

# Subjunctive Complements in Slavic and Romance A Comparative Perspective

Tomislav Sočanac

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Italia

**Abstract** The paper will focus on subjunctive complements in Slavic languages, comparing them with their counterparts in Romance languages, where the subjunctive has been much more extensively studied than in Slavic. We will observe that, despite the surface morphological contrasts in subjunctive marking between these two language groups, subjunctives in Slavic and Romance nonetheless share the bulk of the underlying semantic and syntactic clausal properties. As a result, Romance and Slavic subjunctive will be analysed as constituting a common clausal mood category, which corresponds to a distinct syntactic clause type.

**Keywords** Subjunctive complements. Mood and modality. Verbal mood. Clausal mood. Slavic languages. Romance languages.

**Summary** 1 Introduction. – 2 Subjunctive Mood and Non-veridicality. – 3 Romance vs Slavic Subjunctive: Surface Morphology. – 4 Romance and Slavic Subjunctive: Common Clausal Properties. – 4.1 Subjunctive Distribution and Non-veridicality. – 4.2 Tense. – 4.3 Subject Obviation. – 4.4 Long-distance A'-Movement. – 5 Indicative vs Subjunctive Clausal Mood: Formal account. – 6 Conclusion.



## 1 Introduction

The main focus of this paper will be subjunctive complements in Slavic languages, which have not received sufficient attention in the literature so far.<sup>1</sup> The primary languages that I will be looking at in this context are Russian, Polish and Bulgarian, which were shown to be largely representative of the Slavic subjunctive as a whole, both in terms of its morpho-syntactic realization and in terms of its distribution (Sočanac 2017). Subjunctive complements in these languages will be studied through a comparative approach which will relate them to their counterparts in Romance, where the subjunctive mood has been much more extensively studied than in Slavic. This will allow us to observe that, despite the contrasts in the morphological marking of the subjunctive in these two groups of languages (more on those in §3), Romance and Slavic subjunctives nonetheless share the bulk of the underlying syntactic and semantic clausal properties. As a result, they will be analyzed as constituting the same syntactic clause type, which is distinct from clause types associated with other mood categories, such as the indicative.

The main difference between Slavic and Romance languages in this context is that the latter mark the subjunctive through distinctive verbal morphology, whereas the former do not contain dedicated verb forms for the subjunctive mood (see §3). The lack of distinctive subjunctive morphology in Slavic languages has meant that the traditional descriptive grammars of Slavic generally did not list the subjunctive as one of the mood categories present in these languages. Nevertheless, in this paper I will show that subjunctive mood can be marked through different types of morphological items cross-linguistically, which can be either verbal or non-verbal. Moreover, subjunctive complements across different languages will be shown to exhibit common underlying clausal properties, regardless of the differences in their surface morphological marking from language to language. This will lead to the conclusion that subjunctive is present as a separate mood category in Slavic languages as well and, more broadly, that subjunctive should not only be seen as a verbal mood but also as a clausal mood.

In §2, I will provide an introductory summary outlining the main properties of the subjunctive on a cross-linguistic level, and brief-

---

The research that resulted in the present paper was made possible by the support from the Swiss National Science Foundation. I would also like to thank Genoveva Puskas, Iliyana Krapova and Lena Baunaz (among others) for helpful discussions and suggestions that allowed me to improve and develop the argument and find the relevant data. Any potential mistakes that may remain in the paper are my own.

**1** Some of the more recent theoretical studies of the subjunctive in Slavic that can be mentioned here are Antonenko (2008), Krapova (1998), Sočanac (2017), Todorović (2012), or Tomaszewicz (2012), among others.

ly introducing some of the most influential theories pertaining to this mood category. §3 will look at different types of morphological marking of the subjunctive across languages, focusing specifically on the contrasts that can be observed between Romance and Slavic in this context. §4 will then move beyond these surface morphological contrasts in order to outline the deeper clausal properties that are shared between subjunctive complements in these two groups of languages. §5 will propose a brief formal analysis of the underlying structure and the syntactic realization of subjunctive complements in Slavic and Romance, which will account for the bulk of their clausal properties and the contrasts that they will be shown to exhibit with respect to their indicative counterparts. Finally, §6 will summarize and conclude the paper.

## 2 Subjunctive Mood and Non-veridicality

Before I focus on the main topic of the paper (i.e. Slavic subjunctive in comparison to Romance), I will begin by providing a brief introductory overview of the essential cross-linguistic properties of the subjunctive mood as such, and the main contrasts that it exhibits with respect to other mood categories, particularly the indicative. The main type of syntactic environment where the subjunctive mood is found across languages involves clausal subordination, i.e. embedded subjunctive complements introduced under different types of matrix-clause predicates, as in (1):

1. a. *Voglio che Gianni venga domani.* (Italian)  
       want<sub>1.SG.</sub> that G. come<sub>3.SG.SUBJ</sub> tomorrow  
       ‘I want Gianni to come tomorrow’.
- b. *Le patron exige que nous finissions ce travail.* (French)  
       the boss demand<sub>3.SG.</sub> that we finish<sub>1.PL.SUBJ</sub> this work  
       ‘The boss demands that we finish this work’.

