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1 Subjunctive complements in Bulgarian

Like the rest of the Balkan languages (Modern Greek, Romanian, Albanian) Bulgarian lacks subjunctive morphology but features a specific type of complementation with a subjunctive-like interpretation. In constructions of this type, the embedded verb has indicative morphology and is fully inflected for person/number agreement, although there are some tense restrictions which will be discussed in greater detail further in the text. The only mark for the "subjunctive"\(^1\) appears to be the particle *da* which immediately precedes the finite verb, as illustrated in the examples (1) and (2) below:

   Ivan wants DA come-1sg/DA come-3sg
   "Ivan wants [for] me to come"/"Ivan wants to come"

2. Ivan se opita [e] da razbere v≤prosa.

\(^*\)I would like to express my deepest thanks to Hagit Borer, Anna Cardinaletti, Guglielmo Cinque, Sabine Iatridou and David Pesetsky for valuable suggestions and useful discussions of issues that bear (directly and indirectly) on the topic of subjunctives and control.

\(^1\) Although the term *subjunctive* is rather controversial in Bulgarian linguistics (cf. e.g. Maslov 1982), I will be using it as a cover term for all embedded clauses introduced by the special particle *da* and associated with a subjunctive (or subjunctive-like) interpretation.
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Ivan tried DA understand-3sg question-the
"Ivan tried to understand the question"

As far as the referential properties of the embedded subject are concerned, (1) and (2) present a curious asymmetry in terms of binding relations. In complements to verbs like want the null subject can but need not be coreferential with the matrix subject, while in complements to verbs like try the null subject is necessarily anaphoric upon the matrix subject and is therefore controlled by it.

In the present paper, I will argue that subjunctive clauses in Bulgarian are not structurally identical as regards the category of their null subject. Rather, the set divides between subjunctives like in (1) above which take a pro subject and those like in (2) which take a PRO subject. Following previous work (cf. Krapova 1997, to appear) I label the two subsets of subjunctives in Bulgarian Type I and Type II S(subjunctives) respectively. My aim is to show that the distribution of pro and PRO in Bulgarian can be derived on the basis of a correlation with the morphological content of subjunctive Tense. The analysis will lead to the conclusion that the control relation in clauses with Type II Ss, such as (2) above, does not result from properties intrinsic to PRO, but rather follows from lack of embedded Tense features and provides a configuration where Null Case can be checked successfully.

2 Typically, a Type I S is selected by epistemic verbs (e.g. nadjavam se ‘hope’, vjarvam ‘believe’, trjajba ‘must’, etc.) and volitionals/desideratives (e.g. iskam ‘want’, ‘elaja ‘wish’, etc.), while a Type II S is selected by control verbs (e.g. znaja ‘know how’, the root modal moga ‘can’, opitvam se ‘try’, zabravjam ‘forget’, uspjavan ‘succeed’, etc.) and possibly aspectual verbs (e.g. zapornam ‘begin’, prodsjavam ‘continue’, spiram ‘stop’, etc.). Within this semantically defined categorization, the term control verb can be correlated with the semantic property of control in its broadest sense, i.e. as referring to verbs which take in any non-freely interpreted empty category (Joseph 1992). Also, it is worth noting that the class of verbs which select a Type II S appears to be a mixed one and some of its representatives show certain ambiguities in their behavior as raising rather than control predicates, but I will leave open for further investigation the attempt to establish class membership in a more precise way.

3 Typologically, in all Balkan languages there is a subset of subjunctive-selecting predicates which induce an obligatory internal construal of the embedded null subject, regardless of the presence/absence of infinitives in these languages and/or of an additional subjunctive complementizer (cf. Iatridou 1993, Terzi
2 Null subjects in Bulgarian subjunctives

