observe a different situation here, because, as we can see in (15), the subject in SC subjunctive complements normally appears between the particle *da* and the verb:

(15) Želim da **Ivan** pobijedi.
"I want John to win"

Hence it is highly unlikely that the tense in SC subjunctive complements is related to the matrix tense through verb movement to C. Rather, there must be some other element in the clause that moves up to C in SC subjunctives, thus relating the embedded to the matrix tense. I believe that the likeliest candidate for this is the subjunctive particle *da* itself. This element is a mood particle and, as such, it is already related to the subjunctive CP projection because this is the projection that hosts the subjunctive feature, which needs to be checked by the mood particle. So, I will assume that the tense in SC subjunctive complements is related to matrix tense through particle movement to CP, whereas the verb in such cases remains lower down in the structure, leaving enough place for the subject to appear between the particle and the verb. This movement of the particle to CP thus allows to simultaneously accomplish two functions necessary in the context of SC subjunctive complements: it allows to relate the embedded tense to the matrix tense, as well as to check the uninterpretable subjunctive feature in CP. Hence the element *da* in SC subjunctives functions both as a mood particle and as a temporal operator.

The next question that I want to address here is what type of syntactic derivation would be the best able to account for these different properties of the SC subjunctive particle. I believe that the derivation proposed bellow in (16) could be on the right track

here, because it allows to take into account both the temporal and the mood properties of the subjunctive particle *da*.

(16) [**CP**...**C** SF(u) [**MoodP**...**Mood** SF(i) [**TP**... **T** *Da* [**AspP**...**Asp** [**vP**...**v V**]]]]]

Move Move Move

As we can see in (16), I presume that this particle is inserted in the temporal projection TP, and then it establishes a relation with the matrix tense when it moves from TP to CP. During the course of this movement, the particle must also pass through the Mood projection, given that the latter is situated between TP and CP. This allows it to pick up the interpretable instance of the subjunctive feature (which is situated in the Mood projection), and to check its uninterpretable instance in C. This analysis would explain why the element *da* functions both as a temporal operator and as a mood particle in SC subjunctives: it is related both to TP and to the Mood projection.

The derivation in (16) can also tell us something about the properties of the verb appearing in SC subjunctive complements. Earlier on, I claimed that the verb in SC subjunctives does not move all the way up to C- as is usually presumed to be the case in Greek subjunctives- but remains lower down in the structure, which allows the subject to appear between the particle and the verb. In (16) I make this analysis more precise by claiming that the projection which hosts the verb in SC subjunctives is the *Aspectual Phrase* (AspP), situated above VP and bellow TP. I presume that the verb in clauses of this type moves from VP to AspP, and it stops its movement there because it cannot move up to TP, given that the T-head is already occupied by the variable that was left there when the particle moved up to CP. This analysis is consistent with the semantic characteristics of verbs appearing in SC subjunctives. Such verbs are underspecified for tense (as was already shown) because, under this analysis, they do not move up to TP- the projection where the clausal tense is encoded- but they are fully specified for aspect, because they do move to the aspectual projection, and thus they can denote either a punctual event or an event that is repetitive, progressive or habitual. Hence this is one more reason why I think that the derivation in (16) could be correct when it comes to SC subjunctives.

On the basis of all the facts presented in this section, I can conclude that SC subjunctives are realized very similarly as their equivalents in Greek and other Balkan languages. The only significant syntactic difference between SC and Greek in this context is related to verb movement: while the verb in Greek subjunctives likely moves up to CP in order to relate the embedded to the matrix tense, in SC the verb remains lower down in the structure and the element that relates the two tenses is the subjunctive particle itself, which thus functions both as a temporal operator and as a mood particle. The next section will address some of the problems related to subjunctive distribution in SC.

4. SC Subjunctive: Distribution

If we look at the distribution of subjunctives 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 so-called phenomenon of *Balkan sprachbund*, which is a term used to

describe a specific linguistic development that took place in the history of most Balkan languages, particularly those situated more to the south-east of this region, whereby they have lost the capacity to license infinitive complements and replaced them with finite complements that have the same overt form as subjunctives. So, as we can see from the Greek and Romanian examples bellow, the complements that correspond to non-Balkan infinitives are accompanied in these languages by the same particle that we observed earlier on with the more typical subjunctive complements.