The paper will primarily focus on the syntactic contexts of the type exemplified in (1), which constitute the core cases of subjunctive use cross-linguistically, whereas some other syntactic environments where this mood can also be occasionally found (e.g. in matrix clauses or relative clauses) will not be dealt with here due to space constraints.

The main focus of the authors dealing with the subjunctive (and with mood distinctions more broadly) has been to reach a comprehensive definition of the mood category in question, accounting for its semantic contributions as well as the range of syntactic contexts along which it is distributed. Mood in general is typically defined as the grammatical expression of modality, the latter being a semantic notion having to do with the speaker’s (or some other epistemic agent’s) perception or

attitude towards the propositional content of any given clause (Palmer 2001; Portner 2018). Subjunctive mood in this context has been typically related to modalities of unrealized expressions (*irrealis*), as opposed to the indicative mood, which tends to appear in statements about the actual world (*realis*). The contrast in question is illustrated in the French examples in (2), where we can see the indicative complement introduced under the assertive predicate *dire* ‘say’ (2a), used to describe a particular state-of-affairs in the world, and the subjunctive appearing under the volitional predicate *vouloir* ‘want’ (2b), denoting a proposition that is yet unrealized in the actual world.

2. a. *Jean dit que Marie part demain.* (French)  
 J. say3.SG. that M. leave3.SG.IND tomorrow  
 ‘Jean says that Marie leaves tomorrow’.
- b. *Jean veut que Marie parte.*  
 J. want3.SG. that M. leave3.SG.SUBJ  
 ‘Jean wants Marie to leave’.

Nevertheless, deeper studies of the semantic contributions and the distribution of the indicative and the subjunctive mood across languages have shown that the *realis/irrealis* distinction described above is too simplistic and unable to fully account for the properties of the mood categories in question. One of the more obvious problems in this context has to do with mood selection by epistemic, propositional attitude verbs, such as *think* or *believe*. Even though such predicates do not introduce direct statements about the actual world and are hence not *realis*,<sup>2</sup> they typically select indicative as opposed to subjunctive complements across languages, as shown in the French and Spanish examples in (3).<sup>3</sup>

3. a. *Je pense que Jean part demain.* (French)  
 I think1.SG. that J. leave3.SG.IND tomorrow  
 ‘I think that Jean leaves tomorrow’.
- b. *Creo que Juan viene este mes.* (Spanish)  
 believe1.SG. that J. come3.SG.IND this month.  
 ‘I believe that Juan is coming this month’.

<sup>2</sup> Rather than referring to the actual world, propositional attitude verbs are usually analyzed in the semantic literature as introducing a *set of possible worlds* compatible with the epistemic model of the speaker (or some other epistemic agent) (cf. Portner 2018 or Quer 1998, for instance).

<sup>3</sup> One Romance language which constitutes an exception here is Italian, because it tends to introduce subjunctive complements under propositional attitude verbs as well, as opposed to indicatives. The specific properties of Italian in this context will not be further addressed in the present paper, but cf. Giannakidou, Mari (2015, 2017) for more on Italian epistemic predicates and their mood selection.

Data of this type have led a number of authors to propose more refined semantic approaches to mood distinctions, capable of overcoming the problems inherent in the traditional realis/irrealis approach to mood.<sup>4</sup>

The main approach that I will describe here, which will be shown as relevant both in Romance and in Slavic, is the one based on the distinction between the notions of *veridicality* and *non-veridicality* (Egré 2008; Giannakidou 1998, 2009; Zwarts 1995 etc.). The semantic approaches based on (non)veridicality can differ depending on the author, but the specific perspective that I will assume here (because of its usefulness in the context of mood distinctions) is the one adopted by Giannakidou, summarized in (4) below:

#### 4. (Non)veridicality

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

To put it in slightly simpler terms, relevant for the present discussion, the embedded clausal complement can be considered as veridical if some individual *x* (typically the speaker or the matrix-clause subject) is committed to its truth, whereas the absence of such truth commitment means that the complement is non-veridical. When it comes to mood selection, the prediction is that predicates which bring about truth commitment (i.e. veridical predicates) will select the indicative, whereas predicates that do not involve truth commitment (non-veridical predicates) will select the subjunctive (Giannakidou 1998, 2009). This covers the most typical contexts of indicative vs subjunctive distribution across languages: indicative-selecting predicates such as assertives (e.g. *say*, *claim*) or factives (e.g. *know*) are all veridical because they imply a truth commitment on the part of some epistemic agent, whereas the typical subjunctive-selecting verbs such as volitionals (e.g. *want*, *prefer*) or directives (e.g. *order*, *demand*) are non-veridical because they do not imply any truth commitment.