There is abundant evidence that the empty subject in cases like (1) vs. (2) is associated with an array of properties which uniquely identify them as pro and PRO, respectively. More concretely, in Type I Ss like (1) the null subject may alternate with a lexical DP or an overt pronoun, it may function as an expletive, it may take split antecedents, it permits both sloppy and strict identity readings, it is compatible with arbitrary effects and is not thematically constrained. On other hand, the null subject in Type II Ss like (2) is to be associated with anaphoric PRO since it instantiates none of the above properties. These differences are summarized in the table below (see Krapova 1997 for a detailed discussion):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type I S</th>
<th>Type II S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference</td>
<td>+pron</td>
<td>+anaph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternation with a lexical DP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>split antecedents</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covariant interpretation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbitrary effects</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thematic constraints</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1992, 1998, Roussou 1999 for Modern Greek; Turano 1993 for Albanian; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 for Romanian. The problem however is whether this type of coreference can be shown cross-linguistically to instantiate a control relation, and if it can, whether it indicates the presence of a category PRO in these languages, all of which have either lost completely the morphological category of the infinitive, or have limited its use considerably. The availability of PRO in languages with finite-only complements has been questioned or even denied in a number of works within the GB model on the basis of the governing properties of finite INFL (cf Philippaki-Warburton 1987, for Modern Greek, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, to appear, for Romanian and Bulgarian). It has been argued that subjunctives with anaphoric subjects are only apparent control cases and that the empty subject position should rather be occupied by pro. Various mechanisms have been proposed in order to capture the control facts. In the GB version these mechanisms reduce to possible ways of defining a GC for the embedded subject in the above mentioned languages, in order to account for its ambiguous behavior as a pronominal or as a bound variable (cf. Rivero 1987, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, etc.).
Consider for example the pair in (3):

(3) a. Ivan, iska_e toj/da/ pro dej da ostane pri nego.
    Ivan wanted-3sg he DA stay-3sg with him
    "Ivan wanted (him) to stay with him."

b. Ivan uspja PRO/*brat mu da ostane pri nego.4
    Ivan managed-3sg brother his DA stay-3sg with him

(3a) shows that only in Type I Ss the null subject can alternate with an overt one. The subject pronoun may be coreferent with the matrix subject, or refer to some salient DP from the context.5 In Type II Ss, on the other hand, which correspond to (3b), alternation with a lexical DP/pronoun is blocked and the understood subject has to be obligatorily controlled. Under the current proposal, the anaphoric relation exemplified in (3b) is to be attributed to the presence of a syntactic element, namely PRO, despite the fact that the embedded verb is finite (see Terzi 1998 for arguments from Modern Greek on compatibility between PRO and finiteness).

It could be argued (along the lines of Borer’s 1989 proposal) that the control relation in Type II Ss derives from the anaphoric properties of embedded AGR. However, person/number morphology does not change with the choice of complement clause type, but it is only (3b) which exhibits the standard control effect. It could also be argued that if control is an instantiation of an anaphoric relation rather than an indication for the presence of a particular linguistic element, namely PRO, the identity of matrix and embedded agreement features in (3b) is determined by the s-selectional properties of the matrix predicate, i.e. certain verbs in Bulgarian like try, manage, but not want, or hope, will impose such an anaphoric relation/interpretation. However, although it is clear that

---

4 In the text examples PRO and pro will always be given to the left of da which is meant to mark the presence of the respective null subject in the subjunctive complement. The actual structural positions will be discussed in section 4.

5 It should be pointed out, however, that when the subject pronoun is overt, each reading is associated with a different interpretation - focused in the coreferent reading and topocalized in the non-coreferent reading. Pending the discussion in section 4., and assuming that focus and topic phrases are situated in the left periphery of the clause (following Rizzi’s 1997 proposal), this contrast indicates that overt subjects in da-complements of Type I may not surface in one and the same position inside the embedded clause.
such a distinction in lexical properties indeed exists, I will show that the null embedded subjects in (3a) vs. (3b) have a different syntactic behavior which cannot be otherwise accounted for unless one postulates that they belong to different categories.

First, locality effects obtain only with Type II Ss, i.e. in subjunctives which take PRO subjects, since this is a property characteristic of obligatory control. The contrast in (4) is thus expected, given that (4a) is a control structure, while (4b) is not:

(4) a. [Na Ivan], [majka mu], mo’e [PRO da SE_{i,1} izmrie.
   of Ivan mother his is able DA self wash
   “Ivan’s mother can wash herself”
   b. [Na Ivan], [majka mu], se nadjava [pro_{i,2} da SE_{i,1} izmrie.
   of Ivan mother his hopes DA self wash
   “Ivan’s mother hopes to wash herself.”, or
   “Ivan’s mother hopes that he will wash himself “

(5) John’s mother hopes PRO to wash herself/*herself.

The PRO subject in (4a) can only be controlled by a local c-commanding antecedent, thus precluding a non-local construal of the embedded anaphor se (‘self’) with Ivan, similarly to the corresponding English example in (5). In (4b), on the other hand, which contains a pro subject, the reflexive can be construed with an antecedent (Ivan), which need not be local.

