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For the most part, my study is a descriptive analysis of infinitival complement clauses and the corresponding subjunctive clauses in Romanian, that is, obligatory control (OC) structures. OC is a relation of obligatory coreferentiality between a matrix argument (controller) and the null subject of the subordinate (controlee) of the same sentence. An OC sentence constructed with infinitive is given in (1) and its corresponding subjunctive sentence appears in (2).

(1) Radu a încercat (de) [a deveni doctor].
Radu has tried Comp Inf become doctor
‘Radu tried to become a doctor.’

(2) Radu a încercat (ca) [să devină doctor].
Radu has tried Comp Sbj become.3sg doctor
‘Radu tried to become a doctor.’

Between the sixteenth century and roughly the middle of the twentieth century, OC structures were available in both variants (with infinitive and subjunctive) but infinitival complements were on the brink of disappearance, thus diachronic analysis is necessary.

The two types of complements are analyzed in parallel and their components, the elements of control, are described in order to designate their syntactic status. It will be found that the infinitival particle *de* is a complementizer (C element) and the particle *a* is the infinitival mood marker (I element). The subjunctive particle *să* is also an I element. The null subject (controlee)
in these OC structures combines the characteristics of PRO in the classical approach of control, thus I assign this status to it.

In addition, the history of the infinitive, besides its documentation value, provides valuable information on the status of the infinitival particles *a* and *de* at different stages of development.

Finally, a theoretical framework is to be found to reflect the infinitival and subjunctive OC structures. The two (opposing) theoretical approaches of obligatory control considered are Movement Theory of Control (MTC) and Agreement Model of Obligatory Control. Due to case mismatch between the controller and PRO, and the presence of lexical complementizers, especially in infinitive clauses, the MTC is rather unattractive. The Agreement Model of OC seems to better reflect the Romanian OC-type constructions.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Căci întreb, la ce-am începe să-ncercăm în luptă dreaptă
A turna în formă nouă limba veche şi-nțeleaptă?\(^1\)
-Eminescu

1.1 Background

Romanian is genetically a Romance language. It is also a member of the Balkan Sprachbund, along with Greek, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, southeastern dialect of Serbian and some other languages. As usually the case, not all the features of a linguistic area are shared by all the members. Among the areal features shared by Romanian are: postposed articles (1), a merger of dative and genitive morphology (2), a periphrastic future tense (3), and total or partial loss of the infinitive.

(1) carte ‘book’; cartea ‘the book’

(2) a. Dau Marei o carte.
    give.1sg Mara.Dat a book
    ‘I give Mara a book.’

    b. Cartea Marei
    book.the Mara.Gen
    ‘Mara’s book’

(3) a. Ei vor cânta.
    they will.3pl sing
    ‘They will sing.’

    b. Eu voi cânta.
    I will.1sg sing
    ‘I will sing.’

While Modern Greek lost its infinitive entirely, Romanian lost its infinitive only in complement clauses. It still has the category infinitives in adjunct clauses, relative clauses and

\(^1\) But, I wonder, why would we fight for trying
To recast our old and sage language?
other structures, which will be presented in Chapter 4. Although rare instances of infinitive complement clauses are still possible, mostly in written (literary) sources, these structures are considered to be no longer in use in Contemporary Romanian. The only productive infinitival complement is selected by the modal *a putea* ‘can’ as illustrated by the example in (4).

Alternatively and equally frequently the modal *a putea* takes a subjunctive complement (5).

(4) Pot pleca imediat.  
  can.1sg leave.Inf immediately  
  ‘I can leave immediately.’

(5) Pot să plec imediat.  
  can.1sg Sbj leave.1sg immediately  
  ‘I can leave soon.’

Generally speaking the languages of the Balkans replaced their infinitival complementation with subjunctive complementation. The donor of this particular trait is considered to be Greek, which initiated and completed this change before the other languages. Then, this feature diffused through contact to other languages. Definitely, the influence of the Greek language led to the loss of infinitival complementation in southern dialects of Italian, through the Greek population as Rosetti (1968) points out. As we shall see in Chapter 2, Greek also had a clear and significant influence on the regression of the Romanian infinitive from complement structures.

The subjunctives in the Balkan languages manifest some distinctive characteristics, not shared by other European languages. They do not have specific subjunctive morphology but use the indicative present paradigm. Romanian is different in the sense that a subjunctive verb has distinctive morphology for third person, the same form for singular and plural. The Balkan subjunctive also includes a subjunctive particle: *na* in Greek, *da* in Bulgarian, *të* in Albanian, *să* in Romanian, etc. In addition, Romanian and Albanian have special subjunctive
complementizers, *ca* and *që*, respectively. The other languages use a general (indicative) complementizer in subjunctive structures when necessary. Furthermore, unlike with Romance subjunctive clauses, the Balkan subjunctive complement clauses display obligatory control and do not manifest obviation as reflected by the Greek (6a,7a) and Romanian examples (6b, 7b).

(6) a. I Maria₁ prospathise [e₁/*₂ na diavasi].
   Maria  tried.3sg  PRT  read.3sg
   ‘Maria tried to read.’

   b. Maria₁ a încercat [e₁/*₂ să citească]
   Maria  has  tried.3sg  PRT  read.3sg
   ‘Maria tried to read.’

(7) a. O Yiannis₁ theli [e₁/₂ na diavasi].
   John  want.3sg  PRT  read.3sg
   ‘John wants (him/her) to read.’

   b. Ion₁ vrea [e₁/₂ să citească]
   John  want.3sg  PRT  read.3sg
   ‘John wants (him/her) to read.’

The embedded clauses in the Greek example (6a) and the Romanian one (6b) are obligatory control complements. As the indices show, their null subjects must be coreferential with the matrix subject (controller). In the next examples (7), the embedded subjects corefer freely, with the matrix subjects or some other entity not mentioned in the sentence. Obviation would have been manifested only if the embedded subject were disjoint in reference from the matrix subject. (Obviation will be discussed in Chapter 3).

Since the term *control* will be the leitmotif of this dissertation, an overview of this syntactic phenomenon is presented in the next section.

### 1.2 Control

The term control is used to refer to a relation of referential dependency between an unexpressed subject (the controlled element) and an expressed or unexpressed constituent (the controller). The referential properties of the controlled element … are determined by those of the
controller. (Bresnan, 1982:372). Obligatory control (OC) is a relation holding between an
infinitive *in-situ* and a local controller (Landau 2000), i.e., the controller must be in the clause
immediately preceding the infinitive complement as the controller *Mary* in (8).

In Government and Binding² (GB), (Chomsky 1981, 1986a, 1986b), the unpronounced
controller in control structures is analyzed as the null formative PRO. The obligatory control
construction (8) has the structure in (9). (9) shows that an OC structure, consisting of a matrix
and its infinitival complement clause, has two subjects, a lexical subject upstairs and a null
subject downstairs represented by PRO. *Mary* is the controller of PRO and the two arguments are
coreferential, a relation established through coindexation.

(8) Mary tried [to write a poem]
(9) [IP Mary₁ [VP tMary tried [CP [IP PRO₁ to [VP tPRO write a poem]]]]

In GB, postulating PRO is necessary to satisfy the Projection Principle, the Theta
Criterion and the Extended Projection Principle.

The Projection Principle (PP) requires that lexical information be syntactically
represented. Representations at each syntactic level (i.e., Deep Structure, Surface Structure, and
Logical Form) are projected from the lexicon, in that they observe the subcategorization
properties of lexical items (Chomsky 1981:29). The lexical information we are concerned with
here refers to the number and the types of arguments a predicate takes. The thematic structure
associated with lexical items is regulated by the Theta Criterion: Each argument A appears in a
chain³ containing a unique visible theta position P, and each theta position P is visible in a chain

---

² Government and Binding is made up of several modules: Case Theory, Binding Theory, Bounding Theory, Phrase
Structure (X-Bare Theory, Movement Theory, Control Theory, Theta Theory, and Trace Theory.

³ A chain is a sequence of coindexed positions, called traces, later copies, and each of them locally binds the next
position down. As the traces show, there are two chains in (9), one of PRO in the embedded clause, the other of
*Mary* in the matrix.
containing a unique argument A (Chomsky 1981:36). Finally, the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) is the structural requirement that every sentence must have a subject. In other words, the subject position, [Spec,IP] must be filled (Haegeman 1994: 68/255). Thus, PRO in (9) is needed to serve as the external argument of the verb write. It originates in the predicate-internal subject position where it satisfies the Projection Principle and the Theta Criterion. It then moves to the subject position of the complement clause, [Spec,IP], to satisfy the EPP.

The distribution of PRO is restricted by the PRO Theorem: PRO must be ungoverned with Government (Chomsky 1986a, Chomsky & Lasnik 1993) defined in (10).

\[ \alpha \text{ governs } \beta \text{ only if} \]
\[ a. \quad \alpha \text{ is a head} \]
\[ b. \quad \alpha \text{ c-commands beta and} \]
\[ c. \quad \text{there is no barrier (e.g., a CP) that intervenes between } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \]

The proposition that PRO must be ungoverned is not self-evident. It follows from the Binding Theory in (11) and (12) if PRO is assigned the features [+anaphor, +pronominal].

\[ \text{(11) Principle A:} \]
An NP with the feature [+anaphor] must be bound in its governing category.

\[ \text{(12) Principle B:} \]
An NP with the feature [+pronominal] must not be bound in its governing category.

Since PRO must obey two contradictory requirements, to be bound and free in its governing category, the only way for this element to survive is not to have a governing category at all (not to be governed). As a further consequence, since PRO cannot be governed, it also cannot be assigned Case, since Case is assigned under government. It thus cannot occur in a finite clause because I^0 and C^0 are governors.
GB contained a Control module which determined the antecedent for PRO – the NP with which PRO was coindexed. In Obligatory Control (OC) structures like the one in (13), the controller must be the closest NP that c-commands PRO (Rosenbaum 1967).

(13) Jack told John’s sister\(_1\) [PRO\(_1\) to behave herself\(_1/\ast \)himself].

This is stipulated in GB via the Minimal Distance Principle in (14).

(14) **Minimal Distance Principle** (Rosenbaum 1967)
An infinitive complement of a predicate P selects as its controller the minimal c-commanding noun phrase in the functional complex of P.

As a consequence, only John’s sister can control PRO in (13) and not Jack or John. Thus, there is a configurational constraint on the obligatory control-relation.

OC structures display the additional properties listed in Williams’ (1980:211f)\(^4\).

(15) a. A lexical NP cannot replace PRO.
b. The controller must c-command the controlled structure
c. The controller must precede the controlled structure.
d. The controller must be thematically or grammatically unique
e. The controller must be overt.

In the more recent Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995 and others), Chomsky replaces ungoverned PRO with a PRO that has a special null Case licensed by nonfinite I\(^0\) head (Chomsky & Lasnik 1993).

Meanwhile, reports of PRO bearing standard Case in infinitive control contexts in languages such as Icelandic, Russian, Latin, etc have shown that the distribution of PRO should be dissociated from Case. In addition, Terzí’s (1992) breakthrough analysis of subjunctive clauses in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund shows that obligatory control occurs in finite structures, have PRO subjects, and must be handled in the same way as OC in infinitival

\(^4\) Many of these properties have been dismissed or challenged: a.PRO can be replaced by a lexical NP: I want PRO to leave vs. I want you to leave. c.In back control this is the other way around. d. Koster & May’s (1982) counterexample John proposed to Mary to help each other. e. The sentence The general ordered e\(_1\) to PRO\(_1\) encircle the enemy is considered a true OC structure.
contexts. Other languages that exhibit such finite control are Hebrew, Persian, Kannada, (Landau, 2004).

Given these developments, the literature contains new theoretical approaches to control, which try to include finite control and Case-marked PRO. Two of them will be presented in Chapter 5.

Before ending this section, I am introducing the varieties of control analyzed in this study. The terminology includes exhaustive control and partial control (PC) both considered to be OC (Landau, 2000). Exhaustive control (EC) refers to obligatory control where PRO must be identical to the controller (16). In Partial control (PC) PRO must include the controller, but the two are not necessarily identical. In (17) PRO includes the controller, the director, and some other persons as indicated by the plus sign. Both EC and PC are different from non-obligatory control (NOC) where the controlee does not have to have a local controller (among other things). As shown in (18), the controller Mary is far away from the controlee, the PRO subject of the infinitive clause.

(16) Mary$_1$ managed PRO$_1$ to read the whole article.
(17) The director$_1$ decided PRO$_{1+}$ to gather once a week.
(18) Mary$_1$ believes that it will be fun PRO$_1$ to eat the whole pie herself.

1.3 Goals and Organization of the Study

The primary goals of this study are to document the history of the infinitive in Romanian and to analyze infinitival and subjunctive complement clauses in this language. Two chapters document the changes that these complement clauses underwent during the period between the sixteenth century and around 1950, a period that I will call Older Stages of Romanian (OSR).

During this time, infinitival complement structures were replaced by subjunctive complements. This study documents these developments using data from original written sources. Chapter 2 is dedicated to the history of the Romanian infinitive. The first half deals with
the infinitive particle *a* and the linguistic changes that the infinitive underwent: phonological, semantic, morphological, and syntactic changes. The second part discussed the factors that caused the retirement of infinitives from complement clauses. Both internal and external factors are considered. I argue that the main cause was the overwhelming influence of Greek.

Chapter 3 offers a diachronic description of subjunctive clauses, with focus on complementation. The only difference between OSR and CR is the distribution of the subjunctive complementizer *ca*, which no longer introduces subjunctive complements in CR. Subjunctive complement clauses are divided into OC-subjunctive structures and F-subjunctive structures. These two types of complement clauses differ in regards to the semantic categories of the predicates that select them, and the tense and subject options that they allow. The chapter demonstrates that the subjunctive particle *să* is an I element, leaving no room for mixed properties of complementizer and inflectional element, as previously claimed.

Two further chapters provide syntactic analyses of subjunctive and infinitival complement clauses.

Chapter 4 continues the analysis of infinitival complement clauses begun in Chapter 2. The first part of this chapter discusses and establishes the status of the infinitival particles *de* and *a*, demonstrating that the former is a complementizer and the latter an I element. In the second part, infinitival complement (OC) clauses are divided into Exhaustive Control (EC) and Partial control (PC). The properties of these two types of OC are contrasted with the properties of Non Obligatory Control (NOC) complements. Finally, the specific properties of PC clauses and the differences between EC and PC will be established.

Chapter 5 analyzes control structures in Romanian (OSR and CR). These structures are important because both infinitival and subjunctive complements yield obligatory control (OC).

Chapter 6 includes a summary of the findings of this dissertation, points out the similarities and differences between infinitive and subjunctive complementation, and emphasizes some of the theoretical implications of the Romanian data. It ends with some topics for future research. Some have not been solved in this study and others have not been addressed but are related to the topics of this dissertation.
CHAPTER 2
FROM INFINITIVE TO SUBJUNCTIVE

Nu credeam să-nvăţ a muri vreodată
-Eminescu

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is about history: The history of the infinitive as a syntactic category and the historical events that could possibly explain the loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian.

The history of the infinitive not only puts together the chronological events in the development of the Romanian infinitive, but also presents the circumstances of each change, the reasons for the emergence of new infinitival elements and their evolution, i.e., how they change, whether losing some initial functions, like the particle *a*, or expanding them as in the case of the particle *de*. The history of the infinitive is especially important because it yields preliminary evidence for determining the status of the particles *a* and *de*. The history of the changes undergone by the infinitive will further show that they were not sufficiently significant to bring about the infinitive-loss phenomenon.

Besides the linguistic changes of the infinitive, this chapter is also concerned with the external factors, the shared Balkan areal feature of replacing infinitive structures with finite (subjunctive) structures, and the influence of Greek resulting from language contact. These factors eventually led to the demise of the infinitive from complement structures in Romanian.

Additionally, an infinitive-subjunctive comparison restricted to the type of structures these moods are in is included in this chapter, primarily to introduce them since they are the protagonists of this dissertation and secondly with the idea expressed in Faarlund (1990:48) that "A change from one form F to another form G cannot take place unless F and G can coexist as

---

1 I wouldn’t believe that I will learn to die some day.
alternatives in a language.” As discussed in Section 2.4, the loss of the infinitive began when the subjunctive started to replace infinitive structures. Since so far only infinitive complement clauses disappeared or are moribund, the question for future research is whether Romanian is prone to lose all the other infinitival structures because parallel subjunctive structures exist.

The chapter is organized as follows: Since the loss of the infinitive in certain structures is replaced by corresponding subjunctive structures, a comparison - contrast between infinitive and subjunctive is included, in Section 2.2.

The next section, 2.3, is dedicated to the history of the Romanian infinitive, that is, the development of this mood and the morphological, semantic and syntactic changes it underwent: loss of the specific infinitive suffix, the addition of the particle _a_, the emergence of the particle _de_, and the early appearance of the prepositional complementizers in infinitival adjuncts.

The history of the infinitive continues in Section 2.4 with the distribution of the infinitival particle _a_. The diachronic analysis shows that the absence of _a_ is possible due to the nature of some matrix verbs selecting infinitival complements. Although all infinitives are homophonous with some indicative forms, the absence of _a_ does not lead to infinitive – indicative ambiguity when the verbs _a putea_ ‘can’, (nondeontic) _a avea_ ‘to have’ and to some extent _a ști_ ‘to know’ take infinitive complements.

The factors that caused the loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian are discussed in Section 2.5. Since the Greek influence seems to be a crucial factor in the infinitive-loss development in Romanian, the avenues of language contact with Greek will be discussed. The internal factors, i.e., the changes undergone by infinitive, are also considered to have some role in the infinitive-loss phenomenon.
2.2 Infinitive vs. Subjunctive

This section presents the similarities and differences between infinitive and subjunctive, first regarding their elements, then the structures in which they are found. As we shall see, infinitive and subjunctive include the same components and appear in almost the same structure types.

2.2.1 Infinitive/Subjunctive Mood Components

Each of the two moods has its own special particle, a special complementizer, and allows the same elements between the particle and the lexical verb. The subjunctive particle să (passing through the intermediate form se) comes from the Latin conjunction si ‘if’. The infinitive particle a comes from the Latin preposition ad ‘to/towards’.

There are three one-syllable elements between the particle and the subjunctive/infinitive verb. As shown in the infinitive structure of (1a) and the subjunctive structure of (1b), these elements are: the negation nu, a pronominal clitic and an (adverbial) intensifier.

(1) a. A nu se mai lamenta ar fi de dorit
     to not cl. more lament would be of desired
     ‘To not complain anymore would be desirable.’

     b. Încercă să nu te mai lamentezi.
        try.Imp să not cl. more lament.2sg
        ‘Try not to lament any more.’

The subjunctive has its own (attested) complementizer ca whose etymology goes back to the Latin conjunction qua (quia) ‘as/because/for/since’ (Graur et al 1969:290). Ca used to introduce să-subjunctive clauses of every kind in OSR but its presence is much reduced in complement clauses in CR but still necessary in purpose clauses. A complete account of the distribution of ca is given in 3.1.

Besides the particle a, the infinitive particle de precedes the a-infinitive. In Section 2.3 and Chapter 4, Section 4.3, there will be presented comprehensive evidence for the
complementizer status of *de*. Both *ca* and *de* are optional. The representation in (2) includes an infinitival complement clause introduced by *de*, while *ca* introduces a subjunctive complement in the next example (3).²

(2) apucaseră *de*-a fugire în Polonia managed.3pl de-to escape in Poland ‘They had managed to escape to Poland.’ Bălcescu (1852:33)

(3) i-am dat voie *ca* să o vândă he.Dat-have.1sg given permission that să it sell ‘I allowed him to sell it.’ Stefanelli (1915:124), 1777 document

As the next two examples reveal, an infinitival clause may be (rarely) introduced by the subjunctive complementizer *ca* (4) and a subjunctive clause may be introduced by *de* (5).

(4) Şi aşu avea toată credinţa *ca* munţii a *muta* and would.1sg have all faith that mountains to move ‘And I would have all the faith to move (the) mountains.’ Coresi (1581:338)

(5) Nu vrea *de* să-l ştie cineva not want.3sg de să-him know.3sg somebody ‘He doesn’t want anyone to know (something about) him.’ Coresi (1581:84)

The Romanian infinitive has only one form (it is a plain infinitive), its morphological identity as a distinct mood being assumed by the particle *a*. Although a finite mood, subjunctive borrowed the present indicative morphology for first and second person singular and plural. The subjunctive has its separate morphology for third person singular/plural only. According to Graur et al. (1969:97-8) in the Late Latin spoken in the Danube region there was a replacement of present subjunctive forms – first and second person – with the corresponding present indicative

² *De* followed by the *a*- infinitive may be written as separate words: *de a* or linked: *de-a* as in (2), as well as *de’a* or *d-a/ d’a*. The difference in the orthography has no bearing in the status/function of these two particles.
forms, a phenomenon inherited then by Romanian. Graur et al. notice that a similar phenomenon is also found in Old French.

2.2.2 Structures with Infinitive and Subjunctive

With very few exceptions, infinitive and subjunctive appear in the same types of syntactic structures.

2.2.2.1 Complex tenses

A bare infinitive (without the particle *a*) helps form the future tense and conditional. The bare infinitive follows the future marker in (6) and the conditional marker in (7) to form future and conditional respectively. A subjunctive verb and the particle (proclisis) *o*/*or* form what is called *viitorul popular* ‘folk future’, as shown in (8). The auxiliary *a avea* ‘to have’ and subjunctive verbs also create future expressions. Two examples are included in (9). *A avea* and infinitive combinations will be discussed in Section 2.4.

(6) Unde *vei găsi* cuvântul ce exprimă adevărul?
Where will.2sg find word.the which expresses truth.the ‘Where will you find the word that expresses the truth?’
Eminescu (1852-1889), *Criticilor mei*

(7) Ar face dintr-un lac o Marmara,
would.3sg make from-a lake a Marmara ‘She would make a (sea of) Marmara from a lake.’
Minulescu (1881-1944), *Română policromă*

(8) Astea *n-or să* ne *aducă* decât pierdere de vreme
these not-will.s.3pl bring.3pl only waste of time ‘These (things) will only waste our time.’
Alexandrescu (1810-1885), *O profesiune de credință*

(9) De *n-ai să* vii,
if not-have.2sg s.2sg come.2sg, *am să-te-aștept* și mâine
have.1sg s.1sg Acc-wait.1sg and tomorrow ‘If you do not come (today), I will wait for you tomorrow.’
(Song)
2.2.2.2 Imperative

Constructions with imperative force, also called suppletive imperatives, are possible with both infinitive and subjunctive. Suppletive forms with subjunctive have always been used with significantly greater frequency than those with infinitive. Two examples with infinitive forms are given in (10), one of which (10b) is an interdiction inscription used in trains not so long in the past. An imperative suppletion constructed with subjunctive is given in (11).

(10) a. în toate Dumineci a se ceti (evenghelia) in all Sundays to rflx read (liturgy.the) ‘To be read every Sunday’/”Read every Sunday!”
Coresi (1581:1)

b. A nu se apleca pe fereastra vagonului! to not rflx bend P window carriage.Gen ‘Do not bend over the window of the (railway) carriage’

(11) Oricare-ar fi sfârșitul luptei, whatever-would be end.the battle.Gen Să stai luptând, căci ești dator. să stay fighting because are.2sg dutiful ‘Regardless of the outcome,
Keep fighting because it’s your duty!’
Coșbuc (1866-1918), Lupta vieții

2.2.2.3 Subject

Unlike subjunctive, infinitive can be the subject of a clause or sentence. The infinitive (in bold) is the subject of the sentence in the structure of (12).

(12) Iar în lumea cea comună a visa e un pericul and in world the common to dream is a danger ‘And in the common world to dream is a danger.’
Eminescu (1852-1889), Scrisoarea II

2.2.2.4 Raising

Raising structures are possible with either infinitive or subjunctive. The OSR sources I have studied so far do not seem to have noticeable examples of raising structures constructed with subjunctive. However, raising structures with subjunctive are more abundant in CR. One
infinitive raising structure is given in (13a) and the corresponding subjunctive raising structure (the bold part of (13a) appears in (13b)).

(13) a. Şi oraşul cu trei sute de biserici, and city.the with three hundred of churches
De trei zile, for three days
Pare a fi pictat în dosul unui geam de panoramă! seems-to be painted on back.the one.Gen glass of panorama
‘And the city with three hundred churches,
For three days,
Seems to be painted on the back of a show window.’
Minulescu (1881-1944), In oraşul cu trei sute de biserici

b. Oraşul pare să fie pictat. city.the seems s.3sg painted.
‘The city seems to be painted.’

2.2.2.5 Adjuncts

Both infinitive and subjunctive are found in purpose clauses and in other adjuncts as well. The representations (14) and (15) feature purpose clauses constructed with infinitive and subjunctive respectively. The infinitival adjunct of (16) and the subjunctive adjunct of (17) are introduced by the same prepositional complementizer fără ‘without.

(14) populaţia s-a strâns population rflx-has gathered
pentru a primi armata română for to receive army.the Romanian
‘The people gathered to acclaim the Romanian army.’
România Liberă, June 3, 2006

(15) se îndreptară spre Bucureşti rflx headed towards Bucharest
ca să ducă lui Sinan vestea acestei nenorociri that s.3sg bring to Sinan news.the this.Gen disaster
‘They headed to Bucharest to inform Sinan about this disaster.’
Bălcescu (1852:117)

3 A purpose clause is used to show the purpose or intention of the action of the main verb (in the independent clause). This type of clause is meant to show intention not to state whether something actually happens or not. A purpose clause answers the question Why? or For what reason? E.g., I went to the store to buy milk.
(16) Dacă adunări sau camere pot vorbi fără se teme
if assemblies or chambers can speak without-to rflx fear
‘If assemblies or chambers (of a parliament) can speak without being afraid.’
Alexandrescu (1810-1885), *O profesiune de credință*

(17) Gingașa copilă ceti răvașul,…
dainty damsel read.3sg letter.the
fără să verse măcar o lacrimă
without să shed even one tear
‘The dainty damsel read the letter without even shedding a tear.’
Negruzi (1808-1868) *Scrisoriile lui* …

2.2.2.6 Complements to nouns

Complements to nouns are mostly encountered with infinitive (comparing with sâ-
subjunctive), usually introduced by the preposition/relative\(^4\) *de*. (18) includes a complement to
the noun *teama* ‘the fear’, while the noun *mângâiere* ‘consolation’ takes a subjunctive
complement in (19).

(18) Dar *teama de-a rămâne tot ce sunt*
but fear.the of- to remain still what am
A sugrumat în mine orice- avânt
has suppressed in me any- élan
‘The fear of my unchanging self
Has chocked, inside me, any new desire’
Minulescu (1881-1944), *Rânduri pentru întregirea mea*

(19) Căci mie mi-a dat soarta amara *mângâiere*
because me.Dat cl.Dat-has given fate bitter consolation
*O piatră să ador*
A stone să adore.1sg
‘Because fate has offered me the bitter consolation
A slab of marble to adore.’
Eminescu (1852-1889), *Amorul unei marmure*

\(^4\) One of the multiple functions of the preposition *de* is that of a relativizing element. Gramatica (1965) calls it an
invariable relative pronoun (since it has only one form). Depending on the context, this *de* may be translated in
English by *which/who/that* (i) or of (18), but the sense in Romanian is always *which*.

(i). Unde iaste Hristosu *de șade d-a dereapta lu Dumnezu*
where is Christ.the that stands at right.the of God
‘Where is the Christ who/that stands at God’s right side’
Coresi (1581:482)
2.2.2.7 Complements to adjectives

Adjectives may take infinitival complements or subjunctive complements in OSR, but those with infinitive are rather rare in CR. One example with infinitive is illustrated in (20), one with subjunctive appears in (21).

(20) Dator eu însă sunt a vă spune
indebted I however am to you.pl.Dat tell
‘It is my duty however to tell you this’
Alexandrescu (1810-1885), Ursul și Lupul

(21) Sunt bucuros să vă cunosc.
am glad să you.Acc meet.1sg
‘I’m glad to meet you/to make your acquaintance.’

2.2.2.8 Impersonal expressions

Some verbs are impersonal by nature⁵ and appear in the third person only, e.g., se cade and se cuvine both having the same meaning: ‘it is proper/fitting’. Both verbs take either infinitival or subjunctive complements. The examples of (22) are constructed with se cade, with an infinitive complement in (22a) and a subjunctive complement in (22b).

(22) a. Se cade cu destonicie a se veseli
rflx fits with efficacy to rflx rejoice
‘It is proper to rejoice lively.’
Coresi (1581:31)

b. Se cade să se ungă cu milosteniiia
rflx fits să rflx anoint.3sg with grace
‘It is proper to be anointed with grace.’
Coresi (1581:51)

2.2.2.9 Complements to verbs

The examples in (23), (24) are subject control complement structures constructed with infinitive and with subjunctive respectively and both are selected by the same matrix predicate,

---

⁵ Other verbs are impersonal par excellence like a trebui ‘need’ but could be also used with various person forms. Still some other verbs may have impersonal use although they are preeminently personal verbs. All of them may take either infinitive or subjunctive complements.
the verb *a (în)cercă* ‘to try’. The matching person and number, first person singular, of the matrix verb and the embedded subjunctive verb (24) indicates that the two clauses share the same subject. (Obligatory control structures constructed with subjunctive are discussed in Chapter 3).

(23)  dacă ar *cercă* stăpâni, moșiilor e₁ a le lua zălogo
if would.3pl try owners estates.Gen to cl take pawns
‘If the owners of the estates would try to impose pawning…’
Stefanelli (1915:90), 1767 document

(24)  Azi-noapte-am *încercat* e₁ sǎ mă-ntregesc
last-night-have.1sg tried sǎ me-blend.1sg
Cu focurile globului ceresc!
with fires.the globe.Gen celestial
‘Last night I tried to blend
Into the fires of the celestial globe.’
Minulescu (1881-1944), *Rânduri pentru întregirea mea*

The same semantic categories of verbs may select either infinitive complement clauses or subjunctive complement clauses, with the difference that, in OSR, some verbs occur more with infinitive (e.g., *a îndrăznī/cuteza* ‘to dare’) while other verbs occur mostly with subjunctive (e.g., *a vrea* ‘to want’). Examples with every category of verbs selecting subjunctive clauses are given in Chapter 3. Parallel examples with infinitive are found in Chapter 4.

Not only the same verb may select either infinitive or subjunctive complements, but conjoined infinitival complements and subjunctive complements may alternate in the same sentence. In (25), the subjunctive clause and the infinitive clause are conjoined by the connective *nici* ‘nor’. The connective *și* ‘and’ unites the subjunctive complement clause and the infinitival complement clause of the verb *a vrea* in (26).

(25)  Nu *vură* în calea lui sǎ îmble
not wanted.3pl in way his sǎ walk.3pl
nici *a asculta* legea lui
nor to listen law his
‘They didn’t want to follow him nor to listen to his rules.’
Coresi (1581:141)
‘Wanting to court the emperor’s favor and to obtain the rank of a cardinal,’
Bălcescu (1852:262)

While an infinitival complement clause has always a non-lexical subject, always
coreferential with a matrix argument, subjunctive complement clauses selected by desiderative,
interrogative, factive/experiencer and propositional predicates may have a separate subject (not
coreferential with a matrix argument), and even a lexical subject. Thus, the verb a vrea ‘to want’
may take a subject control (subjunctive) complement (27a) or a noncontrol (subjunctive)
complement with a lexical subject, different from the matrix subject, (27b). When the same
matrix verb, a vrea, takes infinitival control complements as in (28), there must always be
coreference between the subordinate subject and a matrix argument. A structure like (27b)
constructed with infinitive (with embedded lexical subject) does not exist.

(27) a. Aş vrea [e să văd acuma natala mea vilcioară] would.1sg want [1sg să se.1sg now native my glen]
‘I would want to see my childhood glen now.’
Eminescu (1852-1889), Din străinătate

b. N-ai vrea [ca nime-n uşa ta să bată] not-would.2sg want [that nobody.3sg-in door your să knock.3sg]
‘You wouldn’t want anyone to knock at your door.’
Eminescu (1852-1889), Sonete

(28) Și parc-ai vrea [e a-mi spune ceva apoi suspini] and likely-would.2sg want [2sg to-me say something then sigh.2sg]
‘You would want to tell me something then you sigh.’
Eminescu (1852-1889), Departe sunt de tine

Having said that, it is necessary to clarify Mensching’s (2000:37) statement on
Romanian: “Generally, it seems that whenever speakers accept an infinitive construction, they
also accept the fact that it may have a specified subject.” To demonstrate that Romanian, like
other Romance languages, employs postverbal subjects in infinitival constructions, Mensching illustrates his point with the examples (29), (30) and (31) (his 46a,b,c).

(29) E o absurdidate [a se bate cineva  
is an absurdity [to rflx fight someone.Nom  
pentru ochii unei actrițe]  
for eyes-the one.Gen actress]  
‘It is foolish for someone to fight (to get in trouble) for the eyes of an actress.’

(30) [Înainte de a veni zăpada] a bătut un vânt puternic.  
[before of to come snow-the] has blown a wind strong  
‘Before the snow came a strong wind was blowing.’

(31) Vine vremea [de a pricepe omul  
comes time-the.Nom [de to perceive man-the.Nom  
ce-i bine și ce-i rău]  
what-is good and what-is bad]  
‘There comes a time for a man to understand what is good and what is bad.’

The bracketed infinitival clause, which includes the impersonal/generic cineva ‘someone’, represents the subject of the sentence (29). In other words, the infinitival clause by its entirety represents the subject of the sentence (29).

The example in (30) contains an infinitival (temporal) adjunct, a structure-type found in Romance in general called Personal Infinitive by Ledgeway (1998, 2000). Personal Infinitive is distinguished from Inflected Infinitive in that the former does not have morphological agreement but can take overt nominative (postverbal) subject, whereas the latter exhibits both morphological agreement and can take overt nominative subjects.

Finally, the subordinate of (31) is a complement to the noun vremea ‘the time’ an infinitival relative clause introduced by the invariable relative de. In any event, these three examples have no bearing on the subject of infinitival (control) complement clauses, as they are not control structures at all.
To wrap up this section, it has been shown that infinitive and subjunctive can appear in the same structure-types, with basically one exception, that is, subjunctive may not be the subject of a clause. Subjunctive and infinitive complement clauses can be selected by the same matrix verb and conjoined subjunctive complements may alternate with infinitive complements in the same sentences. The alternation infinitive–subjunctive in the same type of complement clauses may actually have led to the increased use of subjunctive at the expense of the infinitive. (The crucial point here is that the infinitive was the older structure and the subjunctive has been gaining in productivity against it).

2.3 History of Infinitive

The history of Romanian infinitive, as far as it can be traced, indicates that this verbal form endured a number of changes. The purpose of this section is to determine the phonological, morphological and syntactic changes undergone by the Romanian infinitive. Following Haspelmath’s (1989) universal path of grammaticalization, I will explore the evolution and changes of the infinitive and infinitival structures not only as historical events but also to gather some preliminary evidence regarding the status of the infinitival particles a and de.

Haspelmath (1989) argues that infinitives in Indo-European languages (and beyond) are inherently connected to purpose. Infinitives originate in purposive action nominals, which become infinitives through grammaticalization. Also, infinitives have their own morphological form and a meaning of their own, which is non-factual or irrealis. Morphologically, infinitives may be marked by a suffix like the Latin –re or German –en or by a particle, as the English to or

---

6 Grammaticalization (or grammaticization) is “the process whereby lexical material in highly constrained pragmatic and morphosyntactic contexts is assigned grammatical function, and once grammatical, is assigned increasingly grammatical, operator-like function” (Traugott 2003: 645).
German _zu_. Haspelmath points out that infinitival particles (in European languages) are allative prepositions.

The term “allative” comes from _allātus_ ‘brought to’, the past participle of the Latin verb _afferre_ ‘to bring toward’. Generally, allative is a type of directional case used in a number of languages (e.g., Finnish, Basque, Eskimo) expressing motion, i.e., _to_ or _toward_ a place/the referent of the noun it marks.

Haspelmath (1989:290) argues that the diachronic change of infinitives is “a general process that happens in language after language” independently. Thus, infinitival particles (usually allative prepositions) begin as purpose-marking entities or marking the case of verbal nouns, become complementizers and can further become the morphology of infinitive, “one-member paradigm” as Haspelmath puts it. From purpose markers, these particles may go back to direction markers and end up introducing complement clauses.

Infinitives may also undergo loss of integrity, which can be phonological and semantic. The loss of phonological integrity, called erosion, happens to infinitival suffixes and to particles as well. The loss of semantic integrity, or desemanticization, means that the original purposive meaning is weakened or lost. When that happens, infinitives undergo some process of reinforcement, to regain the function of purpose.

### 2.3.1 First Reinforcement: The Addition of the Proclisis _a_

Romanian inherited the Latin infinitive form with the suffix _–re_: Latin _facere_ – Romanian _facere_ ‘to make’. Then, at some point in time, prior to the sixteenth century, the Romanian infinitive underwent two morphological changes. It began to loose its _–re_ suffix possibly (but not necessarily) through phonological erosion, in Haspelmath’s (1989) terms, and the proclisis _a_ started to accompany the infinitive. However, it is not clear which change took
place first, the loss of the suffix –re or the addition of the proclisis a. The loss of the suffix –re resulted in infinitive – indicative homophony, e.g., (a) scrie ‘to write’, scrie ‘writes’.

Losing the suffix, the infinitive lost its integrity: phonological and semantic integrity. The addition of the preposition a, the phonologically eroded form of the Latin motion (allative) preposition ad ‘to/towards’ was meant to supply the identity of the infinitive and to reinforce the original meaning and function: purpose. In Latin, ad was used with gerund to express purpose, e.g., ad amandum ‘for the purpose of loving’.

Taking Portuguese, Romanian and Spanish as examples, Schulte (2004) also argues that the preposition a was added to the infinitive in Romance to reinforce the purposive value. An early purpose clause is included in (32) where the infinitive has the form a plus short infinitive or a-infinitive.

(32) Ei împărtășiră-se a mâncă e nu se săturără
they shared-rflx to eat and not rflx sated
‘They shared (the food) to eat but didn’t have enough’
Coresi (1577:249/50)

The role of a in (32) is to introduce the adjunct (purpose) clause and its position in the sentence is likely C₀, thus it has complementizer status. The infinitival particle a in other Romance languages has also been always considered a complementizer.

Sixteenth-century documents show that the a-infinitive had already spread to complement clauses of verbs, adjectives and nouns. In Coresi (1581) a rather small number of adjectives and nouns can take infinitival complement clauses. By contrast, the frequency of infinitival complements to verbs is definitely great.

The following data feature infinitival complements to adjectives (33), infinitival complements to nouns (34), and infinitival (control) complements to verbs (35). As can be seen, all infinitives are preceded by the particle a ‘to’.
(33) a. **datori** săntemu a ne teame
    obliged are.1pl to cl.us be afraid
    ‘We are obliged to be afraid.’
    Coresi (1581:19)

    b. Nu săntu **destoinicu** a mă chema fiului tău
    not am worthy to cl.me call son yours
    ‘I’m not worthy to be called your son.’
    Coresi (1581:21)

(34) a. Are **puteare** a vătâma și trupulu și sufletulu
    has power to harm and body.the and soul.the
    ‘He has the power to harm both the body and the soul.’
    Coresi (1581:60)

    b. Au **volnicie** a se întoarce
    have.3pl liberty to rflx return
    ‘They have the liberty to return/They are free to return’
    Coresi (1581:99)

(35) a. **Făgăduia** a bea și a se boteza
    was promising to drink and to rflx baptize
    ‘He was promising to drink and to be baptized.’
    Coresi (1581:90)

    b. Ne îndeamnă cu nevoință a săvârși
    us urges with no will to succeed
    ‘He urges us to succeed against our will.’
    Coresi (1581:124)

    b. Să nu **îndrăznimu** a răbdă
    să not dare to suffer
    ‘Let us not dare to suffer’
    Coresi (1581:199)

By the end of the sixteenth century, the particle *a* lost or was on the verge of losing its original function of purpose. In Coresi (1577) the number of *a*-infinitival purpose clauses seems satisfactory in order to consider this structure alive. However, in Coresi’s (1581) book of 563 pages, where purpose (finite) structures are abundant, only (about) three are constructed with an infinitive. One is given below in (36).
Şi neajunsei împărăţiei lui pre noi va întâri a alerga and unreachable empire his P us will.3sg strengthen to run ‘He will strengthen us to hurry towards his unreachable empire.’
Coresi (1581:231)

Purpose clauses with *a*-infinitive are still present in Coresi (1581) after verbs of motion, like the next two examples (37a,b).

(37) a. Thoma *mearse a-i spune* lui ce vrea Thomas went to-cl say him.Dat what wants ‘Thomas went to tell him what he wants’
Coresi (1581:131)

b. Şi *vine a spăşi* un ucenicu necredinciosu and comes to repent a apprentice unfaithful ‘And an unfaithful apprentice comes to repent’
Coresi (1581:131)

The particle *a* continues to introduce infinitival purpose clauses triggered by a few motion verbs⁷ (especially *a veni* ‘to come) as a result of its purposive value. Rosetti (1968:175) points out the “final value” of the preposition *a* in certain constructions, i.e., with motion verbs. In (38) the verb for ‘go’ and the preposition *a* are the ingredients of the purpose action. Thus, a motion verb + *a* can express a goal even in the absence of an infinitive.

(38) *mearsă în pădure a leamne*
went.3sg in forest at wood (for fire)
‘He went to the forest for wood/to gather wood (for fire)’
Dosoftei (Vieţile Sfintilor) from Rosetti (1968:175)

Although infinitival purpose structures to motion verbs continued to appear here and there after 1600, the *a*-infinitive was no longer able to introduce purpose clauses, even after motion verbs. Gramatica (1963) notes that purpose clauses formed only with *a*-infinitive are

---

⁷ It appears, as Haspelmath (1989) notices, that the action of a motion verb encodes directional and/or goal meaning. It is not coincidental that there are examples of purpose clauses of motion verbs not introduced by subordinators. Thus, in Biblical Greek from the New Testament, the infinitive of purpose triggered by verbs of motion appears with or without the “subordinator” *tou* (a genitive neuter article), initially added to bare infinitives (Joseph, 1983). In Miller (2002), there are Old English (OE) examples of infinitival purpose clauses triggered by motion verbs where the infinitive appears with or without the particle *to*. Thus, it is plausible for a weak particle like *a* to introduce infinitival purpose clauses of motion verbs, at least temporarily, before loosing its C status totally.
archaisms. Similarly, the German particle *zu* also lost its ability to introduce purpose clauses. By contrast, English *to* has never lost this function completely (Langacker 1992, Miller 2002).

In Coresi (1581), the solution for expressing purpose using an infinitive is not found yet, but the premises are somehow sketched. For instance, the infinitival purpose clause in (39a) and the indicative purpose structure in (39b) express semantically the same purpose action triggered by the verb *a ieşi* ‘to go out’. *Semănare* in (39b) has the long infinitive, in –*re*, and probably is an infinitive (the noun has the same form). For the next step, the infinitival purpose of type (39a) employs the preposition *spre* used in (39b), resulting in the infinitival purpose construction in (39c) in conformity with (40). Infinitival purpose clauses introduced by the preposition *spre* ‘towards’ (like 39c,40) are still in use in CR.

(39) a. Eşti semănătoriului a semâna sămanţa lui
     went out.3sg sower.the to sow seed his
     ‘The sower went out to sow his seed.’
     Coresi (1581:354)

     b. Iară Hristosu *spre* semănare eşi
        and Christ.the towards sowing went out.3sg
        ‘And Christ went out for sowing.’
        Coresi (1581:355)

     c. Semănătorul ieşi *spre* a semâna
        sower.the went out.3sg towards to sow
        ‘The sower went out to sow.’

