

# The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive

Virginia Hill

**Abstract:** This paper argues that *să*-subjunctives arise and spread in Early Modern Romanian (EMR) because of two properties: (i) *să* values the complementizer head (C) as unambiguously *irrealis*; and (ii) the subjunctive clause is systematically phasal. The emergence of *să* is kept distinct from the emergence of the subjunctive in the Balkan Sprachbund, and is situated, instead, in the context of a more generalized shift in the list of EMR complementizers. The investigation resorts to cartography and addresses the issue of cross-linguistic variation in the mapping of modality at the left periphery of subjunctive clauses, which is finer-grained in EMR compared to other Romance (Balkan) languages.

**Key words:** subjunctive, infinitive, Early Modern Romanian, mood

## 1. Preliminaries

This paper looks at the emergence of the Romanian subjunctive clause and at its spread in the language. In particular, by the end of 17<sup>th</sup> century, the subjunctive clause became the preferred option for sentential complements after control verbs that require *irrealis* modality. The data from EMR<sup>1</sup> provided in this paper indicate the following:

- EMR has subjunctive verb forms inherited from Latin (Fischer 1985), but, before the modality marker *să* emerges, these forms do not have the properties needed to generate a subjunctive clause.
- The short infinitive is strong and productive in EMR (Sandfeld 1930), replacing the long infinitive that had been nominalized. Thus, the nominalization of infinitives did not trigger their replacement with subjunctives (as in other Balkan languages; see Joseph 1983), but with another infinitive form.
- Long infinitive complements had also been replaced by *de*-indicative complements before the emergence of the subjunctive clause (e.g., Frâncu 2009). Hence, the subjunctive clause did not arise from a need for [+finite] valuation of C, but for some other reason, to be established.

On the basis of these observations, this paper argues that the subjunctive arises from a gradient feature analysis of *să*: as a conditional complementizer, *să* had inherent [conditional] and [irrealis] features in pre-EMR, and became re-analyzed as [irrealis] only in EMR. The re-analysis is related to a change in the spell-out location (i.e., re-analysis from Force<sup>o</sup> to Fin<sup>o</sup>). The corollary of this analysis is that, in Romanian, the *de*-indicative qualifies as the Balkan equivalent for the replacement of nominalized infinitives (in a language contact context); the *a*-infinitive is a language internal innovation to compensate for the limited distribution of *de*-indicatives; whereas the emergence of *să*-subjunctives reflects a second replacement process (of *de*-indicatives and *a*-infinitives), triggered by language internal changes in CP field.

---

<sup>1</sup>The time span for Early Modern Romanian starts with mid 16<sup>th</sup> c. (the time of the first written documents) up to the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> c. (Densușianu 1901/1997; Chivu et al. 1997 a.o.). The data presented in this paper cover this time span, and come from literary, religious and bureaucratic documents.

The formal analysis resorts to cartography (Rizzi 1997, 2004) in order to document these changes. Briefly, the proposal capitalizes on the possibility of having Fin° split in two: Fin1° for [finite], and Fin2° for [modal]. The split takes place through a process of gradient feature distinction (Roberts 2010), whereby the features clustered in Fin° become mapped to syntax separately. This analysis brings new justification for the separate representation of MoodP in the Romanian clause hierarchy, but motivates it through the properties of FinP (i.e., the encoding of modality), rather than through the inflectional mapping of [mood] to the TP field, as currently assumed (Rivero 1994 a.o.).

The empirical basis for the analysis consists of EMR texts that provide evidence for the emergence of the subjunctive clause. The relevant data are introduced in Section 2, followed, in Section 3, by a summary of the information provided in historical linguistics studies. Section 4 contains a short presentation of the theoretical framework in which the subjunctive will be assessed. Sections 5 to 7 develop the analysis step by step, starting with the investigation of the loss of long infinitives in the pre-EMR period, and leading to the emergence and the spread of the subjunctive in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

## 2. Key data

The constructions discussed in this paper are shown in (1) to (6): they illustrate the competition between three types of CPs for the complement position under EMR control verbs.<sup>2</sup> Two such verbs are presented in these examples: the injunctive *zice* ‘tell’ (i.e., meaning ‘order’, ‘suggest’ versus reportative), in (1)-(3); and the aspectual *apuca* ‘get to’, in (4)-(6). Each verb may select three types of sentential complements: an infinitive (in (1), (4)); an indicative (in (2), (5)); and a subjunctive (in (3), (6)).

- (1) *zice[ a face ciudese]*  
tells INFM make.INF miracles  
‘he tells him to make miracles’ (16<sup>th</sup> c.; CC, 276 apud Frîncu 1969:96/28)
- (2) *iară pre aceialalți au zis [de i-au spînzurat]*  
and DOM the.others has told DE CL.ACC-have hanged  
‘and for the others, he ordered to be hanged’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 111)
- (3) *i-au zis în taină [să o ia]*  
CL.DAT-has told in secret SUBJM CL.ACC take  
‘he told him in secret to take her’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 158)
- (4) *cît să nu hie apucat [a ieși un buluc de nemți]*  
as SUBJM not be.SUBJ3 got INFM exit.INF a group of Germans  
‘enough so that a group of Germans did not get to exit’ (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Costin 1979: 55)
- (5) *Pușcilor apucase cazacii [de le stricase roatele]*  
guns.the.DAT get.PAST3PL Cosacks.the DE CL.DAT ruin.PAST3 wheels.the  
‘The Cosacks got to ruin the wheels of the guns...’ (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Costin 1979: 54)
- (6) *nu am apucat [să-ți dzică]*  
not have.1SG got SUBJM-CL.DAT tell.1SG  
‘I didn’t get to tell you’ (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Costin 1979: 65)

<sup>2</sup> I mentioned the century in which the texts are written to indicate that this optionality lasted through the entire EMR period.

It is generally assumed (see the historical discussion in the next section) that the subjunctive replaces the infinitive because the latter became nominalized. Examples as in (1) to (6) indicate, however, that in EMR the infinitive is verbal (being headed by the maker *a* ‘to’). Furthermore, the phi-features – which is another advantage attributed to the subjunctive (see Roberts & Roussou 2003) – can be secured by a *de*-indicative clause. Hence, the question is: why did the subjunctive emerge in EMR, since the other types of CP were already established, and fulfilled the needs for [V] and finiteness? The answer we propose capitalizes on the distinction between *long* and *short* infinitives, and takes into consideration the changes in the list of complementizers that start to occur in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. These changes are brought to the fore by a formal syntactic approach.

Accordingly, the working hypothesis is the following:

- (i) The infinitive has been replaced twice in Romanian: first, the *long infinitive* is replaced with *de*-indicatives and *a*-infinitives; second, the latter constructions are replaced with *să*-subjunctives. This distinction is obscured in the current literature.
- (ii) The switch to subjunctives in EMR is triggered by a need to better mark the *irrealis* in the embedded CP, as a reflex of more general changes in the lists of complementizers.

Some arguments for this hypothesis are already present in current historical studies, as pointed out in the next section. More arguments will follow when we develop the syntactic analysis.

### 3. History

#### 3.1. Balkan history

An important Balkan Sprachbund property (see Tomić 2006 for the list of properties) is that subjunctive clauses are organized after a similar pattern: a particle precedes an indicative verb form; e.g., Bulgarian *da otida* ‘SUBJM go.INDIC.3SG’; Greek *na erthis* ‘SUBJM come.INDIC.2SG’; Romanian *să scriu* ‘SUBJM write.INDIC.1SG’ (see Rivero 1994 for a pan-Balkan analysis). The subjunctive emerged to replace the infinitive forms, which were becoming nominalized.

More precisely, the emergence of the subjunctive, for example, in Greek, consists in the switch from [-finite] verbs (infinitives) to [+finite] verbs (indicatives) (Roussou 2009 and previous work; Terzi 1992). This switch is justified by the nominalization of the infinitive<sup>3</sup>, and preserves the anaphoric tense of the infinitive clause by inserting a “subjunctive” particle in front of the indicative verb (i.e., *na* > indicative V).

Historical linguistics studies (Hesseling 1892; Robertson 1911 a.o.) provide evidence for the loss of the Greek infinitive since the 7<sup>th</sup> century. By the 15<sup>th</sup> century, there are no infinitive forms left in the language (including complex tenses) (Joseph 1980; Tomić 2006). Taking into consideration that other Balkan languages display the same phenomenon, but that the loss of infinitives is not complete in some of these languages, Sandfeld (1930) proposes an areal spread approach, with Greek in the epicenter: the more we advance towards the North of the peninsula the less infinitive replacement we see (also Rohlf 1933; and Joseph 1983 in formal linguistics).

Several linguists (Demiraj 1970; Philippide 1927; Reichenkron 1962 a.o.) contested the thesis of language contact for explaining the subjunctive in the Balkans.

<sup>3</sup> For an overview of the literature see Tomić (2006: 413-416).

They argue that language internal triggers lead independently to similar results, and that serious problems of chronology (especially in the case of Romanian) arise if we consider Greek as the source of the replacement process. That is, Romanian experienced the replacement very late, the process being still incipient in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and there is no historical evidence for language contact around the 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries.

### 3.2. Romanian history: complementizers

The first documents written in Romanian date from mid 16<sup>th</sup> century, so they grasp very well the gradual albeit fast spread of the subjunctive clause headed by *să*. The form that became nominalized in Romanian (at the time of the Balkan Sprachbund change) is the *long infinitive* (explained in the next section), not the *short a-infinitive* seen in (1) and (4). The need to replace the long infinitive in Romanian triggered the emergence of a new infinitive form (i.e., the short *a* ‘to’ infinitive); whereas the switch to “finiteness” (meaning that the phi-features are morphologically marked) involved *de*-indicative clauses (as seen in (1) to (6)). This happened in the pre-EMR period (Chivu et al. 1997; Densușianu 1901/1997 a.o.), and the subjunctive clause was not in the picture. The latter is estimated to have emerged shortly before the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Frîncu 1969). Thus, the context in which the subjunctive emerged in EMR is different, insofar as it does not concern the replacement of the long infinitive.