Further, the ungrammaticality of (6a) below which contains the impersonal modal trjabva ‘must’ in the intermediate subjunctive clause shows that PRO is prevented from picking up the semantically appropriate controller because of the intervention of the expletive which is a closer (yet unsuitable) antecedent. Thus, similar to the English case in (7), (6a) is ruled out as a locality violation, despite the fact that the intended interpretation is the one with PRO being controlled by Ivan. Unlike (6a), (6b) contains the root modal moga ‘can’ which agrees in phi-features with its subject Peter. Since locality conditions are respected, control of PRO by Peter in the intermediate clause yields a grammatical result:

(6) a.*Ivan ne smjata [proex da trjabva [PRO da zamine vednaga]]
   Ivan not thinks DA must DA leaves immediately
b. Ivan ne smjata [PetSr da mo’e [PRO da zamine vednaga]]
   Ivan not thinks Peter DA is able DA leaves immediately.
   “Ivan doesn’t consider Peter capable of leaving immediately”
(7) *John thinks that it is expected PRO to leave.
If in the above examples (2), (3b), (4a), (6b) I have the subject-oriented anaphor PRO, then I predict that it should be sensitive to the referential properties of its local antecedent. Following Higginbotham's generalization (Higginbotham 1992), PRO may receive a pronominal interpretation, in case it has a local pronominal controller. This situation is exemplified in (8) which presents a combination of a Type I and a Type II S. PRO in the most embedded clause can be interpreted as referring either to the superordinate subject Ivan, or to some discourse-salient participant. These referential differences, however, are not to be attributed to properties of a presumed pro subject, but rather to the fact that PRO is controlled by the null/overt pronoun in the intermediate clause. Thus, binding is local, rather than long-distance:

(8) Ivan ne si predstavja [pro_toj da mo-e [PRO_toj da zamine]]
   Ivan not imagines he DA is able DA leaves
   ‘Ivan does not imagine that he will be able to leave’

Consider next the interpretation of the reflexive/impersonal pronoun se ‘self’ in the two types of subjunctive clauses that I have postulated. First, as the examples in (9a&b) show, a Type I S permits all interpretations which are available to se: passive, reciprocal, reflexive, null object, and impersonal:

(9) a. Ivan iska decata da SE bijat
   Ivan wants children-the DA self spank
   ‘Ivan wants the children to be spanked’/
   ‘Ivan wants the children to spank each other’/
   ‘Ivan wants the children to spank themselves’/
   ‘Ivan wants the children to spank someone’
   b. Ivan iska da SE raboti i v nedelja
   Ivan wants DA SE works and on Sunday
   ‘Ivan wants [for] people to work on Sundays as well’

Following Progovac (1998), I will consider se an expletive element whose presence is imposed by the fact that one of the arguments is not expressed. According to Progovac, se may check either the Accusative Case feature on the verb, thereby deriving a passive structure with a Nominative theme like the one in (9a), or the Nominative Case feature of

---

⁶ In the text examples only the impersonal se is glossed with “SE”, while all the other usages of se are glossed with “self”
the verb, thereby deriving the impersonal structure like the one in (9b). Reflexive/reciprocal/null object structures differ from passive ones in that the external argument, rather than the internal one raises to the Nominative position.

(9a) and (9b) contrast in grammaticality with (10a) and (10b) which contain Type II Ss:

(10) a. *Ivan otkazva [da SE bijat decata.
   Ivan refuses DA self spank children-the
   [Intended interpretation]: Ivan refuses for the children to be spanked/to spank each other/to spank someone
   b. *Ivan otkazva [da SE zamine.
   Ivan refuses DA SE leave

(11) Decata otkazvat [PRO da SE bijat.
   children-the refuse DA self spank
   “The children refuse to spank each other/themselves/ someone”

The above examples show that the presence of PRO blocks the passive and the impersonal interpretations of *se and allows only the reflexive/reciprocal/ null object one. Moreover, the fact that an arbitrary null subject is impossible in impersonal structures like (10b) shows that a subset of subjunctive complements in Bulgarian do not provide a Nominative Case checking environment, assuming with Progovac that in impersonal structures *se checks Nominative Case.7

It has been noted for English (Lasnik 1992: 240) that “for a wide range of obligatory control constructions, the predicate of the complement must be an intentional action, that is one either fully, or partially within the intentional control of the subject”. Lasnik’s observation holds for Bulgarian as well and apparently, PRO does not admit a non-agentive interpretation on a general basis, as the ungrammaticality of (12b) illustrates:

(12) a. Ivan _te se opita [PRO da pomaga na Anton
   Ivan will try DA helps to Anton
   “Ivan will try to help Anton”
   b. *Ivan _te se opita [PRO da napodobjava na Anton
   Ivan will try DA resembles to Anton

7 Note that the present conclusion is also compatible with the standard analysis of *se, according to which *se is not involved in Case checking but rather absorbs an internal or an external argument, depending on interpretation. I will not go into comparing the alternative hypotheses.
As expected, no thematic constraints are imposed on pro subjects, cf. (13). Thus, with verbs which permit either pro, or a lexical DP as the subject of their subjunctive complement, a full range of theta-roles is available to that subject.8

(13) a. Ivan se nadjava [pro da pomaga Peter]
    Ivan hopes DA helps Peter
b. Ivan se nadjava [pro da napodobjava na Peter]
    Ivan hopes DA resembles to Peter

3 Subjunctives and Tense features

Having provided evidence as to the existence of PRO in Bulgarian Type II Ss, let us see what are the factors that stand behind the distinction between the two types of null subjects in Bulgarian subjunctive clauses. I will claim that the relevant factor is the referential (and the morphological) content of embedded Tense. I will assume that Tense comes in two varieties - Tpres and Tpast. The former corresponds to a [+T] specification and checks Nominative Case, while the latter corresponds to [-T], to indicate lack of temporal specification, and checks Null Case. In the next section I will try to motivate how the right type of Case is checked in each relevant configuration. What I would like to argue is that the control relation in Type II Ss is not imposed by the anaphoric properties of PRO, but follows from, or at least correlates with the specific temporal reference of the clause in which it is licensed.

Although it is generally true that subjunctive tense is defective and dependent on matrix Tense for interpretation, Type I and Type II Ss differ considerably with respect to

---

8 This situation finds a parallel in English, for verbs like want, which may take a lexical DP, as well as PRO, i.e. they do not require an obligatorily controlled PRO, as Williams (1980) and Lasnik (1992) have observed:

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

Lasnik (1992: 241) notes that “these thematic constraints on Control tend to obtain only in configurations where PRO is demanded (rather than simply allowed)".
their Tense specification. More precisely, in terms of Tense features the former type has a more rich semantic content than the latter.

Turning now to the data, the following generalization obtains: Type I Ss may not appear in the whole range of indicative tenses,\(^9\) but they nevertheless exhibit fewer tense restrictions than Type II Ss.

Since Type I Ss appear as complements to epistemic and volitional predicates, they have a 'possible future' interpretation (Bresnan 1972), i.e. they describe a hypothetical or an unrealized event. All Bulgarian subjunctives are incompatible with the morphological past (aorist) tense and with the future tense, implicating that the [±Past] features of embedded Tense do not have an independent status. As a consequence, the aorist is excluded (cf. (14) below) since, in contrast to the imperfect, it has to be directly linked to the utterance time and cannot rely on any other reference point for its interpretation. Besides, the aorist is incompatible with a hypothetical/irrealis interpretation and also with the fact that subjunctives cannot be assigned a truth-value, as far as the speaker is concerned (Farkas 1992):

(14) *Ivan se nadjava_e/mo\'e_e da napisa pismoto.

Ivan hoped/could DA write-aor letter-the

With respect to other tense restrictions, however, Type I and Type II Ss behave differently. Type I Ss permit all of the indicative tenses, except for the future and the aorist: present (the unmarked case), imperfect, present perfect and past perfect. Consider first present tense subjunctives in complements to volitional and epistemic predicates:

\(^9\) It has been noted (e.g. Picallo 1984, Stowell 1982, Borer 1989, etc.) that 1. tense in subjunctives is defective (or degenerate) in comparison to indicative clauses and 2. it is anaphoric upon the tense of the matrix clause. To account for the latter fact, it could be argued that subjunctives lack a TP altogether (cf. Tsimpli 1990). However, as noted by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994: 105), when it comes to temporal reference, anaphoricity does not imply lack of Tense, but should rather be interpreted in terms of a referential dependency of the embedded Tense features upon the matrix Tense features. Thus, properties 1. and 2. are not independent but should rather be taken to correlate.
(15) a. Iskam da dojde_.
want-1sg DA come-2sg
"I want you to come"
b. Mislex da dojde_.
thought-1sg DA come-2sg
"I thought you would come"