The (non)veridicality approach described above can also overcome some of the problems noted in relation to the realis/irrealis approach

<sup>4</sup> Due to space constraints, here I will only introduce one particularly influential perspective in this context, i.e. the *(non)veridicality* approach. Nevertheless, there is a large number of additional theoretical notions that have been proposed in the literature in order to account for the subjunctive vs indicative distinction: *(non)assertivity* (Hopper 1975), *possible worlds* (Farkas 1992b; Portner 1997), *evaluative models* (Quer 1998), or *emotivity* (Baunaz, Puskas 2014), among others. Those interested in a more comprehensive overview of the subjunctive and of mood distinctions in general are directed to these sources.

to mood distinctions, specifically when it comes to propositional attitude verbs of the type exemplified in (3). Even though clauses in (3) do not involve direct statements about an actual state-of-affairs in the world, they nonetheless imply an epistemic commitment on the part of the speaker/subject (i.e. regardless of whether the embedded complements are true *per se*, the speaker/subject believes in their truth, and is thus committed to it). As a result, the predicates in (3) should be considered as veridical and hence the fact that they select the indicative is expected under this approach. Note, moreover, that the negated variants of these predicates (i.e. *not think*, *not believe*) typically select the subjunctive, as opposed to the indicative:

5. a. *Je pense pas que Jean parte demain.* (French)  
 I think<sub>1.SG.</sub> not that J. leave<sub>3.SG.SUBJ</sub> tomorrow  
 'I don't think that Jean leaves tomorrow'.
- b. *No creo que Juan venga este mes.* (Spanish)  
 not believe<sub>1.SG.</sub> that J. come<sub>3.SG.SUBJ</sub> this month  
 'I don't believe that Juan is coming this month'.

The presence of the matrix negation in (5) means that the speaker/subject is no longer committed to the truth of the embedded clause and thus the semantic context is no longer veridical but non-veridical. As a result, the introduction of the subjunctive in such contexts is predicted by the (non)veridicality approach as well. These are some of the reasons why this theoretical perspective is more successful when it comes to accounting for the cross-linguistic mood distributions than some of its theoretical alternatives, such the traditional realis/irrealis approach.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted, however, that subjunctive distribution in particular is a notoriously difficult issue, and none of the semantic definitions of the subjunctive that have been proposed in the literature (including non-veridicality) can fully account for the entire range of contexts where this mood is observed across languages. One especially difficult context of subjunctive use involves those cases where subjunctive complements are selected by so-called 'factive-emotive predicates' (e.g. *regret*, *be glad*), which one observes in Romance languages in particular, as illustrated in the French example in (i). (i) *Je regrette qu' il soit parti.*

I regret<sub>1.SG.</sub> that he have<sub>3.SG.SUBJ</sub> left

These types of predicates would not be expected to select the subjunctive due to their factive/veridical properties, and yet they consistently select this mood in languages such as Italian, French or Spanish (Baunaz, Puskas 2014; Giorgi 2009 etc.). Such problematic cases of subjunctive distribution will not be dealt with in this paper, because they are not observed in Slavic languages, where factive emotives select the indicative, as opposed to the subjunctive (Krapova 2002; Sočanac 2017). The paper will only focus on those cases of subjunctive distribution that are observed both in Slavic and in Romance.

### 3 Romance vs Slavic Subjunctive: Surface Morphology

As we could already observe in some of the examples in §2, Romance subjunctive is distinguished from other mood categories, such as the indicative, through verbal morphology, i.e. both the subjunctive and the indicative are marked through their own dedicated verb forms, as shown once again in the examples below:

6. a. *Dice che Gianni viene domani.* (Italian)  
say3.SG. that G. come3.SG.IND tomorrow  
'He says that Gianni is coming tomorrow'.  
b. *Voglio che Gianni venga domani.*  
want1.SG. that G. come3.SG.SUBJ tomorrow  
'I want Gianni to come tomorrow'.
7. a. *Je sais que Jean vient demain.* (French)  
I know1.SG. that J. come3.SG.IND tomorrow  
'I know that Jean is coming tomorrow'.  
b. *J'exige que Jean vienne tout de suite.*  
I demand1.SG. that J. come3.SG.SUBJ right away  
'I demand that Jean comes right away'.

The use of distinctive verb forms is the most common cross-linguistic strategy used to differentiate the subjunctive from other mood categories.

Nevertheless, if we now look at Slavic languages in this context, we will observe that they do not exhibit the same type of mood marking. Let us first compare the examples in (8-9):

8. a. *Ivan prišel segodnja.* (Russian)  
I. came3.SG. today  
'Ivan came today'.  
b. *Ja hoću, čtoby Ivan prišel segodnja.*  
I want1.SG., that I. came3.SG. today  
'I want Ivan to come today'.
9. a. *Jan przyszedł dzisiaj.* (Polish)  
J. came3.SG. today  
'Jan came today'.  
b. *Chcę, żeby Jan przyszedł dzisiaj.*  
want1.SG. that J. came3.SG. today  
'I want Jan to come today'.

If we compare simple matrix assertions in (8-9a), which represent the most typical contexts of indicative use, and the irrealis/non-veridical complements to volitional verbs in (8-9b), which constitute the

most typical environments of subjunctive use across languages, we can note that the verb forms appearing in both of these contexts are the same. Hence if we limited our attention only to verbal morphology, there would be no way to overtly distinguish subjunctive-type complements from indicatives in Slavic.