We relate the emergence of the subjunctive to a noticeable drift targeting the CP fields. The changes produced a modified complementizer list, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Sentential complements – list of complementizers

Matrix clause	Embedded CP	
	EMR (Early MR)	MR (Modern Romanian)
Control V	Engl. ‘to’ <i>de</i> + indicative <i>a</i> + infinitive <i>să</i> + subjunctive/indicative <i>de să</i> + subjunctive/indic <i>ca să</i> + subjunctive/indic	<i>să</i> <i>ca... să</i> (vs. * <i>ca să</i> )
Regular transitive V	Engl. ‘that’ + indicative or conditional <i>că/ căci/ cum/ cum că</i>	<i>că</i>

The complementizers listed under MR are productive. The EMR complementizers may still occur in restricted environments and are unproductive. All ‘that’ complementizers exist in MR and can be productive, but they became specialized (e.g., *cum că* marks a hypothetical CP; *cum* an evidential CP etc.). The only modality free complementizer in MR is *că*. In (7), we draw the attention to the contrast between *că* in (7a) and *ca* in (7b)<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> EMR (alike MR) is basically VSO, and has verb movement to T<sup>o</sup> or higher; e.g., in (i.a) the verb is higher than the subject *nime* ‘nobody’ in Spec,vP, which is higher than the direct object in-situ (i.b). SVO follows from subject movement as in (i.c), where both *Cantemir* and *nime* precede the negation. The negation is located between CP and TP: Fin > Neg > TP (Cornilescu 2000; Isac & Jakab 2004 a.o.).

- (7) a. *Cunoaști-se [că au fost neașezați...]*  
 know-REFL.3 that have been unsettled  
 ‘One can tell that they were not settled’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 73)
- b. *Vrîndu Cazimir crai [ca să dobîndească țara...]*  
 wanting Cazimir prince that SUBJM grab.SUBJ3 country.the  
 ‘Prince Cazimir wanting to grab the country’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 74)

These two items have different properties: *că* (< Lat. *quod*; Coteanu et al./DEX 1998: 147) occurs exclusively and obligatorily in indicative complements; *ca* (< Lat. *quia*; Coteanu et al./DEX 1998: 123) occurs exclusively and optionally in subjunctive complements.

### 3.3. Romanian history: infinitives and subjunctives

Relevant to this paper are the complementizers listed under “Control V” in Table 1, together with the verb forms they select. There is no historical discussion targeting *de* as an indicative complementizer. However, various studies focused on *a* ‘to’ and the subjunctive verb form. A summary of the literature is provided below.

**3.3.1. The infinitive.** In Romanian, the nominalization of the infinitive brought about a re-analysis within the verbal paradigm (Rosetti 1985 and references therein). That is, the long infinitive inherited from Latin has been re-analyzed as a short infinitive, which was very productive in sentential complements and adjunct clauses (Frîncu 1969: 74/6). More precisely, the inherited infinitive form had an infinitive specific ending *-re* (e.g., *cântare* < stem *cânta* + suffix *-re*), which is seen in many Romance languages. In the Romanization process, this form starts to be re-analyzed as a noun, in conjunction with the emergence and spread of the definite article (Meyer-Lübke 1900: 26), which is enclitic in Romanian. Thus, the infinitive *cântare* becomes the noun *cântarea*<sup>5</sup>.

However, in the process, a new infinitive form arises, in the verbal paradigm: the short infinitive. This form amounts to the deletion of the suffix *-re*, and the creation of a pre-verbal mood marker (i.e., *a* ‘to’), whose etymology is the Latin preposition *ad* (Coteanu et al./DEX 1998: 1); hence, we have *a cânta* instead of *cântare*. Importantly, the

- 
- (i) a. *iar de Antohi-vodă nu fug nime.*  
 but from Antohi-king not run.3PL nobody  
 ‘nobody runs from King Antohi’ (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce 1955: 235)
- b. *Nu cutedza nime un cuvîntu*  
 not dared nobody one word  
 ‘nobody dared say a word’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Costin 1979: 129)
- c. *Și Cantemir-vodă carte nu știè, sama nime nu-i lua*  
 and Cantemir-king letter not knew heed nobody not-CL.DAT paid  
 ‘Although King Cantemir was illiterate, nobody paid attention to it.’  
 (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce 1955: 178)

<sup>5</sup> The nominalization process replicates what happened in Bulgarian as well: the infinitive lost its ending *-ti* and became re-analyzed as a noun. This process is well documented for 10<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> centuries in Bulgarian (MacRobert 1980). Most likely, language contact on both sides of the Danube was a reality at that time (for the Dacic-Slavic population), and the nominalization of *long infinitives* was, thus, con-current or shortly sub-sequent in Romanian.

mood marker *a* has also been extended to the long infinitive (e.g., *a cântare(a)*), and it blocks its nominal re-categorization. Thus, we cannot say that *a* ‘to’ replaced the ending *-re*, since they co-occur; what *a* ‘to’ does is to establish the clausal use of the infinitive stem. Thus, although the *bare* long infinitive had been completely nominalized by the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Frâncu 2009), the *a*-headed long infinitive (with or without definite article) is used up to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, in free alternation with the short infinitive. The examples in (8) to (10) illustrate the alternation in infinitive forms as sentential complements.

- (8) *au vrut milostivul Dumnedzau a nu lăsarea*  
 has wanted good.the Lord INFM not leave.INFLG.the  
*acestă pământ fără de oameni*  
 this land without of people  
 ‘The merciful Lord willed it that this land not be left without people.’  
 (Ureche 66)
- (9) *s-au gătit a stare cu războiă împotriva lui Răzvan.*  
 REFL-has prepared INFM stand.INFLG with war against of Razvan  
 ‘he prepared himself to wage war against Razvan’ (Costin 16)
- (10) *nicăire nu i-au cotezatu a-i sta împotriva Radul vodă*  
 nowhere not CL.DAT-has dared INFM-CL.DAT stand.INF against Radu King  
 ‘There was no place where King Radu would dare to confront him.’ (Ureche 147)

The *a*-infinitive is phasal, since it can license Nominative subjects, as shown in (11).

- (11) *au dzis că-i «pre lesne a plini măriă ta giurămîntul».*  
 has said that-is too easy INFM fulfill.INF majesty your oath.the  
 ‘he said that is “too easy for your Majesty to fulfill the oath”’  
 (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce 1955: 110)

Therefore, the re-analysis of the long infinitive as a noun triggered the creation of a new infinitive form that preserved the infinitive in the verbal paradigm. That happened in addition to the *de*-indicative option, seen in (2) and (5). Thus, there was no need for a subjunctive in Romanian at the time when it arises in other Balkan languages.

**3.3.2. The subjunctive.** The Vulgar Latin of the Balkans had replaced the Classical Latin subjunctive with the infinitive in most contexts (Frâncu 1969: 82/14 and references therein). Predictably, this is related to the loss of the morphological paradigm of the Latin subjunctive, the forms being re-distributed to other conjugations (Nevaci 2004: 3, 2006). Traces of the Latin present subjunctive appear in EMR only in third person, where a systematic (and productive) alternation arises with the indicative (Fischer 1985: 114); for example, SUBJ *vadză* ‘see.3’ versus indicative *vede* ‘see.3’<sup>6</sup>.

Crucially, bare subjunctive forms<sup>7</sup> are attested in imperative clauses (as *hortatives* in Frâncu 1969: 79/11 and 98/30), see (12), but subjunctive clauses do not exist.

<sup>6</sup> Some irregular verbs also maintain bare subjunctive forms in imperatives for the second person as well (e.g. *fi* ‘be.2SG’ in Densușianu 1901/1997: 574; Maiden 2006: 47; *aibi* ‘have.2SG’ in Frâncu 2009: 126).

<sup>7</sup> I use the term *bare subjunctive* for those forms that are not preceded by *să*.

- (12) a. *fie voao ce iaste*  
 be.SUBJ3 CL.DAT what is  
 ‘be onto you as it should be’ (16<sup>th</sup> c.; CPB, 2936 apud Frâncu 2009: 120)
- b. *sfîntească-se numele tău*  
 bless.SUBJ3-REFL name.the yours  
 ‘blessed be your name’ (16<sup>th</sup> c.; CT, 10r,13-14 apud Frâncu 2009: 120)

There is no attestation of an independently embedded bare subjunctive form. That is, constructions as in (13) are not found in EMR (and they are ungrammatical in MR).

- (13) \**au pus [preotu sfîntească ograda]*  
 has put priest.the bless.SUBJ3 yard.the  
 Intended: ‘He made the priest bless the yard.’

Therefore, *să* (which is missing in the above examples) is the element that qualifies a clause as “subjunctive”, not the mood inflection on the verb (which is subjunctive).

#### 4. Theoretical background

##### 4.1. Cartography

Cartography provides a finer articulation of the CP field (Rizzi 1997, 2004), to which many studies on the Balkan subjunctive add the Mood Phrase (MoodP), where Mood° is the location for subjunctive mood markers (Krapova 2001, Motapanyane 1991, Rivero 1994, Tomić 2002 a.o.). Thus, the hierarchy has the composition in (14).

- (14) ForceP > TopP > FocusP<sub>contrast</sub> > ModP > FinP > MoodP > NegP > TP > vP

In Rizzi (1997, 2004), Fin° is associated with *finiteness* and *modality*; finiteness stands for phi-features and the tense typing feature. In this paper, we keep the phi-features and the tense typing separately: the former are associated with Force°, in line with Chomsky (2008) and Alboiu (2010) for Romanian; whereas the latter is a property of Fin°, and decides on whether the embedded T° is anaphoric or not. This separation is necessary because sentential complements with anaphoric tense are able to have the phi-features transferred to T° and license Nominative subjects. Thus, in this paper [-finite] means anaphoric T° (which can, however, license a Nominative subject).