(40) Să meargă la faţa locului *spre* a se afla faţă
     să go to face place.Gen towards to rflx be present
     la alegerea moşii
     at choosing estate.Gen
     ‘Let him go to the spot in order to supervise the marking of the estate’
     Alexiu (1939:76), 1795 document

Coresi actually produces one infinitival purpose clause introduced by *spre*, as shown in (41a). Coresi’s sentence has an unorthodox word order, as frequently happens in his books of translation (following the original too closely). The natural word order is given in (41b).
Coresi’s infinitival purpose clause of (41a) is the first introduced by the preposition *spre* ‘towards’.

\[(41)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Cei draci ce se batu cu ispita} \\
& \text{those devils who rflx fight.3pl with temptation.the} \\
& \text{spre noi a ne turbura} \\
& \text{towards us to us perturb} \\
& \text{‘Those devils who compete in order to perturb us with temptation.’} \\
& \text{Coresi (1581:279)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Cei draci ce se bat} \\
& \text{those devils which rflx fight} \\
& \text{spre a ne turbura pe noi cu ispita} \\
& \text{towards to us perturb P us with temptation.the} \\
& \text{‘Those devils who compete in order to perturb us with temptation.’}
\end{align*}\]

By the end of the sixteenth century, the particle *a* not only was losing its ability to introduce purpose clauses, but concurrently *a* was losing its ability to function as a preposition in any context, especially locatival\(^8\). The only example I could find with *a* having locative meaning is given in (42). *A* was being replaced by the preposition *la* ‘to/at’ for location and direction.

One example with the (replacing) locative *la* is included in (43).

\[(42)\]
\[\text{Ca ceaia ce zace a mijlocu} \\
\text{like that which lies at middle} \\
\text{‘Like the one that lies in the middle.’} \\
\text{Coresi (1581:273)}\]

\(^8\) At this time *a* still marks dative case (i), but it is being replaced by *la* (ii), or by the dative suffix (iii).

\[(i)\]
\[\text{A mulţi se pare} \\
\text{to.Dat many rflx seems} \\
\text{‘It appears to many …’} \\
\text{Coresi (1581:242)}\]

\[(ii)\]
\[\text{La mulţi se pare ‘It appears to many’}\]

\[(iii)\]
\[\text{Multoră li se pare} \\
\text{many.Dat cl.Dat rflx seems} \\
\text{‘It appears to many’}\]

The preposition *a* also remained in a few frozen expressions, e.g., *Miroase a mentă*. ‘Smells like mint’. It also combines with definite article forming genitive markers.
In summary, the infinitival particle \( a \) emerged to reinforce the value of purpose, to introduce purpose clauses. Sixteenth-century sources show a great decrease in frequency of purpose clauses of non-motion verbs constructed with the \( a \)-infinitive, which became residual by the end of the sixteenth century. \( A \)-infinitive purpose clauses triggered by motion verbs are still in use during the same period.

2.3.2 Second Reinforcement: The Emergence of \textit{de}

The Romanian preposition \textit{de} was inherited from the Latin preposition \textit{de} ‘about/from’. \textit{De} is a multifunctional syntactic element in Romanian, but our interest is related to its function of introducing infinitival clauses. Three questions are to be answered regarding the emergence of \textit{de} as an infinitival element: a) When did \textit{de} join the infinitive? b) Why was it necessary in the first place? And c) Why did \textit{de} and not some other preposition or syntactic element had to accompany the infinitive?

2.3.2.1 When was \textit{de} added to the \textit{a}-infinitive?

The earliest evidence of \textit{de} in an infinitival construction that I was able to find is attested in \textit{Codicele Voronețean –CV} - (The Deeds of the Apostles), a translation from Slavonic dated approximately 1528/1532. The example in (44) is the only one I found in CV and before Coresi (1581). Notice that \textit{de} precedes the particle \( a \). \textit{De} without \( a \) is not possible in a Romanian infinitive while in West Romance languages either \( a \) or \textit{de/di} may precede the infinitive verb but not both\(^9\).

\(^9\) These Italian examples show that the infinitive (\textit{lavorare}) may be preceded by \textit{di} or \( a \), depending on the matrix verb. Neither example is possible with both particles.

(i) Tenterò \textit{di} lavorare \textit{di più.}
There is no instance of the infinitival *de* in Coresi (1561) or Coresi (1577), but in Coresi (1581) *de* is established as an infinitival particle, preceding the particle *a*. The difference in time regarding the association of *de* with the infinitive may be explained by the regional difference. CV (1532) is produced in Northern Transylvania, while Coresi’s dialect belongs to the South, Țara Românească (The Romanian Country/Walachia). It seems that the association *de* – infinitive is not older than the sixteenth century.

2.3.2.2 Why was the addition of *de* necessary?

The most important aspects of the emergence of *de* with the *a*-infinitive to be considered are its function, position, and constituency.

In Coresi (1581), there is a significant number of infinitival constructions where the infinitive has the original suffix -re, that is, the long infinitive, followed by the morpheme for the definite article (enclisis) -a. This infinitive form is preceded by the particle *a*, which is in turn preceded by the preposition *de*, e.g., *de a cântarea* (cânta-re-a) ‘to sing’, where cânta is the short infinitive, -re is the long infinitive affix, and –a is the enclitic article.

As the contrast between (45) and (46) shows, *de* only appears where the infinitive is long and has the definite article (46). (Short infinitives with article do not exist). The examples in (45) have regular *a*-infinitives (without *de*). The infinitives in (46) are in fact nominalized infinitives, as marked by the definite article *a*, thus they need a case assigner.

(44) nu mă lepădu *de* a muri
not me disavow.1sg de to die
‘I don’t disavow death.’
CV (1528/1532:66)

(ii) Proverò *a* lavorare di piú.
‘I will try to work more.’
(Rizzi, 1982:94)
we have power to repudiate thing.
‘We have the power to repudiate that somber thing.’
Coresi (1581:45)

b. Iaste obiceaiulu a lăsa i a se începe al doilea
is custom to let and to rflx begin the second
‘There is a custom to let others first and to be the second.’
Coresi (1581:507)

(46) a. Nu va fi folosu de-a ne căi-re-a
not will be use de-to us repent.the
‘There will be no use for us to repent’
Coresi (1581:480)

b. Că acmucă vreamea de-a priimi-re-a buntatea
that now is time de-to receive.the goodness.the
‘Because now is the time to receive goodness.’
Coresi (1581:480)

The particle a plus long infinitive is preceded by de not only in complements to nouns
(46) but whenever the infinitive has the definite article suffix as in the complement to the verb in
(47) or in the impersonal structure in (48).

(47) a. Și gata vom putea fi de-a merge-re-a
and ready will.1pl can be de-to go.the
‘We will be ready and able to go’
Coresi (1581:335)

b. Iară deață încetă de-a grăi-re-a, zise către Simonu:
and if ceased.3sg de-to preach, said.3sg to Simon
‘And when he ceased to preach, said to Simon:’
Coresi (1581:330)

(48) Iară de-a mâncă-re-a și de-a be-re-a și a ne îmbrăca
but de-to eat.the and de-to drink.the and to us clothe
noao nu apară Domnului
us.Dat not helps Lord.Dat
‘And to eat and to drink and to provide our clothes does not assist the Lord/does not matter to the Lord’
Coresi (1581:222)
The nominalized infinitives (marked with definite article) in the examples (46,47,48) need a case assigner, a function the particle *a* is not able to perform\(^{10}\). Then *a* and the infinitive were reanalyzed as a constituent and *de* was required to assign case to nominalized infinitives. Therefore, one reason for the emergence of *de* was to assign case to nominalized infinitives. This implies that the status and position of the particle *a* in the sentence had changed, from a C element/position to an I element/position. As Gramatica (1963) points out *de* and *a* do not form a unit, i.e., a complex mood marker or a complex complementizer.

Next, *de* began to introduce infinitival complements with *a* plus the -*re* infinitive without an article. As illustrated in (49), *facere* is not marked by the article *a*.

(49) a. Ci de *a* facere lege au făgădui
And de to make law have promised
‘They promised to make a law’
Ureche (1647:93)

As expected, since the usual form of the infinitive was without the suffix –*re* (the sixteenth century) *de* became established as an element whose function was to introduce *a*-(short)infinitival clauses. One example is found as early as Coresi (1581). Notice that the same matrix verb *a sta* ‘to cease’ takes a *de a* long infinitive complement (50a) and a *de a*-infinitive complement (50b). *De* began to introduce *a*-infinitival control clauses.

(50) a. Cându stătu *de-a grăirea* lui
when ceased.3sg de to say.the he.Dat/Gen
‘When he ceased to preach./When he stopped from sermonizing’
Coresi (1581:461)

b. Că stătu *de-a grăi, zise către Simonu*
that ceased.3g de to preach, said.3sg to Simon
‘When he ceased to preach, said to Simon:’
Coresi (1581:329)

\(^{10}\) There seems to be no evidence that the particle *a* also used to assign case to nominalized infinitives and subsequently lost this function.
Having made its debut in Coresi (1581), the *de a*-infinitive took some time to attain productivity. The first Moldavian (preserved) chronicles of the next century include *de a*-infinitive structures. The illustration of (51) includes an infinitival control clause; an adjective triggers the infinitival clause in (52).

(51)  Iară alți împărați carii au urmat
but other emperors who have followed
lăsăm de a-i mai scrie
give up.1pl de to-them more write
‘But we decline to write about other emperors who followed.’
Ureche (1647:75)

(52)  n-a fost harnic de a lua tabăra căzăcească
not-has been able de to take camp.the Cossack
‘He wasn’t able to take the Cossack camp’
Costin (1675:61)

Aside from assigning case, *de* joined the infinitive in order to reinforce the purposive value. In the next example (53), featuring an infinitival purpose clause (the only one with *de* in Coresi, 1581), *de* has two functions: assigning case to the infinitive verbal noun and introducing the purpose clause. The perception that the *a*-infinitive lost its capacity to form purpose clauses is supported by this example (i.e., the need for a stronger subordinator).

(53)  de-a răspunderea înaintea nărodului pre acesta puse
de-to answer.the before people.the P this put
‘He appointed this man in order to answer before the people’
Coresi (1581:268)

In sum, *de* was initially necessary to assign case to infinitival verbal nouns and to introduce purpose clauses.

2.3.2.3 Why *de*?

The third question about the association of *de* with infinitive is why this particular element was chosen to introduce infinitival clauses. According to the view expressed in Gramatica I (1963:225) infinitival complements proceeded by the preposition *de* are Gallicisms.
However, since de/di also introduces infinitival complements in Romance languages in general, a plausible explanation could be that parallel changes may have common causes and common solutions, although the changes may take place independently in each language.

The diachronic evidence shows that this evolutionary similarity is independent in Romanian. This particular element, de, had been employed in the C position in finite structures, before its adoption by infinitive structures. In CV (1532) there are a few purpose structures produced with indicative and introduced by the preposition de. In Coresi (1561, 1577) and especially in Coresi (1581), these structures are quite abundant. Two instances of indicative purpose clauses introduced by de are shown in (54).

(54) a. Și șni șnu de mă spălai
and went.1sg de me.Acc washed.1sg
‘And I went to wash (myself)’
Coresi (1581:170)

b. și se va întoarce de va face păcatu
and rflx will.3sg return de will.3sg do sin
‘And he will revert to sin.’
Coresi 1581:23

De even replaces the subjunctive complementizer ca. In the examples (55a) and (56a) the subjunctive clauses (marked by să) are introduced by de. The b. examples are the normal counterparts introduced by the subjunctive complementizer ca. De must be a complementizer in the finite purpose clauses constructed with indicative (54) or subjunctive (55a, 56a) so it occupies the C⁰ position. Thus, it is plausible to assume that de has been transplanted in infinitival complement and purpose clauses with the same function in the same, C⁰, position.

(55) a. Se nevoiescu de să o ajungă
rflx strive.3pl de să her reach
‘They strive to reach it.’
Coresi (1581:518)
b. Se nevoiescă ca să ajunge
refl. strive.3pl that să it.Acc reach
‘They strive to reach it.’

(56) a. lucrului sfârșii ce-ai datu mie de să facu
thing.the finished.1sg which-have.2sg given me.Dat de să do.1sg
‘I finished the thing you asked me to do.’
Coresi (1581:185)

b. lucrului sfârșii ce-ai datu mie ca să facu
thing.the finished.1sg which-have.2sg given me.Dat that să do.1sg
‘I finished the thing you asked me to do.’

The most interesting and unexpected constructions found in Coresi (1581) consist of
matrix implicative verbs taking indicative complement clauses introduced by de, as illustrated in
(57a, 58a). While indicative purpose clauses introduced by de have always existed and are still
in use in CR, it is unusual for implicative verbs (normally OC verbs) such as a îndrăznii ‘to dare’
(57a) and a căuta ‘to try’ (58a) to take indicative complements.

By hypothesis, the indicative structures of (57a) and (58a) will become the infinitival
control complement clauses in (57b) and (58b). It is shown in Chapter 4, Section 4.3, that these
two verbs select de a-infinitive complements.

The examples in (57a) and (58a) may also suggest that the a-infinitive is becoming
weaker not only for creating adjunct clauses but even for complement control clauses.

(57) a. Îndrăznii de se apropiia
dared.3sg de reflx approached.3sg
‘He dared to come closer.’
Coresi (1581:547)

b. Radu îndrăznii de a se apropiia.
Radu dared.3sg de to reflx approach
‘Radu dared to come closer.’

(58) a. Va căuta de va vedea acelu șarpe
will.3sg try de will.3sg see that snake
‘He will try to see that snake’
Coresi (1581:463)
b. Radu va căuta de a vedea acel șarpe
Radu will.3sg try de to see that snake
‘Radu will try to see that snake’

Since *de* is obviously a complementizer introducing finite purpose clauses and finite complement clauses, it is only natural to use the same complementizer with the same function to introduce infinitival clauses. Thus, it is plausible to assume that the complementizer *de* has been extended to infinitival complement clauses also as a complementizer. As a *C*^0^ element, *de* was the best candidate to perform the duties lost by the particle *a*. (In 4.3, crucial evidence establishes the *C*^0^ status of *de*).

### 2.3.3 Addition of Other Prepositional Complementizers

As shown above, *a*-infinitival purpose clauses were extinct or moribund by the end of the sixteenth century. As also noted, the preposition *de* and the preposition *spre* ‘towards’ were observed to introduce infinitival purpose clauses. The next two examples (59,60) feature infinitival purpose constructions introduced by *de*. Recall that one purpose clause introduced by *de*, in (53) above, appears even in Coresi (1581).

(59) A(u) fost chemat de a se afla față
has been called de to rflx be present
la deosebirea acelor stânjeni
of differentiating those.Gen acres
‘He was called to witness the marking of the boundary between two pieces of land’
Alexiu (1939:76), 1795 document

(60) Să fie legiuită de a se vinde
să be.3sg legalized de to rflx sell
‘Let it be legalized in order to be sold.’
Alexiu (1939:128), 1815 document

However, infinitival purpose clauses introduced by *de* are not as productive as those introduced by the preposition/prepositional complementizers *spre* ‘towards’ and *pentru* ‘for/in order to’. It has been noted above that purpose constructions with *spre* and finite verbs were the
precursors of infinitival purpose clauses introduced by this preposition. It is remarkable that, still in the light of Haspelmath (1989), another allative preposition (*spre*) is employed to introduce infinitival purpose clauses.

Infinitival purposives with *spre* are more frequent than those introduced by *pentru*, a pattern reflected in Alexiu’s (1939) collections of rural documents issued between 1608-1841. (61) with *spre* and (62) with *pentru* are from Alexiu’s collection. No such constructions occur in Ureche (1647) or Costin (1675). Both types are in use in CR.

(61) Nu-l scoate față (*hrișovul*)
    not-it.Acc show (charter)
    *spre* a să izbrâni judecata
    towards to rflx conclude trial.the
    ‘He doesn’t show the charter in order to conclude the trial’
    Alexiu (1939:44), 1777 document

(62) orânduiți boeri *pentru* a să hotărâ aceasta
    designate.2pl boyards for to rflx trace this
    mai sus numita moșie
    above mentioned estate
    ‘Designate boyards in order to mark the borderline of the estate in question.’
    Alexiu (1939:54), 1778 document

Various prepositions will also begin to introduce other adjuncts around the middle of the seventeenth century. A construction with an adjunct introduced by the complex preposition *în loc de* ‘instead of’ appears as early as Coresi (1581). This construction is cited in (63) and a more recent example appears in (64).

(63) Și *în locu de* a sparge și a risipi
    and instead of to break and to waste
    ‘And instead of breaking and wasting..’
    Coresi (1581:404)

(64) *în loc d’* a porni asupră-le, el sta în nelucrare,..
    instead of to embark against-them, he stood in inaction
    ‘Instead of embarking against them, he stood doing nothing.’
    Bălcescu (1852:340)
Other adjuncts are introduced by the prepositions: până ‘till/until’ (65), fără/fără de ‘without’ (66), and înainte de ‘before of’ (67)

(65) Au purces până a se strânge oastea
have.3pl left till to rflx gather army.the
‘They left before the army was gathered.’
Ureche (1647:49)

(66) A(u) vândut partea ei făr de a nu întreba la socră-său
has sold part her without to not ask P father-in-law-her
‘She sold her part without asking her father-in-law’s approval’
Alexiu (1939:39), 1777 document

(67) Înainte de a se despărți … prințul se învoi a
before of to rflx depart prince.the rflx agreed to ..
‘Before departing the prince agreed to.’
Bălcescu (1852:141)

All these infinitival adjuncts have spread and increased in frequency, reaching their peaks during the nineteenth century. None of the prepositional complementizers introducing infinitival adjuncts form a complex preposition with the infinitival preposition a, thus a must have a different status.

In sum, the Romanian infinitive underwent the following changes. It lost its initial morpheme, the suffix –re, and the particle a was added for its purposive value and to stand for the identity of infinitive. (It is also possible that a had already become an infinitival adjunct. When it was subsequently reanalyzed as the infinitival mood marker, -re became vacuous and dropped).

Bleached of its purposive value and unable to assign case, a and the infinitive verb were reanalyzed as a constituent. The status and position of a is expected to change. Assuming that prior to these events a was a C^0 element, now it is reanalyzed as generated in I^0, leaving the C^0 position for the emerging de. Thus, the particle de came into play to replace the functions the
particle *a* was not able (or not longer able) to fulfill. By the end of the sixteenth century, the particle *a* was no longer a complementizer.

### 2.3.4 The Romanian Infinitive vs. Infinitives of Other Languages

A brief survey of the changes involving infinitives in other languages will reveal to what extent the Romanian changes are normal or idiosyncratic, and what brought about the demise of the Romanian infinitive in control complements.

Like Romanian, English lost its infinitive suffixes, *-an* and *-enne*, and like the *a*-infinitive, the *to*-infinitive began as a purposive and spread as a complement (Miller 2002:187). By contrast, the English *to* never completely lost its capacity to introduce purpose clauses. Also *to* never lost its integrity as a preposition, whereas the Romanian particle *a* became confined to the role of infinitive marker.

The German infinitive underwent two reinforcements, as reported by Haspelmath (1989). Because the bare infinitive was less clearly marked as infinitive, the particle *zi/zu* had to be added as the first reinforcement. Then *um* (with initial meaning ‘about’; ‘for’) was added to fulfill the function of purpose. In Modern German, *zu* is not able to express purpose.

Also, the Dutch particle *te* lost its semantic integrity, so it was no longer able to introduce purpose clauses, and the particle *om* had to come into play. An infinitival purpose clause requires *om te* (Miller 2002:236). Thus, the Romanian infinitive like the infinitives in German and Dutch underwent two reinforcements regarding purpose clauses.

The Romanian infinitive and that in other Romance languages added the same particles (of Latin origin) *a* and *de/di*, but unlike Romance, the Romanian infinitive lost its specific suffix. In addition, the particle *a* becomes obligatory in Romanian (the mark of the infinitive), which never happened in the rest of Romance. Finally, *de* must precede the *a*-infinitive in Romanian, while *a* and *de/di* never coexist in the rest of Romance. Like Romanian, other Romance
languages employ specific prepositional complementizers for introducing purpose clauses, e.g., Spanish *para* ‘for’.

Overall, the changes undergone by the Romanian infinitive are similar to those in other languages. No extraordinary changes occurred in the Romanian infinitive, yet only Romanian and none of the languages mentioned above lost infinitival complementation.

2.4 **Distribution of the Particle a**

The particle *a* became the mark of the infinitive after the infinitive distinguishing morpheme (the suffix *–re*) vanished making the infinitive verbal form indistinguishable from indicative verbal forms. The presence of the particle *a* is always required in constructions with infinitives, with very few exceptions however. Besides the complex tenses future and conditional (shown in 2.2), the bare infinitive is possible after certain verbs. This section is concerned with the contexts in which the bare infinitive occurs or used to occur.

From the sixteenth century, the time of the earliest documents, the Romanian infinitive is established with the form *a* plus short infinitive, e.g., *a face* ‘to make’, or simply *a*-infinitive. Long-form infinitives (with *–re* suffix) appear here and there as vestiges, mostly in Coresi (1581) and Ureche (1650). Rarely, the long infinitive continues to appear from time to time and can be found as late as Creangă (1879), but the last documented *–re* infinitive remains to be attested.

The infinitive in (68) represents one of the earliest attested *a*-infinitive forms. (69) shows the original form of the infinitive with its specific *–re* suffix and without the particle *a*. The same matrix verb, *a ti* ‘to know’, that triggers the long infinitive in (69) triggers an *a*-infinitive in (70). The long infinitive in (69) is really a relic, a rare attestation of older form of the infinitive, before losing the suffix *–re* and adding the proclisis *a*. In the available sources, the long infinitive is typically found preceded by the particle *a* (71).
When the particle *a* was added to the infinitive, a small number of matrix verbs rejected the particle when followed by infinitive verbs, a phenomenon not unique to Romanian. Vittorini (1942) observes that potentially auxiliary verbs like *to want, to be able to, to have, to be obliged to* do not select infinitives preceded by prepositions in Romance (Spanish, Italian, French). Miller (2002) also points out that (pre-)modal verbs rejected the *to*-infinitive (in later Early Old English) when it spread to various control structures. At that stage, Miller argues, *to* was not yet in the M(ood) position (not an inflectional element yet).

In Romanian, four matrix verbs initially rejected *a*-infinitive complements: *a vrea* ‘to want’, *a putea* ‘can, a ști ‘to know’ and *a avea* ‘to have’. Passing through stages of selecting either bare infinitives or *a*-infinitives, only two of them ended up selecting bare infinitives.

Regardless of the selection preferences, when the infinitive is preposed, the infinitival particle *a* must be present, as the contrast in (72) indicates. In (72a) the nonfinite verb normally follows the modal that selected it and the particle *a* is not necessary. If the infinitive can be
preposed like in (72b), the particle must be present. This constraint is evident from (72c) where
the absence of the particle a renders the derivation ungrammatical.

(72) a. Nu pot pleca devreme.
   not can.1sg leave.Inf early
   ‘I cannot leave early.’

   b. A pleca devreme, nu pot.
      to leave early, not can.1sg
      ‘I cannot leave early.’

   c. *pleca devreme, nu pot.

2.4.1 The Verb a Vrea ‘to Want’

The future marker in Romanian developed from the verb a vrea (a Balkanesque feature). Thus, although initially the verb a vrea selected bare infinitive complements, there was a split
between the future construction with the bare infinitive and the volitional structure with the a-infinitive, possibly in order to avoid the ambiguity infinitive – future indicative.

The data below include instances of a vrea followed by bare infinitive (73), examples of
early forms of future markers (74) and a vrea selecting a-infinitive complements (75).

In (73), a vrea takes verb complements, that is, bare infinitive complements. The past forms of a
vrea in all the examples of (73) exclude them as future markers.

(73) a. Toate câte vru Domnul face în ceriu
   all those wanted Lord.the do.Inf in Heaven
   ‘All the things the Lord wanted to make in Heaven.’
   Coresi (1577:553)

   b. nimea n’au vrut întreba nici dinioară
      nobody.Acc not’have wanted ask.Inf nor before
      ‘They never wanted to ask anyone (about that).’
      Coresi (1581:273)

   c. Au vrut fi apucat şi alte cetăţi
      have.3pl wanted be seized and other citadels
      ‘They wanted to have seized other citadels too.’
      Ureche (1647:45)
A vrea in (74), is the future marker. In (74a) the contexts indicates that vre is the future marker. Also, the clitics -l and -i in (74a) and (74d) respectively, which can precede the future marker but not the lexical verb, indicate that the forms of vrea are not lexical verbs in these two examples. The future marker for first person plural is already different from the form of the verb a vrea for the same person. Compare vâmu ‘we will’ and vremu ‘we want’ in (74b). At this stage however both forms may indicate future. The two consecutive (indicative) lexical verbs are impossible in (74c), showing that vrea is a future marker form.

(74) a. iară de-l vre piarde (sufletul) but if-cl.Acc will lose (the soul) ‘But if he will lose it (his soul)’

Coresi (1560/1:127)

b. că vâmu totu avea de vremu bea that will.1pl all have if want.1pl drink.Inf ‘That we will have everything if we want to drink,’

Coresi (1581:154)

c. Nu vrea putea fi not will.3sg can be.Inf ‘He will not be able to be…’

Ureche (1647:133)

d. Mai apoi, de-i vrea fi a domni mult, then, if-cl.Dat will be to reign long

nu vrea putea fi să nu urmeze frăține-său not will can be să not follow brother-his.Acc ‘Then, if it will be preordained for him to reign for a long time, he will not be allowed not to follow his brother.’

Ureche (1647:118)

A vrea in all the examples in (75) is the lexical verb. In (75a) vrea is itself preceded by the future marker, so it cannot be a future marker. The presence of the particle a in all three examples of (75) excludes the verb a vrea as a future marker. The a-infinitive may directly follow the matrix verb a vrea in (75b), while the subject is postverbal (after vrea) in (75a). Only
\(a\)-infinitives can be preposed (75c). The embedded clauses in (75) are infinitival control complement clauses.

(75) a. că de voru  
\(\text{a vrea}\)  
\(pizmașii\)  
\(ludeii\)  
\(a\)  
\(ocără\)  
that if will.3pl want embittered Jews to defame (Jesus)  
‘If the embittered Jews will want to defame (Jesus)’  
Coresi (1581:349)

b. Cel ce ciudese  
\(\text{făcea}\)  
\(\text{vru a se răstigni}\)  
that which miracles made wanted to rflx crucify  
‘The one who was making miracles wanted to be crucified.’  
Coresi 1581:519)

c. \(\text{A veni nu vrură}\)  
to come not wanted.3pl  
‘To come, they didn’t want.’  
Coresi (1581:305)

In many cases, \(\text{a vrea}\) followed by bare infinitives is ambiguous, as in the following two examples where the forms of \(\text{a vrea}\) in (76) could be either future marker or infinitive.

(76) a. și  
\(\text{vremu lăcui}\)  
\(acie întru anu, \text{și vremu face}\)  
\(negotu\)  
and want.1pl live here in year and want.1pl make trade  
‘And we want to live here next year and want to do business’  
‘And we will live here next year and will do business’  
CV (1528/1532:130)

b. De nu  
\(\text{vrea iarăși căuta}\)  
\(\text{pre Hristosu}\)  
if not wants again seek.Inf (P Christ.the)  
‘If he doesn’t want to seek (the Lord) again’  
‘If he will not seek (Jesus) again’  
Coresi (1581:268)

The future – volition ambiguity and the confusion it may have created led to selection reanalysis, so the verb \(\text{a vrea}\) eventually ended up selecting \(a\)-infinitive complements.

Unfortunately, the duality infinitive – future auxiliary of \(\text{a vrea}\) that existed for a long period of time led to its avoidance as a matrix verb taking infinitive complement clauses. Although \(a\)-infinitive complements selected by \(\text{a vrea}\) appear in rural documents (77) and are also used by
illustrious writers (78), subjunctive complements to this verb spread at the expense of the infinitive. *A vrea* was the first verb that lost its infinitival complementation.

(77) Toader nu **vra a eşi din casă**  
Tudor not wants to exit from house  
‘Tudor does not want to leave the house’  
Stefanelli (1915:410), 1837 document

(78) **Vru a cuprinde** Modova şi a-şi răzbuna…  
wanted.3sg to take Moldavia and to-rflx revenge …  
‘He wanted to take Moldavia and to revenge …’  
Bălcescu (1852:191)

In sum, the evidence shows that the verb *a vrea* initially selected bare infinitive but since the future marker evolved from this verb, it had to change and select *a*-infinitives.

Infrequently used as a matrix verb taking infinitival complement clauses, *a vrea* ended up selecting subjunctive complements and is often called a subjunctive verb.

2.4.2 The Verb *a Putea* ‘Can’

The verb *a putea* rejected the *a*-infinitive in the oldest documents, e.g., CV 1528/32, but change was already underway. For instance, when a clitic (or other element) precedes the nonfinite verb *a* is required. When the word order does not follow the standard pattern (i.e., preposing the infinitive) the particle is also required. Diachronically, apart from these restrictions, *a putea* freely takes *a*-infinitive or bare infinitive complements. In (79), *a putea* selects bare infinitives, i.e., VP complements.

(79) a. cela ce **poate mântui** şi piarde  
that who can redeem.Inf and destroy.Inf  
‘The one who can redeem or destroy’  
CV (1528/1532 :130)

b. Nedreptatea nu **putui vedea**  
injustice.the not could.1sg see.Inf  
‘I could not see that injustice.’  
Coresi (1577:527)
In (80), *a putea* must take an *a*-infinitive when a clitic or adverb precedes the verb. A pronominal clitic is present in (80a,b) and an intensifier in (80c) and the infinitival particle is present.

(80) a. așa vămă putea a ne chema oile
so will.1pl can to us.cl call.Inf sheep
‘We will not be able to gather our sheep.’
Coresi (1581:490)

b. copila Măriei tale nu poate a-ți ascunde nimic.
damsel greatness your not can.3sg to-cl.2.Dat hide anything
‘Your greatness’ daughter cannot hide anything from you.’
Sadoveanu (1880-1961) Zodia Cancerului

c. nu putem a mai răspunde
not can.1pl a more answer
‘We cannot be responsible anymore.’
Stefanelli (1915:189), 1790 document

Unlike the examples of (80), the clitics in (81) appear in the matrix (preceding the verb *a putea*). In this environment, the infinitival particle is not allowed. The examples (81a,b) are said to be the result of clitic climbing, i.e., from the infinitival (embedded) clause to the clitic position of the matrix. (Restructuring and clitic climbing will be discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4.8).

Clitic climbing is disallowed when *a* is present (81c).

(81) a. Nu-l poate îmblânzi
not-he.cl Acc can.3sg appease.Inf
‘He cannot appease him.’
Ureche (1647:60)

b. Nu le putem afla numele
not-they.cl Acc can.1pl find out.Inf names.the
‘We cannot find out their names.’
Ureche (1647:87)

c. *Nu le putem a afla numele.

In all examples of (82), *a putea* selects *a*-infinitive complement clauses, although nothing imposes the presence of the infinitive marker. The position of the matrix subject *oile* ‘the sheep’,
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between the matrix verb and the infinitive verb in (82d) or the connective of the conjoined
infinitival clauses in (82e) have no input in the presence of a. Both (82d) and (82e) are possible
without the infinitival particle, diachronically. In CR, they are possible only without the particle.

(82) a. nu poate a mearge pre urma Domnului
    not can.3sg to go P way Lord.Gen
    ‘He is not able to follow God’s way.’
    Coresi (1581:416)

b. Nice împărătul nemţăscu au putut a aşedza
    nor emperor.the German has could to put
    Ardealul în partea sa
    Transylvania in part.the his
    ‘Not even the German emperor was able to take Transylvania’
    Costin (1675:16)

c. Să putem a împlini această datorie
    să can.1pl to fulfill this duty
    ‘So that we can fulfill this duty.’
    Stefanelli (1915:281), 1800 document

d. nu potu oile a treace pren mijlocul lupilor
    not can.3pl sheep to pass through middle wolves.Gen
    ‘The sheep cannot pass through a pack of wolves.’
    Coresi (1581:202)

e. putem cânta şi a grăi
    can.1pl sing.Inf and to speak
    ‘We can sing and talk.’
    Coresi (1581:108)

The verb a putea has become restricted to bare infinitive complements in CR. This means
that, without the particle a, no negation, clitics or adverbial intensifiers are possible immediately
preceding the bare nonfinite verb. These elements must occur in the matrix. In (83) the negation,
the clitic, and the intensifier are placed in the matrix. A putea is here reanalyzed as a member of
the category M(modal).

(83)   Nu îl mai pot vedea
    Not cl.him more can see.Inf
    ‘I cannot see him anymore.’
Nonetheless, there are cases where \( a \) is required. The construction in (84a) is identical in OSR and CR. The negation must be both in the matrix and the subordinate clause and \( nu \) ‘not’ before an infinitive is not possible when the mood marker is absent (84b).

(84) a. că el nu putea a nu primi cu cuviință un ambasador that he not could to not receive with homage an ambassador ‘That he couldn’t receive an ambassador without homage’.
   Bălcescu (1852:303)

b. *că el nu putea nu primi cu cuviință un ambasador

Also, when \( a \) putea is used in its reflexive form, a clitic or an intensifier (\( mai \)) are not allowed in the matrix, thus they must be in the embedded clause and the mood marker is required (85). When the infinitive precedes \( a \) putea, the infinitive must have its marker (86).

(85) Nu se poate a-l mai urca pe aici not rflx can.3sg to-him more lift P here ‘He cannot be lifted this way anymore.’
   Popescu (1992:449)

(86) Voi a vă mântui nu puteți you.pl to rflx redeem not can.2pl ‘You cannot redeem yourselves on your own.’
   CV (1528/1532:92)

In the absence of any factor that requires \( a \), \( a \) putea takes a bare infinitive complement, simply because there is no infinitive – indicative semantic ambiguity.

2.4.3 The Verb \( a \) Ști ‘to Know’

The verb \( a \) ști followed by the infinitive is rather rare in the oldest documents. In Coresi (1577) there is one instance of \( a \) ști followed by the long infinitive, with no infinitival particle, as illustrated above in (69). In Coresi (1581), there are two instances of \( a \) ști selecting an infinitive. One is followed by the \( a \)-infinitive (87) the other by a bare infinitive (88).

(87) Mai multu nemica nu știe alta a înțoarce către Dumnezeu more nothing not knows other to turn to God ‘He knows nothing more than to turn to God.’
   Coresi (1581:238)
A ști continues to select either a-infinitives (89) or bare infinitives (90), but the a-infinitive is predominant.

(89) căți am știut scrie
those have.1pl known write.Inf
‘Those of us who knew how to write.’
Stefanelli (1915:290), 1801 document

(90) n-ai știut a profita de ocazie
not-have.2sg known to profit of occasion
‘You didn’t know how to take advantage of this occasion.’
Potra et al (1972) 1848 letter

As expected, when one of the one-syllable elements allowed between the infinitival particle and the infinitive verb is present, the particle is required. The examples (91) and (92) have a-infinitives imposed by the presence of the reflexive pronouns. Both the negation and the clitic in (93a) require the presence of the infinitival particle. Without the particle, the derivation is ungrammatical (93b).

(91) martorii neștiind a să ișcăli
witnesses-the not knowing to rflx sign
‘The witnesses didn’t know how to sign (were illiterate).’
Stefanelli (1915:409) 1836 document, Câmpulung Moldova

(92) Nemții știu a se bate
germans.the know to rflx fight
‘The Germans know how to fight.’
Bălcescu (1852:66)

(93) a. Să fie știut a nu mă tăgădui …
să be known to not me.cl deny
‘Let it be known that I have an uncontestable right…’
Alexiu (1939:144), 1821 document, V.Teleajenului

b. *Să fie știut nu mă tăgădui
A ști may also select infinitival question/interrogative complements where the infinitival particle is present. One example is included below (94).

(94)  nu știm de ce a ne minuna mai mult
not know.1pl of what to us wonder more
‘We don’t know what more to wonder about.’
Bălcescu (1852:95)

When the verb a ști takes infinitival interrogative complements, the particle a may be optional (95) or required (96a). The latter may be possible only as an indicative construction (96b). In some cases, the absence of the particle a results in infinitive (97a) – indicative (97b) ambiguity.

(95)  Nu știu cu cine (a) mă împrieteni
not know.1sg with who to rflx befriend
‘I don’t know with who to be friend.’

(96) a. Știe încotro/unde *(a) merge
knows where (to) go
‘She knows where to go.’

b. Știe încotro/unde merge
knows where goes
‘She knows where he goes.’

(97) a. Nu știu ce face.
not know.1sg what do.Inf
‘I don’t know what to do.’

b. Nu știu ce face.
not know.1sg what does.Ind
‘I don’t know what he does.’

Assuming that a is a complementizer when this particle is absent when following wh-phrases11 in constructions with the verb a ști plus interrogative complements is disproved by the

---

11 A wh-word and a complementizer do not coexist in Romanian (shown in Section 3.4). Therefore, a cannot be a complementizer if it appears following wh-words.
fact that the infinitive following wh-phrases may or may not be accompanied by the particle a. In addition, the particle is often required in such constructions.

Popescu (1992:307) believes that a ști followed by bare infinitives is a regionalism. Diachronically, some writers never use bare infinitives after the verb a ști, while others use either bare infinitives or a-infinitives when possible, but an a-infinitive when wh-words are present.

In general, the verb a ști is rarely able to select infinitival complements if the infinitival particle a is absent.

2.4.4 The Verb a Avea ‘to Have’

Deontic a avea, which denotes obligation, permission and possibility, always selects a-infinitives (98) or de a-infinitive complements (99). The contrast in (100) shows that the infinitival particle is required when deontic a avea takes an infinitival complement. The example (100a) is repeated in (100b) but without the particle and the derivation crashes.

(98) Iară de veri zice să vie [ea are a veni] but if will.2sg say să comes she has to come ‘But if you will tell her to come she has to come’ Coresi (1581:228)

(99) Au avut de a răscumpăra (cincizeci stânjeni) have.3pl had de to buy back (fifty fathoms) ‘They had to by back those fifty fathoms’ Alexiu (1939:62) 1786 document

(100) a. Veți avea a semănă întru deșertu will.2pl have to sow into desert ‘You will have to sow in the desert’ Coresi (1581:459)

b. * Veți avea semănă întru deșertu

A avea followed by the a-infinitive could be also considered a future tense where a avea is an auxiliary. This construction seems to be inherited from Vulgar Latin which had a future formed with habere ‘to have’ and the infinitive. Structures with habere expressed initially
necessity, then future (Graur et al., 1965:82). Actually, it may be possible to consider *are a veni* ‘has to come’ in (98) a periphrastic structure expressing future: ‘she will come’. However, there are structures with *a avea* and infinitives where *a avea* itself may have future tense as in (100) or past tense as in (99).

Apart from the constructions with deontic *a avea* and infinitival clauses, there are some constructions with *a avea* plus expressions with *wh*-words and infinitives\(^\text{12}\). The infinitive in these constructions is usually bare in OSR (102) but the particle *a* may be also present (101). In CR, these constructions appear only with bare infinitives.

(101) a.  
   n-are  **cine a asculta**, nici **a spăşi**,  
   not-has who to listen, nor to repent  
   ‘There is no one to listen or to repent.’  
   Coresi (1581:254)

   b.  
   şi neavând **de unde a plăti** datornicilor  
   and not having from where to pay creditors.Dat  
   ‘and they weren’t able to pay the creditors’  
   Stefanelli (1915:412), 1837 document

(102) a.  
   N- avem **de unde lua**  
   not- have.1pl from where take.Inf  
   ‘There is nothing we can take from anywhere.’  
   Stefanelli (1915:234), 1793 document

   b.  
   Nu avea **de ce se apuca**  
   not had.3sg of what rflx lean.Inf  
   ‘He didn’t have anything to lean on’  
   Costin (1675:105)

   c.  
   N’amu  **cu ce mă hrăni**  
   not’have.1sg with what rflx feed.Inf  
   ‘I don’t have anything to feed myself’  
   Coresi (1581:399)

\(^\text{12}\) Schulte (2004:161) calls structures like those in (101, 102) “coreferential indirect wh-questions complements”. However, they seem different from the structures with *a ști* and interrogative complements (94, 95, 97). The segment that begins with the *wh*-word seems to be an NP, e.g., the chunk in bold in (101, 102).
By contrast, the same type of constructions but with the verb *a fi* ‘to be’ plus *wh*-words must always be followed by the *a*-infinitive, as illustrated by the examples in (103a,104a,105a).

The b. examples are the a. examples, but with bare infinitives. Without the particle *a* the verb *ascunde* ‘hide’ in (103b) has the form of 3rd person singular, present indicative; the verb *izbăvi* in (104b) has the form of 3rd person singular simple perfect indicative; The example (104b) is ungrammatical without the particle *a*.

(103) a. Că nu e cine *a* **ascunde** căldura sa that not is who to hide warmth his `Because there is no one to hide his warmth’
Coresi (1577:94) CP2, 1589 variant

b. Că nu e cine **ascunde** căldura sa that not is who hide.3sg warmth his `Because this is not the one who hides his warmth.’

(104) a. Prindeți-l că nu e cine *a-l* **izbăvi** catch.Imp.2pl-him that not is who to-him redeem `Catch him because there is no one to redeem him.’
Coresi (1577:294) CP2, 1589 variant

b. Prindeți-l că nu e cine -l **izbăvi** catch.Imp.2pl-him that not is who -him redeemed `Catch him because he is not the one who redeemed him

(105) a. nu era cum *a sta* împotriva őstilor not was how to stay against armies.Gen `It wasn’t possible to confront those armies.’
Costin (1675:137)

b. *nu era cum **sta** împotriva őstilor

The question is what makes it possible for an infinitive to appear without the particle *a*?

Comparing the examples with *a avea* ‘to have’ (101-102) with those with *a fi* ‘to be’ (103-105), it appears that the particle *a* is required when its absence leads to ungrammaticality or to ambiguity between infinitive and indicative readings.
Since nearly any bare infinitive form is homophonous with some indicative verbal form, the occurrence of bare infinitive complements (with or without *wh*-words) is strictly attributed to the nature of the respective matrix verb.

In the end, due to their nature, only two verbs are able to take bare infinitive complements: *a putea* ‘can’ and, rarely, *a şti* ‘to know’. Apart from these exceptions, the infinitive is always preceded by the particle *a*, in any infinitival structure. Without *a*, an infinitival structure is rendered ungrammatical, e.g., (106b). Although *write* could be infinitive or indicative, (106b) cannot be grammatical as an indicative structure because a C element is always needed to introduce an embedded indicative clause (106c). Therefore, an infinitive-indicative ambiguity is only possible when a subordinator, i.e., *wh*-phrases, precedes the nonfinite verb in the absence of the infinitival particle *a*, as seen in the case of the verb *a şti*.

(106) a. Radu speră *a* scrie o carte.  
Radu hopes *to write a book*  
‘Radu hopes to write a book.’

b. *Radu speră scrie* o carte.  
*Radu hopes write.Inf/3sg.Ind*  
*Radu hopes write/writes a book*

c. Radu speră *că* scrie o carte.  
Radu hopes that *write.3sg.Ind a book*  
‘Radu hopes that she is writing a book.’

In sum, the particle *a* is the unique morphology of the infinitive: the “one-member paradigm” of infinitive in Haspelmath’s (1989) terms. Without the particle *a*, the infinitive has no identity and infinitival structures are not possible (excepting the cases discussed above).

### 2.5 Causes of Infinitive Loss

This section is concerned with the factors that caused, contributed and ultimately led to the loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian.
The theory of a single language influence that spread into the languages of the Balkans seems to be true for Romanian. In Sandfeld’s (1930) view, Greek influence was the source for the loss of the infinitive in control complements. Sandfeld’s approach is sustained by the following arguments. Traces of infinitives do not exist in the southernmost languages, Greek and Tosk Albanian, and the traces increase from South to North, with some traces in Bulgarian and more in Romanian and Serbo-Croatian. This means that the change was propagated from the South to the North of the Balkan region, a conclusion further sustained by the evidence of early development in the Greek infinitive (i.e., loss of the infinitive). Subsequently, the predominant influence of the Greek culture, which began early, can be observed in the whole Balkan region. Lastly, the changes undergone by the Greek infinitive, which began at a very early date (just before the AD era), imply that the infinitive-replacement phenomenon appears to be a natural development in this language.

