How much discourse is there in the syntactic licensing of subjunctive?
A crosslinguistic puzzle

Manuela Ambar
Universidade de Lisboa, FL-CLUL

In spite of so much diversity in the crosslinguistic expression of *subjunctive*, many works have contributed to a deeper understanding of this mood. Yet the universal patterns remain challenging for the theory of grammar.

As the label 'subjunctive' suggests, *dependency* has been seen as its hallmark. As a corollary, subjunctive is traditionally considered the mood of subordination *par excellence*. However, subjunctive matrix clauses are possible and both their syntax and interpretation are of relevant import for a syntactic theory of this mood.

In 1. we outline our proposal for the syntactic derivation of subjunctive concentrating on complement clauses; in 2. we consider root subjunctives. In both sections, we take languages with subjunctive morphology on the verb (Portuguese, as representative of other Romance languages) and without subjunctive morphology on the verb (Greek, Bulgarian, Russian).

1. In the generative framework the *dependence* of subjunctive was implemented in two different directions: (i) in complements to volitional predicates the tense of subjunctive is dependent on the matrix tense (Picallo 1985, Raposo 1987, Borer 1989, Ambar 1988, a.o.) – lack of a tense operator in the embedded domain allows for the tense domain extension concerning Binding, obviation being derived in a principled way; (ii) clausal complements to volitional predicates are [+tense, -finite] (Bošković 1997, Martin 1992, Enç 1991), relying on Stowell's 1982 observation that the *temporal interpretation* of infinitival Control clauses under volitional predicates is independent wrt the matrix one, it is *unrealized*, future. Stowell's observation conflicts with the anaphoric view of Tense in (i). However both views seem to be right (an apparent paradox).

We assume a distinction between *formal tense valuation* (of t-features in the heads) and *temporal interpretation* (Zagona 1990; Giorgi and Pianesi 1997; Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 2000; Ritter & Wiltschko 2009). The system we propose relies on the probe-goal system (Chomsky 1999, 2005). Our proposal shares with Pesetsky & Torrego (2004) and Ambar (1988, 1998) the idea that *t(ense)-features* have to be considered on par with φ-*features* – both are present in the heads (C, T, v and V, plausibly To(bj), as in Ambar 1998, Pesetsky & Torrego 2001) in need of valuation. But we will differ from P&T by considering a more restricted system: features are [±valued], much as in Chomsky's 1999 [±interpretable].

Two types of t-features are assumed: a) t-t features, related to the highest Tense (TP-head) (morphological) and b) t-ev features (related to vP or ToP). The apparent paradox is then nothing but the fact that in subjunctive t-ev features are valued in the embedded domain, but t-t features are not (they will be valued in the matrix, the embedded domain being not a phase). The system covers other structures (indicative, (un)inflected infinitive, in a scale of finiteness. The properties of complementizers (or particles) – Russian *čtoby*, Greek *na,* Bulgarian *da* – as well as the tenses associated to them – *past* for Russian, perfective non-past (PNP) for Greek and Bulgarian – will be discussed considering the literature on the topic: (namely Mezhevich 2006, Giannakidou 2007, Dimitrova in press).

2. In main clauses, subjunctive is associated to an *evaluative* value, i.e. to an evaluation made by the *speaker*. Adopting two projections of the left periphery – EvaluativeP and AssertiveP – proposed in Ambar (1999, 2003), we will claim that both indicative and subjunctive (plausibly all the so-called 'moods' (notions as mood, modality, tense, illocution, behavioural, a.o., associated to different views on the subjunctive, will be discussed), besides *tense valuation,* need another type of licensing accomplished in the *left periphery* (as a window to the world), indicative being Assertive-related and subjunctive Evaluative-related (Giannakidou 2007, 2009, 2016, Ambar 2016, Quer, 2009, a.o.). Hungarian, a language with subjunctive morphology on the verb, is particularly revealing: on the one hand it displays the standard affix *–j* for subjunctive (irrespectively of its morpho-phonological variation, cf. Kenesei et al. 1998, de Groot 2010), on the other hand perfective verbal prefixes appear in different positions depending on the type of the clause and its interpretation (e.g. imperative vs. threat), suggesting verb movement has taken place when the perfective morpheme is post verbal, a hypothesis we make for languages with no such overt evidence. The properties of *–j,* and the particles *ctoby, na, da* above as well as *ca* and *sa* in Romanian will be addressed. Unfortunately lack of space precludes the presentation of the examples here.