The feature cluster [finite] and [modal] in Fin° is of outmost importance, as it accounts for the finer-grained analysis of subjunctive CP. Modality mapping in Fin° made some linguists dispense with a separate mapping of the subjunctive [mood] feature as Mood° in (8) (e.g., Damonte 2006), whereas other linguists maintain the distinction between Fin° and Mood° to account for cross-linguistic variation (see discussion in Paoli 2003). The current proposals count MoodP as part of the inflectional field, because the subjunctive mood marker it contains is classified as an inflectional morpheme. Thus, MoodP heads the inflectional field and may or may not be embedded under a CP (Alboiu 2002, Cornilescu 2000, Rivero 1994 a.o.). Paoli (2007) raises this question: do we really need a MoodP, or is it just a descriptive device to deal with empirical variations?

#### 4.2. *FinP and modality in subjunctives*

The answer to this question depends on how we define the modality of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ . The literature promotes a distinction between *semantic modality* and *grammatical mood*. For example, Bybee & Fleischman (1995:2) indicate that, in semantics, *irrealis* connotes that the proposition with which it is associated is non-actual or non-factual. It covers a broad range of modal nuances: jussive, hypothetical, dubitative, exclamative. In syntax, on the other hand, modal values may be mapped as grammatical [mood] features that are expressed inflectionally, as a form of the verb.

This clear-cut distinction has been blurred in recent studies, especially in cartography, where various types of semantic modality have been shown to be mapped through functional features within both the CP and the TP fields (e.g., being spelled out through adverbs - Cinque 1999- or through pragmatic markers - Speas 2004 a.o.). Relevant to this paper is the fact that irrealis modality such as defined in Bybee & Fleischman (1995) is mapped to  $\text{Force}^\circ$  (not to  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ ) as a clause typing operator, such as conditional (e.g., Haegeman 2010) or directive, in imperatives (e.g., Han 1998). These operators further map a modal feature on the selected  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , which ensures a compatible verb inflection, by selecting  $\text{T}^\circ$  with an agreeing [mood] feature. Alternatively, in selected contexts, the modality feature of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  reflects the semantics of the matrix verb (i.e., not the properties of an unselected clause typing operator), with the same effects on  $\text{T}^\circ$  selection. The verb semantics requires an irrealis modality connoting wishes, beliefs, attitude, instead of conditions, options, commands (Saeed 2003).

When it comes to the syntactic encoding of modality in  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , there is no separate mapping for each type of irrealis modality. However, there is an underspecified [modal] functional feature that can be valued as realis or irrealis. For the irrealis value, the exact reading arises compositionally from the sentence. Accordingly, the configuration involved in this mapping has the hierarchy:  $\text{V/OP} > \text{Fin}_{[\text{modal}]} > \text{T}_{[\text{mood}]}$ , and the spell-out for  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  may be *de*, *a* or *să*. It will be shown that *de* and *a* check but do not value [modal], whereas *să* values it as irrealis, and it is, thus, unambiguous with respect to modality.

The marking of irrealis in  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  is a separate issue from the inflectional marking for the grammatical subjunctive [mood] feature. This point is brought home by the ungrammaticality of (13). In some languages, the two features may be checked by the same item in  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , whereas other languages keep these features mapped and checked on separate heads. For example, Ledgeway (2003) shows that Southern Italian dialects tend to have a dual spell out of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , according to whether it involves irrealis (i.e., *che*) or not (i.e., *ca*). In this case, one lexical item (i.e., *che*) spells out irrealis, finiteness and [mood] as a cluster. *Che* merges directly in  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  and may or may not move to  $\text{Force}^\circ$ .

On the other hand, D'Alessandro & Ledgeway (2010) bring evidence from Abruzzese that the subjunctive complementizer can be either *ca* or *chi*, both versions spelling out the irrealis modality of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , while the grammatical [mood] feature has a separate spell out, as *ocche*. They argue, on the basis of word order tests, that when [modal] and [mood] are encoded separately in syntax, the former is associated with  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  (as *ca* or *chi*), the latter with  $\text{T}^\circ$  (e.g., *ocche* follows the negation). Their conclusion is that, in light of Abruzzese data, we do not need a MoodP in a representation as in (14).

There is much cross-linguistic variation in the left periphery of subjunctive clauses, so hierarchies are hard to generalize. Let us adopt D'Alessandro & Ledgeway's



analysis of *ca/chi* (as I shall do in the rest of the paper), and apply it to the word order of a subjunctive clause in EMR, as in (15).

- (15) *au datu veste petitinderile [ca să nu priimească niminea acest săbor]*  
 have given word all.over that SUBJM not receive.SUBJ3 nobody this feast  
 ‘he sent word all over that nobody should accept this feast’  
 (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1979: 79)

In (15), EMR *ca* resembles Abruzzese *ca*, it checks [finite], [modal] in Fin° (it does not move to Force°). *Să* is hierarchically lower, like *ocche* in Abruzzese, but, unlike the latter, it precedes the negation. Since the negation is above TP, *să* cannot be in T°, it must be higher. It follows that *să* cannot be located in Fin° (where *ca* is merged) nor in T° (beneath the negation), but in-between, in Mood°, as in (14). Thus, the necessity of MoodP arises on empirical grounds. It will be shown in this paper that the postulation of another head between Fin° and Neg° is not just a matter of descriptive convenience, but a necessary step to explain the re-analysis of *a* and *să* from Force° to Fin°.

## 5. Before the *să*-subjunctive: *de*-indicatives

Historical linguistics does not provide a detailed study of *de*-indicative clauses as sentential complements, as in (2) and (5). However, it is descriptively striking how *de*-indicatives mimic the replacement pattern of infinitives in Balkan languages: *de* is a nonfinite complementizer systematically followed by an indicative verb form, and the result is a clause with anaphoric tense. *De* instead of some other particle has been used for this purpose because it was desemanticized and available for relational functions.

### 5.1. Ambiguous *de*

In EMR, *de* is the wild card for relational needs in the structure, attesting to a long use of this desemanticized particle before the first written documents. Its productivity is high, yielding frequent repetitions, as in (16), which is a section title in Neculce’s Chronicle.

- (16) *Începerea lui Despot-vodă cum au fost de au agiunsă de au fost domnu.*  
 beginning.the of Despot-king how has been DE has come DE has been king  
 ‘The beginning of King Despot’s times, how it happened that he got to be king’  
 (18<sup>th</sup> c.: Neculce 1955: 111)

In EMR grammar, *de* occurs as a preposition and as a complementizer. As a preposition, it heads possessives, complements of origin, ‘by’ phrases, complements of location, attributive phrases, and even occurs as a Differential Object Marker (Todi 2001: 62). As a complementizer, *de* heads infinitives (see next section) and indicatives (see examples 2, 5). *De* also heads finite and non-finite relatives (Hill 2013), adverbial clauses, conditionals, and it may also be a clause coordinator. Most of these functions have disappeared in MR, which indicates that speakers replaced *de* with less ambiguous markers. The emergence of subjunctive CP is a case in point.

The examples in (17) show that *de*-indicatives were constantly non-finite (i.e., anaphoric T°), despite the presence of phi-features in morphology; they lacked a value for [modal], so it is compatible with either realis (17a) or irrealis (17b) readings.

- (17) a. *Că întâi au fost învățat de au pîrjolit iarba* +realis/-finite  
 for first has been learned DE has burnt grass.the  
*pretitindinea, de au slăbit caii turcilor cei gingași.*  
 everywhere DE has weakened horses.the Turks.the.GEN the delicate  
 ‘For, first of all, he learned to burn the grass everywhere, so he weakened the Turks’ delicate horses’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 100)
- b. *au poruncit de au făcut un sicriu* -realis/-finite  
 has ordered DE have made a coffin  
 ‘he has ordered (them) to make a coffin’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 178)

This means that *de* checks the features of Fin° but values it only as [-finite]<sup>8</sup>. The ambiguity of *de* for modality makes it compatible with other grammatical moods, and we shall see in the following sections that it also occurs with infinitives and subjunctives. Thus, *de* is ambiguous for modal values in sentential complements. Another observation is that *de*-indicatives display obligatory object control with verbs such as *porunci* ‘to order’ (17b), although, elsewhere, the verb generates structures with optional control.

## 5.2. Location of *de*

Examples as in (18) show that *de* surfaces above the negation in the indicative clause. In this context, the texts do not show material to the left of *de*. The example in (19) is an exception, showing a Topic constituent above *de*. Although (19) is a marked construction, at least it indicates that if material may occur in the CP, it would precede *de*.

- (18) *să tîmplasă de nu știè nemic*  
 REFL happened DE not knew.INDIC3 nothing  
 ‘it happened that he did not know anything’ (Neculce 1955: 242)
- (19) *Tîmplatu-s-au atunce, [grecii, carii era a lui*  
 happened-REFL-has then Greeks.the who.the were of his  
*Mihai-vodă capichihai, și alții ce slujie la dînsul],*  
 Mihai-king captains and others who served at him  
*de-au început a să sfădi ei în de ei.*  
 DE-have started INFM REFL counsel.INF they in between they  
 ‘It happened at that time that the Greeks, who were King Mihai’s captains, and others who served him, have started to talk among themselves.’  
 (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce 1955: 334)

<sup>8</sup> For examples as in (17), Frâncu (2009) considers that *de*-indicatives bring *actualization* versus the *non-actualization* of the subjunctive. In order to formally grasp this distinction, we would have to factor in the [speaker] feature, because the actualization involves a shifting relation between the event time and the reference time (i.e., between matrix verb and embedded clause), versus the relation between event/reference time and speech time (i.e., the narrator’s time, when the outcome of the previous time relation is known). See Sigurðsson (2004) for a theoretical discussion. We chose not to extend the analysis to the encoding of pragmatic features, especially that other examples, such as (18), do not warrant an actualization reading.

The word order in (18) and (19) indicates that *de* is in Fin°. The rarity of examples as in (19) also indicates that, by default, CP is not articulated in these constructions. Hence, adjacency between the matrix V position and *de* in Fin° means that ForceP is either not projected, or it is collapsed with FinP, as shown in (20).

(20) [<sub>ForceP?/FinP</sub> Fin<sub>de</sub> [TP...]]]

Under control verbs, as in (17), *de*-indicatives are probably truncated clauses (i.e., FinP), since control is obligatory on the embedded subject. However, raising verbs, such as *împla* ‘to happen’ in (18), must have a collapsed ForceP/FinP, occasionally articulated as in (19), because such constructions allow for Nominative subjects, as further shown in (21). It means that Force° exists and transfers the EPP and phi-features to embedded T°.