Nevertheless, if we focus more closely on the context of clausal subordination, we can note some overt morphological contrasts between complements introduced under veridical predicates (e.g. *say*, *know*) and those introduced under non-veridical predicates (e.g. *want*, *prefer*) in Slavic as well, even though these contrasts are not situated on the level of verbal morphology.

10. a. *On govorit, čto Ivan prišel segodnja.* (Russian)  
 he say3.SG. that-IND I. came3.SG. today  
 'He says that Ivan came today'.
- b. *On hočet, čtoby Ivan prišel segodnja.*  
 he want3.SG. that-SUBJ I. came3.SG. today  
 'He wants Ivan to come today'.
11. a. *Wiem, że Jan przyszedł dzisiaj.* (Polish)  
 know1.SG. that-IND J. came3.SG. today  
 'I know that Jan came today'.
- b. *Chcę, żeby Jan przyszedł dzisiaj.*  
 want1.SG. that-SUBJ J. came3.SG. today  
 'I want Jan to come today'.
12. a. *Znam, że dojde dnes.* (Bulgarian)  
 know1.SG. that-IND came3.SG. today  
 'I know that she came today'.
- b. *Predpočitam da dojde dnes.*  
 prefer1.SG. that-SUBJ come today  
 'I prefer that she come today'.

In the examples (10-12), we can observe that indicative and subjunctive-type complements in Slavic are morphologically distinguished through syntactic items appearing at the beginning of the embedded clause: respectively, *čto* vs *čtoby* in Russian (10); *że* vs *żeby* in Polish (11); and *če* vs *da* in Bulgarian (12). Similar contrasts are observed in other Slavic languages as well (cf. Sočanac 2017). In the following section, we will see that, despite the difference in their overt morphological marking, subjunctive-type complements in Slavic and Romance share the bulk of their semantic and syntactic clausal properties.



## 4 Romance and Slavic Subjunctive: Common Clausal Properties

Besides the overt morphological contrasts that we observed in §3 between indicatives and subjunctives in both Romance and Slavic (expressed through verbal morphology and clause-initial items, respectively), there is a series of additional, more underlying differences between these two types of embedded complements as well. The contrasts that we will focus on in this context involve the following areas: the semantics of (non)veridicality; tense; embedded subject licensing; and A'-movement from the embedded to the matrix clause.

### 4.1 Subjunctive Distribution and Non-veridicality

In §2 we noted that one of the criteria that can be used in order to account for the distribution of the subjunctive vs indicative mood across languages has to do with the semantic notion of (non)veridicality, in the sense of Giannakidou (1998, 2009): those verbs that imply a truth commitment on the part of the speaker or the subject (i.e. veridical predicates) are expected to select the indicative, whereas verbs that do not imply such a truth commitment (non-veridical predicates) are expected to select the subjunctive. The most typical groups of veridical predicates are assertives (e.g. *say, claim*), factives (e.g. *know, realize*) and (non-negated) epistemics (e.g. *think, believe*). On the other hand, the typical groups of non-veridical predicates are volitionals (e.g. *want, prefer*), directives (e.g. *order, demand*) and negated epistemics (e.g. *not think, not believe*).<sup>6</sup> In the examples below, we can note once again that (in most cases at least) veridical and non-veridical verbs in Romance exhibit the expected mood-selection patterns:

13. a. *Dice che Gianni viene domani.* (Italian)  
say3.SG. that G. come3.SG.IND tomorrow  
'He says that Gianni is coming tomorrow'.
- b. *Jean sait que Marie part demain.* (French)  
J. know3.SG. that M. leave3.SG.IND tomorrow  
'Jean knows that Marie leaves tomorrow'.
- c. *Creo que Juan viene este mes.* (Spanish)  
believe1.SG. that J. come3.SG.IND this month  
'I believe that Juan is coming this month'.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Giannakidou (1998, 2009) for a more detailed semantic elaboration of the veridicality vs non-veridicality distinction along different groups of predicates, which I cannot get into here due to space constraints.

14. a. *Voglio che Gianni venga domani.* (Italian)  
 want1.SG. that G. come3.SG.SUBJ tomorrow  
 'I want Gianni to come tomorrow'.
- b. *J'exige que Jean vienne tout de suite.* (French)  
 I demand1.SG. that J. come3.SG.SUBJ right away  
 'I demand that Jean comes right away'.
- c. *No creo que Juan venga este mes.* (Spanish)  
 not believe1.SG. that J. come3.SG.SUBJ this month  
 'I don't believe that Juan is coming this month'.

Modulo a small number of exceptions (see fn.3 and fn.5), indicative vs subjunctive distribution in Romance largely falls along the lines of the semantic distinction in terms of (non)veridicality: veridical predicates of the type exemplified in (13) select indicative complements, whereas non-veridical predicates (14) select subjunctives.