For Romanian, language contact with Greek was crucial for the loss of the infinitive. This section discusses the avenues of the Greek influence, that is, the proof of language contact, the origin of the infinitive-subjunctive alternation in the same structure types, and the possible internal factors contribution. Since the influence exercised by the Greek language on Romanian has been determinative, a summary of the events that caused the loss of the Greek infinitive is also included. Also, the inventory of the numerous changes undergone by the Greek infinitive is significant when comparing them with the few changes undergone by the Romanian infinitive, suggesting that the internal changes in Greek but not in Romanian caused the loss of infinitival complementation.

2.5.1 Loss of Infinitive in Greek

The regression of the infinitive and its replacement by a reflex of the subjunctive in Greek was a long and gradual process. An outline of the changes undergone by the Greek
The beginning of the regression of the infinitive is placed in late Classical Greek at the time of Thucydides\footnote{Thucydides - Probable date of birth around mid 460s BC; elected Athenian general in 424 BC; The author of *Histories.*} (born approximately mid 460s BC). The phenomenon is marked by the addition of the particle *tou* (a genitive neuter article) in places where the infinitive was strictly bare. This infinitive is called articular infinitive and the particle is called subordinator. Thucydides’ writings include such examples. This “morphological renewal”, is believed to have weakened the infinitive domain without changing its nonfinite status (Joseph, 1983).

In the next stage, of Post-Classical Greek, between circa the second century BC and the sixth century AD, the infinitive appears with the conjunctions *hina, hopo:s,* and *hoti* in a number of environments. In Classical Greek, these conjunctions were used only with finite forms. The use of these conjunctions with infinitives is considered “performance” errors or “popular confusion”, but they brought about the “demise of the infinitive” (Joseph, 1983:51).

In Biblical or Hellenistic Greek, the infinitive is found as a sole form in a small number of environments or, more frequently, in alternation with finite verb forms in other contexts, as attested in early Christian writings.

The New Testament includes infinitives of purpose triggered by verbs of motion with or without *tou* but mostly with *tou*. Its usage with *tou* appears to be greater than in Classical Greek. Parallel, subjunctives with *hina* were possible in the New Testament but still optional. The

---

13 Thucydides - Probable date of birth around mid 460s BC; elected Athenian general in 424 BC; The author of *Histories.*
articulair infinitive was common with the prepositions *dia* and *para* to indicate cause and with *eis* and *pros* to indicate purpose.

It is interesting to notice that verbs like *mello* ‘be about to’, *opheilo* ‘ought to’, *dunamai* ‘can’, *arkhomai* ‘begin, tolm‘ dare’ and *epithumo* ‘wish/desire’ that are usually control verbs occurred with infinitive complements. *Thelo* ‘want’ selected both infinitive clauses and finite clause with *hina* (*na* in Modern Greek). *Thelo* took infinitive complements when the subject of the matrix and that of the subordinate were identical (control) and took finite forms with *hina* in noncontrol situations. Sometimes, an infinitive complement was conjoined with a *hina* complement (as in Romanian: an infinitive clause can be conjoined with a subjunctive clause).

The result was that for almost every construction with the infinitive there was a finite variant, and in general the examples with the infinitive only (e.g., object deletion and object raising) are in small number in the Bible.

From the second century and into Medieval Greek (twelfth century) many changes took place on the morphology of the infinitive: the perfect infinitive was lost; the middle ending was replaced by the passive ending; the first aorist active ending underwent some changes that made it more like the second aorist, etc.

The infinitive continued to appear in Greek during the early Byzantine period, but its replacements were more frequently used. However, the use of the infinitive in nonliterary papiry continued until the seventh century. The infinitive was also quite widely used in Malalas (sixth century) and Moschos (seventh century).

---

14 Aorist (Greek meaning: without horizon, unbounded) is a verb tense which in infinitive and participle is purely aspectual and devoid of any temporal meaning. In Greek (and Sanskrit) the aorist is marked by several morphological devices.

15 Malalas – author of *Chronographia*; chronicler of the sixth century.

16 Moschos - a Desert Father, (D.619) author of the compilation of stories and sayings *The Spiritual Meadow*. 
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The final stages of the loss of the infinitive are perceived during the Medieval Greek (or later stages of Byzantine Greek) from the eleventh century to the seventeenth century. The alternation between infinitive and finite verbs can be noticed between earlier and later manuscripts of the same text. The Paris manuscript of the fifteenth century of *Chronicle of Morea* in many cases has a finite verb where the earlier manuscript, the fourteenth century manuscript of Copenhagen, had an infinitive. The observation here is that these infinitival complements in the manuscript of Copenhagen are triggered by control verbs, the same verbs that were used in Biblical Greek.

The articular infinitive appears sporadically in this period, but these forms are “fixed phrases or lexicalized forms used as simple nouns.” (Joseph, 1983:59.) Some new uses of the infinitive also appear in Medieval Greek. For instance, the temporal or circumstantial infinitive that is an extension of the articular infinitive, now marked with to, (previously tou?) lengthened a bit the duration of the infinitive in general. This temporal infinitive appeared during the tenth century. It was not really used in the Byzantine times but it was quite common in the Medieval Greek vernacular. It shows up in *Chronicle of Morea* quite frequently. The temporal infinitive lasted until the beginning of the fifteenth century. After that, it was replaced by a finite verb.

In the Medieval Greek vernacular texts, the infinitive occurs as complement to the verbs for *have* and *want*, only to form future, conditional and irrealis moods. The loss of the infinitive in Greek must have been over at a time subsequent to the medieval period. In Joseph (1999), the replacement is considered to be over just before the 1600s.

The changes undergone by the Greek infinitive were in much greater number than the changes in other Indo-European languages, Romanian included. In Haspelmath’s (1989)
counting, the Greek infinitive underwent thirteen reinforcements. This difference suggests that the loss of the infinitive in Greek was caused by the numerous internal changes.

2.5.2 Infinitive-Subjunctive Alternation

The oldest Romanian records (sixteenth century) show that some syntactic structures are constructed with either infinitive or subjunctive. These sources leave no indication about the origin of this alternation or about when this phenomenon began, that is when structures constructed with infinitive only began to be also constructed with subjunctive.

For instance, in one of the oldest Romanian sources CV (Codicele Voronețean) the motion verb *a veni* ‘to come’ triggers purpose clauses with infinitive (107a) or subjunctive (107b). The subjunctive-type of purpose clause is still rare at this time. The example below is the only one in CV. Notice that the subjunctive particle is in its stage of se\(^{17}\).

\[(107)\]
\[
a. \text{nime n'au veinritu} a \text{grăi de tinre ceva reu}  
nobody not'have.3sg come to speak of you something bad  
‘Nobody came to say something bad about you.’  
CV (1528/1532:102)
\]
\[
b. E Aleksandru veinre se răspundă gloateei  
and Alexander came Sbj answer.3sg crowd.Gen  
‘And Alexander came to answer the crowd’s questions’  
CV (1528/1532:12)
\]

Also a number of matrix predicates may select either infinitive or subjunctive complement clauses: *a se nevoi* ‘to try/strive’, *a fi gata* ‘to be ready’, *a voi* ‘will’, *a ruga* ‘to ask/beg’, *a putea* ‘can’, *a vrea* ‘to want’, *a dice (zice)* ‘to say’. For instance, the verb *a se nevoi* ‘to try’ takes an infinitival complement clause in (108a) and a subjunctive complement clause in (108b). Both examples are subject control clauses.

\[(108)\]
\[
a. si se nevoiască a întoarce rătăciții cătără dedevărui
\]

\(^{17}\) The form of the subjunctive particle in Old Romanian has the form *se*, which is homophonous with the reflexive pronoun *se*. Sometimes, this reflexive has the form *să*, identical to the subjunctive particle in CR.
And they are trying to guide the lost ones back to the truth.

CV (1528/1532:109)

b. nevoitea-se se pomenească de ... învățători
   tried-rflx Sbj mention.3sg of teachers
   ‘They tried to remember the (spiritual) teachers’
   CV (1528/1532:166)

Some opinions link the replacement of the infinitive with subjunctive complementation in Romanian to some changes in Latin inherited then by Romanian. Joseph (1983) notes that some scholars (Barić 1961, Iliescu 1968, Saltarelli 1981, Rozencvejg 1976) believe that the alternation of the infinitive in Vulgar Latin with finite clauses in certain structures continued and extended into Romanian and ultimately led to a full-scale replacement of the infinitive.

For instance, Barić (1961) argues that there was an inclination in Latin conditional clauses constructed with the subjunctive and the conjunction si to undertake a goal or purpose sense. This tendency permitted the association si- subjunctive to assume the role of infinitival replacement. This argument may have some validity since the subjunctive particle să comes from the Latin si via Old Romanian se. Indeed, să subjunctive may replace most infinitival clauses in Romanian.

However, Joseph (1983) argues that despite an early East-West split within Vulgar Latin, Romanian and the other Romance languages must have shared the same linguistic system at some point. The fact that the loss of the infinitive is restricted to Romanian, the phenomenon may have occurred within the development of Romanian proper. It is well known that in other Romance languages complement to verb structures are constructed with the infinitive when the matrix and the subordinate clauses share the same subject (control), and with the subjunctive
when the two clauses have separate subjects\(^\text{18}\}.\) Romanian departs from Romance by allowing control structures with the subjunctive, (108b) above, or the infinitive (108a).

Furthermore, Joseph (1983) points out that the connection with those fluctuations in Latin could not be more than a starting point in the replacement of some infinitive functions with the subjunctive in Romanian, since this phenomenon never happened in the rest of the Romance languages. Besides, Megleno-Romanian\(^\text{19}\) and Aromanian\(^\text{20}\) whose speakers are deeply located in the Balkans lost all their infinitives, whereas Istro-Romanian\(^\text{21}\) whose speakers are in Croatia, at the border with Italy (their country in the past, before border redesign) retained most of infinitive functions. The replacement of the infinitive in Romania, which is not a fully Balkan country, was considerably slower.

Another source for the infinitive – subjunctive alternation would be language contact. The early contacts among Balkan languages are placed around 600 to 800 AD, according to Klagstadt (1963) cited by Joseph (1983).

Joseph relates that there was a bilingual situation in which Macedonian, Bulgarian and Albanian speakers also spoke Greek. Since the loss of the infinitive in Greek began early and the process was in an advanced stage, it could have motivated the generalization of this phenomenon in the languages of the region.

---

\(^{18}\) As the Spanish examples show, in (i) both verbs share the same subject, whereas in (ii) each verb/clause has its own subject. The examples are borrowed from Joseph (1983).

(i) Quiero venir.
    want.1sg come.Inf
    ‘I want to come’

(ii) Quiero que venga.
    want.1sg that come.Sbj.2sg
    ‘I want you to come’

\(^{19}\) Megleno-Romanian – spoken in Macedonia and Bulgaria northeast of Thessaloniki.

\(^{20}\) Aromanian – or Macedo-Romanian - is spoken in parts of Greece, Albania, and Macedonia.

\(^{21}\) Istro-Romanian – spoken by Romanians in Istria, the territory that used to be Italian, today Croatia.
For Romanian, Joseph argues that the contact with Bulgarian in the south would have promoted the spread of the infinitive-loss. Rosetti (1968:292) mentions another situation of bilingualism (in the region) used by Slavs and Romanians who lived together on the south territory of today’s Romania. Joseph assumes that the difference between Romanian and the languages from the central Balkan region is a chronological one. The process of replacement, which started at an earlier date and was more advanced in Greek than in Bulgarian, explains the late influence of Bulgarian on Romanian. One way of this influence was through the translation of religious books. All Romanian books (at least those preserved) printed during the sixteenth century were religious and church books translated from Slavonic/Old Bulgarian, which in turn were translated from Greek.

Regarding the old Slavic texts translated from Greek, Rosetti (1968:558) describes those translations as “absolutely subservient and often very awkward”. Similarly, the Romanian texts translated from Slavonic follow the Slavonic syntax too closely, resulting in obsequious imitations of the original structures without consideration for the natural Romanian word order and structures. This manner of translation may explain the small number of infinitival complement clauses in the religious books of the sixteenth century.

Regardless of the initial source of the infinitive–subjunctive alternation in Romanian, the possibility of expressing the same structure with two moods will have eventually led to the preference of one of them (subjunctive) at the expense of the other (infinitive). Nonetheless, this alternation alone may not necessarily explain the high-scale retreat of the infinitive from complement clauses in Romanian.

2.5.3 Internal Factors

As already known, the loss of the specific infinitive suffix –re caused the loss of the infinitive morphological and semantic identity. One of the effects of this shortening is that the
new infinitive form is identical with 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular verbal form in indicative present, imperfect, or simple perfect (examples included in the previous section, 2.4).

Some authors argue that the homophony between an infinitive verb and various finite forms may have been a possibility for the interpretation of infinitive forms as being finite. Since similar changes happened in other languages (e.g., Bulgarian, Macedonian), Togeby (1962) argues that these morpho-phonetic developments are the actual explanation for the infinitive loss in those languages. Joseph (1983) considers that although this homophony could have some contribution, there is no evidence for any reanalysis of the infinitive as finite forms, but the potential for such interpretation still exists.

Nevertheless, as evidenced in the previous section on the distribution of the particle \textit{a}, a short infinitive is not possible without this particle, with very few exceptions. For instance, it is simply not possible for a structure like (109a) with a bare infinitive to be interpreted as (109b), where the second clause has an indicative present verb and a subject distinct from the subject of the matrix verb. Although the infinitive verb in (109a) and the third person present indicative verb in (109b) have the same form, there is no infinitive-indicative ambiguity. When this kind of ambiguity may arise, the particle \textit{a} is required, as seen in the parallel examples with the verb \textit{a fi} ‘to be’ in (110). These kinds of examples are discussed in Section 2.4.

(109) a. \textit{Nu am ce face}  
\hspace{1cm} not have.1sg what do.Inf  
\hspace{1cm} ‘I do not have (anything) to do.’

b. *\textit{Nu am ce face el/ea}  
\hspace{1cm} not have.1sg what does he/she  
\hspace{1cm} ‘I don’t have anything him/her to do.’

(110) a. \textit{Că nu e cine a ascunde căldura sa}  
\hspace{1cm} that not is who to hide warmth his  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Because there is no one to hide his warmth’
\hspace{1cm} Coresi (1577:94) CP2, 1589 variant
b. Că nu e cine ascunde căldura sa
that not is who hide.3sg warmth his
‘Because this is not the one who hides his warmth.’

Besides, the loss of the infinitive suffix and the infinitive – indicative homophony in English have not led to the reanalysis of infinitive as finite forms or to the regression of the infinitive in this language. Thus, the shortening of the infinitive verbal form may not explain the infinitive-loss in Romanian.

The weakening of the particle a seemed to have a greater impact on the weakening of the infinitive, however. Recall that by the end of the sixteenth century, a was not able to assign case to nominalized infinitives and to introduce purpose clauses of non-motion verbs. The weakness of the infinitive led to innovations like implicative verbs taking indicative complements (instead of infinitival complements) introduced by the complementizer de. This complementizer replaced the functions of the particle a and began to introduce a-infinitive clauses. The emergence of de as an infinitival complementizer (evidenced in 2.3 and Chapter 4) may have actually strengthened the infinitive.

Joseph (1983) believes that the infinitival particle de slowed the process of the replacement so that infinitive complement structures survived for a longer time in Romanian comparing with other languages of the Balkan Sprachbund.

Unfortunately, as any linguistic change, the process of establishing de as an infinitival component was slow. Introduced in Coresi (1581), de actually began to appear in sources from the middle of the next century only.

In conclusion, admitting that some of the changes undergone by the infinitive contributed to the infinitive loss, they alone cannot explain this phenomenon since the infinitive in other languages underwent similar changes (examples given in Section 2.3), but never lost their
infinitival complementation. Moreover, the infinitive of Southern dialects of Italian, e.g., Salentino of Brindisi\textsuperscript{22}, never lost their original morphological form but still replaced their infinitival complementation with subjunctive complementation under the influence of the Greek language through the Greek population in the region.

### 2.5.4 Greek Influence

Between the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries, the Romanian Principalities of Moldavia and Walachia (Ţara Românească) evolved as part of the Eastern Orthodox religious and cultural world: their ecclesiastical allegiance was to the patriarchate of Constantinople; their princes emulated the Byzantine emperors and drew their written law from Byzantine codes.

The spread of Greek culture in the Romanian principalities was part of the larger culture of the Orthodox Christianity. Greek culture influenced Romanian culture through many avenues: religion, politics, philosophy and education, all of them by means of Greek people and the Greek language.

According to Bâlcescu’s (1852:14-17) account, after the fall of Eastern Empire (1453), many Greeks from Constantinople and Rumelia\textsuperscript{23} found refuge in the Romanian Principalities. These Greeks began to practice commerce and industry, became rich, married Romanian women and gained civic rights. Controlling the commerce and industry, the Greeks gained economical and political power. In the 1600s, the presence of the Greeks, at least the wealthy and powerful ones, was great, and perceived as a threat to the Romanian national character of the country.

\textsuperscript{22} For instance the infinitive \textit{cantare} ‘to sing’ of Salentino still has the initial Latin form with the suffix –\textit{re}, also the original Romanian form, now \textit{cânta}.

\textsuperscript{23} Rumelia or Rumell (Turkish Rumeli ‘Land of the Romans) a name used from the 15th century onwards for the southern Balkan regions of the Ottoman Empire. Rumelia included ancient provinces of Constantinople, Thessaloniki, Thrace, Macedonia and Moesia, today’s central Greece and European Turkey. In Greece the name Rumeli has been used since Ottoman times to refer to Central Greece.
Rosetti (1968:604) reminds us that the Greek influence, especially through the Orthodox Church, was very powerful until the nineteenth century. Around 1702, Eduard Chisthull, an English monk notes that in Țara Românească “church services took place in Greek or Slavonic, and not in Romanian.” (cf. Panaitescu, 1965:225). Many Romanians today recall that many churches still had Greek priests in the 1970s-1980s.

Books were a significant means of spreading Greek culture and language. As Panaitescu (1965) reports, Romanian humanists who knew Greek believed that the most powerful source of the church books and the books of laws was Greek literature and not Slavonic one. Panaitescu points out that starting with the middle of the seventeenth century almost all religious books written in Romanian were translated from Greek. The most important book printed by the Romanian printing art of the time was Biblia de la București (The Bible of Bucharest), printed at the printing office of the Metropolitan Church of Bucharest in 1688. It was a translation from Greek.

In addition, many of the printing presses belonging to various churches and monasteries had Greek sections like the printing office of the Metropolitan Church of Bucharest. Another Greek printing office functioned at the Cetățuia Monastery in Moldavia. Other Greek printing offices functioned in Snagov, Râmnic, Târgoviște, Iași, etc. 24

The books of translations from Greek are not only religious, but secular as well. Greek books in the original like chronicles and new editions, translations in Romanian of older books, or new literary work produced by the Greek diaspora, began to spread in the Romanian Principalities, beginning in the second half of the seventeenth century.

24 See for instance Papacostea-Danielopolu (1995) and Băltuță (1993), among others
On the other hand, 1566 volumes of Greek manuscripts that include records about the entire spectrum of activities in medieval Romania have been written and preserved in the country (Rotaru 1981).

Panaitescu (1965) relates that the followers of the Neo-Aristotelian philosophy defeated in Constantinople find protection and understanding in the regal schools of Țara Românească. For instance, Ioan Cariofil accused of heresy by the Patriarchy of Constantinople comes to Bucharest where he prints his Greek *Manual about some confusions*, regarding the church dogmas.

Then, during the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century, more precisely between 1717-1821, the Greek political domination reaches its zenith in Romania. This period is known in history as the Phanariot epoch. The Phanariots were Greeks from the Orthodox section of Constantinople, Phanar, the residence of the privileged Greek families. The Phanariot rulers in the Romanian Principalities belonged to eleven families, nine of which were Greek and two Hellenized Romanians. Greek influence in church and the cultural life expanded, despite opposition from native boyars (nobles) and churchmen.

Adamescu (2007) points out, that the Phanariot rulers created Greek schools, wrote laws and issued decrees in Greek, and ruled using their native language. The Greek language is also the language used by the Romanians belonging to the upper classes. Often, members of the great families of Romanian boyars translated books from the Greek literature or wrote original works directly in Greek. The schools conducted in Romanian were considered inferior and were just superfluous additions to the Greek schools.

In Rotaru’s (1981) account, schools in the Greek language (since the thirteenth century) which, along with the presence of numerous libraries of Greek books, explain the diffusion of
Byzantine culture into Romania. Slavic professors in schools of higher education were replaced by Greek professors prepared at Constantinople. The predominance of the Greek language and Greek professors in higher education continued until 1821.

When the Phanariot political system was over, as a result of the 1821 revolution, most of the Phanariot families continued to live in the Romanian Principalities where they had married and accumulated wealth.

In sum, during the Phanariot era, Greek was used in most of the administrative domains in the Romanian Principalities: government and its institutions, education, religion and churches, printing presses and offices, commerce and more. In addition, Greek was the official language and the language of the upper classes. The Greek population and the Romanians who spoke Greek in addition to Romanian must have been numerically significant to make possible the use of Greek in so many domains for so long a period of time.

Consequently, it can be surmised that there was Greek – Romanian language contact, close enough to permit contact-induced structural changes, most relevant for our purposes, the regression and demise of the infinitive in control complement clauses in Romanian. In Greek, the replacement of the infinitive with a subjunctive construction was completed just before the 1600s.

Although Greek influence was not solely responsible for the demise of the infinitive from control complements, it must have contributed a great deal to this phenomenon. Rossetti (1968:258) points out that the dialects of Maramureş and Crişana (Transylvania) still preferred the use of the infinitive whereas in the Southeast the use of the subjunctive predominated at the time of his book. He also emphasizes that the change also occurred in the dialects of south Italy precisely because of the influence of the Greek population in the respective regions.
Overall, the replacement of infinitival complementation with subjunctive complementation happened in stages and as a result of various contributing factors. The starting point goes back to the beginning of the alternation of infinitive structures with finite structures, mostly subjunctive clauses, whether inherited by Romanian from Latin, developed independently in Romanian, or a Balkan feature that spread into Romanian. The effect is competition in control structures between an infinitive and a subjunctive, with the latter increasing over time at the expense of the former.

Next, the Romanian infinitive underwent some changes, which may have led to the weakening of this category. Internal factors such as the loss of the infinitive suffix –re, followed by the weakening of the infinitival particle a, constitute the second stage of the change.

On these propitious conditions, the Greek influence during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries seems to have been the coup de grace, leading to the demise of infinitive in control complement clauses. Following the influence of Greek, it was just a matter of time until the complete disappearance of the infinitive from control structures in Romanian.

2.5.5 On the Spread of Loss of Infinitive Complementation

How this linguistic phenomenon spread over all Romanian regions is beyond the scope of this dissertation. However, some preliminary observations are in order. Concerning the external influence of Greek, it is hard to imagine that the large masses of native Romanians, many of them illiterate, actually learned and spoke Greek.

The difference between literary writing and nonliterary writing indicates that the regression of the infinitive and its replacement with the subjunctive took place first in urban areas, initiated by highly educated people who learned foreign languages and lived in political and cosmopolitan centers. This was also true for chroniclers like Grigore Ureche and Miron
Costin whose education included Latin, Polish, Old Slavonic and Greek. They consulted works in these languages and Costin even wrote versions of his chronicle in Latin and Greek.

Comparing the Moldovan chronicles of Ureche and Costin on the one hand and Stefanelli’s collection of rural documents, also from Moldova, on the other hand, two differences are apparent. First, although the peasants who signed the rural documents had a poor vocabulary, they actually used more matrix verbs with infinitive complements than those found in the two chronicles. For instance, while Ureche uses thirteen matrix verbs with infinitive complements, the rural documents include thirty such verbs. Also, Ureche never uses the verb \textit{a vrea} ‘to want’ with infinitive complements (Costin uses it only once), but the rural documents have fourteen such instances. As already mentioned, this verb disappeared first from infinitival complement structures.

In accord with the findings of Labov (1972a), the variety of Romanian in which subjunctive complementation is preferred to infinitival is the prestige dialect, most common at the top of the social ladder. The upper classes, and upward mobility middle classes, constituted the highest percentage of the prestige variety. “The regression line for the upper working class shows the steepest slope, indicating the highest rate of change, while the middle working class is just behind.” (Labov, 2002). This statement accurately describes the situation in Romanian as well. Then, as Labov (1972b) argues, the vernacular shows irregular influence from the prestige dialect. All of these considerations explain why the loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian occurred first in the speech of the wealthy and most educated people.

As for regional differences, as mentioned above, Rosetti (1968) observes that some Transylvanian territories, Crișana and Maramureș, were amongst the last to undergo the loss of the infinitive. From Râmniceanu’s (1800) \textit{Chronicle of Blaj} (city in Transylvania) a similar
observation could be made. The frequency of the infinitive in general and in complement clauses is quite high in this chronicle. In short, the loss of the infinitive crossed the Carpathians later.

Summing up, the spread of the replacement of infinitival complementation with subjunctive complementation took place from the more educated to the less educated, from urban areas to rural areas, from Walachia and Moldova to Transylvania.

In Contemporary Romanian, infinitival complementation still persists to some extent, mostly used by writers and older speakers.

2.6 Conclusions

This chapter has discussed some important details concerning infinitives, their history, and the demise of certain infinitival constructions in Romanian. The history of the infinitive reveals that the infinitival particle *a* was on the verge of losing its complementizer status by the end of the sixteenth century. The addition of the particle *de* (to introduce purpose clauses of motion verbs) suggests that this second particle actually replaced the status and the position of *a*.

The absence of the particle *a* from some infinitival complements is argued to be due to the nature of a few matrix verbs selecting bare infinitives. The fact that the particle *a* can be omitted in some interrogative complements (with *wh*-word) has nothing to do with the status of *a* (i.e., being a complementizer). On the contrary, the particle *a* can coexist with *wh*-words, as shown with illustrative examples.

The changes undergone by the Romanian infinitive are pretty much of the same kinds undergone by other European languages (e.g., English, German, Romance). However, Romanian and these languages underwent many fewer changes compared to Greek. The Romanian infinitive underwent some relatively minor changes prior to the external influence of Greek, suggesting that contact was the main motivating factor in its demise from complement clauses.
Future research is needed to determine the extent to which the infinitive has been reduced or lost in other structures.
CHAPTER 3
SUBJUNCTIVE COMPLEMENT CLAUSES

Am apucat cărarea-ngustă ca să trec
Cărând în spate muntele întreg.¹
-Tudor Arghezi

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the clausal structure and the major properties of Romanian subjunctives. The central task is to describe the constituents of subjunctive complement clauses and to establish their status in conformity with their syntactic properties as revealed by empirical data.

Following Landau’s (2004) typology of the Balkan type of subjunctive complement clauses, I divide the Romanian corresponding clauses into OC (Obligatory Control)-subjunctives and F(ree)-subjunctives. An OC-subjunctive construction only permits strict coreference between the null embedded subject and its antecedent, a matrix argument (1a). A lexical subject is not allowed in OC-subjunctives (1b). For reasons that will become apparent in Section 3.5, I place the coreferential null subject in front of the particle sâ (1a) and the lexical or null subject not coreferential with a matrix argument in the postverbal position (1b).

Obligatory control structures constructed with subjunctive in the languages of the Balkans, Romanian included, is a phenomenon unanimously recognized in the literature, e.g., Terzi (1992), Varlokosta (1993), Dobrovie-Sorin (2001), Landau (2004, 2006) among others, hence I will call them OC, but the proof will be presented in 3.5.

(1) a. Mara₁ încearcă [e₁ să scrie ea însăși₁/*el însuși₂ o scrisoare] Mara trials 3sg herself/*himself to write a letter
       ‘Mara is trying to write a letter.’

¹ I chose the narrowest of paths
And forged ahead with mountains on my back.
b. Mara_{1} încercă [să scrie *Radu_{2} o scrisoare]
Mara tries să write.3sg Radu a letter
*Mara is trying to write Radu a letter

By contrast, the subject of an F-subjunctive clause corefers freely, i.e. the embedded subject may be coreferent with the matrix subject (2a) or the embedded subject may be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject (2b). Also, F-subjunctives may be ambiguous between coreference and disjoint reference, as illustrated by the sentence (2c). Besides the referential choice, the embedded subject of an F-subjunctive clause may be null as represented by e in (2a) and the pro of (2b), or it may be lexical as appears in (2b) and (2c).

(2) a. Mara_{1} vrea [e_{1} să plece ea însăși/*el însuși curând]
Mara wants să leave.3sg herself/*himself soon
‘Mara wants to leave.’

b. Mara_{1} vrea [să plece Radu_{2}/pro_{2} repede]
Mara wants să come.3sg Radu/pro quickly
‘Mara wants Radu/him to leave quickly’

c. Mara_{1} vrea [să plece ea_{1/2} repede]
Mara wants să leave.3sg she quickly
‘Mara wants her to leave quickly.’

While there is consensus in labeling subjunctive complements of the type included in the example (1a) as OC structures, previous accounts have different views regarding F-subjunctive complement clauses. Some researchers as Terzi (1992) and Landau (2004, 2006) consider (2a) an instance of OC structure and argue that F-subjunctives complements may be OC clauses or NOC clauses. Krapova (2001) divides subjunctive clauses into Type I (our F-subjunctives) and Type II (our OC-subjunctives) and distinguishes them by their subject. The subject of Type II is PRO and the subject of Type I is pro because, the author concludes, there is no complementary distribution between null subjects and lexical subjects, a behavior of pro but not of PRO. Varlokosta and Hornstein (1993) take F-subjunctive complements as a bulk and label them NOC.
Until F-subjunctive complements will be analyzed in 3.5.2, if it will be necessary to distinguish between them, examples like (2a) will be referred to as structures with coreferential subjects or just control (not obligatory control), in agreement with Bresnan’s (1982) definition of control included in 1.3. The rest of F-subjunctive complements will be clauses with subject disjoint reference or ambiguous between coreference and disjoint reference.

The starting point for the subjunctive clause typology comes from the distinct semantic classes of matrix verbs that trigger each type of clause. Guided by Stiebels et al (2003) and Landau (2004), I have built an incomplete list of Romanian verbs for each relevant class.

(3) OC-subjunctives are introduced by the following classes of verbs:

a. Implicatives
   *a reuși ‘to succeed’, a izbuti/izbândi/răzbi ‘to manage’, a cîteza/indrăzni/incumeta ‘dare’, a risca ‘to risk’, a-și amînti ‘to remember’, a încerca/cauta ‘to try’, a uita ‘to forget’, a omit ‘to omit’, a neglija ‘to neglect’, a scăpa din vedere ‘to forget/overlook’, a evita ‘to avoid’, a se eschiva ‘to eschew’, a se feri ‘to keep away from’, a ajunge să ‘to get to’, a refuza ‘to refuse’, a se abîte ‘to abstain’, a se lipsi ‘to give up’, a renunța ‘to renounce’, a se infrâna/reține/stâpânī ‘to refrain from’, a eşua ‘to fail.’

b. Phasal/Aspectual (Some of these verbs may be raising verb in certain contexts)
   *a începe ‘to begin’, a se apuca/se porni ‘to start’, a continua ‘to continue’, a persista ‘to persist’, a stări ‘to persevere’, a înceta/conteni ‘to cease’, a se opri ‘to stop’

c. Modal
   *a putea ‘can, a fi capabil ‘be able’, a fi obligat ‘be obliged’, a avea ‘to have to’ a trebui ‘should/must’ has also impersonal use.

(4) F-subjunctives are selected by the following classes of verbs:

a. Desiderative predicates
b. Interrogative predicates. The verbs that follow are F-subjunctive verbs that occur with
wh-phrases or with the complementizer: dacă ‘whether/if’
a afla ‘to find out’, a ști ‘to know’, a se prinde ‘to grasp’, a întreba ‘to ask
(question)’, a se mira ‘to wonder’, a delibera ‘to deliberate’, a ghici ‘to guess’, a
înțelege ‘to understand’, a fi neclar ‘to be unclear

c. Factivs (experiencer)
a regreta ‘to regret’, a ură ‘to hate’, a detesta ‘to detest’, a avea oroare ‘to hate’,
a iubi să ‘to love to’, a fi surprins ‘to be surprised’, a se amuza ‘to amuse’, a se
distra ‘to entertain’, a se destinde ‘to relax’, a se tulbura/emotiona ‘to disturb/get
emotional’, a se înfiora ‘to thrill’, a (se) înveseli ‘to cheer’, a satisface ‘satisfy’, a
se întrista ‘to sadden’, a se măhni/necâi/ji/amâră/indispune ‘to distress’, a (se)
dezgusta ‘to disgust’, a îngrozi ‘to be scared’, a-i repugna ‘to be repugnant’, a-i
fi groază ‘be afraid’, a-i displace ‘to dislike’, a-i place ‘to enjoy/like, a-i fi drag
‘to like to’, a-i fi silă/scărbă ‘to loath’

d. Propositional
a (se) gândi ‘to think’, a nu crede ‘not to believe’, a sugera ‘to suggest’

The chapter is organized as follows: I will begin with a diachronic distribution of the
subjunctive complementizer ca, in Section 3.2. This section reveals that in OSR ca is optionally
present in OC-subjunctives, F-subjunctives, and subjunctive purpose clauses. In CR, ca is no
longer present in subjunctive complement clauses. Both in OSR and CR, the complementizer ca
is mandatory or disallowed in the same environments. A discussion about the complementizer ca
and obviation reveals that this phenomenon is not manifested in OSR, regardless of the presence
of ca.

The next section, 3.3, continues the discussion about obviation but in CR at this time.
This section has two parts. First, I present previous approaches to this phenomenon in CR,
resulting three different conclusions: Obviation is not manifested in Romanian at all; Obviation
is possible and is triggered by the complementizer ca; Obviation is very limited as a combination
of two or all of three factors: the presence of the complementizer, the presence of a lexical
pronoun, and the semantics of some matrix verbs. In the second part, I describe and report the
findings of an empirical study I recently conducted, to see whether obviation is triggered by any
of the three factors mentioned above. The study shows that obviation is not manifested in CR in general, not even triggered by certain factors.

Section 3.4 is concerned with the syntactic properties of the subjunctive particle sā and its relationship vis-à-vis complementizers. From the presented arguments regarding the status of sā as a complementizer or as an inflectional element, I draw the conclusion that this particle is an I₀ element and not a complementizer.

Subsequently, I will discuss the tense of subjunctive clauses in Section 3.5. Both types of clauses have semantic tense: OC-subjunctives have anaphoric tense, whereas the tense of F-subjunctives is dependent. Furthermore, OC-subjunctives are endowed with the feature [-T], whereas F-subjunctives have the feature [+T]. The locus of the uninterpretable [-T]/[+T] is C₀.

Next, I will switch gears, in Section 3.6, to establish what kind of subjects are possible in subjunctive complement clauses. The null subject of OC clauses displays all the characteristics associated with PRO in obligatory control context, thus I conclude that their subject is indeed PRO. F-subjunctive structures where the matrix subject is a first or second person DP parallel the English structures with predicates like prefer, want etc. in the sense that these predicates take either OC or NOC complements. When the matrix subject is a third person entity, the embedded complements are like those in example (2). However, there are some characteristics that distinguish one from the other. In the last part of the section I argue, based on Rizzi (1986), that arbitrary PRO is possible in subjunctive clauses.

Section 3.7 investigates whether subjunctive complements are IP or CP clauses. In regards to the presence of a lexical complementizer, I present two points of view. According to one view, all subjunctive clauses are CP clauses, while for the other view subjunctive clauses are CP clauses only when a lexical complementizer is present. To remain neutral, I agree with both
points of view. In the end, since subjunctive complement clauses have uninterpretable [T] features located in C₀, these clauses must be CP clauses. The major conclusions of this chapter and suggestions for further research will be gathered in Section 3.8.

3.2 Distribution of the Subjunctive Complementizer ca

As already mentioned, Romanian subjunctive mood has its own complementizer, ca, distinguished from the indicative complementizer că. The oldest Romanian documents attest these two complementizers, each for its own mood. The goal of this section is to determine the diachronic distribution of the complementizer ca in the various environments it appears and to give an idea about the dramatic change in its distribution from OSR to CR. Although this section is included mostly for documentation value, and because ca is part of subjunctive clauses described in this chapter, it will also furnish some significant inferences. They will be gathered at the end of the section.

3.2.1 Distribution of ca in OSR

Old Romanian documents include să subjunctives and ca să subjunctives, often in the same environment (e.g., clauses selected by the same matrix verb), in the same document, on the same page.

In Stefanelli’s collection of 308 documents issued between 1611 and 1848 in Câmpulung Moldavia, the subjunctive complementizer is obligatory in purposive clauses, which are frequently encountered. Rarely, an exception appears but only after the 1800s. Often ca introduces F-subjunctive subordinate clauses with or without a subject disjoint reference. Ca also appears in OC-subjunctives clauses, slightly less frequently than in the two types of clauses mentioned first.

This description closely matches Alexiu's (1939) collection consisting of similar documents spanning 1608-1841 from Valea Teleajenului. The same patterns of ca distribution
are observed in Ureche’s (1647) chronicle, only somewhat reduced in frequency\(^2\). Although the majority of the data in this section is from these three sources, other sources will be also used.

In what follows, I will substantiate each pattern of distribution with illustrative data. Although frequently encountered, *ca* may be optional for (almost) each pattern, so some examples lacking *ca* will be also included. Grosu & Horvath (1984) point out this difference between the subjunctive complementizer *ca*, which may be optional, “lexically unfilled”, and the indicative complementizer *că*, which is always overt.

### 3.2.1.1 *Ca* in OC-subjunctive structures

The examples in (5-8) feature subject (obligatory) control clauses introduced by the complementizer *ca*. Notice that the empty embedded subject corefers with the matrix subject. Each class of OC-subjunctive verbs is represented: implicative (5,6), aspectual (7), and modal (8). The pair of (8) shows that the same matrix verb can take an OC-subjunctive complement whose complementizer can be present (8a) or absent (8b).

(5)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pro}_1 \text{ am cercat} & \text{ ca } \text{ e}_1 \text{ să putem afla …} \\
& \text{we have tried that } \text{să can.1pl find out} \\
& \text{‘We tried to find out (something)’} \\
& \text{Ureche 1647 (Simion Dascălu variant)}
\end{align*}
\]

(6)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pro}_1 \text{ Îndrăznesc} & \text{ ca } \text{ e}_1 \text{ să rostească pân’şi numele tâu țară!} \\
& \text{they dare that } \text{să utter.3pl even name.the your country} \\
& \text{‘They even dare to evoke your name, my country!’} \\
& \text{Eminescu (1852-1889), Scrisoarea III}
\end{align*}
\]

(7)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{M}_1 \text{-am apucat} & \text{ ca } \text{ e}_1 \text{ să dau de tot anul} \\
& \text{me-have begun that } \text{să give all year} \\
& \text{câte o oca de ceară} \\
& \text{every a Kg of wax} \\
& \text{‘I began to give away one kilogram of wax every year (to the church).’} \\
& \text{Stefanelli (1915:96), 1768 document}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^2\) The difference in the frequency of *ca* may be the difference between rural documents (Stefanelli and Alexiu’s collections) and literary work like Ureche’s chronicle.
(8) a. pro₁ este bolnav ști nu poate ca e₁ să meargă …
   he is sick and not can.3sg that să walk.3sg
   ‘He is sick and cannot walk.’
   Alexiu (1939:76), 1795 document

   b. pro₁ putem să e₁ zicem că toate pe izvod
   we can să say.1pl that all P ledger
   le-au ținut
   them-have.3pl kept
   ‘We can say that they recorded all the transactions in the ledger.’
   Ureche (1647:179)

Object control clauses may be also introduced by the complementizer ca. The empty
subjects of the embedded clauses (9-11) corefer with the accusative object of the matrix. The pair
in (11) indicates that the same matrix predicate may take an OC complement with ca (11a) or
without it (11b).

(9) au poftit pe domnul controlor₁ ca e₁ să meargă
   have.3pl invited P Mr. controller.Acc that să go.3sg
   ‘They invited the inspector (government official) to go’
   Stefanelli (1915:235), 1793 document

(10) l₁- au rugat ca e₁ să facă
    they.Acc-have.3pl begged that să make.3sg
    pace cu craiul leșesc
    peace with prince Polish
    ‘They begged him to make peace with the Polish prince.’
    Ureche (1647:51)

11) a. Îl₁ sfătuia boerii ca e₁ să
    he.Acc advised.3pl boyards that să
    se dea la loc strâm
    reflx get to spot narrow
    ‘The boyards advised him to move to a narrow (battle) position.’
    Ureche (1647:41)

   b. pro₁ Au sfătuit craiul₂ e₂ să-i₃ tocmească
   they have advised prince.Acc să-them hire.3sg
   ‘They advised the prince to hire them.’
   Ureche (1647:22)
The representations (12) and (13) below are instances of dative control subjunctives. As the indices show, the dative object of the matrix corefers with the embedded null subject. Again, the complementizer *ca* may be present (12, 13a) or absent (13b) in these structures.

(12) *m- am rugat milostivului₁ Dumnezeu ca e₁ să me-have.1sg begged merciful.Dat God that să mă luminează me enlighten.3sg*  
‘I begged the merciful God to enlighten me’  
Stefanelli (1915:363), 1816 document

(13) a. *Se poruncește căpitanilor₁ ca e₁ să privigheze… rflx order.3sg/pl captains.Dat that să watch.3pl*  
‘An order was given to the captains to watch and guard…’  
Stefanelli (1915:268), 1796 document

b. *Vă₁ poruncim să e₁ faceti strănsoare numitului pârît you.Dat order.1pl să make.2pl pressure to the said defendant*  
‘We order you to force the said defendant …’  
Alexiu (1939: 44), 1777 document

The data presented in this subsection show that OC-subjunctive clauses (subject, object and dative control) are indeed introduced by the subjunctive complementizer *ca*, which may be optionally present or absent.

3.2.1.2 *Ca in F-subjunctive structures*

*Ca* may be found when the subject of the matrix and that of the embedded clause are coreferential in F-subjunctives. Either the context/semantic in (15, 16, 17, 18) or the verbal morphology in (14) ensures the coreference between the embedded subject and a matrix argument in these sentences.

(14) *pro₁ om vre ca e₁ să-l₂ scoatem de pe moșie we will want that să-him pull out.1pl from estate*  
‘We will want to put him out from the estate….’  
Stefanelli (1915:148), 1784 document

(15) *Dechival₁ au hotarat ca e₁ să se închiză Decebal has decided that să rflx close in.3sg cu ostașii săi in cetatea sa*
with soldiers-the his in fortress-the his
‘Decebal decided to lock himself, together with his soldiers, in his fortress’
Râmniceanu (1802:80)

(16) pro₁ au giurat ca e₁ să nu mai taie de acum
they have sworn that sā not more cut.3pl from now
domnu de Moldova.
prince of Moldova
‘And they swore not to kill again a Moldavian prince.’
Neculce (1672-1745/6), *O samă de cuvinte*

(17) pro₁ Gândi ca e₁ să-l₂ scoată din domnie
he thought that sā-him remove.3sg from throne
‘He thought about how to remove him (the ruler) from the throne.’
Ureche (1647:134)

In (18b) the complementizer is absent, showing that the presence of *ca* is also optional in
F-subjunctive structures with embedded subject coreferential with the matrix subject, selected by
the same verb (18a vs. 18b).