(17) a. Arxizo **na** grafo (Greek)
begin(1.p.sg.) SUBJ writePNP(1.p.sg.)
"I begin to write"

b. O Janos bori **na** odhiji
the John can SUBJ drivePNP(3.p.sg.)
"John can drive"

(18) a. Inceps **sa** scriu. (Romanian)
begin(1.p.sg.) SUBJ. write(1.p.sg.)
"I begin to write"

b. Ion poate **sa** conduce
John can SUBJ drive(3.p.sg.)
"John can drive"

The same phenomenon is also at work in SC, because infinitives in this language can also be replaced by finite complements that resemble subjunctives.

(19) a. Počinjem **da** pišem (SC)
begin(1.p.sg.) SUBJ writePNP(1.p.sg.)
"I begin to write"

b. Ivan može **da** vozi
John can SUBJ drivePNP(3.p.sg.)
"John can drive"

Hence SC, like other Balkan languages, seems to distribute its subjunctive very widely.

The question that I will be addressing through the remainder of this section is whether the *Balkan sprachbund* phenomenon really affected the distribution of the subjunctive mood in SC and, by extension, in other Balkan languages as well, or whether it should be analyzed as a more surface-related morpho-syntactic change 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.

There are several reasons that warrant the conclusion that complements such as those in (19) are not true subjunctives. First of all, if we assumed that complements of this type were part of a separate subjunctive mood in SC, alongside the more typical subjunctive complements such as those we observed in (6), this would make a coherent semantic account of the subjunctive mood 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 bellow:

(20) a. Počeo je da trči.
began aux.past.(3.p.sg.) PART run(3.p.sg.)
"He began to run"

b. Uspio je da dođe.
managed aux.past(3.p.sg.) PART come(3.p.sg.)
"He managed to come"

c. Zna da računa
know(3.p.sg.) PART calculate(3.p.sg.)
"He knows how to calculate"

d. Može da dođe sutra.
can(3.p.sg.) PART come(3.p.sg.) tomorrow
"He can come tomorrow"

e. Namjeravam da dođem sljedeće sedmice.
intend(1.p.sg.) PART come(1.p.sg.) next week
"I intend to come next week"

f. Mora da dođe sutra.
must(3.p.sg.) PART come(3.p.sg.) tomorrow
"He must come tomorrow"

Here we can see that the range of verbs that select for these subjunctive-like finite equivalents of infinitives is very wide and very diverse when it comes to their semantic properties. The semantic diversity of these verbs is not entirely 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 usually seen as a much more coherent category. Hence this is one reason why I think that complements of this type 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 finite equivalents of infinitives with those of simple infinitives. SC allows for this possibility because it can still use both infinitives and their finite equivalents in the same contexts[2], as we can see bellow:

(21) a. Počeo je da trči. = b. Počeo je trčati.
"He began to run" began past.aux.(3.p.sg.) run-INF.

(22) a. Može da dođe sutra. = b. Može doći sutra.
"He can come tomorrow" can(3.p.sg.) come-INF tomorrow

The relevant fact here is that no speaker that I consulted found any interpretative difference between the two options in (21) and (22). What this suggests is that the

[2] SC is situated in the western part of the Balkans and hence it was not as affected by the phenomenon of *Balkan sprachbund* as those languages situated more to the south-east of this region. As a result, SC infinitives were not entirely lost.

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 expect them to realize their subjunctive mood in much the same manner. This expectation, however, would not hold if we analyzed the finite equivalents of infinitives such as those in (19) and (20) 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.[3] 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, complements such as those in (19) and (20) were not analyzed as true subjunctives and only the more typical subjunctive complements such as those we observed earlier on in (6) were, then this anomaly would be avoided, because both Serbian and Croatian use the subjunctive construction in the latter context.

All of the facts mentioned above point to the conclusion that the replacement of infinitives with their finite equivalents in SC did not cause any shift in the mood properties of such expressions. It appears more likely that this change took place out of a purely structural necessity: once the infinitive construction began to disappear, it was replaced by the subjunctive construction, because the latter was structurally closest to infinitives, as indicated, among other things, by the fact that both of these types of complements are characterized by deficient tense. So if we analyzed this phenomenon from the point of view of minimalism, then we would say that the structural shift from infinitives to subjunctive-like finite complements was a surface change which did not involve the introduction of the subjunctive feature with this type of complements – hence there was no shift in their mood properties.