If the clause-initial items used to introduce indicative and subjunctive-type complements in the Slavic examples we observed earlier in (10-12) are to be viewed as similar types of mood markers as the indicative and subjunctive verb forms in Romance, then one would expect their distribution to fall along the lines of the semantic contrasts in terms of (non)veridicality as well. In the examples below, we can see that this is indeed the case: veridical predicates in (15) select indicative mood markers (Russian *čto*; Polish *że*; Bulgarian *če*), whereas non-veridical predicates in (16) select subjunctive markers (Russian *čtoby*; Polish *żeby*; Bulgarian *da*).

15. a. *On govorit, čto Ivan prišel segodnja.* (Russian)  
 he say3.SG. that-IND I. came3.SG. today  
 'He says that Ivan came today'.
- b. *Wiem, że Jan przyszedł dzisiaj.* (Polish)  
 know1.SG.that-IND J. came3.SG. today  
 'I know that Jan came today'.
- c. *Az mislja, če Ivan dojde dnes.* (Bulgarian)  
 I think1.SG. that-IND I. came today  
 'I think that Ivan came today'.
16. a. *Ja predpočitaju, čtoby on prišel segodnja.* (Russian)  
 I prefer1.SG. that-SUBJ he came3.SG. today  
 'I prefer that he came today'.
- b. *Rozkazuje, żeby Jan przyszedł dzisiaj.* (Polish)  
 order3.SG. that-SUBJ J. came today  
 'He orders Jan to come today'.
- c. *Ne vjarvjam da dojde dnes.* (Bulgarian)  
 not believe1.SG. that-SUBJ come3.SG. today  
 'I don't believe he comes today'.

Just like in Romance, veridical predicates such as assertives (15a), factives (15b) or (non-negated) epistemics (15c) select the indicative, whereas non-veridical predicates like volitionals (16a), directives (16b) and negated epistemics (16c) select the subjunctive in Slavic as well. Hence the semantic notion of non-veridicality can be considered as a defining characteristic of the subjunctive both in Slavic and in Romance.

## 4.2 Tense

Another clausal property which distinguishes subjunctives from indicatives in both Romance and Slavic languages is tense. It has been widely observed in the literature that subjunctive complements across languages exhibit deficient tense which is dependent on the tense of the matrix clause. Indicative complements, on the other hand, are less temporally dependent in this sense (Landau 2004; Manzini 2000; Raposo 1987 etc.). One of the more salient manifestations of this contrast is the fact that the embedded predicate in indicative complements can generally denote all types of temporal relations with respect to the reference time<sup>7</sup> of the matrix predicate, whereas the embedded predicate in subjunctives is typically restricted to a future-referring interval with respect to the matrix tense and, as a result, it cannot denote an event that took place prior to the one denoted by the matrix predicate. The temporal contrast in question is illustrated through the French example in (17) for Romance and through the Russian and Bulgarian examples in (18) and (19), respectively, for Slavic (taken from Sočanac 2017):

17. a. *Je crois qu'il est venu hier / vient maintenant / viendra demain.*  
 I believe<sub>1.SG.</sub> that he have<sub>3.SG.</sub> come yesterday / come<sub>3.SG.</sub> now / come<sub>3.SG.</sub> FUT. tomorrow  
 'I believe that he came yesterday / is coming now / will come tomorrow'.
- b. *Je veux qu'il vienne demain / \*soit venu hier.*  
 I want<sub>1.SG.</sub> that he come<sub>3.SG.</sub> SUBJ tomorrow / have<sub>3.SG.</sub> SUBJ come yesterday  
 'I want him to come tomorrow / \* to have come yesterday'.
18. a. *Ja dumaju, što on ušel včera / ukhodit segodnja / ujdiot zavtra.*  
 I think<sub>1.SG.</sub> that- IND he left<sub>3.SG.</sub> yesterday / leave<sub>3.SG.</sub> today / leave<sub>3.SG.</sub> FUT. tomorrow  
 'I think that he left yesterday / is leaving today / will leave tomorrow'.

<sup>7</sup> The notion of 'reference time' is used in the sense of Stowell (1993).

- b. *Ja hoću, čtoby on ušel zavtra / \*on ušel včera.*  
 I want<sub>1.SG.</sub> that-SUBJ he left<sub>3.SG.</sub> tomorrow / he left<sub>3.SG.</sub> yesterday  
 ‘I want him to leave tomorrow / \* to have left yesterday’.
19. a. *Znam, će toi otide včera / otiva dnes / šte otide utre.*  
 know<sub>1.SG.</sub> that-IND he left<sub>3.SG.</sub> yesterday / leave<sub>3.SG.</sub> today / will leave<sub>3.SG.</sub> tomorrow  
 ‘I know that he left yesterday / is leaving today / will leave tomorrow’.
- b. *Zapovjadam da otide utre / \*otide včera.*  
 order<sub>1.SG.</sub> that-SUBJ leave<sub>3.SG.</sub> tomorrow / left<sub>3.SG.</sub> yesterday  
 ‘I order him to leave tomorrow / \* to have left yesterday’.