(18) a. cât va voi dumnealui₁ ca e₁ să-l ție…
how will.3sg want he.polite that sā-it hold.3sg
‘as long as he will want to hold it….’
Alexiu (1939:160), 1833 document

b. Câmpulungenii₁ au voit să e₁ cumpere
Campulung people have wanted să buy.3pl
această bucată de fânaț
this piece of pasture
‘The people from Campulung wanted to by this piece of pasture.’
Stefanelli (1915:141), 1783 document

*Ca* also introduces subjunctive complement clauses when there is subject disjoint
reference between the matrix and the embedded clause. The embedded subject in (19) is an
impersonal/arbitrary entity, thus it is different from the matrix subject. In the rest of the examples
(20-22) the embedded subject is a lexical DP, different from the matrix subject. (Examples of F-
subjunctives with subject disjoint reference where the embedded subject is null are given below
in (28) and (29)). As usually, *ca* may be present (19-22a) or absent (22b).
(19) ei₁ au răspunsu că voesc ca să fie împărțală they have answered that want.3pl that să be.3sg allotment ‘They answered that they want there to be equitable allotment’ Stefanelli (1915:126), 1778 document

(20) Ne₁-am învoit ca să dea nepotu-mieu Vlad₂ alt loc we-have agreed that să give.3sg nephew-my Vlad other lot ‘We decided that my nephew Vlad should give away some piece of land.’ Alexiu (1939:98), 1833 document

(21) pro₁ Au hotărât dum-lor₁ ca să meargă have.3pl decided they that să go.3sg mumbașir₂ tax collector ‘They decided for the tax collector to go …’ Alexiu (1939:33), 1766 document, V. Teleajenului

(22) a. Se₁ temu ca să nu-l părăsească (oastea₂) reflx was afraid that să not-him abandon.3sg (his army) ‘He was afraid that his army will abandon him ‘ Ureche (1647:41)

b. Temându-se₁ să nu-i viclenească Moldovenii₂ being afraid reflx.3pl să not-them deceive.3pl Moldovans ‘They were afraid that the Moldovans will Ureche (1647:168)

Summing up, ca introduces F-subjunctive clauses whose subjects are coreferential with the respective matrix subject and F-subjunctive clauses whose subjects are disjoint in reference from the matrix subject. As expected, ca may be optional in these structures.

3.2.1.3 Ca and obviation

Obviation is the requirement that the subject of a subjunctive complement clause be disjointing in reference from the matrix subject. “General obviation” occurs when the subject of a subjunctive clause is always different from the matrix subject, like in Romance languages. In some languages, obviation is triggered by a certain factor, as in Serbo-Croatian, where obviation occurs only when the embedded subject is a lexical pronoun that matches the phi-features of the
matrix subject. The embedded pronoun is necessarily disjoint in reference from the matrix subject (Farkas, 1992). This kind of obviation could be called “reduced obviation”.

Subject obviation is supposed to distinguish two (or more) third person subjects, one of which will become obviative. (The matrix subject cannot be obviative). Subject obviation is a phenomenon characteristic to subjunctive clauses in most Romance languages and many Slavic languages, but apparently not manifested in the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund. The presence of a complementizer is considered the most likely factor to trigger obviation. (Terzi, 1992, Avrutin & Babyonishev 1997, Landau, 2004).

In Romance languages, the subject of a subjunctive complement clause is automatically disjoint in reference (some exceptions apply) from the matrix subject, as in Spanish: (23).

(23) Juan₁ quiere que e₁⁹/₂ venga.
    ‘Juan wants him/her to eat.’

By contrast, in F-subjunctive complement clauses, where the matrix verb and the embedded verb show third person inflection, the empty embedded subject is referentially free and the sentence may be ambiguous. Without their contexts, the examples (24) with ca and (25) lacking ca are both ambiguous. Only the context shows that the matrix subject corefers with the embedded subject in both sentences. Since the complementizer ca is optional it cannot trigger obviation (its presence does not impose subject disjoint reference in (24)).

(24) De n- a vrea ca  să vie.
    If not-would.3sg want that să come.3sg
    ‘If she wouldn’t want to come.’
    Alecsandri (1821-1890) Opere Complete. Poesii.

(25) fimeia lui nu vra să plătească…
    woman-the his not wants să pay.3sg
    ‘his woman doesn’t want to pay….’
    Stefanelli (1915:112), 1784 document
In (26), the third line (in bold) includes a F-subjunctive clause whose subject is different from that of the matrix. The disjoint reference is not triggered by the complementizer because with or without *ca* the subject of the subjunctive clause is semantically restricted. Also, the context only helps narrow down the possible subject of the embedded clause. The sentence in boldface by itself needs the subject of the second clause to be disjointing in reference from the matrix subject. Clearly, the country could only be subdued by an entity different from the one that is afraid this may happen.

(26)  ci Turcul₁, după puţină vreme, înţelegând că Leşii₂ but Turk.the after little while, understanding that Poles.the se ridică cu tărie mare asupra lui Petru Vodă,… rf1x rise.3pl with force great against Dat. Petru Voda… şi temându-se₁ ca să nu ia e₂ țara… and fear.Ger-cl refl.3sg that sā not takes country.the ‘And the Turk, after a while, understanding that the Poles are rising with force against Petru Vodă, and being afraid that they will subdue the country…’

Ureche (1647:101)

By contrast, the subject of the subjunctive clause in (27), with or without *ca*, is referentially free. Semantically, it may be possible that, both the person filled with fear (the matrix subject) or somebody else (e.g., a loved one), could contract influenza. As it appears, the meaning of the subjunctive verb determines disjoint reference in (28) and free reference in (29).

(27)  temându-se₁ (ca) să nu ia e₁/₂ gripa fear.Ger-rflx (that) sā not contract.3sg influenza-the ‘fearing that she will get the flu’

The matrix pronoun *el* ‘he’ in (28) is the subject of the subjunctive clause. Considering only the boldface part, the matrix verb and its subjunctive complement, it is very unlikely for the embedded subject to corefer with the matrix subject (*e₁*). Usually, we do not want anybody else (not ourselves) to suspect anything, probably bad. Again, it is the meaning of the embedded verb that imposes disjoint reference. The presence of *ca* does not make any difference.
It appears that OSR subjunctives do not manifest subject obviation. This phenomenon is very limited and happens only for semantic reasons. The complementizer *ca* definitely does not trigger subject obviation effect in OSR because its presence is optional and may occur with any subjunctive complement, regardless of the referential choices of the embedded subject.

A sentence with subject disjoint reference implied by the context, in the absence of the complementizer, would probably further support the idea that *ca* does not trigger obviation in OSR. (29) reflects this assumption. The second line (in bold) of this sentence by itself is ambiguous in the sense that the subject of the second clause is capable of free reference. However, the first line reveals that the mother did not want her son to do the “thing”, thus only *craiu* ‘the prince’ could be the subject of the embedded clause.

I conclude that obviation is not an attribute of subjunctives in OSR. This phenomenon is not general, since complements whose subject is coreferential with the matrix subject are possible (control), nor triggered by a certain factor. Clearly, the subjunctive complementizer does not trigger obviation.
3.2.1.4 Purpose clauses

In the following examples, the second (adjunct) clause shows the purpose or intention of the action of the matrix verb, without indicating whether the action was accomplished or not. These purpose clauses may be *ca să* clauses (30,31,33b) or *să* clauses (32, 33a).

Although the complementizer *ca* is optional in subjunctive purpose clauses in OSR, it is actually almost always present. *Ca* may usually be absent when the purpose clause is triggered by motion verbs: *a veni* ‘to come’, *a merge* ‘to go’, *a trimit* ‘to send’. Recall that there was an inclination in Latin conditional clauses constructed with subjunctive and the conjunction *si* to undertake a goal or purpose sense (Chapter 2/2.5.2). Since this conjunction has been inherited by Romanian as the subjunctive particle *să* (via *se*), it is plausible to assume that this particle also encodes purpose (See also fn5, Chapter 2). *Ca*-less purpose clauses are rather found in Transylvania, like the example in (32).

(30) Te facem vechil *ca să* stai
you.Acc make.1pl bailiff that să stay.2sg
la hotărătul moșilor noastre
at boundary land.pl our.pl
‘We name you the bailiff of our estates in order to guard their boundaries.’
Stefanelli (1915:445), 1813 document

(31) se naște *ca să* fie rob
cl.3sg born that să be.3sg bondman
și să trăiască *ca* dobitoc.
and să live.3sg like animal
‘One is born just to be a bondman and to live like an animal.’
Potra et al (1972:47), 1839 letter

(32) multe jertfe au adus
many sacrifices have.3pl brought
*să înblânzească* pre d[umne]zi[i] mâniei.
să calm down.3pl P gods-the wrath.Dat
‘They offered many sacrifices in order to calm down the angry gods’
S.Micu (1789:30)
(33) a. și n-au venit să cheame derepții, ce păcătoșii
and not-have.3pl come să call.3pl right.pl-the, but sinners
‘And he didn’t come to call on the righteous people, but on the sinners’
Coresi (1581:419)

b. Veniseră la Călifăr ca să-i procopsească.
came.3pl to Califar that să-them endow.3sg
‘They had come to Califar to be endowed by him’
Galaction (1879-1961) Opere

The general picture of subjunctive purpose clauses in OSR is the following: Normally,
they are ca să clauses, that is, the complementizer ca is rarely absent. When ca is absent from
purpose clauses, it happens after verbs of motion or as regional dialect.

3.2.1.5 Required ca vs. prohibited ca

The presence of ca is a must when some lexical material belonging to the subjunctive
clause (topicalized material) appears between the matrix and the subjunctive clause (preceding
the particle sând). In (34a), the chunk peste dânșii ‘over them’ is normally placed after the
subjunctive verb, like in (34b). Although ca may be present in (34b), it is not necessary as
shown. However, once peste dânșii is moved in front of să (for rhetorical effects or, in this case,
for metrical /rhyme reasons), ca must show up (34a).

(34) a. Am jurat [ca peste dânșii să trec falnic
have.1sg sworn that over them să pass.1sg glorious
fără pâș] without care
‘I swore to gloriously trample them without care.’
Eminescu (1852-1889), Scrisoarea III

b. Am jurat [să trec peste dânșii falnic, fără pâș]

In OSR as well as in CR, the complementizer ca is disallowed in raising constructions,
according to the contrast in (35). Ca renders the raising in (35a) ungrammatical conform (35b).

(35) a. Radu pare să fie trist
Radu seems să be.3sg sad
‘Radu seems to be sad.’
b.  *Radu pare ca să fie trist.
    Radu seems that să be.3sg sad
    ‘Radu seems to be sad.’

Finally, both in OSR and CR, *ca does not appear in temporal subjunctive clauses, or other adjuncts introduced by prepositions because the respective prepositions are complementizers in those contexts, e.g., (36). As a rule, two complementizers are not allowed to head a clause in Romanian, as illustrated by (37) where the complementizers *că ‘that’ and *dacă ‘if/whether’ cannot coexist in the same structure.

(36)  Am plecat *ca/ până să ajungă mama.
      have.1sg left that/ before să arrive.3sg mother
      ‘I left before mother arrived.’

(37)  *Mara nu ştie că/dacă Radu vine mâine.
      Mara not knows that/whether Radu comes tomorrow
      *Mara does not know that/whether Radu comes tomorrow

As the presented data indicate, the complementizer *ca used to appear in any type of subjunctive complement clauses and in purpose clauses. In all these types of clauses, although frequent, *ca may be optional. The presence of *ca in purpose clauses may not be a strong rule, but definitely the norm. As a rule, *ca must be absent in raising constructions and when accompanied by another complementizer. *Ca is mandatory when lexical material belonging to the subjunctive is topicalized. Finally, *ca is not able to trigger obviation effect in OSR.

3.2.2 Distribution of *ca in CR

3.2.2.1 *Ca in subjunctive complement clauses

Slowly, the subjunctive complementizer has disappeared both from OC-subjunctive clauses and from F-subjunctive constructions. When *ca ceased to appear in subjunctive clauses is not easy to ascertain. It certainly has survived longer in speech than in written sources. Despite some exceptions, *ca is no longer present in OC-subjunctives (38). A recent exception is given in (39). A quite old speaker from a village between Bucharest and Târgovişte produced this
sentence in July 2005. Both verbs have archaic forms: *poci* for *pot* ‘I can’ and *văz* for *văd* ‘I see’.

Examples like (39) are considered idiolects or specific to older speakers from rural areas.

Nonetheless, (39) does not pose any parsing problems to a standard dialect speaker.

(38)  *Am reușit ca să plec devreme.
      have.1sg managed that să leave.1sg early
      ‘I managed to leave early.’

(39)  Nu poci ca să-l mai văz.
      not can.1sg that să-him more see1.sg
      ‘I cannot see him anymore.(I’m angry with him)’

Farkas (1984) notices that *ca* may introduce subjunctive complements after the verb *a vrea* ‘to want’ (our F-subjunctives) in non-standard Romanian, as reflected by her example (7), repeated here under (40). Even today, *ca* may appear here and there in F-subjunctive complement clauses.

(40)  Vreau ca să-i spun ceva.
      want.1sg that să-him tell.1sg something
      ‘I want to tell him something.’

Although people do not use *ca să* F-subjunctive complements in their speech, do not reject such structures in reading or listening. However, *ca* is no longer used in the standard dialect of Romanian in F-subjunctive constructions with normal word order (i.e., without topic/focus).

3.2.2.2  *Ca* in topic and focus context

*Ca* has been always required when lexical material such as topic or focus (lexical subjects, adverbs, etc.) is placed in front of the embedded *să* verb, in order to mark the boundaries between the matrix and the subordinate. In this context, *ca* is still obligatory. The representation of (41a) is a normal word order sentence, with postverbal embedded subject.

When the subject, Radu, is preposed, the complementizer *ca* shows up (41b), as happened above
in the OSR example (34). Like in (34), complementizer deletion will render the sentence (41b) ungrammatical as evinced by (41c).

(41) a. Vreau [să vină Radu mâine]  
     want.1sg să come3.sg Radu tomorrow  
     ‘I want Radu to come tomorrow’

b. Vreau [ca Radu să vină mâine]  

c. *Vreau [Radu să vină mâine]

   The examples in (42) depict the same situation, with the difference that the preposed item is an adverb here. These data demonstrate that the topicalized items must be preceded by the complementizer. (This kind of data will be further discussed in Section 3.7).

(42) a. Vreau [să vină Radu mâine]  
     want.1sg să come3.sg Radu tomorrow  
     ‘I want Radu to come tomorrow.’

c. Vreau [ca mâine să vină Radu]  

b. *Vreau [mâine să vină Radu]

   Definitely, ca in CR, as in OSR, is required to mark the boundary between the matrix and its sentential clause when some lexical elements belonging to the latter occur before the particle să.

3.2.2.3 Ca in purpose clauses

   Some speakers say that ca is a must in the purpose clauses (43, 44, 45), while other say that both variants, with or without ca, are good. Most speakers say that (46) is better without ca (as shown). In conclusion, ca is optional in purpose clauses and absent after motion verbs (46).

(43) Cumpăr (ca) să vând.  
     buy.1sg that să sell.1sg  
     ‘I buy (things) in order to resell (them)./I buy to sell’

(44) Ți-am spus (ca) să știi.  
     you.Dat have.1sg told that să know.2sg  
     ‘I told you (that) in order for you to be warned.’
(45) Mănânci (ca) să trăiești.
eat.2sg that să live.2sg
‘You eat in order to support yourself.’

(46) Am venit să te văd.
have.1sg come să you see.1sg
‘I came to see you.’

To summarize the distribution of ca in CR, this complementizer is no longer employed in OC-subjunctives, and it is drastically reduced in F-subjunctives and only appears in non-standard dialects. In F-subjunctives, ca is required in topic situations. As always, as discussed above, ca is not allowed in raising structures, and cannot coexist with another complementizer. The presence of ca in subjunctive purpose clauses seems to be optional.

To conclude this section, it has been shown that, in OSR ca may be present in all kinds of subjunctive complements and in subjunctive purpose clauses, but it is optional in most environments. In CR, the presence of ca has been dramatically decreased over time. It actually disappeared from OC and F-subjunctive complements and remained optional in purpose clauses.

Ca definitely has consistently been absent in raising structures, and consistently present when some lexical material of the subjunctive clause is topicalized. Finally, ca does not trigger obviation effects in OSR.

Beside diachronic documentation, the distribution of ca yields some interesting consequences. First, Farkas’ (1992:95) view that “subjunctive clauses will be obviative only in contexts in which an infinitive is also possible” is challenged since obviation is not manifested in OSR, although infinitival complement clauses are alive and well³.

---

³ Examples with OSR infinitive complement clause are included in Chapter 2, Chapter 4, and in the next Section 3.3.
In OSR, *ca* was mandatory in topic context and remained mandatory in the same context in CR although it disappeared from complement clauses, with this exception. This behavior supports Rizzi’s (1997) and Rizzi & Shlonsky’s (2007) conclusion that complementizer deletion is illegal when topic/focus of the complement clause is activated.

Finally, the distribution of *ca* in OSR and CR reveals that obligatory control is possible with overt complementizers but raising is not. These observations will be further discussed in this chapter and other chapters.

### 3.3 Obviation in Contemporary Romanian (CR)

The purpose of this section is to present an outline of previous analyses of obviation in CR and to report the findings of an empirical study I conducted recently. This study shows that Romanian subjunctive structures do not manifest subject obviation. We already know that obviation is not manifested in OSR.

#### 3.3.1 Approaches to Obviation in CR

Comorovski (1986) presents two scenarios of obviation in Romanian subjunctives. First, she points out that if the embedded subject of a subjunctive complement of an “optional control” verb (our F-subjunctives) is a lexical pronoun, there is a high preference for obviative interpretation. The author attributes this interpretation to the Avoid Pronoun Principle. As a pro-drop language, Romanian disfavors an overt pronoun subject since its antecedent has been already pronounced in the matrix (or discourse). This contrast is illustrated by (47a,b) below (Comorovski’s examples (12a,b)). While the embedded subject of (47a) can corefer freely, most speakers indicate disjoint reference interpretation for (47b).

(47) a. Ion1 a propus e1/2 să nu ne mai telefoneze. 
John has proposed sā not us.Dat more phone.3sg/pl
‘John suggested not to call us anymore.’
b. Ion has proposed that he să not us.Dat more phone.3sg
‘John suggested that he should not call us anymore.’

The author further indicates that the presence of the complementizer in (47b) is also responsible for the obviation effect. In her view, the complementizer is not necessary when the embedded subject corefers with its antecedent for reasons of “simplicity and economy” (p.52). Comorovski also suggests that semantics may play a role, in the sense that some verbs like a spune ‘to say’ are more likely to trigger obviation. This author argues that Principle B of Binding Theory fails to predict obviation in Romanian. This phenomenon would result from the lexical properties of the matrix verbs.

Farkas (1985, 1992) takes a trenchant approach to obviation. She argues that a language exhibits subject obviation effect in subjunctive structures only if the language also includes infinitive complement clauses, where coreference between the subject of the matrix and that of the subordinate is obligatory. In her view, subject obviation is expected in Romance languages, which have both infinitive and subjunctive complements at their disposal, but not in the languages of the Balkans (Romanian included), which lack infinitive complements.

In Romance languages, when the matrix subject corefers with the embedded subject of a complement clause (obligatory control), the complement clause is constructed with infinitive, like the Spanish example (48a). When the embedded subject is disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, the embedded clause is constructed with subjunctive as seen in (48b), and obviation is required. Recall from the previous section that obviation in Romance is a general phenomenon.

(48) a. Juan quiere e1 comer.
‘Juan wants to eat.’
In OSR, infinitive complements and nonobviative subjunctive complements are contemporaneous, contrary to Farkas’ view. The representations in (49) are instances of control constructed with infinitive (49a) and with subjunctive (49b), selected by the same verb *a voi* ‘to will’. Since control is possible in (49b), obviation is not.

(49)  a. pro₁ Voește e₁ a răspunde banii …  
     she  wants to answer money …  
     ‘She wants to pay the money …’  
     Alexiu (1939:155), 1832 document  

   b. pro₁ au voit e₁ să cumpere această bucată de fânaț  
     they have wanted să buy.3pl this piece of pasture  
     ‘They wanted to buy this piece of pasture.’  
     Stefanelli (1915:141) 1783 document

The control complements of (50) are selected by the verb *a hotărâ* ‘to decide’ and constructed with infinitive (50a) and subjunctive (50b), the example (15) in the previous section. The example (21), repeated below under (51), displaying subject disjoint reference only shows that F-subjunctive complements had free reference in OSR (as already known). Therefore, OSR subjunctives do not manifest obviation despite the existence of parallel infinitive structures.

The pair type (50b) with obligatorily controlled subject and (51) with subject disjoint reference have remained the same in CR, but the parallel infinitive structures, like (50a) have disappeared. The difference between Spanish (Romance) and Romanian vis-à-vis subjunctive is that obviation is anti control in the former but control is anti obviation in the latter.

(50)  a. Dnul controlor₁ (s) ’a hotărât e₁ a executa poruncile  
     Mr. inspector rflx ’has decided to execute orders. the  
     ‘Mr inspector decided to execute the orders (given to him)’  
     Stefanelli (1915:241), 1794 document
b. Dechival₁ a(u) hotărât ca e₁ să se₁ închiză
Decebal has decided that să reflx close in.3sg
‘Decebal decided to lock himself, together with his soldiers, in his fortress’
Râmniceanu (1802:80)

(51) Au hotărât dum-lor₁ ca să meargă mumbaşir₂ ..
have.3pl decided they that ṣ goes tax collector
‘They decided for the tax collector to go …’
Alexiu (1939:33), 1766 document

Also, Martineau (1994:51) demonstrates with illustrative data that in the infinitive-
subjunctive rivalry cannot be extended to Older French because OC infinitive complements and
subjunctive complements with obligatorily control subject freely alternate⁴. It seems that the
absence of obviation cannot be attributed to the concurrent lack of infinitival structures,
neutralizing Farkas’ claims.

For Greek, Miller (2008) observes that constructions with both “the infinitive and the
*hina (the precursor of na) + subjunctive” are frequent in the New Testament. He also mentions
that Homer already knew this competition between infinitives and *hina subjunctives. Miller
includes illustrative examples from the New Testament, e.g coordination of infinitive control and
subjunctive control clauses.

Dobrovie-Sorin (2001:54) argues that obviation is not available in the languages of the
Balkans because their subjunctives OC structures are reduced to anaphoric binding, complying
with the principle “Use an anaphor instead of a pronoun whenever possible”. This principle is
viewed as a special case of the Avoid Pronoun Principle.

---

⁴ In addition, San Martin (2008) notices the following facts about Greek: Classical Greek displayed subjunctive
obviation and had infinitive structures, reflecting Farkas’ view. However, the switch from obviation to free reference
occured around the 2nd century AD, but infinitives of volitional verbs were in use until the 10th century.
Interestingly, Classical Greek subjunctive had its own verbal morphology, but during the Hellenistic Greek the
subjunctive verbal morphology became indistinctive from the indicative morphology and the particle *na became the
subjunctive mood marker. The loss of obviation and the loss of subjunctive morphology/addition of *na are
synchronous.
Terzi (1992) shows that tense dependency, which is generally considered to be the mechanism behind the obviation effect in Romance subjunctives (Piccallo 1985, Meireles & Raposo 1983), is also found in the Balkan type of subjunctive (tense dependency in Romanian it will be shown in Section 3.5). Furthermore, volitional predicates of Romance and Balkans are expected to display similar behavior, that is, to yield obviation. Terzi (1992) predicts that languages which do not manifest obviation are not associated with dependent tense.

In addition, Terzi argues that Romanian and Albanian subjunctives yield subject disjoint reference in the presence of the lexical subjunctive complementizer, thus she considers that the Romanian example represented in (52a) has obviative interpretation.

(52) a. \( \text{Ion}_1 \ vrea \ ca \ e^{*}_{1/2} \ s\`a \ plece. \)
    Ion wants that s\`a leave.3sg
    ‘Ion wants him/her/they to leave.’

b. \( \text{Ion}_1 \ vrea \ ca \ \text{Maria}_2 \ s\`a \ plece \)
    Ion wants that Maria s\`a leave.3sg
    ‘Ion wants Maria to leave.’

Terzi then explains that since Romanian is a pro-drop language, the position occupied by the empty subject in (52a), preceded by the complementizer, must be \textit{pro}. The empty category cannot be PRO because in Terzi’s system PRO is incompatible with overt complementizers. That a lexical subject (Maria) can appear in exactly the same position in (52b) further supports this assumption: \textit{pro} in (52a) is the subject of the embedded clause which is different from \textit{Ion}. The obviation effect in this scenario is caused by the presence of the complementizer.

Terzi (1992) concludes that obviation is expected in Romanian and Albanian whenever the subjunctive complementizer is lexical in F-subjunctives. She believes that a lexical complementizer is a determinant factor, although not the only one, for the obviation to occur.
Landau (2004) integrates Terzi’s (1992) two core ingredients, tense and complementizer, into his framework. For him, the properties of $C_0$ are critical, but unlike Terzi (1992), they do not refer to its conditions of being lexical or governor. The difference between obviative and nonobviative clauses is to be found in $C_0$. Obviative clauses have the feature [+T] in $C_0$, whereas nonobviative clauses have the features [+T, +AGR] on their $C_0$.

To recapitulate, previous approaches to obviation in CR yield three findings: Obviation is not possible in Romanian (Farkas 1985, 1992) and Dobrovie-Sorin (2001); Obviation is possible and triggered by the presence of the complementizer ca (Terzi 1992, Landau 2004); Obviation is limited to a combination of three factors: overt complementizer, a lexical pronoun in the subjunctive clause, and semantics (Comorovski, 1986). “General obviation” is not manifested in Romanian, a very well established fact. Farkas (and Dobrovie-Sorin) is right about the lack of obviation in Romanian, only her argument does not explain it. The debate is about “reduced obviation”, triggered by certain factors.

**3.3.2 Empirical Study**

To shed some light on the obviation – nonobviation debate in Romanian, I have conducted a rather small-scale study, involving 15 native speakers. The participants were born and raised in Romania, attended Romanian schools (at least high school) in Romania and did not leave the country before the age of twenty. The parents of the participants were also native speakers of Romanian. No participant began to learn a foreign language before the age of twelve. Most participants had college degrees obtained in Romania.

There were 13 sentences making three sets. Considering the suggestions discussed above, the following factors were included in some sentences: the complementizer ca, an overt pronoun in the embedded clause, and the matrix verb a zice ‘to say’. Two sets of sentences have identical embedded clauses, but the matrix verb is different. The first set shown in (53) is constructed with
the verb *a vrea* ‘to want’. The second set mirrors the first one with a different matrix verb *a zice* ‘to say’.

(53) a. Radu vrea să plece.
Radu wants să leave.3sg
‘Radu wants to leave.’

b. Radu vrea să plece el.
Radu wants să leave.3sg he
‘Radu wants to leave/Radu wants him to leave.’

c. Radu vrea ca să plece.
Radu wants that să leave.3sg
‘Radu wants to leave.’

d. Radu vrea ca să plece el.
Radu wants that să leave.3sg he
‘Radu wants to leave.’

The third set, given in (54) includes F-subjunctive complements taken by four matrix verbs, with or without *ca*. An adverb appears in each example.

(54) a. Radu speră să plece curând.
Radu hopes să leave.3sg soon
‘Radu hopes to leave soon.’

b. Radu vrea să plece cât mai repede.
Radu wants să leave.3sg as soon as possible
‘Radu wants to leave as soon as possible’.

c. Radu zice ca să plece imediat.
Radu says that să leave.3sg immediately
‘Radu says that he/she should leave immediately.’

d. Radu vrea ca să plece cât mai curând.
Radu wants that să leave.3sg as soon as possible
‘Radu wants to leave as soon as possible.’

e. Radu dorește ca să plece repede.
Radu desires that să leave.3sg fast
‘Radu wants to leave right away.’
The participants were asked to indicate the subject of the second (subjunctive) verb. In order to obtain spontaneous (natural) answers, no other instructions were given. Asking the participants to give all the possible answers for each sentence, it will have led to a very high percentage (if not hundred percent) of free reference, missing the point that some factors could possibly cause disjoint reference.

The obtained answers, i.e. the indication of the embedded subject, were of three kinds: Radu (showing subject coreference/control); Somebody else (showing disjoint reference); and Either -Radu or somebody else- (showing free reference). The results are gathered in (55). The respondent in (d) was the only one who commented about the presence of ca as being unnecessary. (For the rest of the respondents ca may be present in F-subjunctive complements).

(55) a. 4 respondents – Radu - for all sentences
b. 3 respondents  - Either – for all sentences
c. 1 respondent – Somebody else - for all sentences
d. 1 respondent – Somebody else - when the pronoun was present; Radu  - for the rest
e. 2 respondents – Somebody else for the instances with the verb a zice; Radu for the other two verbs.

f. The last 4 respondents found three patterns of disjoint reference caused by three factors: the presence of ca, the presence of the pronoun, and the verb a zice. However, none of these respondents gave the answer “Somebody else” for all the instances of each pattern. Their answers were Radu when none of these factors were present. The adverbs did not have any impact in choosing the answers.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are the following:

(56) a. The variety of answers suggests that, in real-life conversation, the speakers mostly rely on discourse to figure out the embedded subject.

b. The presence of the complementizer ca is still accepted in F-subjunctives, since only one respondent considered its presence unnecessary.
c. Although the three factors may be seen as causing disjoint reference, it happens for such a small number of respondents, so that it could be considered less than an inclination, and definitely not a rule.

d. Thus, the factor mostly associated with obviation, the complementizer, does not trigger this phenomenon.

e. The answer Radu appeared 11 times, suggesting that F-subjunctive complements with obligatorily controlled subject occur much more frequently than those with subject disjoint reference.

f. F-subjunctives do not manifest obviation as known; definitely, it is not the clear, automatic, systematic and general phenomenon manifested in Romance. Also, none of the three factors clearly trigger obviation. Instances of disjoint reference are individual variation/preference.

To conclude this section, it has been found out that no specific factor triggers obviation in Romanian. The reason behind the lack of obviation in F-subjunctives in Romanian (and the Balkan type of languages) still remains a question for future research.

### 3.4 Status of the Subjunctive Particle șă

As mentioned earlier, Romanian and the Balkan group of languages have a special particle, unparalleled within the Indo-European languages, which introduces subjunctive clauses. At least for Romanian, this particle is generally considered to be a mood marker, that is, an I element that heads its own projection M(ood)P according to Kempchinsky (1987), Terzi (1992) for Greek, Romanian, Albanian and in general for the languages of the Balkans. Terzi (1992) also cites Motapanyane (1991) for Romanian.

Regardless of this generally accepted explanation, the Romanian subjunctive particle șă has been the subject of some debate, specifically regarding its status as either a complementizer (Dobrovie-Sorin 1991,1994) or an inflectional element (Terzi 1992). Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) claims that șă is a complementizer, although she does attribute some inflectional properties to this particle. Dobrovie-Sorin (2001) attributes equal status to șă as complementizer and inflectional element, but its designated position is still C.
I do not believe that the subjunctive particle has ambiguous status and I agree with those researchers who argue for the inflectional status of this particle. I will include here the most relevant arguments that support the I status of șă. Subsequently, I will discuss and dismiss the arguments considered to favor the complementizer condition of șă and try to establish a definite status for this particle, that is, an inflectional entity.

3.4.1 Șă as an Inflectional Element

3.4.1.1 Adjacency to the verb

That the adjacency of the subjunctive particle to the verb reflects its inflectional status is widely recognized for Romanian (including by Dobrovie-Sorin 1994) and the languages of the Balkans in general. As we already know, the only elements allowed between șă and the verb, in strict order, are: a negation, a pronominal clitic, and one of the few one-syllable manner adverbs/intensifiers that could be incorporated into the verb. Sometimes, the clitic could be also incorporated with the negation, as in (57) below.

(57) Mara încearcă să nu-l mai vadă pe Radu.
Mara tries să not-him more see.3sg P Radu
‘Mara is trying to not see Radu anymore.’

Moreover, an overt subject may not occur between șă and the verb (58a), whereas an overt subject may occur between the complementizer and the verb, both in subjunctive constructions (58b) and indicative constructions (59).

(58) a. *Mara vrea să Radu vină mai repede.
Mara wants să Radu come.3sg more quick
‘Mara wants Radu to come sooner.’

b. Mara vrea ca Radu să vină mai repede.
Mara wants that Radu să come.3sg more quick
‘Mara wants Radu to come sooner.’

(59) Mara crede că Radu vine târziu.
Mara believes that Radu come.3sg late
‘Mara believes that Radu will be late.’
The contrasts between (58a) and (58b, 59) demonstrates that the particle *să* does not behave like a complementizer behaves; hence, this supports the argument that *să* is inflectional by nature.

### 3.4.1.2 A special subjunctive complementizer exists

While Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) relegates the status of the subjunctive complementizer *ca* as a complementizer-like element, Terzi (1992) takes the existence of *ca* as proof against the complementizer status of *să*. The next two examples show that a subordinate subjunctive clause cannot be introduced by the indicative complementizer *că* (60); and a subordinate indicative clause cannot be introduced by the subjunctive complementizer *ca* (61). These examples, therefore, confirm *ca* as representing the subjunctive complementizer.

(60) *Mara speră [că Radu să facă cumpărături]*
    Mara hopes that Radu să do.3sg shoppings
    ‘Mara hopes that Radu will do the shopping.’

(61) *Mara speră [ca Radu face cumpărături]*
    Mara hopes that Radu do.3sg shoppings
    ‘Mara hopes that Radu will do the shopping.’

In addition, when topicalized lexical material precedes *să*, the presence of the subjunctive complementizer *ca* is a required, as already emphasized in Section 3.2. A new example is included below in (62). Clearly, *să* is not the complementizer that introduces the embedded sentence in (62b).

(62) a. Mara preferă [să scrie scrisoarea mâine]
    Mara prefers să write.3sg letter-the tomorrow
    ‘Mara prefers to write that letter tomorrow.’

b. Mara preferă [ca mâine să scrie scrisoarea]
    Mara prefers that tomorrow să write.3sg letter-the
    ‘Mara prefers to write that letter tomorrow.’
Since the complementizer *ca* used to precede *să* very often in all types of subjunctive clauses, like the object control construction of (63) and still continues to appear in subjunctive adjunct clauses in CR (64), it has not died out.

(63)  să-l roage [ca s-o primească pe ea în casa lui]  
 să-him beg.3sg that să-her take.3sg P her in house his  
 ‘that they beg him to let her stay in his house.’  
 Slavici, 1848-1925

(64)  Te- am avertizat  
 you.Acc-have.1sg warned  
 ca să știi ce ai de facut.  
 that să know.2sg what have.2sg of done  
 ‘I warned you so you will know what to do.’

In addition, two complementizers cannot head a clause in Romanian, hence the existence of a specific subjunctive complementizer proves that the particle *să* is not a complementizer.

3.4.1.3 Wh-words can co-occur with *să*

In Romanian, *wh*-words cannot co-occur with complementizers. Thus, (65a) is ungrammatical because *unde* ‘where’ and either complementizer *dacă* ‘if/whether’ or *că* ‘that’ cannot coexist. The sentence becomes grammatical with *unde* only (65b) or with any of the two complementizers only (65c).

 Radu not knows where if/that leaves Mara  
 *Radu does not know where if/that Mara leaves

 b.  Radu nu știe unde pleacă Mara.  
 Radu not knows where leaves Mara  
 ‘Radu does not know where is Mara leaving for.’

 c.  Radu nu știe dacă/că pleacă Mara.  
 Radu not knows if/that leaves Mara  
 ‘Radu does not know if/that Mara is leaving.’
Unlike the complementizers *dacă* and *că*, the particle *să* is able to co-occur with *wh*-words, therefore this particle is not a complementizer. To illustrate the point, the sentences of (66) include subjunctive clauses introduced by *wh*-words.

(66) a. Mara nu are ce *să* facă în vacanță.  
Mara not has what *să* do.3sg in vacation  
‘Mara has nothing to do during her vacation’.

b. Radu nu a decis unde *să* plece de Crăciun  
Radu not has decided where *să* leave.3sg for Christmas  
‘Radu hasn’t decided where to go for Christmas.’

3.4.1.4 *Să* co-occurs with complementizers

Another indication that *să* is an inflectional element follows from its capacity to occur with a real complementizer (besides the complementizer *ca*). As can be seen in examples (67a,b) *să* subjunctive clauses may be introduced by the complementizer *dacă*, ‘whether’.

(67) a. Mara se întreabă *dacă* *să* plece azi sau mâine.  
Mara rflx asks whether *să* leave.3sg today or tomorrow  
‘Mara asks herself whether to leave today or tomorrow.’

b. Ce nu știi *dacă* *să* pui în plăcintă?  
what not know.2sg whether *să* put.2sg in pie  
‘What don’t you know whether to put in the pie?’

Terzi (1992) claims that the Greek particle *na* and Romanian *să* cannot co-occur with other complementizers because, from their position in $C^0$, they incur a PRO theorem violation, that is, they can govern PRO which must be ungoverned. *Să* and *na* can only co-occur with *wh*-elements which occupy [Spec CP], a position from which they would not govern PRO. This analysis, however, at least in regards to the Romanian subjunctive particle, is not correct. The diachronic evidence shows that the complementizer *ca* immediately preceded the subjunctive particle *să* in both obligatory control and free control subjunctives. Many illustrative examples are given in Section 3.2.
As for Contemporary Romanian (CR), Terzi (1992) bases her assumption on her example included here in (68).

(68) */Maria nu ştie dacă să plece.
     Maria not knows whether să leave.3sg
     ‘Maria doesn’t know whether to go.’
     Terzi (1992:116)

I would say that (68) is only marginal and not totally ungrammatical. Some speakers consider it grammatical or acceptable. Besides, the examples (67a,b) are perfectly grammatical with the complementizer dacă.

Să may also co-occur with prepositional complementizers, as reflected by the subjunctive temporal adjunct of (69).

(69) Mara a plecat până să se întoarcă Radu
     Mara has left till să reflx returns Radu
     ‘Mara left before Radu returned.’

To recapitulate, să is an inflectional element rather than a complementizer for the following reasons: să is adjacent to the verb, and unlike the complementizers ca and că (also dacă) a subject is not allowed to follow this particle. Since a special subjunctive complementizer exists and may cooccur with să, it is not possible for this particle to be a second subjunctive complementizer. Most importantly, să is able to co-occur with wh-words and complementizers, a behavior not manifested by attested complementizers.

3.4.2 Să as a Complementizer

of să. In my account, I will go beyond Terzi’s (1992) discussion providing new information and unexplored data. I will also tackle issues Terzi (1992) left aside for future research.

3.4.2.1 Să heads an embedded clause

We already know that a subjunctive clause may begin with să or with ca să. The two subjunctive embedded clauses of (70) begin with the particle să, while the subjunctive clause of (71) starts with ca să. (Both example types are currently in use.).

(70) M-a rugat [s-o las [să intre în odaie]] me.Acc-has begged.3sg [să-her let.1sg [să enter.3sg in room
‘She asked me to let her enter my room.’
Minulescu (1881-1944), Cu toamna în odaie

(71) Ca să-ajung până la tine, i-am zis calului:
that să-reach.1sg to you, cl.Dat-have.1sg said horse.Dat
- Grăbește...
  hurry.Imp
‘To reach you, I asked my horse to hurry.’
Minulescu (1881-1944), Romântă fără muzică

Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) claims that the complementizer status of să may follow from its capacity to head an embedded clause. In Dobrovie-Sorin (2001:55) this view is adjusted to: să “may head embedded clauses in the absence of any other Comp elements.” “Other Comp elements” could only be wh-words or the complementizer ca, or other complementizer. If să can co-occur with a complementizer (showed above), să cannot be a complementizer. Recall that two complementizers are not allowed to introduce a clause in Romanian.

If heading a clause means that să could be the first word in a clause, this is true but irrelevant for the complementizer status of this particle. By that reasoning, the English infinitival particle to would also be a C⁰, contrary to the fact.

If să is considered the head of a subjunctive clause in the sense that it is located in C⁰, this fact is not guaranteed either. Actually, there are at least equal chances that a null complementizer heads a subjunctive complement clause since a subjunctive complementizer
exists. Recall that Grosu & Horvath (1984) consider *ca* to be optionally lexical or nonlexical, a point of view shared by Comorovski (1986).

Both (24) and (25) repeated under (72) and (73) are representations of subjunctive complement clauses from old documents. They show that *ca* may be overt or nonovert in exactly the same environment. Both subjunctive clauses are selected by the same matrix predicate, *a vrea* ‘to want’, but (72) is introduced by the complementizer *ca* followed by *să*, while the other, (73), begins with *să*. Thus, it is plausible to assume that (73) is introduced by a nonovert complementizer.

(72)  De n-a vrea ca să vie.
If not-would.3sg want that să come.3sg
‘If she wouldn’t want to come.’
Alesandri (1821-1890) Opere

(73)  fimeia lui nu vra să plătească…
woman-the his not wants să pay.3sg
‘his woman doesn’t want to pay….’
Stefanelli (1915:112), 1784 document

Furthermore, placing *să* under C₀ is to say that *ca să* complement clauses in OSR, like (72), and *ca să* purpose clauses in CR and OSR (e.g., 64, 71) are headed by two complementizers, which is a very improbable conclusion.

Therefore, the ability of *să* to head an embedded clause or a sentence, whatever this may mean, does not confer a complementizer status on it.

3.4.2.2 *Să* in surrogate imperative constructions

Romanian has true imperative forms for second person singular and plural only: e.g., *Dute!* ‘Go! (2sg)’ *Duceti-va!* ‘Go! (2pl). Recall that *să* subjunctives can have imperative force, constructions usually called surrogate imperatives or suppletive imperatives. Subjunctive suppletives are possible for all three persons singular and plural. However, since subjunctive has distinct morphology only for third person (same form for singular and plural), a subjunctive
suppletive must be accompanied by the particle să in order to be distinguished from present indicative or true imperative. The examples in (74a,b) are impersonal surrogate imperatives of the type *Let it happen! or So be it!*

Another reason for the complementizer status of să proposed by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) follows from the impossibility of să to head a third person subjunctive surrogate imperative, when the clitic follows the verb (74c). In (74a) the particle să is followed by the clitic and the subjunctive verb, i.e., the normal word order. In (74b) să is omitted and the clitic follows the verb. The postverbal position of the clitic in (74b) is not possible in the presence of să, as illustrated by (74c).

(74) a. Să se întâmplă ce s-o întâmpla.
    să cl.3sg happen.3sg what cl.3sg-Fut happen.3sg
    ‘Let happen what will happen./So be it!’

b. Întâmplă-se ce s-o întâmplă.
    happen.Sbj.3sg- rflx.3sg what rflx.3sg- Fut happen.3sg

c. *să întâmplă-se ce s-o întâmplă
    să happen.3sg- rflx.3sg what rflx.3sg-Fut happen.3sg
    Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:96)

The question to answer is why (74c) is ruled out. (Terzi 1992 leaves this question for further research). In Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), in which the examples in (74) were analyzed, a rule that moves the verb to C, leaving no position for să in (74c), is considered proof for the complementizer status of să.

Now compare the third person subjunctive suppletives of (75) with the second person suppletive of 76). The examples of (75) display the same patterns in (74) with a different verb (I do not use the verb a se întâmpla ‘to happen’, because it is impersonal). (76) includes one example of true imperative (76b). Observe that a postverbal clitic is possible for a third person
suppletive (75b), but not for a second person suppletive (76c). The real question is what is responsible for this difference?

(75) a. Să se ducă acolo imediat!
să cl.3sg/pl go.3sg/pl there immediately
‘Let them go there immediately!’

b. Ducă-se!
go.Se!
cl.3sg/pl

c. *să ducă-se
să go-cl.3
let go-cl.3

(76) a. Să vă duceti acolo imediat!
să cl.2pl go.2pl there immediately
‘Go there immediately!’

b. Duceti-vă!
go.Imp.2pl-
cl.2pl

‘Go there!’

c. *Duceti-vă!
go.Sbj.2pl-


d. *să duceti-vă
să go.2pl-

Obviously, the existence of a true imperative form (76b) precludes the surrogate imperative with the exact same form (76c). As for (75b), two conditions allow it: First, there is no true imperative form for the third person to compete with the subjunctive, and second, the subjunctive exhibits distinct third person morphology. Only under these conditions a subjunctive verb may mimic an imperative by having a postverbal clitic for third person (75b).