There is one concrete syntactic piece of evidence that favours this conclusion, and it is related to subject positioning in complements such as those in (19) and (20). Earlier on we saw (in the example (15)) that the subject in SC subjunctive complements typically appears between the particle *da* and the verb, which is why I previously concluded that the verb in such complements does not move up to CP and that only the subjunctive particle *da* moves up there. The primary motivation for this movement, of course, is to check the uninterpretable subjunctive feature in C. So, in the absence of this feature, there should be no particle movement to CP either. We can therefore predict that the particle *da* in complements such as those in (19) and (20) will not move up to CP- since there is no feature for it to check there- but will remain in its place of insertion- i.e. the TP projection. As a result, there should be no place available for the subject to appear between the particle *da*, which stays in T, and the verb, which I presume is situated in the aspectual head just bellow TP. As we can see in the examples bellow, this prediction is confirmed:

(23) a. (Ivan) počinje (Ivan) da ***(**Ivan**) trči (Ivan)
"John is beginning to run"

[3] Croatian was less affected by *Balkan sprachbund* than Serbian, given that it is situated more to the west of the Balkans.

b. (Ivan) zna (Ivan) da ***(Ivan**) računa (Ivan)
"John knows how to calculate"

≠

(24) Želim da **Ivan** pobijedi.
want(1.p.sg.) that John winPNP(3.p.sg.)
"I want John to win"

The examples in (23) show us that, even though there is great freedom with regards to subject positioning in finite equivalents of infinitives, the subject crucially cannot appear between the particle *da* and the verb in clauses of this type. This would seem to confirm the idea that such complements do not contain the subjunctive feature in their CP and therefore are not true subjunctives.

If this analysis is correct, and if subjunctive-like finite equivalents of 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 core group of complements that do constitute the subjunctive mood in this language. The analysis proposed in Kempchinsky (2009) provides a possible solution in this context. The central idea that Kempchinsky puts forward is that the core group of subjunctive complements across languages correspond to embedded imperatives. Both subjunctives and imperatives are associated with a special type of operator, which Kempchinsky calls the *imperative operator*. The syntactic effect of this operator in the context of subjunctive complements is to ban the co-reference between the matrix and the embedded subject, producing the effect known as subject obviation.

If Kempchinsky is correct, then her analysis should apply to SC as well. In other words, this language should also contain a core group of subjunctive complements that are associated with the imperative operator and that therefore ban the co-reference between the matrix and the embedded subject. In (25) we can see that such a group of complements does indeed exist in SC:

(25) a. Naređujem da to napraviš/*napravim
order(1.p.sg.) that it do(2.p.sg.) do(1.p.sg.)
"I order that you/*I do it"

b. Inzistiram da dođeš / *dođem
insist(1.p.sg.) that come(2.p.sg.) come(1.p.sg.)
"I insist that you/*I come"

c. Molio bih da odeš / *odem.
ask would(1.p.sg.) that leave(2.p.sg.) leave(1.p.sg.)
"I would ask that you/*I leave"

Moreover, unlike the finite equivalents of infinitives that we saw in (20), the complements that we observe here have very coherent semantic characteristics because they can only be selected by directive verbs. These are the types of verbs that always introduce a mood shift in the expressions where they appear (given that they are always associated with irrealis interpretations). Hence complements selected by these verbs can normally be analyzed as part of a separate subjunctive mood in SC, because they

correspond to subjunctives in other, non-Balkan languages. If the same analysis 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. For the moment, though, I cannot yet claim this with certainty because I still need to conduct further research in other Balkan languages.

5. Conclusion

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

References

Agouraki, Y. "A Modern Greek complementizer and its significance for Universal Grammar." *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3. 1991. 1-24.

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

Chomsky, N. "Derivation by Phase." In *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18*. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL. 1999.

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

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

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

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

Tsoulas, G. "Remarks on the structure and interpretation of *na*-clauses." *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, 14. 1993. 191-206.