The data in (17-19) thus further demonstrate the shared grammatical patterns that can be observed between Romance and Slavic subjunctives.

### 4.3 Subject Obviation

Another grammatical area where both Romance and Slavic subjunctives exhibit similar contrasts with respect to their indicative counterparts has to do with the licensing of the embedded clause subject. In this context, it has been noted that subjunctive complements across languages are typically associated with an anti-control phenomenon known as *subject obviation*, which can be described as the ban on conjoined reference between the matrix and the embedded subject (Everaert 1986; Farkas 1992a; Picallo 1985 etc.). Indicative complements, on the other hand, are not subject to this restriction.

Thus, if we first look at the indicative complements in Romance and Slavic examples in (20), we can note that, when the matrix and the embedded subject agree in person and number, they can either refer to the same entity or to separate entities (as shown by the lower-case indices next to the clausal subjects).

20. a. *María<sub>i</sub> dice que ella<sub>ij</sub> viene mañana.* (Spanish)  
 M. say<sub>3.SG.</sub> that she come<sub>3.SG.IND</sub> tomorrow  
 ‘Maria says that she is coming tomorrow’.
- b. *Marija<sub>i</sub> dumaet, čto ona<sub>ij</sub> pridiot zavtra.* (Russian)  
 M. think<sub>3.SG.</sub> that-IND she come<sub>3.SG.FUT</sub> tomorrow  
 ‘Maria thinks that she will come tomorrow’.
- c. *María<sub>i</sub> wie, że ona<sub>ij</sub> odejdzie jutro.* (Polish)  
 M. know<sub>3.SG.</sub> that-IND she leave<sub>3.SG.FUT</sub> tomorrow  
 ‘Maria knows that she will leave tomorrow’.

The embedded pronominal subject *she* in the examples in (20) can either refer to the matrix subject *Maria* or to some other (female) referent, and there is no particular restriction when it comes to embed-

ded subject reference in this context.

When it comes to subjunctive complements, on the other hand, the embedded subject can no longer refer to the matrix subject, due to the effect of subject obviation (as shown by the asterisk, indicating ungrammaticality, next to the variant where the matrix and the embedded subjects are co-indexed).

21. a. *Juan<sub>i</sub> quiere que él<sub>i,ij}</sub> venga mañana.* (Spanish)  
 J. want<sub>3.SG.</sub> that he come<sub>3.SG.SUBJ</sub> tomorrow
- b. *Ivan<sub>i</sub> hočet, čtoby on<sub>i,ij}</sub> prišel zavra.* (Russian)  
 I. want<sub>3.SG.</sub> that-SUBJ he came<sub>3.SG.</sub> tomorrow
- c. *Jan<sub>i</sub> chce, żeby on<sub>i,ij}</sub> przyszedł jutro.* (Polish)  
 J. want<sub>3.SG.</sub> that-SUBJ he came<sub>3.SG.</sub> tomorrow  
 'John wants \*(him) to come tomorrow.'

The examples in (21) thus show us that subject obviation constitutes yet another clausal property that can be observed both in Romance and in Slavic subjunctive complements.<sup>8</sup>

#### 4.4 Long-distance A'-Movement

The last grammatical phenomenon that will be discussed here involves the movement of syntactic constituents from the embedded to the matrix clause, specifically A'-movement.<sup>9</sup> Certain Slavic languages, such as Russian or Polish, place greater constraints on this type of movement than other languages (for reasons that are too complex to address here) (cf. Antonenko 2008; Orszulak 2016; Witkoś 1995). This is yet another context where we can observe contrasts between subjunctive and indicative complements. If we look at long-distance A'-movement of wh-items (22) or topics (23), we can note that this syntactic operation produces ungrammaticality in the case of indicative complements in Polish or Russian, but it is generally allowed in the case of subjunctives.

<sup>8</sup> It should be noted, however, that subject obviation is not equally observed across all Slavic languages but (due to independent grammatical reasons that are too complicated to discuss here) are stronger in certain languages (e.g. East and West Slavic) than in others (South or Balkan Slavic). Cf. Farkas (1992a) or Sočanac (2017) for a more detailed explanation of the contrasts in question.

<sup>9</sup> The theoretical perspective adopted here assumes that cases where a given lexical item is associated with more than one position in the sentence structure are the result of syntactic movement (cf. Chomsky 1981, 1995). A'-movement involves displacing syntactic constituents to non-argument positions (as opposed to A-movement, which displaces them to argument positions).