Constructions like (74b,75b) are said to complete the paradigm of imperative (for third person) as Graur et al. (1969:98) suggest. Since a postverbal clitic is specific to imperative (at least in contrast with subjunctive) să is prohibited in this context because this structure stands for
a true imperative. This is exactly why (75c) and (74c) are ruled out. (76d) is even worse: the subjunctive marker appears with imperative verbal morphology and imperative clitic position. The solution proposed in Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) may possibly account for (74c), (75c) but not for (76c).

In sum, the subjunctive marker is not possible with imperative verbal morphology or/and imperative clitic position, hence the impossibility of (74c) is due to the morphological competition between true imperatives and subjunctive suppletives.

3.4.2.3 Negation placement

To consider an argument involving the negation nu ‘not’, at least some basic characteristics of this entity need to be presented. First, the sequence verb – nu (regardless of the type of the verb: lexical, auxiliary, or modal) has never existed in Romanian, e.g., Nu ştiu (not know) vs. *ştiu nu (know not) ‘I don’t know’.

Furthermore, the negation nu may immediately follow the indicative complementizer că (77), but cannot immediately follow the subjunctive complementizer ca (78a). In the subjunctive structure of (78b), nu illicitly appears between the complementizer ca and the particle să,

---

5 Related to this topic, in French a sentence beginning with *que* followed by the subjunctive is used for third person commands, wishes, concessions, etc, like (i). The subjunctive Romanian version is given in (ii).

(i) Que les masques tombent! Let the masks fall!
(ii) Să cadă măștile!

Then there are set expressions without *que* like (iii). The Romanian version (iv) also lacks să (optionally).

(iii) Vive la France! Long live France!
(iv) Trăiască Franța!

Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) compares the French expressions with the Romanian counterparts and concludes that să in (ii) must be a complementizer like the French que (i). Furthermore, Dobrovie-Sorin (2001:55) takes subjunctive suppletive constructions as instances where să is “sentence initial”, thus it is a complementizer. Notice that by this reasoning to in To be continued! should be also a complementizer, in contradiction with the reality.

6 Unlike Romanian, English used to employ *not* after a main verb: I *loved* you *not*. (From Shakespeare’s Hamlet) In Contemporary English, *not* still appears after modals, and auxiliaries, e.g I *cannot* (and even *We think not*).
showing that it cannot follow the complementizer or precede the particle. It only can be between să and the subjunctive verb.

(77) Mara știe [că nu a făcut Radu asta]
Mara knows that not has done Radu this
‘Mara knows that Radu didn’ do this.’

(78) a. Mă îngrijesc [ca să nu am probleme la bătrânete]
1sg care.1sg that să not have.1sg problems P old age
‘I take care of my self in order to avoid health problems at older age.’

b. *Mă îngrijesc [ca nu să am probleme la bătrânete]

Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) claims that (79b) is ungrammatical because the Neg head (nu ‘not’) should subcategorize for IP complements (according to Zanuttini 1989), but it selects a CP instead, that is, headed by the subjunctive particle să. Assuming that să is under C, the author expects the ungrammaticality of (79b) to be on a par with the indicative structure of (80a). In other words, nu cannot cross a complementizer: the indicative complementizer că in (80a) and the “complementizer” să in (79b). The sentence from which (80a) was derived is given in (80b).

(79) a. Vreau [să nu-l mai întâlnești]
want.1sg [să not-him more meet.2sg]
‘I don’t want you to see him again.’

b. *vreau nu [să-l mai întâlnești]
want.1sg not [să-him more meet.2sg]

(80) a. *știu nu [că a scris Ion poezia asta]
know.1sg not [that has written Ion poem this]
*I know not that Ion wrote this poem
Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:95-96)

b. Stiu [că nu a scris Ion poezia asta]
know.1sg [that not has written Ion poem this]
‘I know that Ion didn’t write this poem.’

Observe that the negation in (79b) and (80a) reached the main clause crossing the subjunctive particle să and the indicative complementizer că, respectively. The prohibited
sequence verb-*nu resulted in the matrix renders these derivations ungrammatical, thus *nu is not able to cross the complementizer or the subjunctive particle. This does not necessarily mean that *să is a complementizer. If one concludes that *să is a complementizer, one has to explain (78b) above, where *nu landed between *să and the complementizer *ca, indicating that *ca and not *să is in C⁰. Therefore, the placement of the negation *nu does not constitute evidence for the complementizer status of *să.

3.4.2.4 Clitic placement

Like the negation *nu, a pronominal clitic cannot cross a complementizer in Romanian.

The clitic –l ‘him’ in (81a) crosses the complementizer *ca, reaching the clitic position of the matrix and the sentence becomes ungrammatical (81b).

(81) a. Mara crede [că-*l va vedea pe Radu mâine] Mara believes that-cl.him will.3sg see P Radu tomorrow
     ‘Mara believes that she will see Radu in the evening.’

     b. *Mara îl crede că va vedea pe Radu mâine.

In Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) the ungrammaticality of (82b) is explained by the impossibility of the clitic l/îl to cross a CP boundary whose head (C⁰) would be occupied by the subjunctive particle *să.

(82) a. Vreau *să-*l mai întâlneşti. want.1sg *să-cl.him more meet.2sg
     ‘I want you to see him again.’

     b. *vreau îl *să mai întâlneşti
     want.1sg cl.him *să more meet.2sg
     Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:95)

Terzi (1992) points out citing Zanuttini (1990) that functional heads, not only C⁰, are capable of interfering with clitic movement. Indeed, the clitic cannot skip over *nu in (83b).

Notice that the ungrammaticality of (83c) may be attributed to the impossibility of the clitic to cross either *nu or *să, or both of the two heads.
(83) a. Vreau să nu-l mai întâlneşti.
    Want.1sg să not-him more meet
    ‘I want you not to see him anymore/again.’

b. *Vreau să îl nu mai întâlneşti

c. *Vreau îl să nu mai întâlneşti

Terzi (1992) argues that clitics are heads, and, as such, they cannot skip over functional heads such as Neg\(^0\) or I/M\(^0\) (which, she maintains, is occupied by the subjunctive particle) because it results in ECP violation. Interestingly, no clitic can precede the negation nu--in any structure--or the subjunctive particle in Romanian. Since the particle să is always present in its I\(^0\) position, no clitic is able to cross it.

So far, it has been found that a clitic cannot cross the complementizer că, the negation nu, and the subjunctive particle să. It only remains to find out the behavior of clitics vis-à-vis the subjunctive complementizer ca. Three different structures will be used to accomplish this test.

For instance, the sentence (43), labeled idolect in Section 3.2 (also an OC-subjunctive structure in OSR), repeated here under (84a) includes a pronominal clitic in the embedded clause. Placing the clitic î/îl in front of să, it appears now between ca and să (84b) and the derivation crashes. Since ca is the complementizer, să cannot be one. Moving the clitic further, over ca, the derivation remains ungrammatical.

(84) a. Nu poci [ca să-îl mai văz].
    not can.1sg [that să-cl.him more see1.sg]
    ‘I cannot see him anymore.’
    (Consultant, 2006)

b. *Nu poci [ca îl să mai văz]
    not can.1sg [that cl.him să more see1.sg]

c. Nu *îl poci *îl [ca să mai văz].
    not cl.him can.1sg cl.him [that să more see1.sg]
Same results obtain in the standard subjunctive structures of CR. The embedded (purpose) clause of (85a) includes a clitic (in bold). Placing the clitic in front of să (85b) renders the sentence ungrammatical. Moving the clitic one step more, over the complementizer ca, in (85c), the derivation crashes again. Therefore, a clitic cannot follow or cross the subjunctive complementizer ca; it cannot cross să and ca in sequence or both in one movement.

(85) a. Fac bani azi [ca să-i cheltui mâine] make.1sg money today [that să-cl.them spend.1sg tomorrow] ‘I make money today to spend it tomorrow.’
   b. *Fac bani azi [ca îi să cheltui mâine]
   c. *Fac bani azi îi [ca să cheltui mâine]

Similarly, the clitic cannot cross să and ca in the subjunctive complement construction of (86), whose preposed subject is between ca and să in (86a). Moving the clitic in front of să or over the subject, the sentence is ruled out (86b). Moving the clitic further to the matrix, the sentence remains ungrammatical (86c).

(86) a. Mara vrea [ca Radu să-l întâlnească pe Ion] Mara wants [that Radu să-cl.him meet.3sg P Ion] ‘Mara wants Radu to meet Ion.’
   b. Mara vrea [ca *îl Radu *îl să întâlnească pe Ion]
   c. Mara *îl vrea *îl [ca Radu să întâlnească pe Ion]

All three examples (84, 85, 86) demonstrate that the clitic that normally occurs between să and the subjunctive verb cannot cross either să or ca, or both. Crossing să, the clitic may land between the complementizer ca and the subjunctive particle (84b, 85b, 86b). Definitely, the attested complementizer ca is the dweller of C⁰ and not să, contrary to Dobrovie-Sorin’s (1994) claim. The b. examples are ruled out because the clitic crossed a functional head, să, which
occupies $I^0$. The c. examples are ruled out because the clitic crossed two functional heads: $să$ in $I^0$ and $ca$ in $C^0$.

The real position/status of $să$ in rapport to clitic placement/movement is given in (87) below:

(87)  

a. In Romanian, no clitic precedes/crosses an attested complementizer, the negation *nu*, or the subjunctive particle, i.e. a functional head.

b. If a clitic is not able to cross $să$, one can safely say that the respective clitic cannot cross a functional head; there is no proof that this functional head is in the $C^0$ position.

c. If a clitic illicitly crossed $să$ in sentences where the complementizer *ca* is present, the clitic is placed between the subjunctive complementizer and the subjunctive particle. The $C^0$ position is occupied by the complementizer *ca*. Therefore, $să$ is not in $C^0$.

All the arguments for the complementizer status of $să$ (discussed above) have been dismissed. At best, these arguments had no saying regarding the status of $să$. In addition, the discussion about some of them (*neg* and clitic placements) furnished evidence against the complementizer status of $să$. Most of the arguments for the complementizer status of $să$ were proposed as a result of overlooked empirical data.

Yet, recently, Dobrovie-Sorin (2001:55-6) maintains that $să$ has both inflectional-like elements and complementizer-like elements. The complementizer-like elements listed in Dobrovie-Sorin (2001) are: “Subjunctive particles are sentence initial, preceding negation as well as clitics, and may head embedded clauses in the absence of any other Comp element;” (all of them discussed in this section). In order to arrange the parts, the complementizer *ca* and the particle $să$, the author postulates two C positions: one for *ca*, one for $să$.

To conclude this section, as demonstrated above, Dobrovie-Sorin’s (1994, 2001) arguments do not support the complementizer status of the subjunctive particle $să$. To my
knowledge, no argument for the complementizer status of șă remains standing. On the contrary, there are solid arguments in favor of the I/M(ood) status of the subjunctive particle șă, such as its co-occurrence with complementizers and \(wh\)-words. Naturally, the complementizer șa, be it overt or nonovert, occupies the \(C^0\) position, while the mood marker șă heads the maximal projection of Mood Phrase (MP) or IP.

The lack of specific subjunctive inflection on the verb for the first and second person singular or plural, makes șă to solely stands for the subjunctive morphological identity. Therefore, it is appropriate to say that șă is the relevant morphology of subjunctive.

3.5 Tense in Romanian Subjunctive Complements

This section highlights the type of tense of Romanian subjunctive complement clauses. In Landau (2004), Balkan subjunctive complements are analyzed, using Greek and Bulgarian data, as having semantic tense: OC-subjunctive complements display anaphoric tense and F-subjunctive ones display independent tense.

Semantic tense as defined in Polinsky and Potsdam (2006:188) is basically a “referential expression” which determines the temporal boundaries of an event. Such an expression indicates whether a proposition is specified by present, past or future interpretation. The respective heads that carry the tense make the crucial difference between morphological and semantic tense. Morphological tense assigns tense openly on some constituent of a clause that may be different from the head of the clause. Semantic tense is an attribute of the clausal head and defines the tense domain of an event. The morphological tense may or may not correspond to the semantic tense.

Following Landau’s (2004. 2006) tense analysis, I will show that Romanian subjunctives display the same patterns of tense characteristic to the Balkan type of subjunctive: anaphoric tense for OC-subjunctives and dependent tense for F-subjunctives.
Anaphoric tense is a semantic tense that does not have its own tense domain, thus it is fully dependent on another tense domain for reference. Therefore, anaphoric tense does not have its own tense operator and its clause is not allowed to have temporal modifiers incompatible with the matrix. Dependent tense is a semantic tense that has its own tense domain/tense operator, independent of the matrix domain but constrained by it. A clause with dependent tense may employ temporal modifiers distinct from those of the matrix, but limited by it.

Landau (2004) takes the temporal expressions mismatch between matrix and its complement clause as a reliable diagnostic for semantic tense. As we shall see, conflicting temporal adverbs are possible to some extent in F-subjunctive structures, but totally disallowed in OC-subjunctive structures.

In the example of (88), the event of the matrix and that of the F-subjunctive complement are temporarily independent, as evidenced by the possibility of conflicting temporal adverbs: \textit{acum} ‘now in the matrix and \textit{mâine} ‘tomorrow’ in the subordinate clause. Thus, the subjunctive clause describes an event temporarily located in the future in spite of the present tense morphology on the subjunctive verb.

\begin{verbatim}
(88)    Acum   Mara speră/vrea să plece mâine.
now  Mara hopes/wants să leave.3sg tomorrow
‘Now, Mara hopes/wants to leave tomorrow.’
\end{verbatim}

The representation in (88) shows that an F-subjunctive complement has a tense domain of its own apart from the matrix tense domain resulting from the future interpretation (as opposed to the present tense of the matrix) and its ability to employ conflicting temporal modifiers. We could also say that F-subjunctives include a tense operator. This tense operator is “distinct from the matrix tense operator although constrained by it” (Landau 2004:831). Notice that \textit{mâine}
‘tomorrow’ in (88) cannot be replaced by *ieri ‘yesterday’ (89). We then can conclude that F-subjunctive complement clauses display dependent semantic tense.

(89) Acum Mara speră/vrea să plece mâine / *ieri.
By contrast, conflicting temporal adverbs are prohibited in the OC-subjunctive example of (90), for a sole event takes place in this construction. Lacking its own tense domain (and tense operator), without the possibility of employing temporal adverbs incompatible with the matrix, an OC-subjunctive falls “within the matrix tense domain” (Landau 2004:831). Thus, OC-subjunctives display anaphoric semantic tense, again despite the present tense morphology on the subjunctive verb.

(90) *Acum Mara încearcă/începe să înoate mâine.

Furthermore, Landau (2004, 2006:161) argues that when complements have semantic tense, dependent or anaphoric, the matrix predicates select the respective tense. Since selection is local, the tense dependence of the embedded I on the matrix predicate is mediated by Comp, the head of the complement clause. Thus, C⁰ bears a [T] feature, the uninterpretable [T] feature because tense is interpreted only once on I⁰, so it hosts the interpretable [T] feature. The author mentions that it is typical for infinitival and subjunctive complements to have their tense specified by the matrix predicate. In case of independent embedded tense, there is no [T] specification on Comp. Furthermore, dependent tense has the feature [+T] since it has its own tense operator and anaphoric tense has the feature [-T] due to the lack of distinct tense operator.

---

7 The relationship between tense and Comp can be traced back to Stowell (1982) who argues that the tense domain of a clause is represented in C⁰. For Kempchinsky (1986), the tense of F-subjunctives is defined by the interdependence between I and C. Terzi (1992) argues that the subjunctives have a [TENSE] operator in C⁰ or it may be a set of tense features. Varlokosta (1993) derives the dependent tense of F-subjunctives through the V-to-T-to-C movement.
Following Landau (2004), Polinsky & Potsdam (2006) also confirm that many complement clauses have dependent or anaphoric tense imposed by the selectional restrictions of the matrix verb and consequently the value of the uninterpretable [T] feature is represented on the embedded C^0 head. Thus, independent tense has no [T] feature on C^0, dependent tense has [+T] feature on C^0 and anaphoric tense has [-T] feature on C^0.

Unlike Landau, Polynsky & Potsdam further argue that the feature [T], whether positive or negative, is associated with an optional EPP feature, which makes possible for C^0 to take an A-specifier. Under these circumstances, the embedded subject can move to the [Spec,CP] of the respective complement clause in order to check its EPP feature. The subject then moves to the subject (or object) position of the matrix. In other words, movement out of complement (OC) clauses displaying dependent or anaphoric tense is possible. In sum, anaphoric semantic tense is transparent for movement, dependent semantic tense is possibly transparent, but independent tense is opaque to movement.

Strictly concerning the purpose of this section, I conclude that OC-subjunctive complements display anaphoric semantic tense endowed with the [-T] feature and F-subjunctive complements display dependent semantic tense endowed with the [+T] feature. The uninterpretable [+T]/[-T] features are located on C^0, the head of the embedded CP projection.

### 3.6 Subject of Subjunctive Complement Clauses

Some researchers argue that the empty subject of all subjunctive complement clauses in the languages of the Balkans is pro: Dobrovie–Sorin (1991, 1994, 2001) for Romanian (and the Balkans), Calabrese (1992) for Salentino, Turano (1994) for Albanian, among others.

Other researchers argue for PRO subject in OC-subjunctives: Kempchinsky (1986) for Romanian, Terzi (1992, 1997) for Greek, Romanian, Albanian, (and the Balkans). Also, Krapova (2001) adopts Terzi’s analysis for Greek and Bulgarian and reaffirms that the subject of OC-
subjunctives is PRO. Landau (2004, 2006) analyses the control in languages of the Balkans within the larger context of control in general. He maintains that the embedded controlled subject of OC-subjunctives is PRO. These researchers also say that the null subject of F-subjunctives may be pro or PRO. Lexical subjects are also possible in F-subjunctives.

Both groups of researchers agree that subjunctive clauses in the languages of the Balkans involve obligatory control.

The main goal of this section is to determine the null subject of OC-subjunctive clauses and the subject of F-subjunctive clauses. I will show that OC-subjunctive complements have a PRO subject and that F-subjunctive are ambiguous between two structures, one associated with a PRO subject, the other with lexical DP or pro subjects. The last part of the section explores the possibility of arbitrary PRO in subjunctive clauses.

### 3.6.1 The OC-Subjunctive Complements Have PRO Subject

#### 3.6.1.1 Basic properties of PRO


Thus, the subject of OC-subjunctive clauses must be null (91a). Lexical subjects are excluded from the same position (91b) or from postverbal position (91c). A null pronominal subject, pro, is also excluded (91bc).

(91) a. Mara₁ a încercat e₁ să scrie o scrisoare  
Mara has tried sₐ write.3sg a letter  
‘Mara tried to write a letter.’

b. *Mara₁ a încercat Ana/pro să scrie o scrisoare  
Mara has tried Ana sₐ write.3sg a letter  
*Mara tried Ana to write a letter
The null subject lacks independent reference. Most importantly, it must be coreferential with a local matrix antecedent (the controller) and c-commanded by it (92a). As can be seen the empty subject (e) is the antecedent of the reflexive/emphatic pronoun and that the coindexation of e with Mara entails the coindexation of the reflexive with Mara. Control by a long-distant antecedent is not possible (92b). Only the reflexive that is coreferential with e is possible in (92b), implying that the long-distance antecedent Radu cannot control the empty subject.

(92) a. **Mara** a încercat e₁ să scrie ea însăşi₁ o scrisoare
Mara has tried sã write.3sg herself a letter
‘Mara tried to write a letter.’

b. Radu₁ stie că **Mara** a încercat e₂ să scrie
Radu knows that Mara has tried sã write.3sg
ea însăşi₂/*el însuşi₁ o scrisoare
herself/himself a letter
‘Radu knows that Mara tried to write a letter herself/*himself.’

According to the properties of the null subject of OC-subjunctive complements discussed so far, the null subject in (91a) and (92a,b) must be PRO.

Furthermore, PRO will always manifest sloppy reading under ellipsis and *de se* interpretation, conform Varlokosta & Hornstein (1993), Varlokosta (1993), Krapova (2001) and Landau (2004), for the languages of the Balkans.

**3.6.1.2 PRO permits only a sloppy reading under ellipsis**

The only interpretation of the verb ellipsis construction of (93a) is that that Ana (and not somebody else or Mara) tried (herself) to leave early. The meaning of the ellipsis is the full-conjoined clause in (93b), that is, Ana controls the embedded subject (PRO) of the second conjunct. This is sloppy reading. The idea is that, according to Bouchard (1985) and followed by Landau (2000:35) among others, PRO behaves like an anaphor in OC contexts and like a
pronoun in NOC (i.e., long-distance control: LDC) contexts. Consequently, PRO in OC-
subjunctive complements will always have sloppy reading under verbal ellipsis.

(93) a. Mara₁ încercă [PRO₁ să plece devreme]
Mara   try.3sg      să leave.3sg early
și Ana -- de asemenea
and Ana – too.
‘Mara is trying to leave early and Ana is too.’

b. Mara₁ încercă [PRO₁ să plece devreme] și
Mara tries      să leave.3sg early and
Ana₂ încercă să plece ea însăși₂ devreme.
Ana tries      să leave.3sg herself early
‘Mara is trying to leave early and Ana is trying (herself) to leave early.’

3.6.1.3 PRO supports only a de se interpretation

*De se* is Latin for ‘of oneself’ and, in philosophy, it is a phrase used to mark off what
some believe to be a category of ascription distinct from *de re* ‘of the thing’ (and from *de
dicto* ‘of the word’).

Varlokosta and Hornstein (1993) notice that in the recent literature PRO is to be
distinguished from pronominals in the sense that it patterns semantically not with personal
pronoun forms like *he*, but rather with emphatic or reflexive forms like *himself*. This
peculiarity is revealed under circumstances where a subject of an attitude verb is confused
about his (her) identity.

In the classical example (Higginbotham, 1989), “The Unfortunate”, a war veteran
suffering from amnesia, is watching a TV show (or is reading a book) dedicated to his own
heroic deeds. Since the Unfortunate does not remember anything about his wartime
experience, admires the man depicted in the show, without knowing that man is himself.
While the Unfortunate is watching the show, he may have beliefs about himself (the man
watching the show), that is the *de se* interpretation, or he may also have beliefs about the hero in the story (who happens to be him), that is the *de re*/*de dicto* interpretation.

The *de se* – *de re* contrast is reflected in the following representations borrowed from Varlokosta and Horsntein (1993:508). (94) and (95) are true if *The Unfortunate* believes that someone is coming to him to give him a medal – the *de se* interpretation. These two sentences cannot be true if *The Unfortunate* believes that war hero depicted in the show (not himself) gets the medal – the *de re* interpretation. The representation of (96) is ambiguous between the two interpretations. In (97) only the *de se* reading is possible. (97) is true only if the man has a belief that himself will get a medal. This reinforces the belief that PRO is an anaphor.

(94) The Unfortunate expects that he himself will get a medal.
(95) The Unfortunate expects himself to get a medal.
(96) The Unfortunate expects that he will get a medal.
(97) The Unfortunate expects [PRO to get a medal].

For Romanian, the verbs for *expect/hope* cannot be used to show the *de se* – *de re* contrast because this verb is an F-subjunctive verb. The mental *de se* attitude verbs *a uita* ‘to forget’ or *a-și aminti* ‘to remember’ can be used instead for this purpose.

So, the sentence of (98a), constructed with indicative, has both the *de re* interpretation and *de se* interpretation in the sense that the forgetful man himself (*de se*) or somebody else (*de re*) remembers to take the train. By contrast, only the forgetful man (himself) could actually remember to take the train in the OC-subjunctive structure of (98b). Thus, (98b) has only a *de se* interpretation, the belief about the self.

(98) a. Uitucul și a amintit că (el1/2) ia trenul
‘The forgetful man remembered that he takes the train.’
b. UitelcI și-a amintit [ei să ia *e2 trenul]
   forgetful-the cl -has remembered să take.3sg train-the
   ‘The forgetful man remembered to take the train.’

We can then conclude that the null subject of an OC-subjunctive complement manifests
the de se interpretation, conform (98b), therefore it is PRO.

3.6.2 The Subject of F-Subjunctives

F-subjunctive predicates are structurally ambiguous between two representations, one of
which is associated with a PRO subject. Terzi (1992) was the first to make this assessment.
Later, Landau (2004:845) notices: “F-subjunctives whose null subject is coindexed with a matrix
argument are systematically ambiguous between a pro-structure with accidental coreference and
a PRO-structure with OC.” Landau argues that OC-subjunctives are a subclass of F-subjunctives
and that the PRO-interpretation is a special case of the pro-interpretation. In his Agreement
Model of OC (which will be presented in Chapter 5) an F-subjunctive structure with embedded
PRO subject does not compete with the parallel one with a pro subject.

An F-subjunctive complement may have a lexical DP subject (pronoun or noun) in the
basic/postverbal position as in (99a), or this subject may be null (99b). This null subject is
referentially independent (different from the matrix subject) and it actually replaces a lexical DP,
thus it is pro.

(99) a. (Eu1) vreau [să plece el/Radu2].
   (I) want să leave.3sg he/Radu
   ‘I want Radu to leave.’

b. (Eu1) vreau [să plece pro2/*eu1].
   (I) want să leave3sg
   ‘I want him to leave.’

---

8 I am not aware of any analysis that clearly demonstrates that OC is not possible in F-subjunctive complements
The embedded lexical DP subject can be preposed/topicalized, and in this case, as we know, the complementizer *ca* must be present (100a). Without *ca*, a lexical DP is not possible in the subject position of (100a), thus a *pro* subject is also excluded there (100b). Since a lexical DP and a (referentially) null *pro* cannot alternatively occupy the subject position of (100b), the null subject must be *PRO* as shown in (101). Furthermore, only the reflexive that doubles and is coreferent with the null subject and with its matrix controller is possible in (101). Therefore, the matrix subject of (101) must control the embedded null subject and be coreferent with it, hindering a non-coreferent subject. Miller (2002:101) also notices that where a disjoint *pro* subject is excluded, the null subject must be *PRO*: “Since *pro* otherwise occurs freely where lexical subjects occur, the ungrammaticality of “an examples like (100b) “makes sense only if the null subject (of (101)) is *PRO* in need of a controller.”

(100) a. (Eu₁) vreau [ca Radu₂ să plece].
   (I) want that Radu să leave.3sg
   ‘I want Radu to leave.’

   b. *(Eu₁) vreau [Radu/pro₂ să plece].
   (I) want Radu să leave.3sg
   ‘I want Radu to leave.’

(101) (Eu₁) vreau [PRO₁ să plec eu însuși₁/*tu însuși₂] curând]
   (I) want să leave.1sg myself/ *yourself soon
   ‘I want to leave (myself).’

Terzi (1992) argues that although Agr is present in sentences such as (101), it is not actually able to govern the subject position and license a *pro* subject. In Terzi’s analysis, along the lines of PRO theorem, PRO is possible in (101) because the position it occupies, [Spec,M(ood)P], is ungoverned and (subsequently) uncased. Most recently, Landau’s (2005) mechanism (Chapter 5) of moving PRO from its initial position VP—internally to [Spec,IP/MP] does not involve case (or EPP). Thus, the position of PRO in (101) may not be occupied by *pro."
Before going further, it is necessary to be noted that OC complements are not confined to inherently OC predicates, i.e. that invariably trigger OC (e.g., implicatives). Huang (1989) argues that certain matrix verbs have OC complements induced by structure/configuration not by lexical properties. Huang refers to verbs like prefer, want, hate, hope etc (our F-subjunctive verbs) which can take complements with free subject like (102) but they also can take OC complements with PRO subject, like his example (7) included below under (103).⁹ Therefore, obligatory control is not a lexical feature and cannot be reduced to the lexical properties of certain verbs. I adopt this view here, that a structural OC is possible with inherently OC verbs and with verbs that are able to take OC complements or NOC complements.

(102)  \[ \text{John}_1 \text{ prefers } \text{her}_2 \text{ to leave early.} \]

(103)  \[ \text{John}_1 \text{ prefers } \text{PRO}_1 \text{ to behave } \text{himself}_1/*\text{oneself}_2 \]

Now, the difference between the Romanian subjunctive constructions (104) and (105) is that the former has a control complement of a semantically OC predicate, while the latter has a control complement of a semantically free-control predicate, that is a predicate that can take an OC complement (105) or a NOC complement (106).

(104)  \[ \text{(Eu}_1\text{)} \text{ încerc [PRO}_1 \text{ să plec eu însu\c{s}_1/*tu însu\c{s}_2 curând]} \]
\[ (\text{I}) \text{ try să leave.1sg myself/yourself soon} \]
‘I am trying to leave (myself/yourself) soon.’

(105)  \[ \text{(Eu}_1\text{)} \text{ vreau [PRO}_1 \text{ să plec eu însu\c{s}_1/*tu însu\c{s}_2 curând]} \]
\[ (\text{I}) \text{ want să leave.1sg myself/yourself soon} \]
‘I want to leave (myself/yourself) soon.’

(106)  \[ \text{(Eu}_1\text{)} \text{ vreau [s\c{s} pleci tu}_2\text{/tu însu\c{s}_2/pro}_2\text{/eu însu\c{s}_1 curând]} \]
\[ (\text{I}) \text{ want s\c{s} leave.2sg you/yourself/pro/ *myself soon} \]
‘I want you to leave (yourself/*myself) soon.’

⁹ Also, Landau (2000), San Martin (2008), among others, consider English examples such as (103) to be OC structures.
Apart from this lexical/semantic difference regarding their matrix predicates (104) and (105) are configurationally/structurally identical. First, both (104) and (105) have a null subject coreferential with the matrix subject, obligatorily controlled by the matrix subject. The matrix subject is the antecedent and the local c-commanding controller of the embedded subject, which can only be PRO. The reflexive/emphatic pronouns cannot be different from its antecedent, i.e., the embedded subject PRO, and from the controller/antecedent of PRO, thus the control in both sentences is not long-distance control (LDC). It follows that both complements of (104) and (105) must be OC complements with PRO subjects.\(^\text{10}\)

By contrast, the NOC complement of (106) may have a lexical DP subject or a referentially null \textit{pro} subject. The reflexives show that the embedded subject must be referentially different from the matrix subject.

It appears that the existence of the English NOC representation of (102) does not challenge the existence of the OC structure with PRO subject (103). Similarly, the existence of the NOC representation of (106) with DP/\textit{pro} subject does not prevent the existence of the obligatory control representation of (105) with a PRO subject.

The examples (105) and (106) where the matrix subject is a first person DP actually show no ambiguity between OC and NOC, respectively. (There cannot be both OC and NOC possible in either example). The embedded clauses of (105) and (106) are distinct complements of the same matrix verb. This is also true when the matrix subject is a second person entity. Thus, the

---

\(^\text{10}\) The examples (104) and (105) also reflect Landau’s (2000:99) OC generalization: “In a configuration […]DP₁ … Pred […] [S PRO₁ […]]…] where DP controls PRO: If, at LF, S occupies a complement/specifier position in the VP-shell of Pred, then the DP (or its trace) also occupies a complement/specifier position in that VP-shell”. Landau further asserts that this generalization merely fixes the domain within which such a controller must be found and makes no claims as to the particular choice of controller within the domain of OC. VP-shell is understood as ranging over all arguments of a predicate including the external one.
subjective complement of (107) is an OC complement with PRO subject, uniquely coreferential with its controller, distinct from the NOC complement of (108).

(107)  Tu₁ vreiiPRO₁ să pleci tu însuși₁/*el însuși₂ devreme
you want să leave.2sg yourself/*himself early
‘You want to leave early (yourself/*himself).’

(108)  Tu₁ vreii[să plece el/el însuși₂/*tu însuși₁ devreme]
you want să leave.3sg him/himself/*yourself early
‘You want him to leave early.’

When the matrix subject and the embedded subjects are both third person entities, the subjective complement clause is indeed ambiguous between OC and NOC. Thus, a representation such as (109) has two interpretations, as the English versions reveal. The two variants of (109) are given in (110), where (110a) has an obligatory control reading with PRO subject, and (110b) is a non-control structure with pro subject.

(109)  Mara speră [să plece mâine].
Mara hopes să leave.3sg tomorrow
‘Mara hopes to leave tomorrow.’
‘Mara hopes him/her to leave tomorrow.’

(110) a. Mara₁ speră [PRO₁ să plece ea însăși₁/*el însuși₂ mâine].
Mara hopes să leave.3sg herself/himself tomorrow
‘Mara wants to leave tomorrow (herself).’

b. Mara₁ speră [să plece pro₂ mâine].
Mara hopes să leave.3sg tomorrow
‘Mara wants him/her to leave tomorrow.’

If the null subjects of (110a) and (110b) were both pro, obviation would have been at work (i.e. (110) should not exist), contrary to the fact. The possibility of obligatory control reading in (109) prevents obviation, that is, OC is anti-obviation (and vice-versa, obviation is anti-control in Spanish for instance, as mentioned in Section 3.3).
Since, naturally, any interpretive property of OC is included as one of the options in NOC, it is not easy to isolate OC from NOC when the matrix subject of an F-subjunctive verb and the embedded subject are third person entities. However, consider the following data as:

(111) an OC structure with PRO subject; (112a) an instance of a complement with subject disjoint reference expressed by lexical DPs. (112b) shows that the embedded lexical DPs of (112a) cannot be replaced by reflexives. When the embedded subject is a personal pronoun matching the gender and number of the matrix subject as in (113), the embedded subject is ambiguous. Adding a matching reflexive in (113), it only can be coreferent with the matrix subject (Radu).

(111) Radu vrea [PRO să scrie el însuşi / *ea însăşi
Radu wants să write.3sg/3pl himself/herself
acel articol].
that article
‘Radu wants to write that article (himself).’

(112) a. Radu vrea [să scrie Mara/ea2 /ei3 acel articol] Radu wants să write.3sg/3pl Mara/she/they that article
‘Radu wants Mara/her/them to write that article.’

b. *Radu vrea [să scrie ea însăşi /ei însişi, acel articol] Radu wants să write.3sg/3pl herself/themselves that article

(113) Radu vrea [să scrie el1/2 (el însuşi) acel articol].
Radu wants să write.3sg he (himself) that article.
‘Radu wants him to write that article.’
‘Radu wants to write that article.’

A few observations could describe these data. (111) and (112) show that the reflexive pronoun can double here a nonreferentially null antecedent only, the PRO of (111). Thus the coindexation of the reflexive with PRO entails the coindexation of the reflexive with the matrix subject (the controller of PRO). Actually, (112b) is an OC environment where PRO is not possible due to the number/gender mismatch between the reflexives and their antecedent, PRO,
that is, (112b) also suggests that \textit{pro} cannot bind a reflexive in this environment. The conclusion is that a reflexive in an F-subjunctive complement is possible only where its antecedent is nonreferential. Therefore, PRO cannot be \textit{pro} in (111). Equivalently, we can say that (111) has a \textit{de se} reading, (112) a non-\textit{de se} (a \textit{de re}) reading, and (113) has both.

Since both a pronoun (lexical DP) and its reflexive counterpart are possible in the NOC structures of (106) and (108), it is quite puzzling why a reflexive pronoun is not possible in (112). For instance, why a feminine DP (totally different from the masculine DP subject of the matrix) cannot be replaced/doubled by its reflexive pronoun in (112)?

I consider that the possibility of the reflexive (and the \textit{de se} reading) of (111) vs. the impossibility of the reflexive (and the \textit{de re} reading) of (112) represents the means of distinguishing between PRO and lexical DPs/\textit{pro} respectively, thus between OC and NOC.

According to Chierchia’s (1989) analysis, in OC the subject of the matrix controls the complement and this relation is “self-ascriptive”. Self-ascriptive relation is simply the semantic aspect of control. Consequently, PRO is one of the ways in which languages single out a \textit{de se} relation. Chierchia also argues that \textit{de se} is systematically and unambiguously associated with the interpretation of PRO, the null subject of OC structures. Thus, OC is possible in F-subjunctive structures where both the controller and the controlled element are third person DPs, as in the example (111) whose subject, PRO, manifests the \textit{de se} interpretation.

An emphatic/reflexive is still possible in a noncontrol complement, but it has to be accompanied by a noun (the emphatic is in fact an adjective). The emphatic in (114) is different from Radu, the matrix subject, although has the same gender and number, showing that there is no control in this sentence.
Radu wants să scrie însuși redactorul acel articol. ‘Radu wants the editor himself to write that article.’

In sum, F-subjunctive complements have only a null subject PRO in OC environment and lexical DP or pro subjects in NOC environment for first and second person. When the matrix subject and the embedded subject are both third person entities and these entities are not coreferential, the embedded subject is a lexical DP. If these entities are coreferential and the embedded subject is null, and an agreeing reflexive is possible, that subject is PRO. A referential null subject (pro) is not possible in this context. Generally, F-subjunctive complements may have a null nonreferential subject or a referential subject (lexical or null).

3.6.3 Arbitrary PRO

In this subsection I argue that arbitrary PRO is possible in subjunctive clauses and has the characteristics in the approach developed by Rizzi (1986a).

Chomsky (1981) regards arbitrary PRO as an instance of PRO, which is not controlled and has arbitrary reference, like in (115).

(115) PROarb To just sit there should be forbidden.

Truly arbitrary PRO in Landau’s (2000:6) definition “need not be linked to any grammatical antecedent”, as illustrated in his example (6a) repeated below under (116). He also specifies that no overt or implicit argument in the sentence may be assumed the controller of PRO11.

(116) John1 thought that it was wrong [PROarb to introduce him1 to the dean].

11 The overt DP John is not the controller of PRO in (116). An example of implicit controller is the empty argument of (i). It is implied that the general ordered someone, a subaltern, to carry on the respective order.

(i) The general ordered e1 PRO1 to attack the enemy.
Although no previous investigation regarding the existence of arbitrary PRO in subjunctive context (Romanian or the Balkans) has been ever conducted, Comorovski (1985:47/51) is the first to notice the existence of arbitrary PRO in her Romanian example (2), repeated below in (117). She considers (117) the counterpart of the English version, and holds that the empty category in the Romanian version “meets the characterizations of PRO”

(117) E ușor să ajungi acolo cu trenul
    is easy 2sg arrive.2sg there with train.the
    ‘It is easy to get there by train.’

In Romanian, one way of expressing an arbitrary subject is through second person singular subjunctive. Although the morphology of the subjunctive verb in (117) would lead to the conclusion that the subject of the embedded clause is a second person singular DP, in reality this subject is generic and arbitrary.

Now consider the representation in (118). Despite the second person morphology on the subjunctive verb, it is hardly conceivable that the embedded null subject refers to a certain person. The embedded subject is generic and arbitrary and refers to any human being, transcending nations and boundaries.

(118) E greu să traiesti în communism.
    is hard 2sg live.2sg in communism
    ‘It is hard to live under communism.’

It is quite evident that some features are purely formal agreement features, which do not carry any semantic significance of their own. Recall that, in spite of the morphological subjunctive tense, subjunctive complement clauses lack independent tense. Also, it has been established above that the null subject in OC subjunctive clauses is PRO, again although the subjunctive verb displays person morphology. In Chomsky (2000 and subsequent work) such features enter an Agree relation, like in (118) between the verb and its subject, then they are
transferred to the phonological interface but deleted before being transferred to the semantic interface. Consequently, they get no semantic interpretation, yet the respective derivation does not crash.

In the light of this reasoning, I propose that the null subject in (118) is PROarb, an uncontrolled PRO not able to bind or corefer with a real person, but it bears this generic and arbitrary second person, no person, actually.

The infinitival construction of (119a) clearly includes PROarb. In the second line, the inflection on the verb ai ‘you have’ indicates that PROarb is second person singular. The first line of (119a) is repeated in (119b) with subjunctive instead of infinitive, while the second line is maintained with infinitive. Actually, whether the first line is constructed with subjunctive or infinitive (119c), the second line can be equally constructed with subjunctive, infinitive, or supine.

(119) a. E ușor [PROarb a scrie versuri] is easy to write verses Când nimic nu aș spune when nothing not have.2sg to say ‘It is easy PROarb to write poetry’ When you don’t have anything to say.’

b. E ușor [PROarb să scrii versuri] is easy să write.2sg verses Când nimic nu ai a spune when nothing not have.2sg to say ‘It is easy to write poetry When you don’t have anything to say.’

c. E ușor [PROarb să scrii/a scrie versuri] is easy să write.2sg/to write verses Când nimic nu ai a spune/ să spui/de spus when nothing not have.2sg to say/ să say.2sg/of saying.Sup ‘It is easy to write poetry When you don’t have anything to say.’
The subjunctive verb is inflected for second person singular, in the embedded clause of the first line in (119b), but there is no lexical (e.g., someone) or implicit controller in the matrix in any variant of (119). Since it does not refer to anyone in particular, the subject cannot be a pro2sg. Thus both variants, with infinitive and subjunctive, should have the same kind of subject, PROarb, that is. To posit PROarb in (119a) but pro2sg in (119b) takes more than the verbal morphology.

Following Rizzi (1986a), I will determine the characteristics of PROarb in Romanian. In Rizzi’s (1986a) example (15), included here under (120a), the PROarb must be masculine and plural in Italian, as indicated by the inflection on the adjective allegri. The Romanian version, constructed with subjunctive, (120b) is one of the choices, the first choice of a native speaker to translate the Italian version (119a). (120c) is the infinitive variant used in OSR, but still used and considered appropriate in CR. Fericit ‘happy’ is singular and masculine in both Romanian examples.

(120)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{E difficile [PROarb essere sempre allegri].} \\
& \text{is difficult to be always happy.masc.pl}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{E greu [PROarb să fii mereu fericit].} \\
& \text{is hard să be.2sg always happy.masc.sg}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{E greu [PROarb a fi mereu fericit].} \\
& \text{is hard to be always happy.masc.sg} \\
& \text{‘It is difficult to be happy always.’}
\end{align*}

Rizzi (1986a) shows that when the arbitrary interpretation of PRO must be the primary interpretation, a potential implicit controller in the main clause is not allowed (his fn 3). He contrasts PRO in (122), where it is arbitrary, and (121), where it is not. Genuine arbitrary PRO in Italian is intrinsically plural and masculine, as in (122) and (120a). PRO in (121) can be understood as pragmatically singular, referring to the speaker or the hearer.
In a situation of this kind, it is difficult to be always happy.

Lucia told Maria how to be always happy (masculine, plural)/(masculine, singular).

The basic properties of arb according to Rizzi (1986a) are: [+human, +generic, +singular/plural]. The number varies across languages. In Italian, arb is plural. The phi-features of PROarb in Italian are given in (123). (The person feature of PROarb in Italian is not clear to me).

The properties of PROarb in Romanian (subjunctive and infinitive) are summarized in:

The embedded subject in (120bc) can also be understood as pragmatically masculine, referring to the speaker or the hearer (as Rizzi points that out for Italian).

In conclusion, I assume that structures (118), (119b), (120b) represent the way of expressing PROarb with subjunctive, despite the inflectional agreement on the subjunctive verb. This assumption is further supported by the lack of any lexical or implicit controller in the main clause of these examples.

It is important to point out that this analysis, concerning PROarb, should be kept apart from Suñer’s (1983) “arbitrary pro”. Her Spanish examples feature a generic reading induced by third person plural verbs (125) and the impersonal clitic pronoun se (126). The corresponding Romanian se construction is given in (127).

‘They/people say that it is going to snow.’
Chierchia (1984:411-2) regards *se* constructions of this kind having “overt generic subjects”. He concludes that apart from “the obscurity of their interpretation”, *si*/(*se*) and PROarb have nothing in common\(^{12}\).

In this section, it has been showed that the null subject of OC-subjunctives is PRO, as sustained by the standard properties displayed by this entity. Also, it has been argued that F-subjunctives may have OC complements with nonreferential/PRO subject or NOC complements with independent reference as *pro* or lexical DPs. In the last part of the section, I presented arguments for that arbitrary PRO in subjunctive context and its characteristics.

