

**Natasha Todorovich**

**University of Illinois at Chicago**

*How many da(s) are there in Serbian?*

*FDSL 8, University of Potsdam, Germany, December 2009*

As noted by Vrzić (1996) *da* is used in optatives, secondary imperatives and interrogatives, in both matrix and embedded contexts. It is also used in conditionals and the future tense, in addition to the subjunctive and indicative complement constructions. Although it is necessary to investigate independent as well as dependent environments in which *da* occurs in order to properly define it, at this moment, in this project, I focus only on *da* used in complement constructions introduced after subjunctive and indicative verbs.

Based on the data, subjunctive and indicative *da* complements exhibit different properties in a number of environments. With the non-past, *da* selects either perfective or imperfective verbs in the subjunctive complements while *da* can only occur with the imperfective verbs in the indicative complements. The finite subjunctive *da* complements can be replaced by the infinitive while the indicative *da* complements cannot. The tense of the embedded indicative complements is not dependent on the tense of the matrix verb such as the case with the subjunctive complements whose tense is dependent on the matrix tense. Negation cannot follow *da* in the subjunctive complements while it follows *da* in the indicative complements; licensing of negative polarity items is not as uniform in the subjunctive *da* complements as it is in the indicative *da* complements. Clitic-climbing is possible to some extent out of the embedded subjunctive *da* complements and never allowed out of the indicative *da* complements. In subjunctive complements, *da* creates unity with a succeeding verb in the non-past from which it cannot be separated while this unity does not hold between *da* and a succeeding verb in the indicative complements. I suggest that *da* is homonymous, but this proposal poses many challenges for a syntactic solution. Perhaps homonymous behavior of *da* should be resolved on a semantic not only syntactic level as suggested by Lilia Schürcks (personal communication).

References:

- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2000. Negative...Concord? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 18: 457-523.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2009. On the temporal properties of mood: the subjunctive revisited. In press with *Lingua*.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene. 1994. The subjunctive mood and the syntactic status of the particle *na* in Modern Greek. *Folia Linguistica* XXVIII (3-4): 297-326.
- Rivero, Maria-Luisa. 1994a. Clausal Structure and V-movement in the Language of Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12. 63-120.
- Rizzi, Luigi 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Haegeman L. (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht. Kluwer.
- Vrzić, Zvezdana, 1994. Categorical status of the Serbo-Croatian "modal" *da*. In J. Toman, ed., *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The college Park Meeting 1994*, 291-312. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.