22. a. \* $Co_i$  *Maria sądziła*, że *Piotr wcześniej studiował t\_i?* (Polish)  
 what M. thought3.SG. that-IND P. before studied3.SG.  
 ‘What did Maria think that Piotr studied before?’
- b.  $Co_i$  *Maria chce*, żeby *Piotr kupić t\_i?*  
 what M. want3.SG. that-SUBJ P. bought3.SG.  
 ‘What does Maria want Piotr to buy?’  
 (Orszulak 2016, 44)
23. a. \* $Ja$  *doktor\_i* *videl* *čto t\_i* *pod’ezżał*. (Russian)  
 I doctor-top. saw1.SG. that-IND arrived3.SG.  
 ‘I saw that the doctor arrived’.
- b.  $Ja$  *doktor\_i* *hoću*, *čtoby t\_i* *cašče* *priezżał*.  
 I doctor-top. want1.SG. that-SUBJ more-often arrived3.SG.  
 ‘I want the doctor to arrive more often’.  
 (Antonenko 2008, 7)

The data in (22-23) thus show us that, in addition to other subjunctive vs indicative contrasts we noted before, indicatives also differ from subjunctives in that they present a greater clausal barrier in the context long-distance movement and matrix-embedded clausal dependencies.<sup>10</sup> In the following section, I will propose a brief formal analysis that will account for the contrasts that we observed between indicative and subjunctive complements.

## 5 Indicative vs Subjunctive Clausal Mood: Formal Account

The data we observed in §4 lead to the conclusion that the indicative and the subjunctive should be seen as two different clausal moods, because they were shown to exhibit a whole series of clausal contrasts in both Slavic and Romance languages. I will argue that these contrasts are best accounted for under the analysis that views indicative and subjunctive complements as corresponding to separate embedded clause types, which are selected by the matrix predicates under two formally distinct CP (Complementizer Phrase) projections. In this sense, indicative and subjunctive complements are somewhat analogous to embedded declarative and interrogative complements, which are typically selected under separate CP projections headed by different complementizers, as shown in the English examples below:

<sup>10</sup> The fact that indicative complements present a greater clausal barrier than subjunctives in the context of matrix-embedded dependencies is widely observed on a cross-linguistic basis. Cf. Giannakidou, Quer (1997), Progovac (1993) or Sočanac (2017), among others.

24. a. *I think **that** he left.*  
 b. *I wonder **if** he left.*

A similar syntactic pattern can be plausibly argued to obtain in the context of embedded mood selection in Slavic languages in particular, because we saw that Slavic subjunctives are overtly distinguished from indicatives through complementizer-type items situated on the left periphery of the embedded clause (see §3). Given that Romance subjunctives were shown to share the bulk of the clausal properties observed with their Slavic counterparts, I will claim that subjunctive complements in both of these language groups correspond to a separate embedded CP-type.

The last issue that I want to address here concerns the relative syntactic positioning of the indicative vs subjunctive CP in the embedded clause structure. In this context, I will adopt the analysis proposed in Rizzi (1997), which argued, more generally, that clauses are not introduced under a single CP projection but under a broader syntactic field, typically referred to as the left periphery of the clause, which may contain several CP-type projections hosting different types of complementizers. In particular, Rizzi made a distinction between a higher CP/ForceP and a lower CP/FinP projection,<sup>11</sup> as illustrated (in a simplified form) in (25):

25. CP [ForceP.....FinP]

Rizzi's analysis allows to establish some finer syntactic distinctions between different types of clausal complements, particularly as it pertains to the complexity and the size of their underlying left-periphery structure.

I would like to propose that the CP projection under which indicatives are selected corresponds to the higher ForceP, whereas the subjunctive-related CP is the lower FinP. In other words, indicative clause type is encoded at the level of ForceP, whereas subjunctive clause type is encoded at the level of FinP. As a result, indicative complements contain a full-fledged left-periphery structure, while subjunctives contain a more truncated structure, as shown in (26-27) below:

<sup>11</sup> The higher ForceP (Force Phrase) encodes illocutionary force (e.g. declarative vs interrogative), whereas the lower FinP (Finiteness Phrase) determines whether the clause is finite or non-finite. Given that illocutionary force is primarily relevant in matrix contexts, all matrix clauses will contain ForceP. Embedded clauses, on the other hand, do not need to contain ForceP, since they typically do not encode illocutionary force. I will claim that ForceP is projected only in certain types of embedded clauses, not in others (see the discussion above). A similar idea has already been put forward by a number of different authors (e.g. Roussou 2009). FinP, on the other hand, needs to be present in all embedded (as well as matrix) clauses, because (non)finiteness is a relevant property that needs to be determined for all clauses.

26. [ForceP [FinP [TP [vP]]]] → indicative structure
27. [~~Force~~P [FinP [TP [vP]]]] → subjunctive structure

The fact that they contain a relatively impoverished structure can explain why subjunctives constitute a more ‘deficient’ clausal domain than indicatives, and why they are more dependent on the matrix clause in areas such as tense or embedded subject licensing, among others (see 4.2 and 4.3). The same analysis can also explain why subjunctives constitute a lesser clausal barrier than indicatives when it comes to long-distance A'-movement and matrix-embedded dependencies more generally (see 4.4). The contrasts between indicatives and subjunctives in this context are due to the fact that the latter contain less syntactic material separating the matrix from the embedded clause.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have shown that Slavic subjunctives share the bulk of the clausal properties observed with their Romance counterparts, despite the difference in the overt morphological marking that they exhibit (i.e. the fact that Romance subjunctives are marked through dedicated verbal morphology whereas Slavic subjunctives are marked through separate syntactic items appearing at the beginning of the embedded clause). As a result, even though Slavic languages do not contain dedicated subjunctive verb forms, Slavic subjunctive should nonetheless be viewed as a separate clausal mood category. From a formal standpoint, the grammatical contrasts that we observed between subjunctives and indicatives in Slavic and Romance were accounted for by claiming that these two types of complements are selected under two distinct CP projections, which occupy different structural positions in the left periphery of the embedded clause.