(21) *Iar pre unii să împla de-i ascundè prietenii,*  
 but DOM some REFL happened DE-CL.ACC hide.PAST3PL friends.the  
*care scăpa păn’ la prieteni.*  
 who escaped up to friends  
 ‘But some happened to be hid by their friends, those who escaped and reached their friends.’ (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce 1955: 271)

The conclusions on *de*-indicatives are: (i) *de* is the marker of anaphoricity, so it can be used successfully to mark [-finite] in Fin°, irrespective of the grammatical mood of the verb; (ii) *de* is ambiguous as a marker for the [modal] feature; (iii) *de* is stable as a Fin° head, but the CP it belongs to has a variable structure: it is truncated under verbs of control but complete (as a collapsed or articulated ForceP/FinP) under raising verbs.

## 6. Before the *să*-subjunctive: the short infinitive

We do not know whether *de*-indicatives emerged before or in parallel with *a*-infinitives as a replacement to the long infinitive. What we can establish, from a syntactic perspective, is that *a*-infinitives were more flexible than *de*-indicatives as complements to verbs, insofar as they allow for optional control on the embedded subject and have a consistently split CP field. This section argues that *a* ‘to’ is a C head, not an inflectional head, and that its main function is to stop the reanalysis of the infinitive as a noun.

### 6.1. *A*-infinitives

Jordan (2009) argues that *a* ‘to’ must have had a prepositional status when it started selecting infinitive CP and generating adverbial adjunct clauses. Eventually P<sub>a</sub> > CP has been reanalyzed as Ca, which entails *a* ‘to’ in Force°. All throughout EMR, *de* appears in infinitive clauses as a matter of routine and on an optional basis, in addition to *a* ‘to’.

According to the analysis of *de*-indicatives proposed in the previous section, *de* is a marker for [-finite]. So, its insertion in the infinitive CP ensures that the clause has anaphoric T° and is compatible with control on the embedded subject. By the same reasoning, *de*-indicative must have preceded *a*-infinitives, since *de* was settled for [-finite] valuing in Fin° by the time it was used with the infinitives.

*De* is an important assessment criterion for the internal structure of the infinitive clauses. Consider (22), where both *de* (*dă*) and *a* precede the negation, which situates both items in *Fin*<sup>o</sup>. Accordingly, Topic, contrastive Topic and contrastive Focus constituents can precede *de*, as in (23a, b) and (24) respectively.

- (22) *vina dă a nu să săvârși după cererea soliei mele*  
 guilt DE INFM not REFL accomplish.INF after request.the envoy.GEN my  
 ‘the guilt of not accomplishing it according to my envoy’s request’  
 (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Văcărescu 2001: 135)
- (23) a. *Iar turcii, cum au vădzut poarta cetății deschisă,*  
 and Turks.the as have seen gate.the fort.the.GEN opened  
*au lăsat [pre moscali de-a-i mai gonire] ș-au*  
 have quit DOM Russians DE-INFM-CL.DAT more chase.INFLG and-have  
*ș-început a intra în cetate.*  
 and-started INFM enter.INF in fort  
 ‘And the Turks, as soon as they saw the gate of the fort opened, quit chasing the Russians and started entering the fort.’  
 (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce 1955: 380)
- b. *au lăsat și ei [Cetatea Neamțului] de a o mai bate]]*  
 have quit and they [Fort.the Neamt.GEN]<sub>TOP</sub> DE INFM CL.ACC more attack  
 ‘they’ve also stopped attacking the Neamt fort’ (Neculce 107)
- (24) *noi sîntem datori să fim gata [[de oaste] [în toată*  
 we are obliged SUBJM be.SUBJ ready [of army]<sub>TOP</sub><sub>contr</sub> in any  
*vremea, [cîndu va veni cuvîntul împăratului]],*  
 time when will come order.the emperor.the.GEN  
*și [de bani] de a le darea pururea...]*  
 and of money-<sub>TOP</sub><sub>contr</sub> DE INFM CL.DAT provide. INFLG.the forever  
 ‘We are obligated to be ready to provide them forever with ARMY, at all times, – as soon as the emperor’s order comes – and with MONEY.’  
 (Ureche 131)

The examples in (23) and (24) confirm that *de* is in *Fin*<sup>o</sup>. At the same time, the word order indicates that *a* ‘to’ has been pushed down, but not further than *NegP*. Therefore, we must acknowledge that *Fin*<sup>o</sup> has been split, having *de* in *Fin*<sup>1</sup><sup>o</sup>, where it checks and values [finite], and *a* in *Fin*<sup>2</sup><sup>o</sup>, where it checks but does not value [modal], as in (25).

- (25) [<sub>ForceP</sub> Force [<sub>TopP/FocP</sub> Top/Foc [<sub>FinP</sub> *Fin*<sub>1</sub><sub>de</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> *Fin*<sub>2</sub><sub>a</sub> [<sub>NegP/TP</sub>...]]]]]

There is independent justification for (25). First, if *de* were in *Fin*<sup>o</sup> alone (while *a* would be an inflectional head, as currently assumed), then we would expect to have *de*-infinitives, in alternation with *a*-infinitives, as in French. That is not possible in EMR:

- (26) *au apucat a duce// au apucat de a duce // \*au apucat de duce*  
 have got INF carry// have got DE INF carry // have got DE.INF carry  
 ‘they’ve got to carry’

In (26), the verb is morphologically infinitive. However, it cannot occur only with *de*. Hence, *de* is not able to check both features of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , and *a* is needed for one of them.

Second, (27) and (28) show that *a* is obligatory for an infinitive to be analyzed as a clause, and that it occurs in complementary distribution with *wh*-phrases in CP. This indicates that *a* is a C element, on par with the *wh*-phrase. Notice that the embedded clause in (28) has proclitics, so there is no V-to-C, and  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  is available for *a* insertion. The fact that *a* is not merged in this construction indicates that the function of *a* is redundant to the function of the *wh*-phrase for licensing the infinitive.

- (27) *au apucat a duce* VERSUS \**au apucat duce*  
have managed INFM carry.INF have managed carry.FIN
- (28) *Nu avea [de ce se apuca.]*  
not had on what REFL lean.INF  
‘He had nothing to lean on.’ (Costin 105)

Having established the  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  status of *a*, despite its co-occurrence with *de*, we can extend this analysis to constructions where *a* appears by itself, as in (29) and (30). In these configurations, *a* is constantly in  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , allowing for Topic (29) and Focus (30) constituents to precede it.

- (29) *au început [cătră împăratul] a pîrî tare pre Brîncovanul*  
have started [to Emperor.the]<sub>TOP</sub> INFM tell.on.INF very.much DOM Brîncoveanu  
‘they started to tell a lot on Brîncoveanu to the Emperor’ (Neculce 279)
- (30) *cela ce poate [toate] a face*  
that who can [all]<sub>FOC</sub> INFM do.INF  
‘the one who can do them all’ (CC, 267 apud Frîncu 1969: 17/85)

There is no reason to think that  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  is split in (29) and (30). Here, *a* checks both features of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , and assigns a [-finite] value, on a par with *de*. That is, *a* has been re-analyzed as the equivalent of *de*, with the only difference that ForceP is always present in the derivation (hence, the possibility of having Nominative subjects, as in (31b)). Thus, *a* behaves like *de* insofar as it is compatible with both realis and irrealis contexts. The absence of a [modal] value is shown in (31a, b).

- (31) a. *i-au căutat iarăși a să întoarce înapoi la Tara Leșască* -realis  
CL.DAT-has tried again INFM REFL return.INF back to Country Pole  
‘he tried to go back to Poland’ (Ureche 82)
- b. *nicăire nu i-au cutezat a-i sta împotriva Radul vodă* +realis  
nowhere not CL.DAT-has dared INFM-CL.DAT stand.INF against Radu King  
‘King Radu has not dared to oppose him anywhere.’ (Ureche 147)

The conclusion is that: (i) *De* insertion has been used to define the status of *a* in infinitive clauses, as  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  versus  $\text{Force}^\circ$  (which must have been its first location upon re-analysis from P to C; see also Jordan 2009); (ii) To do that,  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  has been split to map its features on two different heads; this is an example of gradient feature distinction, in terms of Roberts (2010); (iii) Eventually, *a* has been re-analyzed as the equivalent of *de* in  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ :

it is ambiguous for [modal] values, but has [-finite] valuation.

## 6.2. Bare infinitives

When the infinitives are *bare* (i.e., *a* is absent), the long infinitive is computed as a noun, whereas the short infinitive is integrated to complex mood/tense forms in mono-clausal constructions. Crucially, both forms of bare infinitive fail to qualify as sentential complements. Bare short infinitives in modal constructions are often cited as an exception to the subjunctive replacement rule (Frîncu 1969; Rohlf 1933; Sandfeld 1930 a.o.). That is, *putea* ‘can’ occurs with *a*-infinitives (32), bare infinitives (33), and subjunctives (34). What is considered to be an exception to the replacement rule comes from the fact that the patterns in (33) and (34) are equally productive in MR, although (32) has been lost. It was expected that (32) should be lost or archaic as well, since it contains an infinitive.

- (32) *nu le putem [a le cunoaște cu singur pipăitul]*  
 not CL.ACC can.1PL INFM CL.ACC know.INF with just touch.the  
 ‘we can’t know them just by touching’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Costin 1979: 121)
- (33) *[nici-l putem da țării noastre]*  
 nor-CL.ACC can.1PL give.INF country.the.DAT our  
 ‘nor could we give it to our country’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 66)
- (34) *prea lesne va putea [să supuie și Ardealul]*  
 very easy will.3SG can.PAST3 SUBJM subjugate.SUBJ3 and Ardeal.the  
 ‘he could also subjugate Ardeal very easily’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Costin 1979: 18)

The construction in (32) is bi-clausal, and the modal is a deficient (raising) verb that selects a ForceP/FinP complement. This has been successfully replaced with a subjunctive, yielding (34). However, in (33), the construction is mono-clausal: Hill (2011: 39) brings evidence that the bare infinitive is the main verb, whereas the modal is a semi-auxiliary in T°. This difference in the status of *putea* ‘can’ came out in the formal approach, but it was hinted at, intuitively, in Mallinson’s (1986) grammar. Crucially, the replacement applies to CP complements (i.e., bi-clausal constructions as in (32)), while mono-clausal constructions as in (33) are not affected: they do not provide a CP complement, therefore they are not visible to the replacement process. Thus, the preservation of the bare infinitive in (33) is not an exception to the replacement rule, since it has never concerned this rule. The facts in (32)-(33) reinforce the observation that *a* ‘to’ is obligatory to distinguish between mono-clausal and bi-clausal constructions.