### 3.7 Subjunctive Clauses are IP or CP clauses?

This section deals with the options of subjunctive complements as being IP or CP type of clauses. First, it is shown that subjunctive clauses do not manifest the phenomenon of restructuring, thus they are full clauses, separate from their matrix clause. In regards to the presence of a complementizer, two opposing views will be presented: All subjunctive clauses are CP clauses vs. only when a lexical complementizer is present is a clause of the CP type.

---

\(^{12}\) Although an analysis of *se* is beyond the scope of this paper, I mention in passing that it is of the kind of nominative impersonal, as opposed to impersonal passive, in Reinhardt & Siloni (2005) terms, where it is shown that arbitrarization applies in both types. Also, an expletive *pro* satisfies the EPP in both types of constructions. Chierchia (2004) states, in regards to arbitrarization in impersonals with *si* (*se*), that the agent role is existentially closed and restricted to groups of humans, shown that arbitrarization applies in both types. Also, an expletive *pro* satisfies the EPP in both types of constructions. Chierchia (2004) states, in regards to arbitrarization in impersonals with *si* (*se*), that the agent role is existentially closed and restricted to groups of humans.
3.7.1 Subjunctive Clauses Resist Restructuring

That Balkan subjunctive clauses are full clauses and do not undergo restructuring is an uncontroversial fact. Terzi (1992) is the best place to find undeniable evidence for the lack of restructuring in Balkan subjunctive. Landau (2004) also points that out.

In Rizzi’s (1982) concept of restructuring, an underlying biclausal sentence is transformed into a simple (monoclausal) sentence, resulting in a verbal complex, which incorporates the matrix verb and the embedded verb.

The key argument for restructuring, clitic climbing, is simply ruled out in Romanian (and Balkan) subjunctives, as determined in Section 3.4 and illustrated by the examples in (128). As can be seen, the clitic il ‘him’ (128a) cannot cross over să to reach the matrix (128b).

(128) a. Mara vrea să il vadă pe Radu curând.
Mara wants să him see.3sg P R.Acc soon
‘Mara wants to see Radu soon.’

b. *Mara vrea il să vadă pe Radu curând.

Recall that the particle să has been analyzed as the subjunctive mood marker, an I element heading its own projection IP or MP, therefore subjunctive complement clauses are at least IP clauses. Rizzi (1982) actually takes the lack of clitic climbing as indicating that the respective clause is a CP clause.

3.7.2 Subjunctive Complement Clauses and Complementizers

It has been already established that in OSR each subjunctive complement clause may have two variants, one with the complementizer ca, one without it. In CR, ca only appears in case of topicalization. Topicalization is the only environment when ca is mandatory (in OSR and CR).

---

13 Terzi (1992:172-3) citing Guasti (1991) reports that restructuring and clitic climbing happens with some causative verbs in the Albanian-related dialect of Arbëresh of San-Nicola, Southern Italy, in the presence of the subjunctive particle. This, of course, is an exception from the familiar nonrestructuring subjunctive clauses of the Balkan Sprachbund.
Complements of interrogative predicates are introduced by the complementizer *dacă* ‘whether’, as already seen in Section 3.4.

Two opposing views in regards to the type of clause in relation to the presence or absence of a complementizer will be discussed below. According to one view all subjunctive clauses are CP clauses regardless of the presence or absence of a lexical complementizer, while for the other view all subjunctive clauses are IP clauses excepting the situation when a lexical complementizer is present.

### 3.7.2.1 Subjunctive complements are CP clauses

Terzi (1992) argues not only for the capability of the Romanian (and Albanian) subjunctive complementizer to be optionally overt or covert, but she also maintains that Greek has a nonlexical subjunctive complementizer, although there is no instance of it being ever phonetically realized. As already mentioned, the subjunctive complementizer *ca* is lexical or nonlexical according to Grosu & Horvath’s (1984) assessment. Rivero (1987) also supports the idea of a null complementizer in Greek subjunctive clauses. In the same spirit, Giorgi and Pianesi (2004:203), analyzing complementizer deletion in Italian subjunctive clauses, support the idea that “complementizer deletion is no deletion at all”. For Picallo (1985), Kempchinsky (1986) and Landau (2000, 2004) the tense of subjunctives is licensed in the embedded C. In other words, subjunctive clauses must have a C position.

Furthermore, Pesetsky & Torrego (2001) argue that an empty C does not determine the distribution of CP. Kishimoto (2006), based on “complementizerless” clauses in Japanese, argues against Bošković’s (1997) view according to which a phonetically unrealized complementizer involves the absence of the respective CP projection.

Consequently, according to these researchers, two conclusions emerge: that subjunctive clauses are CP clauses, irrespective of the (lexical) presence of a complementizer, and that an
embedded clause lacking a lexical complementizer does not necessarily mean that the clause is a CP-less clause.

### 3.7.2.2 Subjunctive complements are IP clauses

Apparently, an instance of topicalization from a subjunctive clause leads to an illegal adjunction to IP. Consider the following examples from Terzi (1992).

(129) a. *vreau mâine să vină Ion
     want.1sg tomorrow să come.3sg John
     ‘I want John to come tomorrow’

     b. vreau ca mâine să vină Ion
     want.1sg that tomorrow să come.3sg John
     ‘I want that John come(s) tomorrow’
     Terzi (1992:109)

Terzi suggests that the presence of the complementizer in (129b) is necessary in order for the topicalized material (NPs or adverbs) to be lexically governed. Thus, the ungrammaticality of (129a) is explained by the failure of the adverb mâine ‘tomorrow’ to be properly governed. She also suggests that the contrast of these two sentences is reminiscent of a similar contrast evinced in English: (130a,b).

(130) a. I know (that) Mary was angry at him yesterday.
     b. I know *(that) yesterday Mary was angry at him.

Bošković (1997) takes these examples from Terzi (1992) along with the information that the presence of the subjunctive marker să is always required but the presence of the subjunctive complementizer ca is optional. Contrasting these two sentences, now adjusted with brackets (131a,b), Bošković (1997) concludes that whenever the complementizer is present, the respective clause is CP, rather than IP.

(131) a. *vreau [IP mâine [IP să vină Ion]]
     want.1sg tomorrow să come.3sg John
     ‘I want John to come tomorrow’
b. vreau [CP ca [IP mâine [IP să vină Ion]]]
want.1sg that tomorrow să come.3sg John
‘I want that John come(s) tomorrow’

Bošković parallels the Romanian examples (129) to the English examples of (132). Thus, the embedded clause of (129a) should be an IP on a par with the second clause of (132a) as opposed to the second clause of (132b), which is CP. (We may notice in passing that (132a) is not possible in Romanian with indicative simply because the complementizer că is always present, nor with subjunctive since ca is required in front of the embedded subject)\(^{14}\).

(132) a. John believes Peter left.
    b. John believes that Peter left.

Bošković (1997) argues that, since adjunction to IP is a necessary feature/consequence of topicalization, only when there is a CP projection over the IP projection is topicalization possible. Thus, (131a) is ungrammatical because the complement is an IP, so that the adjunction is banned. (131b), on the other hand, is grammatical because the topocalized material is adjoined to an IP within CP.

Bošković’s view goes back to Grimshaw (1977) who states that: ”when the complement is a CP, then adjunction to the IP is possible, whereas when the complement is an IP, then adjunction to IP is ruled out. Hence, only when there is a CP projection over the IP projection will the IP projection be a possible adjunction site”.

---

\(^{14}\) Doherty (1993, 1997) analyzes English (finite) clauses without that as being always IP clauses and only when the complementizer is present they are CPs. The English data used by Doherty to develop and test his analysis are not possible with subjunctive structures in Romanian, excepting nonsentential adverbs fronted as topics. (The Romanian indicative complementizer că is always obligatory).

On the other hand, Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) using the principles of minimalism, determine the distribution of CP through the T-to-C movement. They reach the conclusion that the English C is phonologically null in declarative clauses and the morphemes pronounced in C are a consequence of movement. The authors conclude that this pattern is not expected to be found in all languages so it is necessary to establish it for any given language. Their ultimate conclusion is that there is no general correlation between the emptiness of C and acceptability of CP. To develop and test a similar approach for Romanian is not a trivial task and that is beyond the scope of this study.
Notice that this generalization does not tell anything about overt or nonovert complementizers. It implies however that a matrix verb does not select a Top phrase.

On the other hand, in Rizzi’s (1997) analysis, a lexical complementizer is mandatory when adverbials appear in Top position. Later, Rizzi & Shlonsky (2007) maintain that C deletion is not compatible with the activation of topic and/or focus of the complement clause. Clearly, the activation of topic in subjunctive complement clauses is not compatible with nonovert/lack of complementizers in Romanian. Recall that although *ca* may be optional in some environments, it has been emphasized a few times already that its presence is mandatory in topic situations.

In the end we are facing two explanations for the ungrammaticality of (129a): (i) Topicalization to an argument of the matrix or (ii) Topicalization to the IP of a CP clause, whose complementizer has been illegally deleted with the result of the addition of a wrong adverb to the matrix. This raises the question of how would one ensure which position is right or superior?

Now, regarding the debate the presence of a complementizer means CP clause vs. the absence of a complementizer means CP-less clause, in order to be neutral, I leave this matter unsettled, a good topic for further research. So, a subjunctive clause in OSR is a CP clause when *ca* is present, like (133a) and an IP clause when *ca* is absent (133b,134) according to one view, but both examples of (133) and the representation of (134) are CP clauses in agreement with the other view.

(133) a. Și nu voi ca să mă laud …
and not will.1sg that să me flatter.1sg
‘And I don’t want to flatter myself…’
 Eminescu (1852-1889), *Scrisoarea III*

b. Și nu voi să mă laud …

15 Since complementizers are included amongst null elements and it has not been demonstrated otherwise, it may be also possible that the complementizer is null (dormant) and surfaces only when necessary. i.e., in case of topicalization.
(134) Laurii voiau să-i smulgă de pe fruntea ta de fier laurels wanted.3pl să-ît snatch.3pl from forehead your of iron ‘The laurels, they wanted to snatch from your iron forehead’ Eminescu (1852-1889), Scrisoarea III

In CR, where the complementizer *ca* is mostly absent, as in (133b) and (134), all subjunctive clauses are CP clauses according to one view or all of them are IP clauses, including presumably the (*ca*-less) second conjunct of (135), in agreement with the other view\(^\text{16}\).

Naturally, for the IP view, structures with topicalization (where *ca* is obligatory) and when the complementizer *dacă* is present the respective types of clauses must be CPs.

(135) Vreau **ca** Radu să plece și Mara să rămână. want.1sg that Radu să leave.3sg and Mara să stay.3sg ‘I want Radu to leave and Mara to stay.’

Concerning strictly the presence or absence of a (lexical) complementizer in subjunctive complement clauses, supposedly the only consequence is that a theory of control is expected to apply to both situations.

### 3.8 Conclusions

In this chapter I described the two subjunctive types of clauses, OC-subjunctives and F-subjunctives, and their components: the particle *să*, the subject of each of the two types of clauses, their respective type of tense, and whether these clauses are IP or CP clauses. The distribution of the complementizer *ca* and a discussion about obviation are also included.

While all subjunctive clauses must appear with the subjunctive particle *să*, whose status I have demonstrated to be an I element, the relevant subjunctive inflection, OC-subjunctive and F-subjunctive complement clauses differ in regards to other elements or properties. First, they are

\(^{16}\) For Doherty (1997) coordination of CP and IP is “unsurprising” because IP and CP “denote the same semantic entity *Proposition*”, and because “IP and CP are categorically non-distinct members of the extended (verbal) projection”.
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selected by separate semantic classes of predicates. Then, although both types of clauses have semantic tense, the tense of OC-subjunctives is anaphoric and the tense of F-subjunctives is dependent. Also, OC-subjunctive clauses are always OC clauses with PRO subject, whereas F-subjunctives could be OC clauses with PRO subject or NOC clauses with referential DP subjects.

Concerning obviation, F-subjunctives did not manifest this phenomenon in OSR and is still unavailable in CR regardless of the presence or absence of the complementizer *ca*. For further research, it remains to investigate why Romanian (and Balkan) subjunctives do not manifest obviation.
4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I explore the structure of infinitival OC complement clauses used in older stages of Romanian (OSR). I assume that all infinitives in OSR have the same structure and I use data from non-complement infinitives to support my claims; however, the focus of this chapter remains obligatory control structures. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the infinitive has endured in a large number of constructions, but scarcely in complement clauses. The latter are mostly outdated in Contemporary Romanian (CR).

The chapter is organized as follows: Given the almost complete loss of infinitival complementation, Section 4.2 starts with a description of the data sources used in this chapter. These include written sources and older native speaker consultants.

Sections 4.3 and 4.4 analyze the internal structure of infinitival clauses. The first element to be discussed is the particle de, in de plus a-infinitive clauses. De is the Romanian counterpart of Romance de/di, which is generally considered to be a complementizer (Kayne 1981, 2000, Rizzi 1982). I present a number of properties of Romanian de that parallel those of de/di and argue that Romanian de is also a complementizer.

Section 4.4, establishes the categorical status of the infinitival particle a. Again, as in regards to the subjunctive particle sã, there are two possible analyses for this particle: as an inflectional element (mood marker) or as a complementizer. I argue for the inflectional status of

---

1 To die in peace, restore me first!/ Return me to myself, so I can die in peace!
this particle primarily because it co-occurs with complementizers. A number of counterarguments from the literature are dismissed.

In the next two sections, I discuss infinitive complements in terms of the familiar obligatory control (OC) versus non-obligatory control (NOC) distinction and Landau’s (2000) exhaustive control (EC) and partial control (PC) distinction. Section 4.5 shows that infinitival complements characteristics are typical of obligatory control in contrast with NOC (non-obligatory control) structures, which do not have these characteristics. This section also shows that OC infinitival complements exist in both EC and PC types.

Following Landau (2000), the particular properties of PC are illustrated in Section 4.6. While in both types of complements (EC and PC) the syntactic number of PRO is inherited from the controller and must match, PRO in PC complements can differ in semantic number from its controller: PRO can be semantically plural when the controller is singular. Such structures are constructed with collective predicates e.g., to convene, to reunite, etc. or with the collectivizer together.

Section 4.7 considers the tense properties of EC and PC complements. It shows, based on the discussion of semantic tense in Chapter 3, Section 3.5, that EC complements have anaphoric tense and PC complements have dependent tense, on a par with OC subjunctives and F-subjunctives, respectively.

Section 4.8 contains a brief discussion of the syntactic category of infinitival complements. I show that they are not reduced restructuring complements but full clauses optionally introduced by the complementizer de. Whether infinitival complements are all CP clauses or only when the complementizer is present remains an open question. Section 4.9 gathers the main conclusions of this chapter.
4.2 The Empirical Picture

Infinitival complements existed widely in OSR and were all documented. These constructions began to diminish greatly in frequency, especially during the Phanariot political regime, as a result of Greek influence (Chapter 2) and continued to diminish after 1821, when this epoch was over.

In the 1950s-1960s the number of verbs that takes infinitival complements decreased dramatically. Gramatica I (1963:227) provides an incomplete list of verbs that select for complement clauses: *a apuca* ‘to grab/to begin’, *a avea* ‘to have’, *a se grăbi* ‘to hurry’, *a izbuti* (reuşi) ‘to manage’, *a începe* ‘to begin’, *a încerca* ‘to try’, *a îndrăzni* ‘to dare’, *a învăța* ‘to learn/teach’, *a porni* ‘to start’, *a primi* ‘to agree’, *a putea* ‘can’, *a ști* ‘to know’, *imi vine* a ‘I’m inclined to’, *se cade* (cuvine) ‘to be proper’. Since that time, infinitival complement clauses have further declined.

Schulte (2004) includes contemporary data of infinitival complement clauses selected by at least six matrix verbs, collected from magazines like *România Literară* and *Conviețuirea*, mostly from 1997-1998 and as recent as 2003. For example, the June 6, 2006 issue of *România Liberă*, a leading national newspaper hosts an account of the turbulent World War II years and post-war era in Romania, narrated by a war veteran. There are twenty instances of infinitival constructions in this narrative: two are complements to verbs, five complements to nouns, and the rest adjuncts, mostly purpose clauses. An impersonal construction with an infinitival complement clause is given in (1).

(1) *Se cuvine de a face o analiză sine ira et studii.*

*România Liberă*, 03 June 2006
While these infinitive complements may seem anachronistic to some speakers, they in fact conform that this particular construction is still alive for other, perhaps older, speakers. Not so old speakers also use infinitive complements when selected by verbs such as a îndrăzni ‘to dare’, a începe ‘to begin’ and a opri ‘to stop’. Since language cannot exist independent of its speakers, it must be conceded that infinitival complement constructions are, to some (reduced) extent, part of the contemporary speech. The purpose of the following subsections is to present the available diachronic and synchronic data used in this chapter.

4.2.1 OSR Documented Data

The data below feature infinitive control structures from literature between 1581 and 1981. (Whether 1981 is OSR or CR is not really important). Infinitive control examples are not found in these sources only, nor is the analysis of infinitive complementation in this dissertation based on these sources only.

The examples (2) through (17) are subject control structures constructed with various categories of matrix verbs: implicative (2, 3, 4), aspectual (5, 6), modal (7, 8, 9), desiderative (10, 11, 12), factive (13, 14), interrogative (15) and propositional (16, 17). Accusative object control examples are given in (18, 19) and dative object control examples in (20, 21). One example for each empty controller type is also included: accusative empty controller (22) and empty dative controller (23).

Subject control

(2) De-abia îndrăznesc a mărturisi că am avut cutezarea hardly dare.1sg to confess that have.1sg had boldness
‘I hardly dare to confess that I had the boldness …’
Sadoveanu (1880-1961) Opere

(3) Turcii izbutiră d’a preface țara în pașalâc
Turks.the succeeded de to turn country.the in pashalic
‘The Turks managed to turn the country into a pashalic.’
Bălcescu (1852:100)
(4) au căutat iarăș a se întoarce
have.3pl tried again to rflx return
‘They tried to return again.’
Ureche (1647:93)

(5) Și el nu se poate opri d’a simți durere amară.. and he not rflx can stop de to feel pain bitter
‘And he couldn’t stop to feel bitter pain ..’
Bălcescu (1852:101)

(6) șii începu a grăi înaintea a totu națodului and began.3sg to speak before of all people
‘And he began to
Coresi (1581:348)

(7) Au a plăți numai 3 lei
have.3pl to pay only 3 lei
‘They have to pay 3 lei only.’
Stefanelli (1915:269), 1796 document

(8) Ca să aibă a-și stăpâni partea dumisale that să have.3sg to-rflx own part. the his
‘So that he has ownership permission of his part’
Alexiu (1939:56), 1781 document

(9) Trebuiră a se învoi de a aștepta sosirea dușmanului had.3pl to rflx agree de to wait arrival. the enemy. Gen
‘They had to agree to wait for the enemy’s arrival.’
Bălcescu (1852:86)

(10) Dacă iubești fără să speră de- a fi iubit vreodată if love.2sg without să hope.2sg de- to be loved ever
‘If you love without hoping to be ever loved’
Eminescu (1852-1889) Dacă iubești …

(11) n- au vrut a veni not-have.3pl wanted to come
‘They didn’t want to come.’
Stefanelli (1915:192), 1790 document

(12) Voește a răspunde … will.3sg to answer
‘He wants to answer …’
Alexiu (1939:155), 1832 document
(13) Se temu d’a nu pierde folosul moral …
‘He was afraid not to lose the moral advantage …’
Bălcescu (1852:96)

(14) să îngrozise boierii a mai merge cu dânsul la plimbări
‘The boyards were too scared to go with him again for a walk’
Neculce (1738:26) O samă de cuvinte

(15) aşa se poate înşela omul dacă nu ştie a judeca bine
‘A man can deceive himself if he doesn’t know to judge well…’
Creangă (1879:47) Amintiri din Copilărie

(16) Mihai…se gândi a dobândi ajutor şi din alte părţi
‘Mihai thought of getting help from another parties too.’
Bălcescu (1852:36)

(17) Hasdeu credea a-l putea data cam prin 1654
‘Hasdeu believed of being able to date it around 1654’
Rotaru (1981:40)

(18) Vă rugăm a nu fuma.
‘We ask you not to smoke./No smoking! (Used in public places)

(19) poftim stăpânirea locului a o îscăli
‘We invite the local authorities to sign it.’
Stefanelli (1915:395), 1827 document

(20) să- i permiteşti a o recomanda învăţătorilor
‘allow him to recommend it to the teachers of his district’
Monitorul Oficia a României, Mai 1877. Eminescu’s 1876 letter
I conclude from these data that Romanian infinitive complementation displays control in all the expected/standard contexts, and subject control with all categories of matrix verbs. The examples above represent a small sample of the “prototypical” control structures constructed with infinitives attested in OSR.

4.2.2 Non-Control Infinitival Structures in Use in OSR and CR

Some non-control infinitival structures still in use in CR will contribute to the conclusions in this chapter. Although raising structures are mostly constructed with subjunctives in CR, infinitival raising structures are still in use. The raising example (24a) is as grammatical now as it was when its author created it in 1936. (24b) is a contemporary raising example. (25) shows infinitives used as subjects, structures still in use in CR. (26, 27) are infinitival adjuncts very productive in CR. Infinitival complements to impersonal predicates, like the one in (28), are still in use to some extent. Complements to nouns, usually introduced by de, are quite productive in CR (29).
(24) a. Nu sunt ce par a fi
not am what seem.1sg to be
‘I am not what I seem to be.’
Minulescu (1881-1944) *Nu sunt ce par a fi*

b. Câteva proiecte par a se îndrepta spre succes
few projects seem.3pl to rflx head towards success
‘A few projects seem to move towards completion.’
Astromax, 2008

(25) A cunoaşte înseamnă iarnă
to know means winter
A iubi e primăvară.
To love is spring
‘To have knowledge means winter
To love means spring.’
Blaga (1895-1961) *Primăvară*

(26) Apoi s-a întors pentru a reînnoda firul unui destin.
then rflx-has returned for to reprise path a.Gen destiny
‘Then he came back to reprise the path of his destiny.’
*România Liberă*, March 14, 2007

(27) Duşmânit vei fi de toate, făr-a prinde
detested will.2sg be by all, without to realize
chiar de veste;
even of news
‘You will be detested by all, without even realizing it.’
Eminescu (1850-1889), *Scrisoarea III*

(28) E mai uşor a da vina pe alţii.
Is more easy to give fault P others
‘It is easier to blame others.’

(29) cu speranţa de a nu-şi pierde tronul
with hope.the de to not-rflx loose throne.the
‘with the hope of not loosing his throne’
*România Liberă*, June 3, 2006

4.2.3 *Contemporary (Recent) Data of Infinitival Complements*

As already mentioned, Schulte (2004) includes examples of infinitival control structures
collected from magazines after 1990. They are constructed with the following matrix verbs: *a
dori ‘to wish’, *a îndrăzni ‘to dare’, *a opri ‘to stop’, *a-i place ‘to please’, *a obliga ‘to oblige’, *a
sfătui ‘to advise’, a crede ‘to believe’. The examples (30, 31) are from Schulte (2004). A more recent example (32) is from România Liberă. Two native speakers produced (33) and (34)².

(30)  Nu doreşte a se auzi pe sine.  
     ‘He does not wish to hear himself.’  
     România Literară 31, 5.8.1998

(31)  Autorul crede a putea ataca …  
     ‘The author believes himself to be able to attack Maiorescu’s controversial thesis.’  
     Corina Popescu, 2000. Verismul Italian și literatura română

(32)  să renunţe de a mai crea "mitul Antonescu".  
     ‘They should give up creating the myth Antonescu’  
     România Liberă, June 3, 2006

(33)  A îndrăznit de a veni la uşa mea nechemat.  
     ‘He dared to come to my place uninvited.’  
     Consultant, age 32, October 2006

(34)  Căpitanul a ordonat locotenentului a se dispera pentru a încercui inamicul.  
     ‘The captain ordered the lieutenant to disperse in order to encircle the enemy.’  
     Consultant, age 70, December 2007

The data above (30-34) and the list of the verbs taking infinitival complement clauses show that infinitival complement clauses are still found in Contemporary Romanian.

4.2.4. Infinitive Complement Clauses Introduced by Prepositions

Apart from the complementizer de (to be discussed in Section 4.3) five prepositions may introduce a-infinitive clauses. They are: prin ‘by’, cu ‘with’, în ‘in’, la ‘at/to’, and pe ‘on’.

² This speaker prefers a sentence like (33) with a îndrăznii ‘to dare’ and infinitive than with subjunctive.
These five elements are shown in (35) through (39). Only three of them, *prin* (35a), *cu* (36a), and *în* (37a) were found in texts. The other elements were used by my consultants (I use these types of examples myself).

(35) examples with *prin*
   a. Nu cumva și ei vor fi început *prin* a se împrumuta?  
      not somehow and they will be started by to reflx borrow  
      ‘Isn’t it possible that they would have started to borrow (money)’  
      Delavrancea (1858-1918) *Parazitii*
   b. Începe *prin* a spune adevarul  
      begins by to tell truth.the  
      ‘S/he begins by telling the truth.’
   c. Începe a spune adevarul  
      begins to tell truth.the  
      ‘S/he begins to tell the truth.’

(36) examples with *cu*
   a. Se mulțămi *cu* a prinde acele dobitoace  
      rflx satisfied.3sg with to catch those animals  
      ‘It pleased him to corral those animals.’  
      Alexiu (1939:67), 1792 document
   b. Se mulțumește (*cu*) a trăi de azi pe mâine.  
      rflx pleases with to live of today till tomorrow  
      ‘It pleases her/him to live from day to day.’

(37) examples with *în*
   a. Nerăbdător (*în*) a afla.  
      impatient.masc.sg in to find out  
      ‘He is impatient to find out (the truth)’  
      Gramatica I (1963:363) “old structure”
   b. Persistă *(în)* a face mereu aceeași greșeală.  
      persists in to make always same mistake  
      ‘S/he persists in making always the same mistake.’

(38) example with *la*
   Se rezumă (*la*) a da din umeri.  
   rflx restricts at to move from shoulders  
   ‘One confines (restrict) oneself to shrug (with indifference).’
In some cases, the preposition is optional: \textit{prin} (35b,c); \textit{cu} (36b), \textit{în} (37a) and \textit{la} (38).

This seems to be lexically determined. For example, \textit{cu} is optional in (36), \textit{în} is optional with ‘impatient’ (37a) but there is a difference between \textit{prin} and lack of it, between \textit{begin what} (35b) and \textit{begin how} (35c), which suggests that these prepositions or some of them are not always optional. For instance, the prepositions \textit{în} (37b) and \textit{pe} (39) are required with the matrix verbs \textit{a conta} ‘to count’ and \textit{a persista} ‘to persist’, respectively, and followed by the \textit{a}-infinitive.

The examples of infinitive structures introduced by various preposition are mostly important for their documentation value and for comparison with the infinitival complementizer \textit{de}. One characteristic of these prepositions is that they are usually limited to appearing with one matrix verb (and its synonyms). \textit{De} plus \textit{a}-infinitives, by contrast, occur after all categories of matrix verbs. Such constructions will be analyzed below, in Section 4.3.

### 4.2.5 Partial Control

I have not found yet an example of partial control (PC) in the sources I have studied so far but there is a wealth of sources that remained to be studied.

The only spontaneous example of a PC structure I have ever encountered was produced by an old speaker whose preferred topic of discussion seemed to be military actions. I had asked him to give me a sentence with the verb \textit{a ordona} ‘to order’ plus an infinitive. I actually wanted to know whether his sentence would have an empty or an overt dative controller. The unexpected discovery is given in (34) above repeated below under (40b).

The particular characteristics of partial control will be defined in Section 4.6. One obvious difference between (40a) and (40b) gives some sense of what PC is. A collective verb, \textit{a se dispersa} ‘to disperse’ is involved in the infinitival complement clause [in brackets] in both
sentences. The difference between (40a) and (40b) is the syntactic number of the controller (in bold), which is plural (soldiers) in the former, but singular (lieutenant) in the latter. The null subject of the complement clause is plural in both cases however. The null subject is identical with the controller *soldaților* ‘soldiers’ in (40a), while in the PC clause of (40b), the null subject refers to the controller, *locotenentului* ‘lieutenant’, plus other individuals. The sign [+ ] indicates that other entities are also part of the controlee.

(40) a. Căpitanul$_1$ a ordonat *soldaților*$_2$ [EC$_2$

soldiers.Dat
a se dispersa] pentru a încercui inamicul
to rflx disperse for to encircle enemy.the
‘The captain ordered the soldiers to disperse in order to encircle the enemy.’

b. Căpitanul$_1$ a ordonat *locotenentului*$_2$ [EC$_{2+}$

captain.the has ordered lieutenant.Dat
a se dispersa] pentru a încercui inamicul
to rflx disperse for to encircle enemy.the
‘The captain ordered the lieutenant to disperse in order to encircle the enemy.’

In conclusion, the old data presented in 4.2.1 and the recent data included in 4.2.3, feature infinitival complement clauses, which constitute patterns of (obligatory) control. There are examples with all seven categories of matrix verbs selecting subject control complements in 4.2.1. Each context (category of matrix verb) represents a pattern, which allows the researcher to create similar sentences following the respective pattern.

Also, recall that almost every infinitival structure, definitely complement clauses, can be also constructed with subjunctive, as shown in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2). In addition, infinitival complement clauses and subjunctive complement clauses can be conjoined in the same sentence, implying that they can replace each other.
For instance, the infinitival PC structure of (40a), repeated under (41a) is mirrored by the subjunctive version of (41b). That is, as long as a subjunctive complement clause is possible, its infinitival version is also possible.

(41) a. Căpitanul a ordonat locotenentului captain.the has ordered lieutenant.Dat a se disperşa] pentru a încercui inamicul. to rflx disperse for to encircle enemy.the ‘The captain ordered the lieutenant to disperse in order to encircle the enemy.’

b. Căpitanul a ordonat locotenentului captain.the has ordered lieutenant.Dat să se disperseze pentru a încercui inamicul să rflx disperse.3sg/pl for to encircle enemy.the ‘The captain ordered the lieutenant to disperse in order to encircle the enemy.’

4.3 Status of de

The history of the preposition de ‘of’ vis-à-vis the infinitive has been presented in Chapter 2. The purpose of this section is to establish the syntactic status of this infinitival particle, which I argue to be a complementizer.

4.3.1 Background

Quite a large number of Romanian predicates take de a-infinitive complements. The construction has counterparts in Romance de/di shown in (42a) for French and (42b) for Italian (Kayne 2000). The Romanian version is given in (42c). Unlike French and Italian, the Romanian infinitive also includes the proclitic a.

(42) a. Jean a essayé de chanter. Jean has tried de sing-inf ‘John tried to sing.’

b. Gianni ha tentato di cantare. Gianni has tried di sing-inf ‘John tried to sing.’

c. Ion a încercat de a cânta. Jon has tried de to sing ‘John tried to sing.’
Some of the more frequent Romanian verbs that used to occur with the preposition *de* are listed in (43). Many of the corresponding Italian verbs also take *di* infinitives.

(43)  
*a încerca* ‘to try’, *a căuta* ‘to look for/try’, *a îndrâzni/cuteza* ‘dare’, *a uita* ‘to forget’, *a înceta* ‘to cease’, *a începe/apuca* ‘to begin’, *a spera/nădăjdui* ‘to hope’, *a împiedica* ‘to preclude/impede’, *a opri* ‘to stop’, *a sfârși/a termina* ‘to finish’, *a fi gata* ‘to be ready’, *a hotără* ‘to decide’, *a porunci* ‘to order’, *a renunța* ‘to give up’, *a regreta* ‘to regret’, *a interzice* ‘forbid/interdict’, *a reuși/izbuti/apuca* ‘manage/succeed’, *a agreea/a se învioi/a fi de accord* ‘to agree’, *a jura* ‘swear’, *a refuza* ‘to refuse’, *a ruga* ‘to beg’, *a făgădui* ‘to promise’, *a îndupleca* ‘to convince’, *a amenința* ‘to threat’, *a cere* ‘to ask’, *a sluji* ‘to serve’, *a avea* (deontic) ‘to have’, *a fi* (deontic) ‘to be’, *a lăsa* ‘to let’, *a făgădui/promite* ‘to promise’, *a propune* ‘to propose’, *a dori* ‘to wish’, *a recomanda* ‘to recommend’, *a se îndatora* ‘to be grateful’

A few original constructions with *de* plus *a*-infinitives are given below. The following examples feature *de* plus *a*-infinitive complements with subject control selected by all categories of matrix verbs, except interrogative verbs: implicative (44a); aspectual (45); modal (46); desiderative (47); factive (48); and propositional (49). An object control complement introduced by *de* is also included (50). (Other examples have been presented earlier). Although I have included a variant without *de* just for one of the examples (44b), it appears that *de* is optional in most cases.

(44)  
a. să nu îndrăznească *de* a mai face supărare…  
să not dare.3sg *de* to more do trouble  
‘He shouldn’t dare to cause anymore trouble.’  
Stefanelli (1915:377), 1821 document  

b. să nu îndrăznească cineva a- i supăra  
să not dare.3sg someone to– them disturb  
‘They shouldn’t dare disturb them’  
Stefanelli (1915:93), 1767 document

---

3 Some matrix verbs seem to always take *de* *a*-infinitive complements. One such verb is *a renunța* ‘to give up’. One (contemporary) example is found under (31). A very old one, where the matrix verb is a synonym for *a renunța* appears in Chapter 2 under (51). In general, I have not found examples without *de* for all the verbs that takes *de* *a*-infinitive complements. I still assume that *de* is optional.
Rarely, other prepositions (besides *de*) may also introduce *a*-infinitive complements, e.g., *in, la, cu* as shown in 4.2.4. Rizzi (1982) also reports that other prepositions besides *di* may sporadically introduce infinitive complements in Italian.

Cases such as (51) are excluded from consideration. *De* in (51) is a subcategorized preposition, a true preposition that heads a PP and takes an infinitival complement. This preposition may also take an NP complement, as in *a acuza de crimă* ‘to accuse of murder’.

Unlike the infinitival particle *de*, the subcategorized preposition *de* is never optional, whether it takes an NP complement (52a) or an infinitival complement (52b).
(51) Poate fi învinovățit de a nu cugeta can.3sg be charged de to not think întocmai ca un om civilizat. right like a man civilized ‘He can be accused of not thinking exactly like a civilized man.’ Odobescu (1834-1895) *Screri …

(52) a. Este acuzat *(de) trădare. is accused of treason ‘S/he is accused of treason.’

   b. Este acuzat *(de) a încălca legea is accused of to break law.the ‘S/he is accused of breaking the law.’

Kayne (2000) observes that French *de is restricted to occurring with infinitive only. In contrast, Romanian *de also occurs in finite clauses as a complementizer as illustrated in (53).

Other examples will be given below.

(53) Apoi merse de ocoli cetatea … then went.3sg de round fortress ‘Then, he went to make the tour of the fortress …’ Gramatica I 1963:408

*De plus the infinitive is prohibited after a subcategorized preposition. As can be seen, the example (54a) becomes ungrammatical with *de. Since the sequence pe de exists as in pe de o parte ‘on the one side/hand’ the ungrammaticality of (54b) cannot be blamed on an ungrammatical sequence pe de. These examples raise the question about the status of the preposition pe (and other required prepositions) in infinitival structures, which remaines to be determined by further research.

(54) a. Contez pe a fi onest. Count.1sg on to be honest ‘I count on being honest.’

   c. *Contez pe de a fi onest. Count.1sg on de to be honest *I count on of being honest
To recapitulate, *de* optionally introduces *a*-infinitival complement clauses and occurs with a quite large number of matrix verbs. Occasionally, other prepositions (*cu, la, in*) may also introduce *a*-infinitival complements. Unlike French *de*, Romanian *de* may occur in finite contexts.

### 4.3.2 Arguments for the Complementizer Status of *de*

The history of the infinitive presented in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3) leads to the conclusion that *a* lost its complementizer status by the end of the sixteenth century and the addition of *de* was necessary to fulfill this function\(^4\).

Schulte (2004:168) suggests that *de* and also *din* are infinitival complementizers. This must be so, he argues, because any infinitival complementizer is followed by the *a*-infinitive. Schulte maintains that *a* is the infinitive mood marker.

Here I present a number of arguments for the complementizer status of *de* based on its parallel behavior with Romance *de/di* and other complementizers.

The first argument comes from raising verbs. I assume that the complement of a raising verb is obligatorily smaller than CP. Thus, complementizers are excluded following raising verbs. The fact that *de* is not allowed to appear in raising constructions is compatible with it being a complementizer. The raising structure in (55a) is well formed with the *a*-infinitive, but ungrammatical with a *de* *a*-infinitive, as (55b) demonstrates. Similarly, in French and Italian *de/di* are not compatible with subject-to-subject raising, as the Italian example (56) shows.

(55) a. Copiii par a fi bolnavi.
    *The children seem to be sick.*

b. *Copiii par de a fi bolnavi.*

\(^4\) For Italian, Rizzi (1982:94) considers that “the Comp hypothesis represents the minimal assumption” for *di*. Other assumptions, in his opinion, “would require postulating a position which is not independently justified, and/or complications of the mechanism of subcategorization.”
Gianni sembra (*di) essere felice. Gianni seems di to be happy
‘Gianni seems to be happy.’
Kayne (2000:300)

Another argument that suggests that *de* is a complementizer comes from its impossibility

in infinitival subjects. In Romance, the complementizer *de/di* cannot appear in infinitival

subjects, as illustrated by the Italian example (57).

(57) *Di cercarlo comporta dei rischi
di look for.Inf+him implies risks
‘To look for him/looking for him implies risks.’
Kayne (2000:289)

This is also true of Romanian *de*. The *a*-infinitive (in bold) in the examples (58a, 59a) is

the subject of the sentence. Adding *de* to the *a*-infinitive renders the sentence ungrammatical

(58b, 59b). Notice that the infinitive in an example like (60a) is not the subject of the sentence. It

is the preposed complement clause of the sentence (60b).

(58) a. A-l căuta implică riscuri.
to-him seek implies risks
‘Looking/to look for him implies risks.’

b. *De a- l căuta implică riscuri.
de to-him seek implies risks

(59) a. Iar în lumea cea comună a visa e un pericul
but in world.the that common to dream is a danger
‘But in the ordinary world to dream is a danger.’
Eminescu (1852-1889) *Scrioarea II*

b. *Iar în lumea cea comună de a visa e un pericul

(60) a. De a înțelege, am încercat adesea.
de to understand have.1sg tried sometimes
‘To understand, I tried sometimes.’

b. Am încercat adesea de a înțelege
have.1sg tried sometimes de to understand
‘I tried sometimes to understand.’
A clear piece of evidence for the complementizer status of *de* is the impossibility of *de* co-occurring with another complementizer. For instance, *a hotărâ* ‘to decide’ can take the complementizer *dacă* ‘whether’ plus *a*-infinitive complements (61a) or *de* plus *a*-infinitive complements (61b) but not both (61c). The ungrammaticality of (61c) is explained by the impossibility of putting two elements in C⁰.

(61) a. Mara nu s- a hotărât încă *dacă* a pleca
Mara not rflx-has decided yet whether to leave
sau a mai sta câteva zile.
or to more stay few days
‘Mara has not decided yet whether to leave or to stay a few more days.’

b. Mara s- a hotărât *de* a pleca cu avionul.
Mara rflx- has decided *de* to leave with plane.the
‘Mara decided to leave by plane.’

c. *Mara nu s- a hotărât *dacă* *de* a pleca cu avionul.
Mara not rflx-has decided whether *de* to leave with plane.the

The adoption of *de* as an infinitival complementizer was a natural choice because this entity was already acting as a complementizer in finite structures, e.g., (53) above. The indicative purpose structure in (62a) introduced by the complementizer *de* becomes the infinitival purpose structure in (62b). Both structures are possible in CR, but the infinitival version is predominant.

Also, the indicative structure (63a) becomes the infinitival complement introduced by the complementizer *de* in (63b).

(62) a. aduse-i *de-* i sădi ei în codrulu
brought-cl.pl.Acc that-cl.pl planted they in woods
‘He brought them to plant (them) in the woods’

Coresi (1581:)

b. Îi aduse *de/*pentru a-i sădi în codru
cl.pl.Acc brought.3sg *de*/for to-it.pl plant in woods
‘He brought them to plant (them) in the woods’
(63) a. Îndrăznii de ispiti pre elu
    dared.3sg de allured.3sg P him
    ‘He dared to allure him.’
    Coresi (1581:389)

    b. Îndrăznii de a-l ispiti.
    dared de to-him allure
    ‘He dared to allure him.’

    De can also replace the subjunctive complementizer ca as illustrated in the purpose clause of (64a). The usual and natural way of saying (64a) is (64b) with the subjunctive complementizer ca.

(64) a. Luați ușa cerului de să intre împăratul slavei
    take.2pl door.the sky.Gen that să enter.3sg king.the glory.Gen
    ‘Open the door of Heaven for the king of glory to enter’
    Coresi (1581:)

    b. Luați ușa cerului ca să intre împăratul slavei
    take.2pl door.the sky.Gen that să enter.3sg king.the glory.Gen
    ‘Open the door of Heaven for the king of glory to enter’

    In sum, de in infinitival structures is a complementizer because it behaves like the Romance complementizer de/di in not occurring in raising structures, and not accompanying infinitive verbs in subject position. Further, de has an independently-motivated complementizer use in finite clauses and cannot co-occur with other complementizers.

4.4 Status of the Infinitive Particle a

Chapter 2 discussed the origin, history, and distribution of the infinitival particle a. It has been concluded that the particle a is the unique morphology that stands for the identity of the infinitive. Also, It has been concluded that, by the end of the sixteenth century, its status changed from a C element to an I element. Although bare infinitives were employed in the complex future and conditional, and following some modal verbs, a-infinitives have been always the norm for infinitival structures. With the very few exceptions discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.4, no constructions with the infinitive are possible without the particle a. The example in (65a)
includes two infinitival complement clauses whose infinitive verb is preceded by the particle \(a\).

The same example lacking the particle \(a\) is ungrammatical (65b).

\[\begin{align*}
(65) \text{a. } & \text{preferind} \quad \text{\textit{încerca}} \quad \text{cu} \quad \text{binele} \quad \text{a-și} \quad \text{trage} \\
& \text{preferring} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{try} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{good.the} \quad \text{to-rflx} \quad \text{attract} \\
& \text{inimile} \quad \text{nobililor} \\
& \text{hearts.the} \quad \text{nobles.Gen} \\
& \text{‘Preferring to try, in good terms, to win the hearts of the noblemen’} \\
& \text{Bălcescu (1852:289)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{*preferind} \quad \text{\textit{încerca}} \quad \text{cu} \quad \text{binele} \quad \text{și} \quad \text{trage} \\
& \text{preferring} \quad \text{try} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{good.the} \quad \text{rflx} \quad \text{attract}
\end{align*}\]

In this section, I investigate the syntactic category and position of the infinitival particle \(a\), i.e., to confirm its inflectional status. In Schulte’s (2004) assessment, \(a\) began as a preposition, underwent complete grammaticalization, and finally became a “complementizer/mood marker”. He then concludes that \(a\) is the infinitive marker because it co-occurs with a number of complementizers.

I propose that \(a\) is a mood marker, an \(I^0/M^0\) element that heads its own maximal projection IP/MP on a par with the subjunctive particle \(să\) (Section 3.4). I argue against the claim discussed in Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) that \(a\) is a complementizer located in C^0.

4.4.1 The Infinitive Particle as an Inflectional Head

4.4.1.1 Adjacency to the verb

One piece of empirical evidence to support the view that the infinitival marker is not a complementizer comes from its adjacency with the verb. Although Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:84) considers the Romanian infinitival particle to be a C^0 element, she points out the “strong coherence between \(a\) and the verb” and concedes that this evidence supports the \(I^0\) status of \(a\).