The time reference of a present tense subjunctive, embedded under a present tense verb, as in (15a), is evaluated at the utterance time and yields a future tense reading. When the matrix verb is in the past, as in (15b), the time reference of present tense subjunctives is evaluated with respect to the matrix event time and has a 'future-relative-to-past' value. Such state of affairs argues against the claim that subjunctive Tense is strictly anaphoric. This is confirmed by the possibility of having different temporal adverbs in the higher and the lower clauses, as illustrated in (16):

(16) Vpēra re_ix [utre da ne pu_a povepe]
yesterday decided tomorrow DA not smoke-1sg anymore
"Yesterday I decided that tomorrow I would give up smoking."

(16) shows that the future-oriented adverb utre 'tomorrow' has narrow scope and does not conflict with the higher past tense, nor with the past-oriented adverb Vpēra 'yesterday' which modifies the higher clause. Such facts seem to show that Type I S clauses may denote an independent event and have a distinct time frame, although a specific temporal interpretation is imposed by the Tense of the matrix predicate. More precisely, there exists a (head) dependency between embedded T and matrix T, in order for the temporal evaluation to be achieved. Thus, embedded Tense gets anchored through linking of the embedded T features to the matrix T features (cf. Enç 1987, Roussou 1999, a.o.).

Note that these meaningful tense distinctions are hard to reconcile with the proposal that subjunctive T is necessarily anaphoric and should be specified with [-T], like its infinitival counterparts in other languages. Therefore, I will suggest that T in type I Ss is uniformly specified as [+T]. Since in these complements tense is typically interpreted as shifted “future”, i.e. posterior to the matrix event time (Kempchinsky 1986), it lacks [±Past] features, but it contains other Tense (or Tense-related) features, such as e.g. [±Anteriority] which are anchored to matrix T through the embedded C.

Consider now Type II Ss. First, compare (16) with the ungrammatical (17) which has the matrix control verb zabrajam 'forget':
(17) *\(v\text{\varepsilon}r\alpha\) zabravix [da zamina \(u\text{\varepsilon}r\)]
yesterday forgot-1sg DA leave-1sg tomorrow

(17) shows that an embedded temporal adverb is ungrammatical if it conflicts with
matrix tense and/or a temporal adverbial. This conclusion is confirmed by (18) where the
control root modal \(m\text{\vog}a\) ‘be able’ in the past (aorist) tense requires that the event in the
embedded clause be necessarily interpreted as past, i.e. simultaneous with the matrix
event, hence precluding the occurrence of a non-past time indicator:

(18) Ne mo\'ax da kupja knigata \(v\text{\varepsilon}r\alpha/u\text{\varepsilon}r\)
not could-1sg DA buy-1sg book-the yesterday/tomorrow
"I could not buy the book yesterday"

The wide scope interpretation of the temporal adverbials in Type II Ss is expected,
given that, depending on the semantic properties of the selecting predicate, a Type II S
may denote an event which is either simultaneous with the matrix event (as in (17)), or
one which is aspectually non-distinct from it (as in (18), cf. also Varlakosta and
Hornstein 1993 for similar facts from Modern Greek). Similarly, in (19) the adverbial \(d\text{\acute{o}}
\text{\varepsilon}r\) ‘until tomorrow’ can only be interpreted with a future time reference, as imposed by
the future tense of the matrix verb:

(19) _\text{\text{-}t}e uspeja \(d\text{\acute{a}}\text{\acute{p}}\text{\acute{e}}\text{\acute{t}}a\) tazi kniga \(d\text{\acute{o}} \text{\varepsilon}r\)
will manage-1sg DA read-1sg this book by tomorrow
"I will manage to read this book by tomorrow"

It could be argued that the embedded present tense in (18) and (19) is pleonastic in that
it has no semantic function other than signaling lack of independent tense, or yielding a
simultaneous construal.