From the perspective provided in this paper, the infinitive is preserved in the verbal paradigm either by providing evidence (e.g., spell out *a*) for CP, or by embedding it under a full-fledged T° (e.g., monoclausal *putea* ‘can’). That is, the verb stem by itself indicates the grammatical infinitive [mood], but it is unable to generate a clause, as seen in (27): its categorial [V] feature is underspecified and needs syntactic licensing by C.

## 7. The emergence of *să* subjunctive clauses

This section presents the re-analysis of *să*, first as reported in historical linguistics, then as verified through formal tests. Etymologically, *să* originates from Lat. *si* ‘if/whether’ (Coteanu et al./DEX 1998: 949), so it is intrinsically a conditional complementizer and

functioned as such up to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Shortly before that time, *să* starts to be re-analyzed as a subjunctive marker (Frîncu 1969). This section argues that the change consisted of the re-analysis of *să* in Fin° instead of Force°.

### 7.1. Frîncu (1969)

The most influential discussion on the EMR subjunctive comes in Frîncu (1969). The author argues that the emergence of subjunctive clauses in EMR is tightly related to the re-analysis of the conditional conjunction *să* ‘if’/‘whether’ as a subjunctive mood marker, after semantic attrition. This re-analysis could not have started long before the 16<sup>th</sup> century, because *să* as a subjunctive marker is not present in Istro-Romanian, which split from Daco-Romanian some time after the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Sârbu & Frăţilă 1998), the link being severed before the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Zegrean 2012). The emergence of the subjunctive occurred after the dialectal split (Sandfeld 1930/1968: 214).

Mid 16<sup>th</sup> century texts display *să* in subjunctive clauses, so the process had been started at a previous date. However, the incidence of subjunctive clauses is low in this century, and it varies according to the selecting verb. For example, in Frîncu’s corpus (1969: 82/14), subject control verbs (‘try’, ‘strive’, ‘attempt’, ‘intend’, ‘pretend’ etc.) show about 10% subjunctive complementation in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, increasing to 26% in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and to 31% in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Table 2 summarizes Frîncu’s findings for the EMR corpus (mid 16<sup>th</sup> -18<sup>th</sup> centuries).

Table 2: Subjunctive complements – rate of occurrence (Frîncu 1969)

Verb class	desire: <i>vrea</i> ‘want’	injunction: <i>porunci</i> ‘order’	modal: <sup>9</sup> <i>trebui</i> ‘must’	attempt: <i>încerca</i> ‘try’	BE+INF(LG) <i>este a ucide</i> ‘is to kill’	aspectuals: <i>începe</i> ‘start’
Rate	91,8%	90%	69,2%	31%	29,9%	2.4%

Note, however, that Frîncu measures the *să*-subjunctive occurrence in relation to infinitives of all types (short, long, bare), and does not factor in *de*-indicatives. Nonetheless, the percentages are edifying for the net contrast between ‘desire’ verbs on the one hand, and ‘aspectuals’ on the other hand, the axis decreasing from strong irrealis to realis. Hence, we can capitalize on the inherent irrealis feature of *să* to explain the success of the subjunctive as the sentential complement of ‘desire’ and ‘injunction’ verbs.

### 7.2. Bare subjunctives

We start by considering the syntactic status of bare subjunctive forms that EMR has inherited from Latin, and which were introduced in Section 3. The analysis picks up on the observation in (13), that a subjunctive verb is not sufficient to generate a subjunctive clause. Indeed, Frîncu (1969) notices that these bare subjunctives occur only in imperatives clauses (although we found them in conditionals as well, as shown in this section). Let us see how the imperative licenses the subjunctive verb form.

The properties of bare subjunctives come out when cast in the formal analysis of imperatives proposed in Han (1998 and further work). Han identifies two features that drive the derivation of imperative clauses: [directive] and [irrealis], the former being

<sup>9</sup> Table 2 does not include the modal *putea* ‘can’, for which Frîncu 1969: 84/16 claims a rate of 22,6% subjunctives versus 78,4% infinitives. The reason for excluding this verb class from the Table is that the calculations amalgamate *a*-infinitives and bare infinitives, but the replacement affected only *a*-infinitives.

realized as an illocutionary operator that selects the [irrealis] feature, which, in turn, selects a certain type of [mood] or inflection. Thus, Han's hierarchy has a triple distribution of features: [directive] Force° > [irrealis] Fin° > [mood] T°. Technically, in Han's hierarchy, the [directive] operator cannot be embedded; it selects the [irrealis] feature, which can be embedded, can be dissociated from the [directive] feature, and is spelled out at a lower hierarchical level (i.e., Fin°). True imperative verb forms move up the hierarchy to check [irrealis], then further, to check [directive].

Crucially, when Han's [irrealis] feature is dissociated from [directive], it must select the appropriate [mood] and/or [tense], associated with a lower head. Either infinitives or subjunctives qualify for this selection, but the subjunctives in Han (1998) are regular *să*-clauses. Bare subjunctives do not occur in these suppletive contexts, they occur only in the context in which true imperatives do, as shown in (12), repeated below.

- (12) a. *fie voao ce iaste*  
 be.SUBJ3 CL.DAT what is  
 'be onto you as it should be' (16<sup>th</sup> c.; CPB, 2936 apud Frâncu 2009: 120)
- b. *sfîntească-se numele tău*  
 bless.SUBJ3-REFL name.the yours  
 'blessed be your name' (16<sup>th</sup> c.; CT, 10r,13-14 apud Frâncu 2009: 120)

In (12), the subjunctive verb moves to C – hence, the V > clitic order – in the same way a true imperative would. The formal representation is given in (35).

- (35) [<sub>ForceP/FinP</sub> Fin<sub>verb</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> T<sub>verb</sub> ....]]]

On the other hand, *să*-subjunctives that occur as a suppletive imperatives in MR have the structure in (36), adapted from Isac & Jakab (2004).

- (36) [<sub>ForceP</sub> Force [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin *să* [<sub>TP</sub> T<sub>verb</sub> ....]]]

(35) and (36) differ in one aspect only: Fin° is spelled-out differently (through the verb in the former, through *să* in the latter). Crucially, the reason for the grammaticality of (35) is that the illocutionary force (i.e., the [directive] operator) triggers V-to-Fin and licenses the bare subjunctive in Fin°. When such operators are absent – as they are in the declarative CP selected by a control verb, as in (13) – there is no trigger for V-to-Fin, and the subjunctive verb in T° is not licensed.

### 7.3. Conditional *să*

Texts dated between 1559-1563 show that, by default, *să* served as the conditional complementizer 'if/whether' (Densușianu 1901/1997; Chivu et al. 1997; Frâncu 1969, 2009). *Să* has three regional variants: *se* in the North; *să* in the South and the East; *și* in the West. Free alternation *să/se* is often attested in the same text. As a conditional complementizer, *să* had *de* as competitor for the Force° position, as in (37)<sup>10</sup>.

- (37) a. *Să iești fiul domnului, aruncă-te jos.*

<sup>10</sup> There was also *deacă* 'if/whether', but incipient; it mainly headed adjuncts of time.



if are.2SG son.the lord.the.GEN throw-IMP2SG-REFL down  
 ‘If you are the Lord’s son, throw yourself down.’

(16<sup>th</sup> c.; CT, 5, v.23 apud Frîncu 1969: 75/7)

- b. *au trimis soli, zicîndu că-i va da ajutoriu, de-i va*  
 has sent envoys saying that-to.him will give help if-to.him will  
*tribui, împotriva lui Mateiașu și i-ar fi dat, de nu*  
 need against the Matei and to.him-would be given if not  
*s-ar fi părăsit Mateiașu crai de acel gîndu.*  
 REFL-would be quit Matei king of that thought  
 ‘He sent envoys, telling him that he would provide help against King  
 Matei, if he needed it, and he would have provided it if King Matei had  
 not renounced his intention.’ (Ureche 94).

In this competition, *de* won (Todi 2001: 178)<sup>11</sup>, because it was more successful at restricting the [mood] values of the embedded T° to indicative and conditional verb forms only, both of which occur in (37b). In this respect, *să* was underspecified, allowing for a variety of verb forms in T°, in the protasis, as shown in (38): indicative in (38a); subjunctive in (38b); infinitive in (38c); conditional in (38d).

- (38) a. *Să veți fi împlîndu în tocmelele mele și veți fi socotindu* **INDIC**  
 if will.2PL be following in plans.the my and will.2PL be considering  
*și țiîndu porăncile mele, da-voiu voao ploaie.*  
 and respecting orders.the my give-will.1s to.you rain  
 ‘If you will be going along with my plans, and will consider and respect  
 my orders, I will give you rain.’ (CB, I, 13 apud Frîncu 1969: 76/8)
- b. *ci lucrul în cumpănă sta și punținea jalbă cât de mică* **SUBJ**  
 but process.the in balance was and little complaint as of small  
*și cât de puțini oameni de țară să fie fost n-ar fi luat domniia.*  
 and as of few people of country if be.SUBJ3 been not-would be taken throne  
 ‘but the decision could go either way, and if there were any small written  
 complaint or people from the country present, he would not have been granted the  
 throne.’ (AB, 279 apud Todi 2001: 178)
- c. *E să greșire ție fratele tău, pasă și oblicește el* **INFIN**  
 and if wrong.INFLG to.you brother.the your try.IMP and get.IMP him  
 ‘And if your brother wrongs you, try to understand him.’  
 (CT, 28, v.8-11 apud Frîncu 1969: 76/8)
- d. *Atunci să are zice voao cineva* **COND**  
 then if would.COND.3 say to.you somebody  
 ‘Then if somebody says to you:...’ (CT, 100, r.16 apud Frîncu 1969: 76/8)

These examples show that *să* is not well associated with the irrealis feature of Fin°, hence the mood variation, since the irrealis feature must select T°. In response to this problem, speakers re-analyze *să* in Fin°, to reinforce its function as an irrealis marker. Consider the contrast in (39) and (40): In (39), conditional *să* in Force° is followed by Topic and Contrastive constituents. However, in (40), the same conditional *să* is preceded

<sup>11</sup> Subsequent versions of the New Testament replace *să* with *de* in conditionals (Frîncu 1969: 76/8).

by Topic and Focus constituents, indicating that it starts to be kept in Fin° (versus moved to Force°). This is evidence that the location of *să* moves from Force° to Fin°.