As shown in Chapter 2, Section 2.2, and in Dobrovie-Sorin’s example (6), repeated here as (66), only a few one-syllable items may occur between \(a\) and the lexical verb: negation, a pronominal object clitic, and an adverbial intensifier. Recall that exactly the same elements
appear between the subjunctive marker să and the lexical verb in subjunctive clauses. Full
adverbs are not allowed between să and the verb (67), nor between a and the verb, (68).

(66) A nu îl mai ajuta ar fi o prostie.
    to not cl.Acc more help would be a mistake
    ‘It would be wrong not to help him any more.’

(67) a. Vreau să plec curând.
    want.1sg să leave.1sg soon
    ‘I want to leave soon.’

     b. *Vreau să curând plec

(68) a. A zâmbi mereu e greu.
    to smile always is hard
    ‘It is hard to always smile.’

     b. *A mereu zâmbi e greu.

On the other hand, a full adverb may occur between a complementizer and the verb, as
shown in the indicative clause in (69). A does not behave like a complementizer in this regards.5

(69) Știu că niciodată nu întârzie.
    know.1sg that never not is late
    ‘I know that s/he is never late.’

4.4.1.2 A-Infinitives occur with complementizers and wh-words

The most compelling evidence against the complementizer status of a lies in its ability to
occur with complementizers. Much of this kind of evidence has been already used in relation to
the complementizer status of de in the previous section. For convenience, new relevant
examples are included here. Apart from occurring with the complementizer de (70), a coexists
with a number of complementizers introducing infinitival adjuncts, like the purpose clause in

5 On the other hand, no lexical material is allowed between the complementizer de (or other infinitival
complementizer) and the mood marker a. By contrast, it is possible to have an adverb between the English to and the
infinitival verb.
(71) introduced by the complementizer *pentru* `for`. *A* may also co-occur with the complementizer *dacă* `if/whether` as illustrated in (72) below.

(70)  
| făgăduieşte  d’a face mai multe izbânzi.  |
| promise.3sg de to make more deeds  |
| ‘He promises to accomplish more things.’  |
| Bălcescu (1852:306) *Românii sub Mihai...*  |

(71)  
| s-a purces astăzi *pentru* a nu târâgăna afacerea  |
| cl- has begun today for to not delay business.the  |
| ‘They started today not to delay the business.’  |
| Stefanelli (1915:137) 1785 document  |

(72)  
| Mara nu s-a hotărât încă *dacă* a pleca  |
| Mara not rflx-has decided yet whether to leave  |
| sau a mai sta câteva zile.  |
| or to more stay few days  |
| ‘Mara has not decided yet whether to leave or to stay a few more days.’  |

Section 3.4 (Chapter 3) claimed that both $C^0$ and *[Spec,CP]* could not be filled in Romanian; however, the particle *a* may co-occur with *wh*-words, as illustrated in (73). Although Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) finds (74) to be ungrammatical, I accept it. As already mention (Section 2.4), Popescu (1992) considers examples such as (73) and (74) to be grammatical (standard) and the variants without *a* are regionalisms in her view.

(73)  
| nu ştim de ce a ne minuna mai mult  |
| not know.1pl of what to us wonder more  |
| ‘We don’t know what more to wonder about.’  |
| Bălcescu (1852:95)  |

(74)  
| Nu ştiu unde a pleca.  |
| Not know.1sg where to leave  |
| ‘I/they do not know where to go.’  |

---

6 The problem with (74) is its ambiguity between infinitive (i) and indicative (ii) if the particle *a* is absent:

(i)  
| Nu ştiu unde pleca.  |
| Not know.1sg where leave.Inf  |
| ‘I/they do not know where to go.’  |

(ii)  
| Nu ştiu unde pleca.  |
| Not know.1sg where leave.Imp.3sg  |
| ‘I/they do not know where s/he was leaving.’  |
A may also co-occur with the relativizing preposition de (or invariable relative pronoun, fn. 3, Chapter 2) as in (75) and (76). Assuming that wh-phrases and de occupy [Spec,CP], a cannot be a complementizer.

(75)  Nu era femeia de a se lăsa înșelată.  
not was woman.the which to rflx let cheated  
‘She wasn’t the woman to let herself be cheated on.’

(76)  Nu-mi place ideea de a pleca la miezul nopții.  
not-mi.Dat like idea.the de to leave at midnight  
‘I don’t like the idea of leaving at midnight.’

I take the evidence to support my claim that a is an inflectional element located in I⁰ on a par with the English to and with the Romanian subjunctive mood marker să. I take such examples to support an analysis of a in which it is not a complementizer.

4.4.2. Infinitive Marker as a Complementizer

4.4.2.1 Adverb placement

It has been mentioned that only a fixed number of one-syllable lexical items are allowed between the infinitival particle a and the verb. As illustrated above in (68) and by the contrast in (77), adverbs are disallowed between a and the infinitive verb.

(77) a. a gândi vreodată
       to think sometimes

b. *a vreodată gândi
       to sometimes think

Dobrovie-Sorin uses this contrast to support the complementizer status of a. Her account of this contrast relies on verb movement. Verb raising to I⁰ takes place in Romanian, thus in (77a), the verb obligatorily raises from V⁰ to I⁰, crossing the adverb, which is adjoined to VP. (77b) is ungrammatical because this verb raising has not taken place. This explanation excludes
the possibility that \( a \) is in \( I^0 \). If \( a \) were in \( I^0 \), (77a) should be ungrammatical because there would be no empty landing site for the verb.

I propose an alternative analysis of the contrast in (77) that permits \( a \) to occur in \( I^0 \). It is based on Pollock’s (1989) analysis of French infinitives. In French, infinitive verbs can appear to the right or the left of an adverb:

(78) \textbf{A peine parler} l’italien après cinq ans d’études denote hardly to speak Italian after five years of study indicates un manqué de don pour les langues a lack of gift for the languages ‘To hardly speak Italian after five years of study indicates a lack of gift for languages.’ (Pollock 1989)

(79) \textbf{Parler a peine} l’italien après cinq ans d’études denote to speak hardly Italian after five years of study indicates un manqué de don pour les langues a lack of gift for the languages ‘To hardly speak Italian after five years of study indicates a lack of gift for languages.’ (Pollock 1989)

Pollock’s analysis is that IP is really two projections, TP and AgrP, with TP dominating AgrP. French infinitival verbs optionally raise from \( V^0 \) to \( Agr^0 \), a head position above VP but still below \( T^0 \). The order in (79) is obtained without raising the verb all the way to \( I^0 \). For Romanian, I assume that there is also a split Infl. IP is replaced by MP and TP (and AgrP), following Terzi (1992, 1997), Schütze (1997), and Miller (2002).

The infinitival marker \( a \) resides in \( M^0 \) and the infinitive verb obligatorily raises to \( T^0 \) but not to \( M^0 \), which is filled. This accounts for the contrast in (77). In (77a), \( a \) is in \( M^0 \) and the verb raises to \( T^0 \). (77b) is ungrammatical because the verb has not raised. Unlike in Dobrovie-Sorin’s account there is no conflict, as the verb is moving to an empty head position, \( T^0 \). \( A \) need not be in \( C^0 \) under this analysis.
4.4.2.2 Negation distribution

Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) claims that the distribution of the negation in infinitives, (80), reflects the complementizer status of the infinitival particle a. As can be seen, nu is not able to precede a, nu can only follow.

(80) a. a nu vorbi
   to not speak

   b. *nu a vorbi
      not to speak

Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:85) builds her argument on the claim that nu follows complementizers. This is seen in (81) for the indicative complementizer că. Because the sequence a – nu in the infinitival structure (80a) mimics the sequence că – nu in the indicative structure (81b), her example (8), a must be a complementizer as well.

(81) a. *Știu nu că a plecat
       know.1sg not that has left
       I don’t know that s/he left

   b. Știu că nu a plecat
       know.1sg that not has left
       ‘I know that s/he didn’t leave.’

The problem with this reasoning can be seen by looking at other clause types. In subjunctive clauses, nu occurs to the right of the complementizer ca but also the subjunctive marker să:

(82) a. Te- am sunat ca să nu uți să pleci.
       you have.1sg called that s/ she not forget.2sg s/ she leave.2sg
       ‘I called you in order for you to not forget to leave.’

   b. *Te- am sunat ca nu să uți să pleci.
      you have.1sg called that not s/ she forget.2sg s/ she leave.2sg

   I have already argued that să is not a complementizer. Thus the parallel between a - nu and că – nu breaks down. Nu follows complementizers but it actually appears much lower.
A second problem arises in infinitival purpose clauses with the complementizer *pentru* (83). Seemingly, *nu* cannot follow the complementizer in the infinitival purposive of (83). Again, *nu* must follow both the complementizer and *a*.

(83)  
(a) Te-am sunat *pentru* a *nu* uita să pleci.  
you have.1sg called for to not forget să leave.2sg  
‘I called you in order for you to not forget to leave.’

(b) *Te-am sunat *pentru* nu a uita să pleci.  
you have.1sg called for not to forget să leave.2sg

The data suggest that *nu* follows both complementizers and inflectional heads. The data in (80) is thus compatible with *a* being in C⁰ or I⁰. Specifically, it does not rule out analyzing *a* as an inflectional head, as I am doing. The data in (83) however suggest that *a* is not in C⁰. As suggested above, *a* cannot be a complementizer if *pentru* is also a complementizer, on the assumption that an embedded clause does not have two complementizers.

### 4.4.2.3 Infinitives and case

In Romanian, a gerundial cannot follow a preposition or complementizer as the contrast in (84) shows. Thus, a construction like the English translation of (84b) is not possible in Romanian. The English example (85b) with a gerund following the complementizer *without* can be constructed only with the infinitive in Romanian (85a).

(84)  
(a) A plecat spunand ceva.  
has left saying.Ger something  
‘S/he left saying something.’

(b) *A plecat fără spinând* ceva.  
has left without saying.Ger something  
‘S/he left without saying anything,’

(85)  
(a) A plecat fără a spune o vorbă.  
has left without to say a word  
*S/he left without to say a word

(b) ‘S/he left *without saying* a word.’
Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:85-86) suggests that the difference between the Romanian infinitival adjunct, (85a), and the English version constructed with a gerund, (85b), is the difference between to-infinitives and a-infinitives in relation to case: “to infinitives are IP constituents which are verbal in nature and as such cannot show up in a position to which Case is assigned (by the preposition)”. Thus, the English translation of (85a) is not possible with the infinitive because the to-infinitive appears in a case position. By contrast, “the Romanian example can be understood if we assume a infinitives to be CP constituents, which as such are allowed to take on a nominal status”. From this, Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) concludes that, since a-infinitives are CPs (in her view), a must reside in C^0.

There are a number of problems with this argument. First, English infinitives can appear in case positions. They can be subjects, as in To read is a pleasure, and they can be direct objects, I like to read. However, the to-infinitive can receive subject or object case but not prepositional case, which requires a gerundial (Miller 2002). Romanian does not have that constraints: an a-infinitive can occur as a complement to a preposition/prepositional complementizer.

Second, it is not clear why the English infinitival complement in (86a) would be an IP and its Romanian counterpart (86b) a CP (by Dobrovie-Sorin’s assumption). They should be both the same type of clause.

(86)  a. Mara tried to write a poem.
       b. Mara a încercat a scrie un poem.
       ‘Mara tried to write a poem.’

Lastly, the infinitival adjunct in (85a) is a CP simply because of the complementizer fără ‘without’. Admitting that the infinitive in (85a) needs case, the licenser is the complementizer
fară ‘without’. There is no reason to consider the infinitive marker a complementizer here. (In addition, a complex preposition fară a does not exist).

I conclude that the counterarguments discussed above can be equally well analyzed under the assumption that a is an inflectional head and not a complementizer. These combine with earlier arguments which supported the inflectional head status of a, on a par with să. I will assume that a heads its own inflectional projection, which I label M⁰. The structure of the Romanian infinitive (87a) is the configuration (87b), where only the infinitival clause is included: de is in C⁰, a in M⁰, nu occupies the head Neg⁰. The clitic me cliticizes on the verb and move to T⁰. PRO starts out in [Spec,vP] then moves to [Spec,MP].

(87) 
a. Radu încercă (de) PRO₁ a nu mă dezamăgi. Radu tries de to not cl.me disappoint ‘Radu is trying not to disappoint me.’

b. \[ \text{[CP C⁰} \text{ de [MP PRO [M⁰ a [Neg⁰ nu [TP T⁰ mă dezamăgi [vP tPRO VP t_mădezamăgi]]]]]} \]

Before concluding this section, I would like to present an observation which is potentially problematic for my analysis. When de and a occur together, they must be strictly adjacent. No lexical material can occur between the two. Recall that an adverb is allowed following the infinitive verb, (68a), (88a) but not between a and the infinitive verb (68b). In addition, no adverb is allowed between de and a (88b).

(88) 
a. Radu speră de a pleca curând în vacanţă. Radu hopes de to leave soon in vacation ‘Radu hopes to leave for a vacation soon.’

b. * Radu speră de curând a pleca în vacanţă. Radu hopes de soon to leave in vacation

De and a can even be pronounced together, as a monosyllabic word. This is reflected in the orthography: de a can be written de-a or d’a/d-a (See also fn 2, Chapter 2). This is somewhat surprising given that I have analyzed de and a as two distinct heads, occupying C and M,
respectively. I assume that this adjacency requirement is due to the clitic-like behavior of \textit{de}. Rizzi (1982) also points out this clitic-like behavior of Italian \textit{di}.  

### 4.5 Exhaustive Control (EC) and Partial Control (PC)

In the next two sections of this chapter, I will describe infinitive complements in Landau’s (2000) terms of exhaustive control (EC) and partial control (PC). In this section I discuss the properties of obligatory control shared by EC and PC in contrast to non-obligatory control (NOC). The following section, 4.6, will deal with the specific properties of PC complements.

#### 4.5.1. Background

In Landau’s (2000) typology, obligatory control (OC) complement constructions are divided into EC and PC. In EC, the referent of the embedded subject, which I represent with PRO, is identical to the referent of the controller (89). In PC, the referent of PRO includes the referent of the controller, but the two references are not necessarily identical (90).

(89) 
\[
\text{Radu} \ 1 \ a \ îndrăznit \ PRO_1 \ a \ fluiera \ în \ biserică.}
\]
Radu has dared to whistle in church
‘Radu dared to whistle in the church.’

(90) 
\[
\text{Directorul} \ 1 \ speră \ PRO_1^+ \ a \ se \ întruni \ în \ biserică.}
\]
director.the hopes to reflx gather in church
‘The boss hopes to gather in the church.’

7 It seems that prepositional complementizers in general manifest this behavior. Thus, an adverb is not possible between the complementizer \textit{pentru} ‘for’ and the infinitival particle \textit{a}, as the contrast in (i) shows:

(i) 
\[
\text{a. A venit doar pentru a pleca \textit{repede} înapoi}
\]
has come only for to leave quickly back
‘S/he just came to quickly leave again.’

\[
\text{b. *a venit doar pentru \textit{repede} a pleca înapoi}
\]
has come only for quickly to leave back
In most contexts, one cannot tell whether a predicate selects an EC or a PC complement.

Aside from the different semantic category of the matrix verbs, (89) and (91) are seemingly identical OC constructions.

(91) Radu₁ speră PRO₁ a merge la petrecere.  
Radu hopes to go to party  
‘Radu hopes to go to the party.’

However, (92) shows that the implicative a îndrăzni ‘to dare’ is an EC verb and cannot replace a spera ‘to hope, which is a PC verb. EC and PC infinitives are selected by separate semantic groups of predicates.

(92) *Directorul₁ a îndrăzni PRO₁+ a lucra împreună.  
director.the has dared to work together.  
‘The boss dared to gather in the church.’

It is remarkable that EC-infinitives and OC-subjunctives are selected by the same classes of matrix verbs and PC-infinitives and F-subjunctives are also selected by the same matrix verbs.

A short list for each semantic group of verbs is given below:

(93) EC predicates. The predicates that select EC complement clauses are divided into the following classes:

a. Implicatives

b. Aspectual
   a începe ‘to begin’, a continua ‘to continue’, a termina ‘to finish’, a (se) opri ‘to stop’, a înceta ‘to cease’, a persista ‘to persist’, a stăruiesc ‘to persevere’

---

8 Most of the aspectual verbs may select de a-infinitive complements, thus they cannot be taken as raising verbs in constructions of the type:

(i) Mara a-nceput (de) a scrie o scrisoare.  
Mara has began (de) to write a letter  
‘Mara began to write a letter.’
c. Modal
deontic a avea ‘to have’, deontic a fi ‘to be’, a fi capabil/a fi în stare ‘to be able’
A putea ‘can’ is out because is a restructuring verb.

(94) PC predicates. PC complement clauses are selected by the four classes of verbs given below:
a. Desideratives
   a dori ‘to wish’, a voi ‘will’, a prefera ‘to prefer, a aranja ‘to arrange’, a spera ‘to hope’,
   a agrea/fi de acord ’to agree’, a hotără/decide ‘to decide’, a consimți ‘to consent’.
b. Factive
   a regreta, ‘to regret’, a ură ‘to hate’, a îngrozi ‘to be scared’, a se teme ‘to be afraid’
   a dezgusta ‘to disgust’ a satisface ‘to satisfy’, a fi surprins ‘to be surprised’,
   a amuza ‘to amuse’, a fi bucuros ‘to be glad’.
c. Interrogatives
   a ști ‘to know’, a înțelege ‘to understand’ a afla ‘to find out’. At this time, this
   class is reduced to these verbs only. Further research is needed to find out more
   about this class of verbs vis-a-vis infinitive.
d. Propositional
   a (se) gândi ‘to think’, a(și) închipui ‘to imagine’, a declara ‘to declare’, a afirma
   ‘to affirm’, a nega ‘to deny’, a sugera ‘to suggest’, a crede ‘believe’.

4.5.2 EC and PC vs. NOC

The properties in (95a-d) are characteristics of NOC constructions. They are thus not
allowed in EC and PC constructions, which are OC. Below, I confirm that Romanian infinitival
complements display OC behavior (i.e. (95) is not possible).

(95)  
   a. Arbitrary Control
   b. Long-distance Control (LDC)
   c. Strict reading of PRO under ellipsis
   d. De re reading of PRO

4.5.2.1 Arbitrary control is impossible in EC and PC, possible in NOC

Arbitrary control constructions are constructions in which PRO is not controlled by any
argument, overt or implied. PRO is interpreted as an arbitrary person or persons, represented as
PROarb. Arbitrary control is not possible in (96a) which features an EC construction with
implicative, aspectual, and modal matrix verbs. Since a controller is present in the matrix clause,
PRO cannot be interpreted as PROarb. The examples in (96b) show that PROarb is also disallowed in a PC construction selected by desiderative, factive, propositional predicates. By contrast, PROarb is well behaved in the NOC constructions of (97) and (98), translated from Kawasaki (1993) and Lebeux (1984) respectively, both via Landau (2000).

(96) a. *Radu1 îndrăznește/ continuă/e capabil [PROarb1 a fi obraznic].
Radu dares/continues/is able to be naughty
‘Radu dares/continues/is able to be naughty.’
**”Radu dares/continues/is able for someone to be naughty.’

b. *Radu1 preferă/urăște/pretinde/ [PROarb1 a fi obraznic].
Radu prefers/hates/pretends to be naughty
‘Radu prefers/hates/pretends to be naughty.’

(97) E periculos pentru copii [PROarb a fuma lângă ei]
is dangerous for children to smoke by them
‘It is dangerous for children to smoke around them.’

(98) [PROarb a face profit mare] implică/inseamnă
to make profit big implies/means
[PROarb a exploata muncitorii]
to exploit workers.the
‘Making large profit implies/means to exploit the workers.’

Therefore, EC and PC structures reject PROarb subjects, in conformity with standard behavior of OC structures.

4.5.2.2 LDC is not allowed in EC or PC, but possible in NOC

In an OC environment, it is necessary that the controller be structurally local to the controlee. The controller must c-command the controlee and be in the immediately dominating clause. There cannot be more than one clause boundary between the controller and controlee. The examples in (99) illustrate this restriction in Romanian and English. The reflexive in the complement clause requires a local antecedent, which must be the subject PRO. PRO cannot be controlled by the intended feminine antecedent Mara, the matrix subject, however, because it is
too far away. The intended antecedent is two clauses away. And thus the examples are ungrammatical.

(99) a.  *Mara₁ știa [că Radu₂ a reușit [PRO₁ Mara knew that Radu has managed a șofa ea însăși₁ tot drumul]] to drive herself all way
    *Mara knew that Radu managed to drive herself all the way
b.  *Mara₁ știa [că Radu₂ a încetat [PRO₁ Mara knew that Radu has ceased a se calomnia ea însăși₁]] to reflx perjure herself
    *Mara knew that Radu ceased to perjure herself.
c.  *Mara₁ știa [că Radu₂ e capabil [PRO₁ Mara knew that Radu is capable a se învinovăți ea însăși₁]] to reflx accuse herself
    *Mara knew that Radu is capable of perjuring herself.

Long-distance control is also prohibited in the examples of (100) constructed with PC predicates: volitional (100a), factive (100b), and propositional (100c). Again, PRO is coindexed with a non-local antecedent (Mara) and the sentences are ungrammatical.

(100) a.  *Mara₁ știe [că Radu₂ a decis a se calomnia ea însăși₁] Mara knows that Radu has decided to reflx accuse her self
    *Mara knew that Radu decided to perjure herself.
b.  *Mara₁ știe [că Radu₂ uraște a se învinovăți ea însăși₁] Mara knows [that Radu hates to reflx accuse her self
    *Mara knows that Radu hates to perjure herself.
c.  *Mara₁ știa [că Radu₂ se gândește a șofa Mara knew [that Radu reflx thinks to drive ea însăși₁ tot drumul] her self all way
    *Mara knew that Radu hates to drive herself all the way.

While LDC is prohibited in OC, it is allowed in NOC constructions as shown in (101a)
(adapted from Richardson, 1986, via Landau, 2000) and (101b).
(101) a. [PRO₁ părăsind camera ca o furtună după ce a pierdut
leaving room like a storm after what has lost
jocul] a convins pe oricine că Radu₁ e imatur
game.the has convinced everyone that Radu₁ is immature.
‘Storming out of the room after losing the game convinced everyone that Radu is
immature.’

b. Mara₁ crede că ar fi amuzant [PRO₁ a cânta
Mara believes that would be amusing to sing
toată aria de una singură₁].
all aria by herself
‘Mara believes that it would be fun to sing the whole aria by herself.’

In sum, LDC is disallowed in EC and PC structures, a characteristic of obligatory control.

4.5.2.3 Strict reading of PRO under ellipsis is impossible in EC/PC

The interpretation of (102a) is (102b). In the second conjunct, Ana, and not Mara is
leaving. This is an instance of a sloppy reading in which the interpretation of PRO changes
across the two clauses. The strict reading in which the interpretation of PRO in both clauses
would be Mara is impossible. EC verbs allow only a sloppy interpretation under ellipsis, a
characteristic of obligatory control.

(102) a. Mara₁ a încercat PRO₁ a pleca devreme
Mara has tried to leave early
și Ana₂ de asemenea.
and Ana of same
‘Mara tried to leave early and Ana too.’

b. Mara₁ a încercat RPO₁ a pleca devreme
Mara has tried to leave early
și Ana₂ a încercat PRO₂ a pleca devreme.
and Ana has tried to leave early
‘Mara tried to leave early and Ana tried to leave early.’

Strict readings are also not permitted with PC. The example (103) has only the sloppy
interpretation “Mara hopes to gather in the church and the priest hopes to gather in the church”.
It does not have the strict interpretation “Mara hopes to gather in the church and the priest hopes
that Mara will gather in the church”.
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Mara hopes to gather in church and the priest too.'

By contrast, both strict and sloppy readings are possible in NOC structures. The interpretation of (104) (translated from Bouchard, 1985, via Landau, 2000) is: Both Ion and Bill believe the same thing: that it would be difficult for Ion to feed himself. This strict reading is possible because (104) is an NOC structure. The sloppy reading is also easily available.

As expected, the subject of EC and PC structures (PRO) only yields a sloppy reading under ellipsis as opposed to NOC structures, which allow both strict and sloppy readings under ellipsis.

4.5.2.4 *De re* reading is impossible in OC, possible in NOC

To illustrate *de se* and *de re* readings, I am using again the classical example from the old story about a war hero, “the unfortunate”, who suffers from amnesia and is confused about his identity (the details of the story appear in Section 3.6). The indicative construction of (105a) has both *de se* and *de re* interpretations. It is true if ‘the unfortunate’ expects someone to come and give him a medal, the *de se* interpretation, about the self. If Nefericitul “the unfortunate” believes that the war hero depicted in a TV show, which is actually himself although he does not know it, will get the medal, the statement is the *de re* belief but not the *de se* one. By contrast, the OC infinitive clause of (105b) selected by a PC verb has only the *de se* interpretation, the belief about the self. A *de re* reading is not possible in OC.
(105) a. Nefericitul speră că va primi o medalie
unfortunate.the hopes that will receive a medal
‘The unfortunate hopes that he will get a medal.’

b. Nefericitul₈ speră [PRO₁ a primi o medalie].
unfortunate.the hopes to receive a medal
‘The unfortunate hopes to get a medal.’

The same contrast is seen with the EC (implicative) attitude verbs a uita ‘to forget’ and a-şi aminti ‘to remember’. The example used in Section 3.6 to illustrate the de se interpretation of PRO in OC subjunctives will also illustrate it with an infinitive. While (106a) features an indicative construction with de re and de se interpretations, the de se interpretation is possible in the infinitival construction in (104b). The data of (105) and (106) show that OC infinitives with PC matrix verbs (hope) and EC matrix verbs (remember) exhibit de se readings only.

(106) a. Uitucul îşi aminteşte că ia trenul
forgetful.the rflx remembers that takes train.the
‘The forgetful man remembers that he takes the train.’

b. Uitucul₈ îşi aminteşte PRO₁ a lua trenul.
forgetful.the rflx remembers to take train.the
‘The forgetful man remembers to take the train.’

In conclusion, EC and PC infinitives contrast in regards to the semantic categories of predicates that select them and to the referent of PRO. PRO and its controller are not necessarily identical in PC but they must overlap. As OC constructions, EC and PC infinitives, unlike NOC constructions, disallow PROarţ subjects, disallow LDC, manifest only sloppy readings under ellipsis, and are restricted to the de se interpretation.

4.6 PC Characteristics

As already seen, the referent of the controller in PC is a subset of the referent of PRO while the referent of the controller in EC is identical with the referent of PRO. Another property of PC that differentiates it from EC is that PC “permits an embedded collective predicate to occur with a controller in the singular” (Landau 2000:45) resulting a semantically plural PRO.
The purpose of this section is to show that this distinction also applies to Romanian OC infinitives.

4.6.1 PC with Collective Predicates

Landau (2000) points out that there are some differences across languages concerning the collective predicates involved in PC. For instance, French *se*-verbs are not possible with PC complements, unlike their Italian or Spanish counterparts. He also mentions that, in general, PC complements with factive predicates are not as common and natural as PC complements with desiderative (and interrogative) predicates.

4.6.1.1 PC with collective (*se*) verbs

Unlike French, partial control is possible with *se* verbs in Romanian. The examples below in (107a-110a) feature PC complements selected by verbs from all four semantic groups: desiderative (107a), factive (108a), propositional (109a) and interrogative (110a). The predicates in the complement clauses are lexically collective and all of them are *se* verbs. (107b-110b) represent the F-subjunctive versions of the respective infinitive constructions. Recall that most infinitive structures can be also constructed with subjunctive.

In (107a), directorul is the matrix controller and is part of the PRO in the infinitive clause. The sign for plus represents the people with whom the director will discuss during those biweekly meetings. The controller is syntactically and semantically singular, but PRO is semantically plural, the effect of the collective verb *a se îintruni* ‘to convene’.

(107) a. Directorul1 a hotărât [PRO1+ a se îintruni de două ori pe săptămână]*
    director.the has decided to reflx convene
    of two times per week
    ‘The director decided to convene twice a week.’

---

9 Since no PC construction has been found in the literature, the examples created here will bear the symbol * at the end.
b. Directorul 1  a hotărât [PRO₁⁺ să se întrunească
director.the has decided să rflx convene.3sg
de două ori pe săptămână]
of two times per week
‘The director decided to convene twice a week.’

In the PC-structures (108a-110a), Radu, the subject of the higher clause, represents the
prominent member of the group reference of PRO. The controller, Mara, is semantically singular
while PRO is semantically plural due to the embedded verb that is semantically collective.

(108) a. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ urăște PRO₂⁺ a se întâlni pe furiș]*
Radu knows [that Mara hates to rflx meet furtively]
‘Radu knows that Mara hates to meet furtively.’

b. Radu știe [că Mara urăște să se întâlnească pe furiș]
Radu knows [that Mara hates să rflx meet.3sg/pl furtively]
‘Radu knows that Mara hates to meet furtively.’

(109) a. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ nu crede PRO₂⁺
Radu knows [that Mara not believes
a se reuni fără emoții mari]*
to rflx reunite without emotions great.pl]
‘Radu knows that Mara doesn’t believe they will reunite without great emotions.’

b. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ nu crede
Radu knows [that Mara not believes
să se reunească fără emoții mari]
să rflx reunite.3sg/pl without emotions great.pl]
‘Radu knows that Mara doesn’t believe they will reunite without great emotions.’

(110) a. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ se întreabă dacă PRO₂⁺
Radu knows [that Mara rflx wonders whether
a se reuni e o idee bună]*
to rflx reunite is a idea good]
‘Radu knows that Mara wonders if to reunite is a good idea.’

b. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ se întreabă dacă
Radu knows [that Mara rflx wonders whether
să se reunească e o idee bună]
să rflx reunite.3sg/pl is a idea good]
‘Radu knows that Mara wonders if to reunite is a good idea.’
As expected, similar constructions with EC predicates cannot yield partial control. The attempt to build partial control with matrix implicative (111a) or aspectual predicates (112a) and a collective verb in the embedded clause fails. (However, it may be possible that some of the EC verbs may have a double nature). The b. examples with subjunctive are also ungrammatical.

(111) a. *Radu i- a spus Marei [că a uitat/îndrăznit/
Radu her- has told M.Dat [that has forgotten/dared/
a se despărți]
to rflx separate]
*Radu told Mara that he forgot/dared to separate.

b. *Radu i- a spus Marei [că a uitat/ îndrăznit
Radu her- has told M.Dat [that has forgotten/dared
să se despartă]
să rflx separate.3sg/pl]
*Radu told Mara that he forgot/dared to separate.

(112) a. *Radu i- a spus Marei [că începe a se reuni]
Radu her-has told M.Dat [that begins to rflx reunite]
*Radu told Mara that he begins to reunite.’

b. *Radu i- a spus Marei [că începe să se reunească]
Radu her-has told M.Dat [that begins să rflx reunite.3sg/pl]
*Radu told Mara that he begins to reunite.

4.6.1.2 Predicates with together

The examples (113a – 116a) are PC constructions formed with the collectivizer together, which (like se verbs) requires PRO to be semantically plural. In (113b-116b) the infinitive is replaced by a subjunctive verb. The PC structures are selected by PC verbs: desiderative (113a), factive (114a), interrogative (115a) and propositional (116a). The controller Mara, from (113a-115a), is semantically singular, while PRO is semantically plural due to the collective modifier together. Radu is the prominent member of the group reference of PRO.

(113) a. Radu1 crede [că Mara2 speră PRO2+
Radu believes [that Mara hopes
a rezolva problema împreună]*
to solve problem.the together]
‘Radu believes that Mara hopes to solve the problem together.’
b. Radu₁ crede [că Mara₂ speră  \\
Radu believes [that Mara hopes  \\
să rezolve problema împreună]  \\
să solve.3sg/pl problem.the together]  \\
‘Radu believes that Mara hopes to solve the problem together.’

(114) a. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ uraște PRO₂⁺  \\
Radu knows [that Mara hates  \\
a lucră împreună la proiect]*  \\
to work together at project]  \\
‘Radu knows that Mara hates to work together at the project.’

b. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ uraște  \\
Radu knows [that Mara hates  \\
să lucreze împreună la proiect]  \\
să work.3sg/pl together at project]  \\
‘Radu knows that Mara hates to work together at the project.’

(115) a. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ se întreabă dacă PRO₂⁺  \\
Radu knows [that Mara rflx wonders whether  \\
a lucră împreună (sau nu)]*  \\
to work together (or not)]  \\
‘Radu knows that Mara wonders whether to work together (or not).’

b. Radu₁ știe [că Mara₂ se întreabă dacă  \\
Radu knows [that Mara rflx wonders whether  \\
să lucreze împreună (or nu)]  \\
să work.3sg/pl together (or not)]  \\
‘Radu knows that Mara wonders whether to work together (or not).’

(116) a. Radu₁ i- a spus Marei₂ [că nu crede PRO₁⁺  \\
Radu her-has told M.Dat [that not believes  \\
a merge împreună la petrecere]*  \\
to go together at party]  \\
‘Radu told Mara that he doesn’t believe they will go together at the party.’

b. Radu₁ i- a spus Marei₂ [că nu crede  \\
Radu her-has told M.Dat [that not believes  \\
să meargă împreună la petrecere]  \\
să go.3sg/pl together at party]  \\
‘Radu told Mara that she doesn’t believe they will go together at the party.’

In (116a), Radu is the controller and Mara is part of PRO. The controller, the null 
subjecte of crede ‘believes’, is semantically singular, but PRO is semantically plural.
Partial control is not possible if the matrix verbs are EC verbs with a controller in the singular and in the presence of the collectivizer împreună ‘together’. Both, the infinitive (117a) and subjunctive (117b) examples are ungrammatical.

(117) a. *Radu crede [că Mara a îndrăznit/început a rezolva problema împreună] Radu believes [that Mara has dared/began to solve problem.the together] *Radu knows that Mara dared/began to solve the problem together.

b. *Radu crede [că Mara a îndrăznit/început să rezolve problema împreună] să solve.3sg/pl problem.the together *Radu knows that Mara dared/began to solve the problem together.

The two sets of data, with collective verbs and with the collectivizer împreună, clearly show the difference between EC verbs and PC verbs. Only PC verbs allow a controller in the singular to occur with a collective embedded predicate. In the PC examples above, the controller is semantically singular and PRO semantically plural.

4.6.2 Semantic vs. Syntactic Plurality

Another characteristic of PC complement clauses is the requirement that they cannot contain a plural anaphor or a plural floating quantifier. In Landau’s (2000:48) view: “In a PC construction with a controller in the singular, the embedded predicate can be lexically collective or contain together, but cannot be inflected for plural, or contain a non-singular anaphor/floating quantifier.”

In Landau’s (2000) system, in all PC constructions with a controller in the singular and a collective verb (or together), PRO represents a group name, which is semantically plural but syntactically singular. A mismatch in syntactic number with the controller is not allowed. Consequently, predicates inflected for plural or those that include plural anaphors or plural floating quantifiers are not admitted in PC with a singular controller.
Landau, citing Munn (1999), points out that the choice of a morpheme to agree with syntactic or semantic plurality is language/dialect specific and may even vary among speakers. The PRO in PC is a group name and, as such, is expected to behave like *committee* and *government*. (118) and (119) indicate that these two words cannot be represented as *themselves, each other or all* in Romanian and American English.

(118) *Comitetul s-a consultat unul pe altul/ unii pe alţii* committee.the rflx-has consulted each other.sg/ each other.pl înainte de vot before of vote *The committee consulted each other before the vote.

(119) *Guvernul şi-a declinat ei înşişi/toţi răspunderea government.the rflx-has declined themselves/all responsibility.the * The government cleared themselves/all of any responsibility.

Bearing this in mind, consider the examples in (120). The meaning of (120a) is that the secretary is supposed to carry out the director’s decision and to gather the board of trustees twice a week so that the director would also convene in order to discuss current issues etc. Whether the secretary would participate or not is irrelevant. Thus, while *el însuşi* ‘himself’ correctly refers to *directorul* (120a), *ei înşişi* ‘themselves’ is illegal (120b). Therefore, a plural emphatic (or other element) is disallowed when the controller is syntactically singular.

(120) a. Directorul1 a anunţat-o pe secretară2 [că a hotărât director.the has informed-her P secretary.fem [that has decided PRO+ a se întruni el însuşi1 de două ori pe săptămână]* to rflx convene himself twice per week ‘The director informed his secretary that he decided to convene (himself) twice a week.’

b. *Directorul1 a anunţat-o pe secretară2 [că a hotărât director.the has informed-her P secretary.fem [that has decided PRO+ a se întruni ei însişi1 de două ori pe săptămână]* to rflx convene themselves twice per week ‘The director informed his secretary that he decided to convene (*themselves) twice a week.’
In sum, Romanian PC structures allow a syntactically/semantically singular controller to occur with collective predicates in the subordinate and a semantically plural PRO. In a PC clause, the verb must not have plural morphology and plural elements when the controller is singular.

4.7 Tense of Infinitival Complement Clauses

The discussion about tense in Chapter 3, Section, 3.5, has already introduced the terms anaphoric tense and dependent tense. I show that EC complements are expected to have anaphoric tense, whereas PC clauses show dependent tense, on a par with OC-subjunctives and F-subjunctives, respectively.

4.7.1 EC Complements Have Anaphoric Tense

The claim that EC complements contain anaphoric tense means that EC complements do not allow temporal modifiers that are distinct from those in the matrix clause, (121,122). This restriction implies that the event of the controlled clause is the same as that of the matrix or that the two events are simultaneous. I take these data to show that EC infinitives lack a tense operator. Therefore, EC infinitives have anaphoric tense.

(121) *Azi Radu îndrâznește a-și părăsi mâine sluji. 
   today Radu dares to-rflx quit tomorrow job-the 
   *‘Today Radu dares to quit his job tomorrow.’

(122) *Ieri Radu a reușit a ajunge la Paris mâine. 
   yesterday Radu has managed to reach to Paris tomorrow 
   *‘Yesterday, Radu managed to reach Paris tomorrow.’

4.7.2 PC Complements Have Dependent Tense

In contrast, conflicting temporal modifiers are possible in PC constructions. A temporal adverb denoting future tense in the PC complement of (123) is allowed although the adverb in the matrix clause encodes past tense. Like an F-subjunctive, a PC infinitive has its own tense operator. The embedded tense is nonetheless constrained by the matrix tense operator: mâine
‘tomorrow’ cannot be replaced by *ieri* ‘yesterday’ in (124). In other words, PC complements may have different time adverbs from those of the matrix clause, but the two are not completely independent.

(123)    Ieri,       Mara a sperat a pleca la Paris azi/mâine.  
yesterday Mara has hoped to leave to Paris today/tomorrow  
‘Yesterday, Mara hoped to leave for Paris today/tomorrow.’

(124)    Acum Mara speră a pleca mâine  */ieri.  
now Mara hopes to leave tomorrow/ yesterday  
‘Now, Mara hopes/wants to leave tomorrow/*yesterday.’

In conclusion, parallel to OC and F-subjunctives, respectively, EC complements have anaphoric tense and PC infinitives have dependent tense. Thus, their tense is selected by the matrix verb.

4.8 IP or CP?

This section discusses the phrasal category of infinitival clauses. Are they IPs or CPs I am unable to answer this question conclusively and leave the matter for future research. I do however eliminate the possibility that these structures are restructuring contexts.

4.8.1 Infinitival Complements Resist Restructuring

Recall from Chapter 2, Section 2.4 that the verbs *a putea* ‘can’ and *a ști* ‘to know’ may take *a*-infinitive complements (125) or bare infinitive complements (126) in OSR. In CR, *a putea* can only take a bare infinitive while *a ști* can have both a bare infinitive and an *a*-infinitive.

(125) a. Radu poate *a cânta* acest cântec.  OSR  
Radu can *to sing* this song.  
‘Radu can sing this song.’

b. Mara știe *a cânta* acest cântec  OSR and CR  
Radu can *to sing* this song  
‘Mara knows (how) to sing this song.’

(126) a. Radu poate cânta acest cântec.  OSR and CR  
Radu can *sing.*Inf this song  
‘Radu can sing this song.’
b. Mara știe cânta acest cântec. OSR and CR
Mara knows sing.Inf this song
‘Mara knows (how) to sing this song.’

Restructuring is a phenomenon in which the clausal complement of a verb is reduced in size, i.e., a biclausal sentence is transformed into a monoclause sentence (Rizzi 1982, also Chapter 3, Section 3.7). In Rizzi (1982), a key diagnostic of restructuring is clitic climbing: a clitic associated with the embedded predicate can climb into the higher clause and cliticize to the matrix verb. Clitic climbing shows that restructuring was optional in OSR with a putea, (127a) but is obligatory in CR, (127b). Notice that the non-restructuring example (127a) includes the mood marker a and a clitic. Clitic climbing is impossible in this context, (127c). In the restructuring case, (127b), the mood marker is absent and the clitic climbs.

(127) a. Poate a le cumpără mâine. OSR and CR
Can.3sg to cl.them buy tomorrow
‘S/he can buy them tomorrow.’

b. Le poate cumpără mâine. CR only
cl.them can.3sg buy.Inf tomorrow
‘S/he can buy them tomorrow.’

c. *Le poate a cumpără mâine.
cl.them can.3sg to buy tomorrow

The contrast in (128a) versus (129b) shows that restructuring with clitic climbing has never been possible with the verb a ști. All verbs (except a putea) behave like (128). One example, with the verb a spera ‘to hope’ is given in (129), where clitic climbing fails (129b). Examples like (128, 129) are representative of other verbs as well.

(128) a. Radu știe a le pune la loc. OSR and CR
Radu knows to cl.them put in place
‘Radu knows how to put them back in place.’

b. *Radu le știe pune la loc. OSR and CR
Radu cl.them knows put.Inf in place
(129) a. Mara speră a le termina la timp.
Mara hopes to cl.them finish on time
‘Mara hopes to finish (those things) on time.’

b. *Mara le speră termina la timp.
Mara cl.them hopes finish.Inf on time

If we accept clitic climbing as a diagnostic for restructuring, the data illustrate that
restructuring occurred only with a putea but not elsewhere in Romanian. It follows that infinitive
complements are full clauses and not bare VPs lacking Tense projections.

4.8.2 Infinitival Complement Clauses Can be Introduced by Complementizers

An incomplete list of verbs that take de a-infinitive complements and a number of
original examples of infinitival complements introduced by the complementizer de are included
in Section 4.3. As the examples show, all semantic categories of verbs (excepting interrogative
verbs) may have infinitival complement clauses introduced by the complementizer de.
Interrogative verbs like a ști ‘to know’ can take infinitival complements introduced by the
complementizer dacă ‘whether’. One example is given in (130).

(130) Radu nu știe dacă a se întâlni cu Mara sau cu Ana.
Radu not knows whether to rflx meet with Mara or with Ana.
‘Radu doesn’t know whether to meet Mara or Ana.’

Such examples suggest that control complements can be CPs given the presence of an
overt C˚. Recall that the complementizer de is optional however. For example, a matrix predicate
like a îndrăzni ‘to dare’ may have an a-infinitive complement with or without de:

(131) a. Radu a îndrăznit de a fluiera în biserică.
Radu has dared de to whistle in church
‘Radu dared to whistle in the church.’

b. Radu a îndrăznit a fluiera în biserică.
Radu has dared to whistle in church
‘Radu dared to whistle in the church.’
The question is whether control complements in examples like (131b) are also CPs. Unfortunately, these data do not inform the categorical status of the infinitival complement. The data are compatible with two positions: One position is that, in both cases, the complements are CPs and (130b) has a null complementizer. The second position is that (131a) contains a CP complement while (130b) has only an IP complement. This issue, however, remains a topic for future research.

4.9 Conclusions

In this chapter I described infinitival complement clauses as OC structures, subdivided into EC and PC complements. While both EC and PC have standard obligatory control properties, PC complements have unique characteristics. A PC complement with a syntactically singular controller and a collective predicate must not have a predicate inflected for plural or other plural elements (e.g., emphatic pronouns). Furthermore, EC and PC are different vis-à-vis Tense. EC complements have anaphoric tense whereas PC complements have dependent tense.