Finally, it is worth noting that Type II Ss in Bulgarian can appear only in the present
tense, irrespective of the tense in the matrix clause. All other tenses are excluded, as the
ungrammaticality of the examples in (20a&b) shows:

(20) a. *I\(v\amph\) m\(\acute{o}\)\text{\text{-}e} \(d\text{\acute{a}}\text{\acute{n}}\text{\acute{a}}\text{\acute{e}}\text{\acute{e}}\) pismo\(m\)
Ivan is able DA write-impf-3sg letter-the
b. *I\(v\amph\) m\(\acute{o}\)\text{\text{-}e} \(d\text{\acute{a}}\text{\acute{n}}\text{\acute{a}}\text{\acute{e}}\text{\acute{e}}/b\text{\acute{e}}\text{\acute{e}}\) napisal pismo\(m\)
Ivan could DA read-impf-3sg/had-3sg written letter-the
I conclude therefore, that control complements in Bulgarian do not possess Tense features at all. In the grammatical examples (19)/(20) the present tense is Tense zero, so I will generalize that Tense in Type II S is specified with [-T]. This specification will allow us to capture the strict anaphoric relation which exists between matrix and embedded Tense.

4 Subjunctives, Case checking and V movement

In this section, I will offer an account of how Nominative and Null Case are checked in the respective Tense feature contexts within the subjunctive clause.

First, I will suggest that the base position of the subjunctive particle da is in C (cf. also Penvev 1998, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, a.o.), rather than in some Mood projection inside the IP domain, as is currently maintained (in Rudin 1985, 1988, Rivero 1994,

The contrast between the two subjunctive types in terms of the pro/PRO distinction is reminiscent of the well-known contrast in (i), which illustrates that Control structures prohibit an overt subject, while ECM structures require one:

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

Martin (1992) following Stowell (1982), proposes that this property correlates with Tense: Control Tense is specified for [+T], while ECM Tense is specified for [-T], hence ECM complements do not have an independent temporal interpretation. In terms of Tense specification, it seems that Type I Ss pattern with English Control Tense, while Type II Ss (the control subjunctives) pattern with English ECM Tense. I do not have an explanation for these "mirror-image" effects. Note however, that I do not accept that anaphoric tense dependencies (at least in Bulgarian) amount to lack of Tense altogether (see also footnote 4). Instead, I suggest that control subjunctives have a Tense node which is specified as [-T]. The assumption that [-T] specification should replace lack of Tense will be shown to have important consequences for the minimalist account of Null Case checking of PRO.
a.o.). I will assume (with Chomsky 1995) that C selects TP and that agreement features are checked in a Spec,head relation within TP, as indicated in the structure below:

\[(21) \quad \left[_{CP} \text{C da } \left[_{TP} \text{T [vp SU [\text{V} \text{ OB } ]]} \right] \right]\]

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

Recall that above I have suggested that Tense comes in two varieties, \(T_{\text{nom}}\) and \(T_{\text{null}}\), each having a Case feature which has to be checked by V movement. Suppose \(T_{\text{nom}}\) has an -Interpretable Nominative Case feature which corresponds to its [+T] specification. The situation is similar with that-complements in which Tense is also specified with [+T]. Since pro and lexical DPs check Nominative Case, either one can merge, whenever \(T_{\text{nom}}\) is selected. V-to-T is overt, because the -Interpretable feature \(T_{\text{nom}}\) will attract V's T feature by pied-piping the entire verb, assuming (with Chomsky 1995) that only -Interpretable features attract and get subsequently deleted. The derivation is shown in (22):

\[(22) \quad \text{V...} \left[_{CP} \text{da } \left[_{TP} \text{pro/lexical DP [T V+T [vp } \left[ \text{t}_{\text{SU}} \text{ t}_{\text{v}} \right]\right] \right]\right]\]

Overt V-to-T will ensure that pro/the lexical DP will move from Spec,VP to Spec,TP for checking of both Nominative Case and the strong EPP feature. Since there is no other trigger for movement, pro/the lexical DP will stay in Spec,TP.

As for PRO, I will crucially adopt the Case-theoretic account of its distribution proposed by Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) which argue that PRO is the minimal Case-marked DP which checks Null Case against a minimal InfI. Suppose now that \(T_{\text{null}}\) has a weak Interpretable Tense feature which can only check Null Case because it corresponds to a [-T] specification. Since there are no infinitives in Bulgarian, [-T +Agr] is the minimal finite specification that has to be marked on each verb. Thus, PRO will merge, whenever \(T_{\text{null}}\) is selected, or else the derivation will crash. The weak Interpretable feature of T will attract only V's T features, to check \(T_{\text{null}}\) (obeying Procrastinate), while PRO will move from Spec,VP to Spec,TP for checking of both Null Case and EPP against the raised Tense features of V, in compliance with Last Resort, cf. (23):

\[(23) \quad \text{V...} \left[_{CP} \text{da } \left[_{TP} \text{PRO [T T [vp } \left[ \text{t}_{\text{PRO}} \text{ V } \right]\right] \right]\right]\]
The opposite choice, namely the one by which PRO instead of pro moves to Spec,TP in (22)/(23), will be barred because T\textsubscript{nom} will not have satisfied its Nominative Case feature and the derivation will crash. Alternatively, if pro rather than PRO raises to Spec,TP for Null Case checking, the derivation will crash again, since in this case T\textsubscript{null} will not have satisfied its Null Case feature.