- (39) a. *să inimile noastre nu se întăritare noao, îndrăznire avea-vrem*  
 if hearts.the our not REFL agitate.INFLG to.us courage have-will.1PL  
*cătră Dumnezeu, și dela el vrem cere, primi-vrem dela dînsul*  
 towards God and from him will.1PL ask receive-will.1PL from him  
 ‘our hearts, if they will not get angered, we shall have courage towards  
 God, and if we will ask from him (something) we shall receive (it)’  
 (CPr 73 apud Densușianu 1997/1901: 711)
- b. *Deci se legiea osindești, nu ești făcătoriu legiei ce giudețu*  
 so if law.the condemn.2SG not are.2SG provider law.GEN but judge  
 ‘So, if it is the law you condemn, then you are not the provider of the law  
 but its judge.’ (CV, 129, 12-14 apud Frîncu 1969: 76/8)
- (40) *ci lucrul în cumpănă sta și punținea jalbă cât de mică*  
 but process.the in balance was and little complaint as of small  
*și cât de puțini oameni de țară să fie fost n-ar fi luat domniia.*  
 and as of few people of country if be.SUBJ.3 been not-would be taken throne  
 ‘but the decision could go either way, and if there were any small written  
 complaint or people from the country present, he would not have been granted the  
 throne.’ (AB, 279 apud Todi 2001: 178)

The ambiguity of *să* as a marker of clause typing or of irrealis is in neat contrast with the non-ambiguity of *de* for the same functions. In these constructions, *de* has the same behavior with respect to word order as it has in *de*-indicative complements: it disallows lexical material to separate it from the matrix V position on the left, and from the negation/verb on the right, as further shown in (41).

- (41) a. *Sărace Purece, de-oi scăpa eu și tu, atunci ți-i*  
 poor Lice if-will.1SG escape.INF I and you then CL.DAT-will.1SG  
*schimba numeli din Purice Movilă.*  
 change.INF name.the from Lice Hill  
 ‘Poor Lice, if you and I escape, then I’ll change your name from Lice to  
 Hill.’ (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce apud Iordan 1955: 108)
- b. *că de ne-am socoti pre amăruntul, toate cuvintele*  
 for if CL.ACC-would.COND1 think.INF on detail.the all words.the  
*le-am înțeleage.*  
 CL.ACC-would.COND1 understand.INF  
 ‘for, if we pay close attention, we could understand all the words’  
 (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 67)

The constructions in (41) are ForceP structures (versus possibly truncated FinP complements), because there is a clause typing feature associated with Force° (i.e., the

condition operator)<sup>12</sup> that *de* has to check, and the clause licenses Nominative subjects. Considering the obligatory adjacency around *de*, it follows that these constructions have a collapsed ForceP/FinP, and that *de* checks all the features on the same (collapsed) head.

This analysis leads us to assign the representations in (42) to *de/ să* conditionals.

- (42) a. [ForceP Force(*să*) [Top/FocP Top/Foc [FinP Fin(*să*) [NegP/TP Neg/T<sub>verb</sub>]]]]  
 b. [ForceP/FinP Force/Fin<sub>de</sub> [NegP/TP...]]]

There is no doubt that both (42a, b) are complete CP phases, since they license lexical or *pro* subjects. However, their derivation involves different steps, and the steps in (42a) are unclear because of the ambiguous or weak functional properties of *să*. We consider that the ambiguity of conditional *să* in (42a) is the factor that triggered re-analysis.

#### 7.4. Imperative *să*

This section focuses on the re-analysis of conditional *să* as a marker of Fin° only. The re-analysis occurred within the context of (42a), where *să* started to be left in Fin°, instead of being moved to Force°. This operation weakens the clues for the clause typing feature of *să*, which becomes ambiguous between conditional and imperative ([directive]). Thus, philologists find examples as in (43), which are ambiguous in out-of-the-blue context.

- (43) *Să aveți pismă amară și zavistie întru inimile voastre,*  
 if/SUBJ have.2PL hate bitter and quarrel in hearts.the your  
*nu vă lăudareți nece fireți mincinoși*  
 not CL.ACC boast.IMP.2PL nor be.IMP.2PL liars  
 ‘If you have bitter hate and quarrel in your hearts, don’t boast nor lie.’// ‘Have bitter hate and quarrel in your hearts, don’t boast nor lie.’ (Frîncu 1969:76/8).

The ambiguity in (43) indicates that *să* could be associated with one of two operators - conditional or directive – which means extension of *să* in Fin° to other non-selected contexts that involve irrealis semantics. The form of the verb following *să* does not help the disambiguation, since it is homophonous for indicative and imperative.

There is further evidence from mixed transitional word order as in (44) that the re-analysis of *să* in Fin° affects the imperative clauses before getting established as an irrealis marker in sentential complements.

- (44) a. *ce fie amu voao ceea ce iaste, e!, e!,*  
 what be.SUBJ3 now CL.DAT that which is eh eh  
*și ceea ce nu e, nu!, să nu în fățarie cădeți.*  
 and that which not is not SUBJM not in vanity fall.2PL  
 ‘Let it be for you as it is, eh! eh!, for what is not, is not; don’t fall into vanity’ (16<sup>th</sup> c.; CV, 134, 2-4 apud Frîncu 1969: 76/8)  
 b. *se se sfințească și se smintească-se toți vrăjmașii*  
 SUBJM REFL sanctify.SUBJ3 and SUBJM convert.SUBJ-REFL all enemies.the  
 ‘let all my enemies return to God and convert their minds’

<sup>12</sup> Current studies on conditional clauses identify the clause typing as an operator (e.g., Haegeman 2010), on both semantic and syntactic grounds.

(16<sup>th</sup> c.; PH, 4v/8 apud Frâncu 2009: 120)

- c.      *așea      nice la voi    să      nu hie*  
this.way not at you SUBJM not be.SUBJ3  
'let it not be like this not even for you'

(17<sup>th</sup> c.; Varlaam, C, [25v]/Byck 1964)

If we approach (44) from Han's (1998) perspective on imperatives, it follows that *să* in (44a) is a marker of [directive] in Force°; that is why it can be separated from the verb by a contrastive Topic constituent. In (44b), the word order is unstable in coordinated imperatives: in the first imperative the order is *să* > clitic > verb, whereas in the second imperative the order is *să* > verb > clitic. The former indicates an analysis where *să* checks the features in both Fin° and Force°, so no verb movement applies; the latter indicates that *să* merges directly in Force°, so the verb moves to Fin° to check [irrealis]. Thus, the function of *să* is unclear, as it could be either a marker of Force° or a marker of Fin°. In (44c), *să* is definitely in Fin°, since it is preceded by a Topic and a Focus constituent. This example comes from a later document, and indicates that the specialization of *să* for irrealis Fin° was concluded by that time (17<sup>th</sup> century).

The analysis of imperatives in Han (1998) predicts that [irrealis] can be dissociated from [directive] when it has a separate lexical marker, and it can also be embedded. It is, thus, predictable that once Fin° is spelled out as *să* in imperatives, and is clearly dissociated from [directive], this type of Fin° with spread to other configurations involving irrealis modality (analogical spread).

#### 7.5. Subjunctive *să*: the beginnings

In selected contexts, there is no fluctuation in the position of *să* or of the verb. This suggests that the spread of *să*-Fin° to these contexts took place after *să* has been completely stripped of clause typing feature semantics, that is, after its re-analysis in imperatives. Interestingly, the first uses of *să*-Fin° in sentential complements to verbs display *de* insertion, as shown in the 17<sup>th</sup> century texts in (45).

- (45) a      *și vrea nepotul [de se ia muiare pre mătușea]*  
and wants nephew.the DE SUBJM take spouse DOM aunt.the  
(Prav. 1581, 233r apud Frâncu 2009: 211)
- b.      *să fie volnic [cu cartea domnii meale*  
SUBJM be.SUBJ able with letter.the lordship.GEN my  
*de să-și ție a lui parte]*  
DE SUBJM-REFL keep.SUBJ3 of his part  
'he should be able to keep his part due to the letter from me (my lordship)'  
(București 1619, B, 45, 50 apud Frâncu 1969: 80/12)

The constructions in (45) replicate the configurations with *de a* infinitives, and involve the same *de* that occurs in *de*-indicatives. In fact, in (45a), there is an indicative verb in the embedded clause, the only difference with the usual *de*-indicative being the presence of *să*. The presence of *să* is crucial, since it indicates a different type of derivation: this a split CP, where Topic and contrastive Topic or contrastive Focus phrases precede both *de* and *să*, as in (45b), and the verb form can be subjunctive (45b), which is a selectional

property of *Fin*<sup>o</sup> in imperative clauses. Again, the spread of *să*-*Fin*<sup>o</sup> via imperative clauses is the only way to explain the association between *să* and subjunctive [mood] forms (the default selection being indicatives, according to the pan-Balkan pattern).

*De să* complements as in (45) show a transition from non-selected to selected contexts for the *să*-*Fin*<sup>o</sup> structure. The word order, with Topic and Focus above *de*, shows that *de* is in *Fin*<sup>o</sup>, and values it as [-finite], which ensures an anaphoric T<sup>o</sup> in the embedded clause, as required under selection by control verbs. *Să* is pushed down, but not lower than the negation, as shown in (46).