## Bibliography

- Antonenko, Andrei (2008). “The Nature of Russian Subjunctive Clauses”. Ms. Stony Brook University.
- Baunaz, Lena; Puskas, Genoveva (2014). “The Selection of French Mood”. Côté, Marie-Hélène; Mathieu, Eric (eds), *Variation within and across Romance Languages. Selected Papers from the 41th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* (Ottawa, 5-7 May 2011). Ottawa: John Benjamins, 233-53.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Egrè, Paul (2008). “Question-embedding and Factivity”. *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, 77(1), 85-125.



- Everaert, Martin (1986). "Long Reflexivization and Obviation in Romance Languages". Coopmans, Peter et al. (eds), *Formal Parameters of Generative Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 51-72.
- Farkas, Donka (1992a). "On Obviation". Sag, Ivan; Szabolcsi, Anna (eds), *Lexical Matters*. Stanford CA: CSLI, 85-109.
- Farkas, Donka (1992b). "On the Semantics of Subjunctive Complements". Hirschbuehler, Paul et al. (eds), *Romance Languages and the Modern Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 69-104.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia; Quer, Josep (1997). "Long-distance Licensing of Negative Indefinites". Forget, Danielle et al. (eds), *Negation and Polarity. Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 95-113.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia (1998). *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia (2009). "The Dependency of the Subjunctive Revisited: Temporal Semantics and Polarity". *Lingua*, 119, 1883-908.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia; Mari, Alda (2015). "Future and Universal Epistemic Modals. Reasoning with Non-veridicality and Partial Knowledge". Ms.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia; Mari, Alda (2017). "A Unified Analysis of the Future as Epistemic Modality. The View from Greek and Italian". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 17, 1-45.
- Giorgi, Alessandra (2009). "Toward a Syntax of the Subjunctive Mood". *Lingua*, 119, 1837-58.
- Hopper, Joan B. (1975). "On Assertive Predicates". Kimball, John (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*. London: Academic Press, 91-124.
- Krapova, Iliyana (1998). "Subjunctive Complements, Null Subjects and Case Checking in Bulgarian". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8(2), 73-93.
- Krapova, Iliyana (2002). "On the Left Periphery of the Bulgarian Sentence". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 12, 107-28.
- Landau, Ilan (2004). "The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22, 811-77.
- Manzini, Rita (2000). "Sentential Complementation. The Subjunctive". Coopmans, Peter et al. (eds), *Lexical Specification and Insertion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 241-67.
- Orszulak, Marcin (2016). "What Does *żeby* Introduce? Old and New Research Questions About the Polish *żeby* Complementizer". *Questions and Answers in Linguistics*, 3(1), 27-47.
- Palmer, Frank R. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Picallo, Carme M. (1985). *Opaque Domains* [PhD Dissertation]. New York: CUNY.
- Portner, Paul (1997). "The Semantics of Mood, Complementation and Conversational Force". *Natural Language Semantics*, 5(2), 167-212.
- Portner, Paul (2018). *Modality*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Progovac, Ljiljana (1993). "Subjunctive. The (Mis)behavior of Anaphora and Negative Polarity". *The Linguistic Review*, 10, 37-59.
- Quer, Josep (1998). *Mood at the Interface*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Raposo, Eduardo (1987). "Some Asymmetries in the Binding Theory of Romance". *The Linguistic Review*, 5, 75-110.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery". Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Berkeley: Kluwer, 281-337.
- Roussou, Anna (2009). "In the Mood for Control". *Lingua*, 119, 1811-36.

- Sočanac, Tomislav (2017). *Subjunctive Complements in Slavic Languages. A Syntax-Semantics Interface Approach* [PhD Dissertation]. Geneva: University of Geneva.
- Stowell, Tim (1993). "Syntax of Tense". Ms. UCLA.
- Todorović, Nataša (2012). *The Subjunctive and Indicative Da-complements in Serbian: A Syntactic-Semantic Approach* [PhD Dissertation]. Chicago: University of Illinois.
- Tomaszewicz, Barbara (2012). "Subjunctive Mood in Polish and the Clause Typing Hypothesis". Mihaliček, Vedrana et al. (eds), *Formal Studies in Slavic Linguistics*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 121-42.
- Witkoś, Jacek (1995). "Wh-extraction from Clausal Complements in Polish. A Minimality/locality Account". *Folia Linguistica* 39, 223-64.
- Zwart, Frans (1995). "Nonveridical Contexts". *Linguistic Analysis*, 25(3-4), 286-312.