Unfortunately, this explanation predicts that a lexical DP in Spec,TP should be able to intervene between da in C and the verb in T, contrary to fact, as the contrast in (24) shows:

(24) a. *Iškam da decata/vsińki ostanat
      want-1sg DA children-the/all stay-3pl
b. Iškam da ostanat. decata/vsińki
      want-1sg DA stay-3pl children-the/all
      “I want the children to stay”/”I want them all to stay”

I propose that in (24b) in which the subjunctive subject appears postverbally, the embedded verb has joined to the particle in C, leaving the subject behind in Spec,TP.\textsuperscript{11} The reason for this movement is in the feature specification of embedded C. Recall that Type I Ss appear as complements to epistemic and volitional predicates and describe a possible, hypothetical or unrealized event. Therefore, it seems plausible to assume that C has an –Interpretable Mood feature which attracts the embedded verb into the CP domain and can be checked by overt V+T-to-C. Moreover, the respective verbs which select for a Type I S also have modal or modal-like properties and thus require that their complement realize a Mood feature which is expressed on the embedded C.\textsuperscript{12,13}

\textsuperscript{11} This proposal relies on right adjunction and although not in the spirit of Kayne (1994), it is potentially compatible with Chomsky (1995).

\textsuperscript{12} Interestingly, this latter class of verbs (which includes volitionals, epistemics and desideratives) almost perfectly corresponds to the class of verbs which would normally require a subjunctive in languages which mark this mood morphologically.

\textsuperscript{13} According to traditional Bulgarian grammars, (cf. also Kempchinsky 1986 on this issue) da in these complements is a subordinating conjunction which functions like a modal operator with the effect of
Beside accounting for the strict adjacency between da and the following verb, overt T-to-C across the subject is also responsible for linking of the embedded T features to matrix Tense. Recall that I claimed above that Type I S clauses may denote an independent event and have a distinct time frame, although a specific temporal interpretation is imposed by the Tense of the matrix predicate. In view of this fact, T-to-C raising in Type I Ss will have the additional effect of anchoring embedded T, in the sense of Enç (1987), thereby achieving the temporal evaluation of the subjunctive clause. Under Enç’s approach, T-anchoring proceeds indirectly, i.e. through the embedded C, which is selected by the matrix V, in satisfaction of the locality conditions. More precisely, as argued by Roberts and Roussou (1996) and Roussou (1998) there exists a (head) C-T dependency which is overtly manifested in the V2 Germanic languages where T also moves to C. Furthermore, by the same operation (T-to-C raising) the embedded verb checks off its categorial feature against the V feature of the particle, since da is compatible only with finite verbs, it cannot cooccur with participles, or gerunds.\footnote{Note that the categorial feature of the raised V in (22) in the text is still accessible to the computation and remains visible at LF, in virtue of being Interpretable (Chomsky 1995, ch. 4), although it has been checked by T as a free rider (via the adjunction operation).}

Turning now to Type II Ss, recall that their present tense morphology is not related to the utterance time, but is interpreted as simultaneous with the tense in the matrix clause. In view of this tense dependency, I would like to suggest that CP in Type II Ss is specified for a weak Mood feature. At LF, the latter attracts the subjunctive verb to C (obeying Procrastinate). Through this movement, an anaphoric relation is established between matrix and embedded Tense.\footnote{Note that this proposal allows us to account for the tense dependencies exhibited in subjunctive clauses, making it irrelevant to posit different types of projections (CP or IP) for the various subjunctive complements based on cooccurrence with complementizers and wh-words (as in Varlakosta and Hornstein’s 1993 analysis of Modern Greek subjunctives).} The subjunctive verb also checks off its categorial feature against the V-feature of the particle in C.
As noted above, the current approach runs contrary to the common view that the particle *da* has no complementizer properties. This view is grounded on word order facts: *da* has to be strictly adjacent to the inflected verb or auxiliary, unlike "genuine" complementizers such as *пе* "that", which need not be:

(26) Ivan se nadjava *пе* Peter be-3sg left already
    "Ivan hopes that Peter has already left"

On a general basis, choice of a complement type is lexically determined, i.e. some verbs license a *пе*-clause, while others license a *da*-clause. A limited class of verbs, though, among which the verb *nadjavam se* "hope",\(^{16}\) are equally compatible with both clause types:

(27) Ivan se nadjava Peter DA be-3sg left already
    same as (26)\(^{17}\)

The comparison between (24b) and (27) shows that overt subjunctive subjects can appear preverbally, i.e. to the left of *da*, as well as postverbally. On the other hand, the word order distinctions between (26) and (27) indicate that *пе* and *da* occur at two different sides of the overt preverbal subject: *пе* appears before the subject, while *da* follows it. Fronted constituents such as topic and focus phrases obey the same ordering constraint, i.e. they follow *пе* and precede *da*:

(28) Iskam knigata IVAN *da* mi ja dade.
    want-1sg book-the Ivan DA me it give-3sg
    "I want Ivan to give me the book"
(29) Nadjavam se *пе* knigata IVAN _те_ mi ja dade.

\(^{16}\) All verbs seem to belong to the class of *belief* verbs, such as *vjivar* ‘believe’, *mislja* ‘think’, *predpolagam* ‘assume’, etc.

\(^{17}\) There is a difference in interpretation, however. The subjunctive in (26) expresses the speaker's commitment to the truth and the factual status of the embedded proposition, while in (27) it expresses the speaker's belief in the possible realization of the embedded event.
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hope-1sg that book-the Ivan will me it give-3sg
“I hope that Ivan will give me the book”

The above examples show that πe is higher than da in the embedded structure. Rizzi (1997) proposes that the left periphery of the clause (the CP domain) has a finer structure which has to be split into several projections, as exemplified in (30). This proposal allows us to locate the various elements within the CP domain and makes it possible to assume that there are two complementizer positions in Bulgarian.

(30) \[
(\text{FocusP Force} [\text{TopP Top} [\text{FocusP Focus} [\text{TopP Top} [\text{FinitenessP Finiteness}]]]])
\]

The FinitenessP contains information which “faces the inside, the content of the IP embedded under it” (Rizzi 1997: 283) and its head, Finiteness, differentiates between finite and non-finite clauses. I would like to tentatively suggest that this is the position occupied by da. Since πe is always higher than da and they show on opposite sides of Topic and Focus, it could be argued that πe occupies the head of ForceP, i.e. the projection which contains information about the type of the clause (declarative, exclamative, relative, etc.).

In view of this suggestion, whenever the subjunctive subject is situated to the left of da, it can either stay in Spec,FinitenessP, or be topicalized, or focused and surface in Spec,TopP or Spec,FocP, respectively. The structure in (30) predicts that combinations between several topics and a focus should also be possible. (31) shows that this is indeed the case in Bulgarian:

(31) a. Nadvajam se [knigata [UTRE [Ivan da ja done]]]
    hope-1sg book-the tomorrow Ivan DA it bring-3sg
b. Nadvajam se IVAN utre knigata [t da ja done]]]
    hope-1sg Ivan tomorrow book-the DA it bring-3sg
    “I hope that Ivan will bring the book tomorrow.”

5 Conclusion

In this paper, I have examined the syntactic behavior of the null subjects in finite subjunctive clauses in Bulgarian, a language without infinitives. I have provided
additional arguments which help identify the postulation of two types of subjunctives based on a correlation between their distinct temporal specifications. The results can be summarized with the following descriptive generalizations:

- Bulgarian has two types of subjunctive complements, one which licenses pro and another one which licenses PRO. Complements with a pro subject (Type I Subjunctives) show some tense restrictions but nevertheless their Tense features may not be anaphoric upon the matrix Tense. Complements with a PRO subject (Type II Subjunctives) show very strict tense restrictions. Their Tense features are anaphoric and (present) Tense is pleonastic, or T_null.

- Control relations in Type II Ss do not result from properties intrinsic to PRO, but rather follow from the fact that the negatively specified T in the embedded clause provides a configuration where (Null) Case can be checked successfully.

- Embedded Tense with its respective specification regulates the distribution of pro/PRO subjects, in compliance with Minimalist Principles and the s-selectional properties of matrix predicates.
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