- (46) *acii spuse de să nu osîndească spre mișei bogații în besearecă*  
 those said DE SUBJM not punish.SUBJ3 DOM thugs rich.the in church  
 ‘they said the rich should not punish the thugs in church’ (Coresi L {142})

Therefore, the configurations with *de să* are a complete replica of the configurations with *de a* in infinitives, and consist of a split *Fin*<sup>o</sup>, with *de* in *Fin*<sup>1</sup><sup>o</sup> and *să* in *Fin*<sup>2</sup><sup>o</sup>, as in (47).

- (47) [<sub>ForceP</sub> Force [<sub>Top/FocP</sub> Top/Foc [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin<sup>1</sup><sub>de</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin<sup>2</sup><sub>să</sub> [<sub>Neg/TP</sub>...]]]]]

The difference between *a* and *să* arises only from the ability of *să* to value [modal] as irrealis, whereas *a* was neutral for the [modal] values (at least at the time of the written documents). This specialization of *să* for irrealis (due to its initial reanalysis as the *Fin*<sup>o</sup> marker of conditionals and imperatives), explains the success of this construction with verbs of ‘want’ and ‘command’ classes, as listed in Table 2. Eventually (a couple of centuries later), *să* loses this specialization, and thus spreads to realis contexts as well, occurring as a matter of routine with aspectual verbs in MR.

The comparison with infinitive structures also extends to the fact that *de* cannot function as the sole complementizers in subjunctive clauses: (48) is ungrammatical.

- (48) \**spuse de osîndească*  
 said DE punish.SUBJ3

Again, we see that *de* occurring in an articulated ForceP-FinP field cannot check both features of *Fin*<sup>o</sup>, so it cannot license a subjunctive complement; *să* is the actual complementizer needed in these structures.

#### 7.6. Subjunctive *să*: replacing *de*

The *de să* co-occurrence in subjunctive complements was short lived: there is no trace of it by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and later<sup>13</sup>. One may assume that eventually *să* became the only *Fin*<sup>o</sup> marker, on a par with *a* in infinitives, so the split in (47) is unnecessary. Evidence for this comes from examples as in (49).

- (49) a. *Scrisă amu iaste că îngerilor tăi zis-ai*  
 written now is that angels.the.dat your told-have.2sg  
 [*de tine să te păzească*] și [*pre mâni să te ia*]  
 from you SUBJM CL.ACC guard.SUBJ3PL and by hands SUBJM you take.3PL

<sup>13</sup> I could not find a single example in the Moldovian chronicles.

‘It is written now that you told your angels to guard you and to take you by hand.’ (16<sup>th</sup> c.; CT, 120v/Dimitrescu 1963)

- b. *rîvnitori [nu numai a sale] să scrie ci*  
 keen not only of their SUBJM write but  
*și cele striine să însemneze.*  
 also those foreign SUBJM record.SUBJ  
 ‘keen to write not only about their own events but also to record the events in other countries’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 64)

In (49), *să* is in Fin°, because Topic and Focus constituents can precede it, and it is the only complementizer in Fin°. The example dates from the same century as *de să*, so it indicates instability between the analysis of *să* as the only checking item of Fin°, and an analysis where *să* qualifies only for the checking of the irrealis.

The data from the following centuries show that the split Fin° analysis has been preserved, in alternation with the non-split one. However, *de* has been replaced with *ca* ‘that’, which is compatible with irrealis semantics<sup>14</sup>. The word order indicates that *ca* occupies the same position as *de*, that is, Fin1°. Compare *de să* in (45) with *ca să* in (50).

- (50) a. *socotit-am ca să nu lăsăm acestu lucru nesăvîrșit*  
 decided-have.1SG that SUBJM not leave this thing undone  
 ‘I decided not to leave this thing undone’ (17<sup>th</sup> c.; Ureche 1958: 65)
- b. *vrînd ca să jecuiască // vrînd să să fălească*  
 wanting that SUBJM plunder.SUBJ3 wanting SUBJM REFL boast.SUBJ3  
 ‘wanting to plunder’// ‘wanting to boast himself’  
 (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Neculce 1955: 106)
- c. *nelăsând [nici un boeru și nici o jupâneasă  
 not.letting no one boyar and no one lady  
 ca să nu facă vreo întrebare]*  
 that SUBJM not make.SUBJ3 some question  
 ‘not letting any boyar or lady to ask any question’  
 (18<sup>th</sup> c.; Văcărescu 2001: 117)

On a par with *de*, *ca* is optional (see 50b, with *ca* and *ca*-less constructions occurring on the same text page), but when it appears, it obligatorily selects *să*. So *ca* is not able to check both features of Fin°, which is expected, since *de* could not do that either. Hierarchically, *ca* occupies the same position as *de*, since it can be preceded by Topic and Focus constituents (50c)<sup>15</sup>. The elimination of *de* in this context is not surprising, since this is a general tendency in CP complements to verbs.

<sup>14</sup> Subjunctive *ca* ‘that’ originates from the Lat. *quia* (Coteanu et al./DEX 1998: 123), which selects subjunctive verbs in Latin to express hypotheses, presumptions, hearsay (Bujor & Chiriac 1971: 265). Before being used in subjunctives, *ca* occurred in compound complementizers such as *ca cum* ‘as if’.

<sup>15</sup> Both *ca să* and single *să* occur in MR, but there is obligatory movement to Force° - see the word order:

- (i) *Voiam \*(ca) Maria \*(ca) să plece mai repede.*  
 wanted.1SG that Maria that SUBJM go.SUBJ.3 more soon
- (ii) *Voiam (\*Maria) să plece (Maria) mai repede.*  
 wanted.1SG Maria SUBJM go.SUBJ3 Maria more soon  
 ‘I wanted Maria to leave sooner.’

The decline of *de* as complementizer makes *de*-indicatives ideal targets for replacement with *să*-subjunctives. One disadvantage of *de*-indicatives is they require obligatory control, whereas the subjunctives do not. Furthermore, the replacement generalizes the articulated ForceP-FinP pattern to all the selected CP fields, and eliminates the collapsed or truncated CPs with *de*.

The ambiguity of *de* for the [modal] feature of Fin<sup>o</sup>, contrasting with the irrealis feature of *să*, also seems to have favored the replacement, since it strongly applies under control verbs with irrealis semantics, but it lingers under aspectual verbs. For example, Frîncu (1969) found only one example with *de*-indicative after ‘want’, given in (51a). There are, also, very few examples left by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the ‘command’ class, which, according to the same source, had an affinity for *de*-indicatives. For instance, we found the sentence in (51b) in Ureche’s chronicle, but could not find a similar example at the sub-sequent writers, who use only the subjunctive as the complement to *porunci* ‘to command’.

- (51) a.     *au vrut     de au    făcut*  
           have wanted DE have done  
           ‘they wanted to do’ (VC, 106 apud Frîncu 1969: 23/91)
- b.     *au poruncit   de au   făcut un sicreiu*  
           has ordered   DE have made a coffin  
           ‘he has ordered (them) to make a coffin’ (Ureche 178)

In conclusion, *de* served as the marker of anaphoricity in selected CPs, and has been used with *a* and *să* in order to fix their re-analysis as markers of Fin<sup>o</sup>. Once these alternative markers are established, *de* is eliminated as being weak (e.g., it cannot support an articulated CP) and ambiguous (i.e., too deseminticized).

#### 7.7. Subjunctive *să*: replacing the infinitive complements

Within the EMR grammar, the re-analysis of *să* as a marker of irrealis affected not only *de*-indicative complements, but also the competing *a*-infinitives, as shown in (52).

- (52) a.     *ar     vrea ceva         a     întreba de elu*  
           would want something INFM ask.INF of him  
           (17<sup>th</sup> c.; CV 52 apud Frîncu 1969: 90/22)  
           ‘he would like to ask him about something’
- b.     *vrînd   ceva         să-l           întrebe*  
           wanting something SUBJM-CL.ACC ask.SUBJ  
           (17<sup>th</sup> c.; CV 53 apud Frîncu 1969: 90/22)  
           ‘wanting to ask him about something’

There is no doubt that the *a*-infinitive is a stronger competitor for subjunctives than *de*-indicatives. This is due to the similarity in the underlying structure. The difference between the specialization of *să* for irrealis versus the neutrality of *a* for the

same feature brought about a sharp distributional contrast during the EMR period between control verbs with irrealis semantics, which display mostly subjunctive complementation, and the control verbs with realis semantics, which display mostly infinitive complementation (see Table 2).

Standard MR shows a clear elimination of infinitives as sentential complements to verbs. Notably, Nominative subjects have also disappeared from infinitive complements in these contexts, and in the rare (unproductive) constructions where they still occur, no lexical material can intervene between the matrix V position and *a* ‘to’. These are clues that the infinitive clause started to be re-analyzed as non-phasal, probably due to insufficient evidence for Nominative subjects in these contexts<sup>16</sup>. It is, thus, expected that the unambiguously phasal subjunctive will be preferred.

## 8. Conclusions

This paper aimed to provide a formal account for the emergence of *să*-subjunctive clauses in EMR. The analysis cast the information from historical linguistic studies in the cartographic perspective of generative grammar. The data came from a variety of texts produced between the mid-16<sup>th</sup> and the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> centuries.

One finding of this paper is that the infinitive has been replaced twice in Romanian: (i) the *-re* long infinitive has been replaced with *de*-indicatives and *a*-infinitives in pre-recorded times (presumably around the same time with the replacement of infinitives in Bulgarian, due to the language contact situation around the Danube); and (ii) *de*-indicatives and *a*-infinitives have been replaced by the subjunctive starting around the 16<sup>th</sup> century, due to language internal changes in the list of complementizers (mostly, the elimination or specialization of *de*).

From a morpho-syntactic perspective, this new finding is that *de*-indicatives are the actual equivalent of Greek and Bulgarian subjunctives, not only because of chronology, but also because they replicate the subjunctive pattern of these languages: a particle with a [-finite] feature is systematically followed by an indicative verb form. Comparatively, *a*-infinitives and *să*-subjunctives do not adopt the Balkan pattern insofar as they select other verb forms than indicatives, and allow for co-occurrence with other complementizers (i.e., *de* or *ca*).

Taking the analysis in Frîncu (1969) as a starting point in our analysis, we considered that *să* (< Lat. *si*) served initially as a conditional complementizer, which was eventually re-analyzed as a subjunctive marker. By using the tools of formal grammar, we argued that conditional *să* surfaced either in Force° or in Fin°, and shows transitional fluctuation in its location before its function as irrealis marker is stabilized. The stabilization occurs when *să* is exclusively analyzed as a Fin° marker. Then *să*-Fin° spreads to imperative clauses (as a suppletive imperative) and to sentential complement contexts under control verbs.

Although the analysis capitalizes on the re-analysis of *să* from Force° to Fin°, it does not entail a downwards re-analysis, and is not contradicting the predictions on

---

<sup>16</sup> The infinitive has been preserved in sentential complements in the Northern varieties of Romanian. It has also been preserved in standard MR as the sentential complement to N and to P.



grammaticalization in Roberts & Roussou (2003). As a conditional complementizer, *să* was likely merged in Fin°, with further movement to Force°. What the re-analysis entails is that movement to Force° ceased to apply.

The way in which the subjunctive complement evolved, and the similar pattern observed in *a*-infinitive clauses, indicated a syntactic operation in which Fin° can be split to map its two features on separate heads: Fin1° maps [-finite], Fin2° maps [modal]. The split arises from the insertion of *de* in the structure, to spell-out the [-finite] value; *a* or *să* are then specialized for the checking of [modal], only the latter being able to value it as irrealis. From a theoretical point of view, this analysis brings to the fore the debate on whether a MoodP is necessary in the representation of subjunctive clauses in Balkan languages. According to our results, Mood° is necessary insofar as it stands for FinP2 – that is, a head specialized for the encoding of the semantic modality. It is not, however, necessary as an inflectional head, since the grammatical [mood] feature is a property of T° (inflectional field), and there is evidence that verbs inflected for mood stay in T°. The “mood markers” *a* and *să* are essential as C-licensors of the TP, and the association between these items and the grammatical mood is not intrinsic.

This paper focused on outlining the emergence of *să*-subjunctives on the basis of syntactic tests and corpus search. Further research is necessary to quantify the spread of the subjunctive in contrast to *de*-indicatives and *a*-infinitives. Frequency curves will probably indicate further syntactic interactions and effects (e.g., the decline rate of Nominative subjects in infinitive complements in relation to the rising of the subjunctive in the same environment). This is, therefore, only the beginning of a deeper investigation of these constructions.

## List of abbreviations

ACC = Accusative Case; CL= clitic; COND = conditional verb form; DAT = Dative Case; DOM = Differential Object Marker; GEN = Genitive Case; IMP = imperative verb form; INF = short infinitive verb form; INFLG = long infinitive verb form; INFM = infinitive mood marker; PAST = past tense; PL = plural; REFL= reflexive; SG = singular; SUBJ = subjunctive verb form; SUBJM = subjunctive mood marker.

All the verbs without a gloss for grammatical mood are in indicative.

Clitics have glosses for Case but not for person, number, gender that can be inferred from the translation. The omission is done for space consideration and because the analysis does not hinges on the syntax of clitics.

## References

### Corpus

- Dimitrescu, Florica. 1963. *Tetraevangelul tipărit de Coresi. Braşov 1560-1561*. [The tetraevangelia printed by Coresi]. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei.
- Jordan, Iorgu. 1955. *Ion Neculce, Letopiseşul Ţării Moldovei*. [The Chronicle of the Country of Moldova]. Bucureşti: Editura de Stat.

- Panaiteescu, Petre P. 1958. *Grigore Ureche, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. [The Chronicle of the Country of Moldova]. București: Editura de Stat.
- Panaiteescu, Petre P. 1979. *Miron Costin, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. [The Chronicle of the Country of Moldova]. București: Editura Minerva.
- Ștrempel, Gabriel. 2001. *Ianache Văcărescu, Istoria Othomănicească*. [The history of the Ottoman Empire]. București: Editura Biblioteca Bucureștilor.

### Literature

- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: EUB.
- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2010. A-Probes, Case, and (In)Visibility.  
<http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/001163>
- Bujor, Ion I. & Fr. Chiriac. 1971. *Gramatica limbii latine*. București: Editura Științifică.
- Bybee, Joan & Suzanne Fleischman. 1995. Introduction. In Joan Bybee & Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 1-14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Byck, Jacques. 1964. *Varlaam. Cazania*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Chivu, Gheorghe et al. (eds). 1997. *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche*. [The history of Romanian literary language. The old period.] București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133-167. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads. A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000. The double subject construction in Romanian. In Virginia Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, 83-134. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Coteanu, Ion et al. (eds). 1998. *Dicționarul Explicativ al Limbii Române (DEX)*, II ed. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta & Adam Ledgeway. 2010. At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120. 2040-2060.
- Damonte, Federico. 2006. Complementatori e complementi congiuntivi in alcuni dialetti Sardi. In: A. Padovan & N. Penello (eds.), *Osservazioni sul sardo* (Quaderni di lavoro ASIt n. 6), 71-95. Padova: Unipress.
- Demiraj, Shavan. 1970. De la perte de l'infinif en albanais. *Studia Albanica* 7. 125-130.
- Densușianu, Ovid. 1997/1901. *Histoire de la langue roumaine*. Bucharest: Editura Grai și Suflet – Cultura Națională.
- Fischer, Iancu. 1985. *Latina dunăreană*. [Danubian Latin]. București: Editura Academiei.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 2009. *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521-1780)*. [The grammar of old Romanian]. Iași: Demiurg.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 1969. Cu privire la “uniunea lingvistică balcanică. Înlocuirea infinitivului prin construcții personale în limba română veche. [On the linguistic unity in the Balkans. The replacement of the infinitive by finite constructions in old Romanian]. *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară* 20. 69-116.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. The movement derivation of conditional clauses. *Linguistic*

- Inquiry 41 (4). 595–621.
- Han, Chung-hye. 1998. *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in UG*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- Hesseling, Dirk C. 1892. Essai historique sur l'infinitif grec. In Jean Psichari (ed.), *Études de philologie néo-grecque*. 1-44. Paris: A. Picard.
- Hill, Virginia. 2011. Modal grammaticalization and the pragmatic field: a case study. *Diachronica* 28 (2). 25-53.
- Hill, Virginia. 2013. The emergence of the Romanian supine. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 2 (to appear).
- Isac, Dana & Edith Jakab. 2004. Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkans. In Olga Mišeska-Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, 315-338. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jordan, Maria. 2009. *Loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian. Diachronic syntax*. University of Florida dissertation.
- Joseph, Brian. 1980. A new convergence involving the Balkan loss of the infinitive. *Indogermanischen Forschungen* 80. 176-187.
- Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krapova, Iliyana. 2001. Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek. In Angela Ralli & Maria Luisa Rivero (eds.), *Comparative syntax of Balkan languages*. 105-126. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori. *Rivista italiana di dialettologia* 27. 89–147.
- Maiden, Martin. 2006. On Romanian imperatives. *Philologica Jassyensia* II (1). 47-59.
- Mallinson, Graham. 1986. *Rumanian*. Surry Hills: Croom Helm.
- MacRobert, Catherine Mary. 1980. *The Decline of the Infinitive in Bulgarian*. Oxford: Somerville College - University of Oxford dissertation.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1900. *Grammaire des langues romanes*, III. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Motapanyane, Virginia. 1991. *Theoretical implications of complementation in Romanian*. Geneva: University of Geneva dissertation.
- Nevaci, Manuela. 2004. Observații privind structura și evoluția conjunctivului în aromână. *Philologica* 1. 1-6.
- Nevaci, Manuela. 2006. *Verbul în aromână : structură și valori*. [The Aromanian verb: structure and values]. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Paoli, Sandra. 2003. *COMP and the left-periphery: Comparative Evidence from Romance*. Manchester: University of Manchester dissertation.
- Paoli, Sandra. 2007. The fine structure of the left-periphery: COMPs and Subjects. Evidence from Romance. *Lingua* 117 (6). 1057-1079.
- Philippide, Alexandru. 1927. *Originea românilor*. [The origin of the Romanians]. Iași: Viața Românească.
- Reichenkron, Günter. 1962. Der Typus der Balkansprachen. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 1. 91-122. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- Rivero, Maria Luisa. 1994. Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12. 63-120.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281-339. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 3, 223-252. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. Grammaticalisation, the Clausal Hierarchy and Semantic Bleaching. In Graeme Trousdale & Elisabeth Traugott (eds.), *Gradience, Gradualness, and Grammaticalization*, 45-73. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, Archibald T. 1911. *Grammaire du grec du Nouveau Testament*. Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1933. *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Graecia*. Halle-Roma.
- Rosetti, Alexandru. 1985. *La linguistique balkanique suivie par le nouveau en linguistique dans l'oeuvre de l'auteur*. București: Editura Univers.
- Roussou, Anna. 2009. In the mood for control. *Lingua* 119 (12). 1811–1836.
- Saeed, John. 2003. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930/1968. *Linguistique balcanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Sârbu, Richard & Vasile Frătilă. 1998. *Dialectul istroromân. Texte și glosar*. Timișoara: Amarcord.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2004. The syntax of Person, Tense, and speech features. *Italian Journal of Linguistics / Rivista di Linguistica* 16: 219-251.
- Speas, Margaret. 2004. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114, 255-277.
- Terzi, Arhonto. 1992. *PRO in finite clauses: a study of the inflectional heads of the Balkan languages*. New York: CUNY dissertation.
- Todi, Aida. 2001. *Elemente de sintaxă românească veche*. Iași: Editura Paralela 45.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2002. Modality and mood in Macedonian. In Sjef Barbiers, Frits Beukema; Wim van der Wurff (eds.), *Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System*, 261-277. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic Features*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zegrean, Iulia G. 2012. *Balkan Romance: Aspects of the syntax of Istro-Romanian*. Venezia: University Ca' Foscari dissertation.