There are some similarities between infinitival complements and subjunctive complements. EC and OC-subjunctives complements are selected by the same classes of verbs and the same is true for PC and F-subjunctive complements. Also ECs and OC-subjunctives have anaphoric tense and PCs and F-subjunctives have dependent tense.

Further research is necessary in order to find documented examples with PC structures. Concerning the two infinitival particles, a was found to be an inflectional element that heads its own projection M⁰/τ⁰, while de a complementizer in C⁰.
CHAPTER 5
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

C-ajung pe mine însumi a nu mă mai cunoaște\(^1\)
-Eminescu

5.1 Introduction

Having described the subjunctive complement clauses and the infinitive complement clauses of Romanian and the elements of control, it only remains to determine the syntactic theory that best fits the properties of these structures.

The theoretical framework is expected to accommodate the types of OC and F-subjunctive clauses and EC and PC infinitive clauses, as they have been categorized in the previous chapters. For convenience, one example of each is also given below.

The example in (1) is an obligatory control structure constructed with an OC-subjunctive verb. Recall that F-subjunctive structures are of two kinds. They could be obligatory control structures having a PRO subjunctive like (2a) or they may be NOC structures having a pro or lexical subject, as represented in (2b). Infinitival OC complements are divided into EC-infinitive clauses as illustrated in (3) and PC-infinitive clauses as the one in (4). While both OC-subjunctives and EC-infinitives are actually exhaustive control structures, the difference in label is considered useful for distinguishing subjunctive clauses from infinitival clauses.

(1) \[ \text{Mara}_1 \text{ a reușit PRO}_1 \text{ să doarme putin.} \]
Mara has managed să sleep.3sg little
‘Mara managed to sleep a little.’

(2) a. \[ \text{Radu}_1 \text{ speră PRO}_1 \text{ să plece el însuși}_1/*ei înșiși}_2 \text{ devreme.} \]
Radu hopes să leave.3sg himself/themselves early
‘Radu hopes to return early.’

b. \[ \text{Radu}_1 \text{ speră să plece Mara}_2/\text{pro}_2 \text{ devreme.} \]
Radu hopes să plece.3sg Mara early
‘Radu hopes that Mara will return early.’

---

\(^1\) So that I cannot, any longer, recognize myself.
Radu has dared to stay nude on beach. ‘Radu dared to stay naked on the beach.’

Mara knows that Radu hates to dance together to wedding. ‘Mara knows that Radu hates to dance together at the wedding.’

The two theories considered for Romanian OC structures are the Movement Theory of Control and the Agreement Model of Obligatory Control, both based on the Minimalism Program.

Section 5.2 is dedicated to the Movement Theory of Control (MTC). First, the tenets and the mechanism of this theory will be presented. How the MTC applies to languages reported to have OC PRO case active like Icelandic OC structures will be the topic of the next subsection. Finally, problems concerning case encountered when applying the MTC to Icelandic will be the goal of the last part of this section.

Based on the discussions of how the MTC may apply to Icelandic, Section 5.3 is an attempt to apply the MTC to Romanian OC structures. This section will actually continue the descriptive analysis of Romanian OC structures regarding the case of PRO. The analysis of structural case, default case and quirky case, along with the evidence that PRO is not a trace/copy in an A-movement chain concludes that the MTC is not attractive to Romanian OC constructions. Additionally, this section contains significant findings about case in Romanian OC and raising structures, and differences between them.

In Section 5.4, I describe Landau’s (2000, 2004 et seq.) Agreement Model of Obligatory Control. I present the features involved in this theoretical framework e.g., [Tense], [Agr], etc, and the mechanism of computation, which falls under the operation Agree (Chomsky, 2000,
2001) involving feature matching, checking, and deletion. Then, it will be shown, in detail, how this theory applies to each type of the Romanian OC structures. I will describe and show in diagrams the Agree operation involved in the process of licensing PRO. The main conclusions of this chapter will be gathered in Section 5.5

5.2 The Movement Theory of Control (MTC)

This section presents the Movement Theory of Control (MTC), an alternative approach of control proposed by Hornstein (1999, 2000, 2001 et seq.) First, the main assumption and the mechanism of the MTC will be presented, followed by Boeckx & Hornstein’s (2006) assessment of case in Icelandic OC structures and their approach of applying the MTC to this language. Finally, the problems faced by the MTC vis-à-vis the case of OC PRO will be brought up, as observed in Bobaljik & Landau (2007)

5.2.1 The Tenets and Mechanism of the MTC

Hornstein reduces control to movement so that raising and control are unified as one type of syntactic construction. In his view, OC is a consequence of A-movement and the controlled empty subject exhibits the characteristics of an NP trace/copy. He separates control into obligatory control (OC) and Non-obligatory control (NOC) and interprets obligatory control as a result of movement parallel to raising structures. Under this approach, OC PRO is a trace of the moved argument, the matrix controller, while the NOC PRO is a small pro.

In Government and Binding Chomsky (1981, 1986a, 1986b) and early minimalist approach of OC Chomsky, 1993, 1995 (the classical account of OC) the mechanism includes the following components (See also the review of control in Chapter 1):

(5)  a. An argument chain supports only one theta-role; Theta roles are not checkable features; No movement to a theta position is possible

b. PRO exists and PRO and trace are distinct
c. PRO has null case

d. Control is greed

e. Control is not movement; control and raising are different; control involves two argument chains, whereas raising involves just one.

In the classical approach, the OC sentence (6) has the configuration in (7), where the embedded clause hosts the chain of PRO, while the controller has its own chain in the matrix.

(6) [Lisa tried [to upset Roy]]

(7) [IP Lisa₁ [vp t₁Lisa tried [IP PRO₁ to [vp t₂PRO upset Roy]]]]

The tenets of the MTC listed in (8) are the major departures from the PRO tradition:

(8) a. Theta-roles are checkable features on verbs, and can trigger movement.

b. There is no upper bound on the number of theta-roles a chain can have

c. PRO and trace are indistinguishable, so PRO does not exist

d. There is no null case; the subject of infinitives (OC) is caseless

e. Greed is Enlightened Self-Interest

f. Control is movement subjected to the Minimal Link Condition (MLC)

A movement theory of control is not possible as the effect of the Theta Criterion (defined in Chapter 1). Since a DP must have only one theta role, and the position of PRO is a theta position, movement to a theta position is prohibited.

Hornstein (1999) turns theta roles into checkable features pretty much like person, gender, number features. As checkable features, theta roles can drive movement. Moreover, a DP could have an unlimited number of theta features, thus movement to a theta position becomes possible even when the respective DP has been already assigned a theta role.

Another restriction to movement is greed. Movement is a last resort operation, so that this operation happens for a reason, to check a feature. Chomsky & Lasnik (1993) assume that PRO
has a case, i.e. null case, that must be checked. Since PRO is believed to originate VP internally, it moves to embedded [Spec,IP] to check its case. Since PRO has both theta role and case, it cannot move further, to the [Spec,IP] of the matrix because it would incur a greed violation.

Later, in Lasnik (1995) Greed may be interpreted as “enlightened self interest” whereby an element moves to check a feature of its own or a feature of the target. Within the MTC, treating theta-roles as features on the verb/predicate allows a DP to move to a theta position and complies with Greed by checking that feature.

In GB traces and PRO are fundamentally distinguished. The distribution of PRO is accredited to the PRO Theorem. PRO must not be governed and heads its own chain. Traces are necessary for the Empty Category Principle (ECP), must be governed and cannot head their own chains. In GB as in the Minimalist Program A-chains are constrained to one theta role and that theta position coincides with the foot of a chain.

The main difference between PRO and traces comes from the sources of their indices. Traces derive from movement; the existence of PRO is due to theta-theory.

In Hornstein’s framework, once theta-roles may be accrued in the process of a derivation, a chain may also bear more than one theta-role. Without the theta-role restrictions, Hornstein believes that PRO like NP- trace is residue of movement. Thus, PRO does not exist. It is simply a trace or a copy in A-movement.

The Minimal Distance Principle (MDP) becomes MLC – Minimal Link Condition in the MTC. The MDP formulated first in Rosenbaum (1967) selects the closest c-commanding antecedent as the controller of PRO. Thus, x is the controller of PRO iff x c-commands PRO. In the examples below, the MDP correctly picks the controller (the subject in (9), the object in (10), and the subject in (11).
In Hornstein’s (1999) approach, the MLC is treated as a markedness condition and verbs like persuade become unmarked and promise highly marked, i.e., exceptions. Thus, the MLC restricts A-movement.

Concerning case, Hornstein expects to find OC PRO/copy in positions from which movement is licit, roughly a non-case marked position, e.g., in a nonfinite clause.

In Hornstein’s (1999) account, the mechanism of OC as a reflex of movement follows the steps shown in (12). First John merges with leave, thereby checking the verb’s theta-role. Then John moves to the embedded [Spec,IP] to check the D-features of the IP. This IP is not a case position, so John further moves to [Spec,VP] of hope and checks the external theta-feature of this verb. Each time John/the moved NP checks a theta-feature of a predicate it assumes that theta-role. John has two theta roles here (the minimum in OC movement). Finally John raises to the [Spec,IP] of the matrix to check the D-feature of the IP and nominative case.

The author points out that this is the only place where John checks case. Case is required for phonetic visibility.

(12)  a. John hopes to leave.
    b. [IP John [VP John [hopes [IP John to [VP leave]]]]]

In sum, PRO, now a copy, emerges in a non-case position, then moves for case to the case position of the matrix and once its case is checked, the respective copy becomes phonetically realized. In the process, the copy gets two theta roles: one from the embedded verb, the other from the matrix verb.
5.2.2 The MTC and Case (The Case of Icelandic)

Recently, the MTC has been expanded to incorporate case. Boekcx & Hornstein (2006), henceforth B&H, claim that A-movement is possible in a control environment in Icelandic, a language known to be, as Sigurðsson (2008) puts it, “a moderately rich case language” with “an unusually rich case agreement” and where PRO is also case active, a subject explored in depth by Andrews (1990) and Sigurðsson (1989, 1991, 2003).

The purpose of this subsection is to present B&H’s solutions intended to show that the case of PRO is not a problem in Icelandic OC structures for the MTC.

The configuration in (13) represents the generalization of case pattern in Icelandic OC structures from the available data in the literature (e.g., Sigurdsson, 1991) as interpreted by B&H, where the NP represents the matrix controller and embedded PRO matches its case with the case of floating quantifiers (QF) or with secondary predicates (SP). In B&H’s view, PRO does not exist and case clash between the controller and the embedded null subject is not possible.

(13) …NP₁αCase … […]PRO₁βCase floating Q/secondary predicate βCase …

The authors consider first some basic facts about Icelandic. They argue that overt morphological agreement on finite verbs (person, number) and passive past participles (case, number, gender) is only possible with elements bearing structural case. By contrast, all elements whether bearing structural or quirky case can agree (in case, number, gender) with SPs and FQs. Since these elements overtly display the case of the NP they relate to, B&H believe that Sigurðsson (1991) assumes (incorrectly) that their case reveals the case of PRO. As a result, in Sigurðsson’s interpretation OC PRO can bear either structural or quirky case.

B&H include two examples from Sigurðsson (1991), where the SP for alone has structural accusative (14) or quirky dative case (15).
(14) Jón bað Bjarna að koma einan.
Jon.NOM asked Bjarni.ACC to come alone.ACC
‘Jon asked Bjarni to come alone.’

(15) Jón bað Bjarna að leiðast ekki einum.
Jon.NOM asked Bjarni.ACC to be.bored not alone.DAT
‘Jon asked Bjarni not to be bored alone.’

With these basic facts about Icelandic in mind and from the available data in the literature, B&H find the following case patterns in Icelandic OC infinitival structures, where NP represents the matrix controller and the case on the embedded clause appear only on floating quantifiers (QF) and secondary predicates (SP).

(16)  
   a. nominative NP … [nominative FQ/SP …]
   b. accusative NP … [accusative FQ/SP/(marginally) default nominative FQ/SP]

(17)  
   a. nominative NP … [quirky FQ/SP …]
   b. accusative NP … [quirky FQ/SP …]

(18)  quirky NP … [default nominative FQ/SP …]

(19)  quirky NP … [quirky FQ/SP …]

The patterns (16a) and (16b) are illustrated by the sentences (20) and (21) respectively. B&H (2006:595) notice that when the antecedent is nominative (20) the SP is also nominative. If the antecedent is accusative (21) the SP is either accusative or marginally nominative. They actually conclude that accusative is strongly preferred and take this “to indicate that in such situations, nominative is really a marked default case realization.” They also say that default nominative case in nonfinite contexts is “quite common in Icelandic”.

(20)  Jón vonast til [að koma einn/*einan].
Jon.NOM hopes to to come alone.NOM/ACC
‘Jon hopes to come alone.’

(21)  Jón bað Bjarna að koma einan/??einn.
Jon.NOM asked Bjarni.ACC to come alone.ACC/NOM
‘Jon asked Bjarni to come alone.’
The sentences (22) and (23) reflect the patterns in (17) where the controller is an accusative object (22) or nominative subject (23) both bearing structural case, while the case of the SP is a quirky dative.

(22) Jón bað Bjarna að leiðast ekki einum/*einan/*einn
    Jon.NOM asked Bjarni-ACC to be.bored not alone.DAT/ACC/NOM
    ‘Jon asked Bjarni not to be bored alone.’

(23) Jón vonast til [að leiðast ekki einum/*einan/*einn].
    Jon.NOM hopes to to be.bored not alone.DAT/ACC/NOM
    ‘Jon hopes not to be bored alone.’

The matrix quirky case in the pattern (18) may be accusative (24a) or dative (24b) while the embedded case is limited to nominative. For this situation the nominative on the SP is also considered default case “as there is no source for structural nominative in the embedded clause.” p.596.

    Bjarni-ACC wanted not to to run alone.NOM/ACC
    ‘Bjarni wanted not to run alone.’

b. Bjarna leiddist að hlaupa einn/*?einum.
    Bjarni-DAT was.bored to run alone.NOM/ACC
    ‘Bjarni was bored to be running alone.’

The representations in (25) illustrate the pattern (19) with the observation that the matrix quirky case and the embedded quirky case are never the same. As can be seen, the antecedent in (25a) is quirky accusative and the SP for ‘alone’ is dative. In (25b), the antecedent is quirky dative while the SP is accusative.

(25) a. Bjarna laŋgaði ekki til að leiðast einum/*einan/*einn
    Bjarni-ACC wanted not to to be.bored alone.DAT/ACC/NOM
    ‘Bjarni wanted not to be bored alone.’

b. Bjarna leiddist að vanta einan/*einum/*einn
    Bjarni-DAT was.bored to be.missing alone.ACC/DAT/NOM
    í veisluna.
    from the.party
    ‘Bjarni was bored not to be alone at the party.’
From these data, B&H reach the conclusion that structural nominative is not available in OC structures in Icelandic either because it is default by virtue of being marked or because there is no source for structural nominative in infinitival clauses. And when “it comes to structural Case values, Icelandic control is just like English control.” Multiple case-assignments appear only where multiple quirky case values are assigned and since quirky case “is a kind of inherent Case\(^2\), as conventionally assumed (i.e., a Case that is tightly connected to theta–role assignment as opposed to agreement as Chomsky (1986) argued)”. Icelandic is again just like English.

In applying the MTC to OC structures in Icelandic, B&H (2006) assume certain rules. Following Nunes (1999, 2004) B&H assume that the case value that surfaces on a moving element in a chain is always the highest case value, where the moving element is pronounced (Case is required for phonetic visibility). In B&H’s opinion, “Case is morphologically realized only once” (p.600). In order for the embedded null subject (OC PRO) to move to the matrix case position to get structural case, it must not get structural case locally in the embedded clause.

Since no structural case is possible in an Icelandic OC and the MTC requires multiple theta-role-assignment to a single chain, the copy of the controller moves from the embedded clause where it gets a theta role to the matrix to get the second theta role and structural case. Once the structural case is assigned, the highest copy gets pronounced.

Multiple inherent/quirky case in control structures “simply follow from the connection between theta-role and inherent case”, p.597.

---

\(^2\) Schütze (1993) in his fn1 includes that Levin & Simpson’s (1981) definition of quirky case as “the displacement of structural case by non-NOM marking on subjects … and non-ACC markings on objects”, then Schütze concludes: “thus quirky is not a synonym for inherent, which refers to a case that is assigned in conjunction with a theta-role.” He also adds that not all quirky cases are inherent cases. Zaenen et al. (1985) characterize quirky case as having mixed properties showing distribution like structural case and case preservation.
Technically, the pattern in (17a)/sentences (22) with nominative NP and quirky FQ/SP is realized as in (26). The embedded quirky case equals the assignment of a theta-role to the moving element (controller), but the FQ is assigned quirky case in Step 1. Then the moved NP is attracted by the matrix verb and receives a second theta-role (Step 2). Finally, the NP gets structural case in $T^0$ and moves further to check EPP.

(26) \[ \text{NP}_i \ T^0 \ldots \ t'_i \ V^0 \ldots \ [T_{\text{inf}} \ldots \ V^0 \ [t_i \ FQ]] \]

Step 1: embedded $V^0$ assigns a theta-role/quirky Case to NP and quirky Case to FQ
Step 2: matrix $V^0$ attracts NP and assigns a theta role to it
Step 3: matrix $T^0$ assigns structural Case to NP, which moves to check EPP.

For the pattern (19)/sentences (25a,b) with quirky case upstairs and quirky case downstairs, the first two stops are those in (26). Since there is no structural case in the matrix, the NP raises (Step 3) only to check EPP. The embedded quirky case on the NP is always overridden.

When either nominative or accusative appears both in the matrix and the subordinate, the NP gets its theta-role downstairs and the second theta-role and structural case upstairs. The embedded FQ/SP gets structural case by multiple Agree. The configuration in (27) illustrates the pattern nominative NP – (default) nominative FQ/SP.

(27) \[ \text{NP}_i \ T^0 \ldots \ t'_i \ V^0 \ldots \ [T_{\text{inf}} \ldots \ V^0 \ [t_i \ FQ]] \]

Step 1: embedded $V^0$ assign a theta-role to NP
Step 2: matrix $V^0$ attracts NP and assigns a theta-role to it
Step 3: matrix $T^0$ assigns structural nominative to NP and FQ by multiple Agree

B&H (2006:602) “proposed a possible implementation of Case stacking in control.” To implement this proposal, the authors made two assumptions: “(a) Case is valued as soon as possible, and (b) Case values are fixed morphologically in the PF component.” They also assume that inherent/quirky case cannot be assigned long distance. Finally they point out that “It is important to note that such assumptions are not specific to control.”
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5.2.3 Problems with the MTC and the Case of OC PRO

B&H’s (2006) presentation of the Icelandic facts prompted criticism from Bobaljik & Landau (2007), henceforth B&L, and Sigurðsson (2008). B&L who use the same available data in the literature before B&H (2006) observe that B&H although cite these works, they “systematically neglect to mention the behavior of MP (adjectives, nouns or past participle) in infinitives” and from Sigurðsson’s (1991) paper they “selectively mention only his examples of agreement with FQ/SP.”

Sigurðsson’s (2008) reply is very detailed adding new supportive evidence (to the old one including his own) and characterizes B&H’s account as: “their presentation of the Icelandic facts is inadequate and misleading.”

I will only present the problems with B&H’s solutions for Icelandic as observed by B&L, but I will also include Sigurðsson’s (2008) general patterns of case in this language.

5.2.3.1 Quirky case

The most prominent characteristic of quirky case appears to be preservation, a phenomenon very well established due to quite numerous studies on this subject, and almost all of them included Icelandic. Case preservation means that the lower case of a DP in a chain percolates upwards to the topmost position.

Schütze (1993) dedicates a comprehensive study to the quirky case in Icelandic. He concludes that dative and genitive quirky cases are always preserved under passivization. “The most striking fact about quirky objects is that they retain their quirky case marking under passivization”, p.353. As for quirky subjects, the author notes that “quirky subject verbs embedded under an ECM verb show no change of subject case even under subsequent passive in the matrix clause because their inherent case overrides the structural case of the higher clause”, p.367.
Also, Bejar & Massam (1999:68) confirm that in Icelandic passive sentences, when both a quirky and a structural case are assigned, the quirky case must win.

More generally, Halle & Marantz (1993) argue that the more highly specified case (quirky case) is realized, i.e., in case of a DP with a quirky case and a structural case the quirky case will be phonologically realized. Also, Miller (2002:20-27) points out that structural case yields to quirky case and this is true in every language that permits only one morphological case on a word.

Based on these facts about quirky case in general and Icelandic in particular, B&L (2007) point out the problem faced by the MTC in handling Icelandic OC structures of the type included in B&H’s patterns of (22a,b), where the embedded subject is marked quirky case and the controller is marked nominative or accusative.

B&L cite Andrews (1990:189-190) who calls the phenomenon of case preservation of quirky case-marked NPs in Icelandic a “striking peculiarity”3. B&L reproduce Andrew’s illustration of case preservation under passive, in ECM/Raising-to-object, and passive of ECM. The example included below (28b) shows case preservation in subject-to-subject raising across virðist ‘seem’. (B&L indicate that the embedded predicate batna ‘recover from’ takes a dative subject and nominative object).

(28) a. Barninu batnæði veikin.
    the.child.DAT recovered.from the.disease.NOM
    ‘The child recovered from the disease.’

    b. Barninu virðist hafa batnæð veikin.
       the.child.DAT seems to.have recovered.from the.disease.NOM
       ‘The child seems to have recovered from the disease.’

3 As Sigurðsson (2008) puts it quirky case actually “repels” structural case.
Furthermore, B&L conclude that the sum of all the evidence shows that the distribution
of quirky case DPs behave like structural case DPs and that the case value that surfaces on the
moved DP is always the lowest case value, the one determined by the theta-assigning predicate.

B&L argue that in OC structures the case of the controller is determined locally, case
preservation being ungrammatical. Their illustrative example (from Andrews, 1990) is included
below. In the OC example of (29b) the lower default dative cannot reach the topmost case
position thus the case of the controller is licensed locally in the matrix. Compare (29b) with the
case percolation/preservation in (29a).

(29) a. Honum var bjargað frá fjallinu.
    him.DAT was rescued.DFLT from the.mountain
    ‘He was rescued from the mountain.’

    b. Hann/*Honnum vonast til að verða bjargað frá fjallinu.
    he.NOM/*DAT hopes to be rescued.DFLT from the.mountain
    ‘He hopes to be rescued from the mountain.’

B&L stress that the failure of case preservation in control structures “is the result of there
being two distinct nominal elements involved”: the controller and PRO, each with its own case
and its own theta-role. Consequently, if control is A-movement quirky case should be retained on
the moved DP, contrary to the facts.

B&L also notice that B&H fail to consider data where both the controller and the
controlee bear the same quirky case. B&H’s pattern (24) only shows that those quirky cases have
a different value (e.g., accusative and dative). B&L include four examples with quirky case
transmission in Icelandic implying that quirky/inherent case is not different from structural in
respect to case transmission and it cannot be reducible to a theta role. Thus, the matrix quirky
case is transmitted to PRO but the theta role is not due to unattested long-distance theta role transmission.

5.2.3.2 Icelandic OC PRO and structural case

As discussed above, B&H conclude that no structural case is possible in OC clauses in Icelandic on the grounds that nominative is considered default by virtue of markedness or because there is no source for structural case in infinitival clauses.

For B&H’s pattern (21b), accusative object control, where the embedded agreeing elements show case variation between nominative and accusative, and where accusative is considered the basic form, B&L notice two flaws. First, accusative is not always available on agreeing elements in infinitives as can be seen from the example (30a) from Thráinsson (1979), where nominative is obligatory.

(30) Ég bað María að vera tekin/*tekna af lögreglunni
I.NOM asked Maria.ACC to be taken.NOM/ACC by the.police
‘I asked Maria to be taken by the police.’

Second, nominative is not marginally possible on the floating quantifier and accusative strongly preferred. Rather, the nominative is strongly preferred or exclusively possible. Preference for nominative over accusative case transmission is clear when the agreeing element is not a SP, the only type illustrated by B&H, but an MP, a past participle as in (30).

B&L point out that although B&H cite Andrews (1982) in their fn.8 “they fail to mention that Andrews … was struck by the predominance of NOM in OC infinitives, not its marginality.” In fact, Andrews considers the case matching with the controller (accusative) as “performance”. B&L also include Sigurðsson’s (2002:712) observation that “as a matter of fact, case-copying down into the infinitive is marked or questionable for many speakers and even out
for some”⁴. Obviously, B&L conclude that nominative in Icelandic OC infinitives is not marked, nor default as a result of markedness. Recall that B&H also claim that nominative is default because there is no source for structural nominative in infinitival clauses, that is, due to lack of gender, number and case agreement with MPs.

B&L reply that the passive participle obligatorily exhibits gender, number and case agreement with the null subject of infinitival clauses showing evidence with illustrative examples like the one in (30) above. The default non-agreeing form of the participle in (30) would have been tekið. The default form is mandatory when the subject does not have structural case.

B&L include the pair in (31) taken from Sigurðsson (1991) along with his explanation. Where the embedded infinitive predicate is a structural nominative case assigner (31a) the participle must have agreeing nominative agreement. Where the embedded predicate is a quirky case assigner (31b) – ‘to be helped’ assigns dative – then the participle is obligatorily in the default/non-agreeing form.

(31) a. Strákarnir vonast til að verða aðstoðaðir/*aðstoðað.
the.boys.NOM hoped to be aided.NOM.PL/*DFLT
   ‘The boys hope to be aided.’

   b. Strákarnir vonast til að verða hjálpað/*hjálpaðir/*hjálpaðum.
the.boys.NOM hoped to be helped.DFLT/*NOM.PL/*DAT.PL
   ‘The boys hope to be helped.’

In fact, the nominative on PRO does not behave like any known instances of default nominative in Icelandic, i.e. dislocated DPs and vocative DPs. The example of (32) features a true default nominative DP (in bold), which fail to trigger agreement on participles.

(32) Strákurinn, við hann var ekki dansað/*dansaður.
the.boy.NOM with him.ACC was not dansed.DFLT/*NOM-SG-M
   ‘The boy, nobody danced with him.’

⁴ B&H’s claim that the nominative morphology is rather marked is labeled “untrue” by Sigurðsson, 2008.
To finish this subsection and for more clarity (assuming it is necessary), I add Sigurðsson’s (2008) conclusions regarding the pattern of agreement in Icelandic. He maintains that in Icelandic PRO infinitives there are elements displaying morphological reflections of case: adjectival and participial (primary) predicates (MPs); floating quantifiers; other case-agreement elements (indefinite pronouns, secondary predicates,…).

Furthermore, Sigurðsson states: “PRO usually triggers case agreement in infinitives in the same fashion as overt subjects do in finite clauses.” The general pattern is given in (33,34). It is obvious that there is no difference between finite and infinitive contexts in this respect.

\[
\begin{align*}
(33) & \quad a. \quad [\text{CP} \ldots \text{NP}, \text{NOM} \ldots \ldots \text{V}, \text{FINITE} \ldots \text{X}, \text{NOM} \ldots] \\
& \quad b. \quad [\text{CP} \ldots \text{PRO}, \text{NOM} \ldots \ldots \text{V}, \text{INF} \ldots \ldots \text{X}, \text{NOM} \ldots]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(34) & \quad a. \quad [\text{CP} \ldots \text{NP}, \text{QUIRKY} \ldots \ldots \text{V}, \text{FINITE} \ldots \text{X}, \text{QUIRKY/DFT} \ldots] \\
& \quad b. \quad [\text{CP} \ldots \text{PRO}, \text{QUIRKY} \ldots \ldots \text{V}, \text{INF} \ldots \ldots \text{X}, \text{QUIRKY/DFT} \ldots]
\end{align*}
\]

The author illustrates these generalizations with a wealth of examples, showing that PRO in OC infinitive clauses indeed triggers exactly the same agreement (including with MPs) as any lexical subjects in finite contexts. He demonstrates that only those predicative adjectives and past participles that agree in finite clauses can show agreement in PRO infinitives. He concludes that these “generalizations are exceptionless” and “they are accounted for if Icelandic PRO is assigned structural or quirky case in the same fashion as overt subject NPs in finite clauses.” Sigurðsson points out that B&H do not discuss these patterns.

B&L reach the same conclusion using Icelandic data available in the literature prior to B&H (2006). That is, OC PRO in Icelandic bears structural nominative or quirky case, which is not overridden by a matrix structural case.

5.2.3.3 The lexicalization problem

In Icelandic (and most languages) the DP subject/PRO of infinitival OC complement clauses must always be nonlexical as generally assumed. If OC in Icelandic is a reflex of A-
movement, then the MTC runs into the “lexicalization problem” according to B&L (2007) or Sigurðsson’s (2008)’ “silence problem”, that is, PRO will become phonologically realized.

B&L find that the application of the MTC to Icelandic overgenerates such OC clauses, i.e., with overt subjects⁵. They argue that since the controller and the controlee/PRO bear distinct cases and since lack of case at the base of the chain is a requirement for A-movement, than OC is not a reflex of A-movement.

They present three instances of PRO being lexicalized if control is reduced to A-movement: When PRO bears structural nominative, when PRO bears structural accusative, and when PRO bears inherent/quirky case.

Since the MTC relies on Nunes’ (1995) theory of copy deletion according to which a single copy will be spelled out in an A-chain, the one in the case position, and since it has been established that PRO bears structural (nominative) case in Icelandic, the OC chain is structurally marked twice, at the tail (PRO) and at the head (controller). Once the tail position is structurally marked nominative, that position is able to host a lexical DP, thus the embedded DP subject gets its theta-role and structural nominative and the matrix DP gets its theta-role and case in the matrix clause.

Consequently, the MTC predicts representations like (35a) from Jónsson (1996), B&L’s Overgeneration I, where the embedded null subject is lexicalized. Two separate chains (one in the matrix, one in the embedded clause) will avoid the lexicalization problem.

(35)  *Jón vonast til [hann/Eiríkur að verða ráðinn]
Jon.NOM hopes he/Eric.NOM to be hired.NOM.M.SG
‘Jon hopes for him(self)/Eric to be hired.’

⁵ B&L add that if it may be possible to have a lexical PRO subject in an OC structure (in some languages) to have both the controller and the controlee lexicalized remains a problem.
Overgeneration II, occurs when an accusative PRO become a lexical subject. In case of structural accusative case transmission, B&H’s (16b) pattern, B&L argue that this environment gives rise to a lexical accusative subject under object control, if control is movement. As a result, sentences like (36) from Thráinsson (1979:301) will be overgenerated.

(36) Ég bað Mariu [að (*hana/*Bjarna) fara þangað]
I asked Maria.ACC to he/Bjarni.ACC go there
‘I asked Maria for him/Bjarna to go there.’

Overgeneration III, lexicalizing a quirky PRO would be possible when the controlee bears quirky case and the controller is nominative, an instance of multiple case assignment accepted by B&H (2006). An example, after Zaenen et al (1985:109), is given in (37).

(37) Ég vonast til [að (*mér/*Jóni) verða hjálpad].
I.NOM hope for to me/Jon.DAT be helped
‘I hoped (for myself/Jon) to be helped.’

B&L indicate that there are two possibilities here. Either a quirky case is sufficient to license a lexical DP (as in B&H’s examples (24,25) in which situation the lexicalization of PRO is imminent (37), or a quirky case is not sufficient to license a lexical DP and the case preservation problem arises, thus (22) should not exist.

B&L (2006) conclude that B&H’s article is not a challenge to the 30 year mainstay of the basic contrast between raising and control in Icelandic – case preservation in the former and case independence in the latter, “as attesting to the fundamentally different nature of the two processes”.

“They offer a case overwriting mechanism that appears to simply fail in raising (or any other A-movement) contexts. Likewise, their discussion of NOM case in control infinitives is inconsistent with the facts as reported in all previous studies of the topic. This NOM exhibits the hallmark of standard structural case – it triggers full agreement on MPs. Not only is it not marked (as B&H claim) – it is often the only option available. B&H’s exclusive focus on the case marking of SPs/FQs, as opposed to MPs, is a crucial oversight; it renders their data irrelevant to their defaultness claim.”
Ultimately, B&L state that the previous literature on Icelandic only led to one firm conclusion that PRO bear case and “case cannot distinguish the distribution of lexical DPs from that of PRO”.

5.3 The MTC and OC in Romanian

This section presents evidence from case, similar to that in Icelandic, that renders the Movement Theory of Control problematic for Romanian obligatory control. The idea is that PRO in OC structures has standard case and cannot be reduced to a copy in an A-movement chain. Assuming that B&H’s (2006) solutions for Icelandic are meant to work across languages, at least to languages that display similar case agreement, like Romanian, this section is an attempt to apply the MTC to the OC structures in this language. This analysis is based on both B&H’s solution for Icelandic and the problems with these solutions as discussed by B&L (presented in the previous section).

5.3.1 PRO Has Standard Case

Reports of PRO bearing standard case in infinitive control contexts in languages such as Icelandic, Russian, Latin, etc and in subjunctive control Romanian and Greek, etc., have suggested that the distribution of PRO can be dissociated from case.

Comorovski (1986) was the first to notice that the emphatic pronoun pronounced in the embedded clause has the same case as the clause subject PRO in Romanian subjunctive clauses. In her view, PRO represents the antecedents (a kind of copy) for these emphatic pronouns.

The case of PRO is the case reflected on various elements marked for case: floating quantifiers, emphatic pronouns and epithets. The case of PRO is also reflected on secondary and main predicates. To avoid the repetition of similar data, examples with case agreement with MPs and SPs will be included in 5.2.3.
In (1a,b) the case of PRO is nominative, the case reflected on the agreeing floating quantifier, epithet, and the emphatic pronoun *ei înșiși/chiar ei/ei* ‘themselves’. (38a) is an OC-subjunctive structure and (38b) is its infinitive counterpart. Most of the illustrative examples used in this section will have two variants: one for subjunctive, one for infinitive.

(38) a. Băieții₁ încercă [PRO.Nom₁ să șă înoate boys.the.Nom try3.pl să swim.3pl
totì/ idiotii/ ei înșiși/ chiar ei₁ fără vestă] all/ idiots.the/ themselves/ even they.Nom without vest
‘The boys are trying to swim without a life jacket, the idiots!’

b. Băieții₁ încercă [PRO.Nom₁ a șă înota boys.the.Nom try3.pl to swim
totì/ idiotii/ ei înșiși/ chiar ei₁ fără vestă] all/ idiots.the/ themselves/ even they.Nom without vest
‘The boys are trying to swim without a life jacket, the idiots!’

The case of PRO and the case of the controller may be identical (nominative) as in (38) or distinct according to the examples (39), where the case of the DP controller is nominative and that of PRO is quirky dative. Thus, when the structural nominative is not assigned in the embedded clause, the case of PRO may be a dative quirky case, the case any lexical DP would have in the same position.

(39) a. Mara₁ încercă [PRO.Dat₁ să nu i₁ M.Nom tries să not cl.Dat se facă ei înșiși¹ dor de copii] rflx make.3sg herself.Dat longing of children
‘Mara is trying not to miss her children herself.’

b. Mara₁ încercă [PRO.Dat₁ a nu i₁ M.Nom tries to not cl.Dat se face ei înșiși¹ dor de copii] rflx make herself.Dat longing of children
‘Mara is trying not to miss her children herself.’
The following indicative constructions show that the embedded lexical subject \textit{Mara} may be nominative (40) or quirky dative (41) confirming that the case pattern of subjects is the same for lexical DPs and for PRO.

(40) \begin{align*}
\text{Radu}_1 \quad \text{speră} \quad [\text{că va ajunge} \quad \text{Mara}_2 \\
\text{R.Nom} \quad \text{hopes} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{will.3sg} \quad \text{reach} \quad \text{M.Nom} \\
\text{la timp la aeroport}] \\
\text{on time to airport} \\
\text{on time to airport}
\end{align*}

‘Radu hopes that Mara will reach the airport on time.’

(41) \begin{align*}
\text{Radu}_1 \quad \text{nu crede} \quad [\text{că i se va face} \\
\text{R.Nom} \quad \text{not believes} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{cl.Dat rflx} \quad \text{will.3sg} \quad \text{make} \\
\text{Marei}_2 \quad \text{dor} \quad \text{de familie}]. \\
\text{M.Dat} \quad \text{longing} \quad \text{of} \quad \text{family}
\end{align*}

‘Radu does not believe that Mara will miss her family.’

OC structures where the controller bears non-nominative case will be discussed in the following subsections.

5.3.2 On Raising Structures in Romanian

Since raising structures are a reflex of A-movement and OC structures are also viewed as a reflex of A-movement within the MTC framework, a background of raising structures in Romanian is provided below\(^6\). The importance of raising structures in this study is to contrast them with corresponding OC structures, in order to determine whether control is also an instance of A-movement.

The usual raising verb in Romanian is \textit{a părea} ‘to seem’. The reflexive/se verbs \textit{a se nimeri} and \textit{a se întâmpla} ‘to happen’ are mostly impersonal verbs and excluded here. Although raising structures usually appear in subjunctive constructions, their infinitive counterparts are still in use. To avoid situations where \textit{a părea} has impersonal use whose form matches the third

\(^6\) Although a number of raising sentences are used as A-movement to contrast corresponding OC sentences, a thorough analysis of raising in Romanian is neither intended nor accomplished. For other aspects/analyses of raising structures in Romanian see Motapanyane (1995) and Rivero & Geber (2005).
person singular, the subject of this verb will have other person morphology or third person plural in the illustrative examples.

The example (42a) features an infinitival raising structure and its corresponding configuration is given in (42b). As in ordinary infinitival raising structures, the subject raises to satisfy the EPP and get case.

\[(42)\]
\[
a. \text{Noi părem a fi primii.} \\
\text{we seem to be first.the} \\
\text{‘We seem to be the first ones.’} \\
b. \left[ \text{IP}_\text{Noi} \ldots \ [vP \ părem \ldots \ [\text{IP}_\text{noi} a \ldots \ [vP \text{ noi fi primii}]]] \right]
\]

The subjunctive counterpart of (42a) appears in (43a). Motapanyane (1995) argues that in such instances the subject raises not for case but for the EPP only. On the other hand Rivero (1989) believe that the subject of a subjunctive raising structure raises for case. Without arguing for one or the other, I will treat all raising structures the same, i.e. their subject moves for case and EPP. The sentence of (43a) has the configuration in (44b).

\[(43)\]
\[
a. \text{Noi părem să fim primii.} \\
\text{we seem să be.1pl first.the} \\
\text{‘We seem to be the first ones.’} \\
b. \left[ \text{IP}_\text{Noi} \ldots \ [vP \ părem \ldots \ [\text{IP}_\text{noi să} \ldots \ [vP \text{ noi fi primii}]]] \right]
\]

It is important to note that raising verbs may have a double nature. Park & Park (2004) argue that raising verbs are of two types: They select for the raising type infinitival complement or for the OC-type complement. The latter type occurs in Spanish and Italian and when a dative experiencer argument is involved. Crosslinguistic variation is expected and can be seen even between Spanish and Italian. (Italian \textit{sembrare} ‘seem’ may selectively take a dative experiencer subject in an OC structure (Park & Park, 2004)).
In Romanian, *a părea* can take an OC complement when the infinitival/subjunctive subject (PRO) is a dative experiencer (44a,b). The example (44) seems to be an instance of obligatory control for the following reason. PRO must be dative case, which should be preserved in A-movement. Since it is not, (44) should not involve A-movement. (A raising structure with case mismatch has never been attested). In 5.2.5 it will be shown that *a părea* is not able to have an inherent/quirky (non-expletive) subject.

(44)  a. Noi₁ părem [PRO₁ a ne₁ fi (nouă înșine₁) we,Nom seem to cl.Dat be (ourselves.Dat) teamă de ceva] fear of something ‘We seem to be (ourselves) afraid of something.’

   b. Noi₁ părem [PRO₁ să ne₁ fie (nouă înșine₁) we,Nom seem să cl.Dat be (ourselves.Dat) teamă de ceva] fear of something ‘We seem to be (ourselves) afraid of something.’

In (45) the verb *a părea* selects an indicative complement, whose subject is a dative experiencer marked on the clitic, hence *a părea* does not appear in raising structures only.

(45) Noi părem [că ne e teamă de ceva]. we,Nom seem that cl.Dat is fear of something ‘We seem to be afraid of something.’

The standard configuration of an OC structure, e.g., of (44a) repeated in (46a), is given in (46b) where there is a chain in the matrix (of the subject *noi ‘we’*) and one in the embedded clause, of PRO. In agreement with the MTC, there should be just one chain in (46b) as shown in (47). Notice that the copies have two forms in (47).

(46)  a. Noi₁ părem [PRO.Dat₁ a ne₁ fi (nouă înșine₁) we,Nom seem to cl.Dat be (ourselves.Dat) teamă de ceva] fear of something ‘We seem to be (ourselves) afraid of something.’
Even ignoring that a copy has two different forms in the same chain (47) and deleting them leaving the topmost (nominative) copy to be spelled out, the dative clitic *ne* (in bold), the mandatory double of the copy *nouă*, serves as evidence that a case have been assigned (to PRO) in the subordinate. (Again, the dative clitic *ne* is the double of *nouă* ‘to us’. Only the clitic is required. *Nouă* is optional but excluded in OC clauses simply because PRO is never lexical). It is not clear how the MTC would operate in this context. Quirky case in OC and raising will be discussed in 5.2.5.

5.3.3 Structural Case

The cardinal claim in B&H (2006) is that nominative case in infinitive contexts and nominative case in finite contexts are distinct species. Thus, nominative case in OC clauses would not be structural in Icelandic, and for that matter in Romanian, because of lack of agreement in the infinitive and because nominative would be marginal/marked and consequently a default case.

B&H (2006:592) state: “Overt morphological agreement on finite verbs (person, number) and passive past participle (case, number, gender) can only take place with elements bearing structural case”. Furthermore, the agreement must be shown on MP elements: passive participles and predicate nominals as opposed to floating quantifiers, emphatic pronouns, and SPs like the adjective *singură* ‘alone’ in (49a,b and 50a,b). (By the quoted statement, the MTC is automatically excluded from subjunctive obligatory control).
As already seen, B&L (2007) and Sigurðsson (2008) demonstrate that infinitives trigger the same agreement as in finite clauses, including that with main predicates. Consequently, regular structural nominative morphology is manifested in infinitive control clauses in Icelandic.

In Romanian (as in many languages), these two main predicate elements, passive participles, adjectives and predicate nominals are always nominative both in infinitive and finite (i.e., indicative, subjunctive, etc) contexts according to Sigurðsson’s (1989:308) and Schütze’s (1997:370) generalization:

(48) Passive participles agree only with nominative arguments, or ECM accusative arguments.

In Romanian, MPs have different forms for gender and number only, while their case is invariably nominative. Romanian lacks ECM structures.

Our task here is to show that indeed infinitive structures trigger the same agreement as in finite structures in order to establish that by B&H’s account the embedded nominative subject in an OC clause, the only possible structural case of a subject in Romanian, is a structural nominative.

The illustrative examples that follow feature OC sentences whose controllers bear non-nominative case. This will eliminate the possibility of nominative case transmission to PRO. It will be demonstrated that the agreeing elements in the embedded clauses bear nominative case only, and no case variation is possible.

The examples in (49), (50), (51) are OC structures (subjunctive and infinitive) whose PRO subjects are nominative and the controllers are accusative object (49), dative object (50) and quirky dative subject (51). All the a. and b. examples show agreement with emphatic/reflexive pronouns. (49a,b) and (50a,b) also show agreement with an SP (singură ‘alone’). The rest of the examples show agreement with MPs: passive participles (c,d) and
predicate nominals (e,f). Both subjunctive and infinitive examples trigger the same kinds of agreement with SP and MP elements.

(49)  Accusative object controller – nominative PRO
   a. Radu₁ a convins-o₂ pe Mara₂ PRO₂
      R.Nom has convinced- her P Mara.Acc
      să se₂ întoarcă ea însăşi₂ singură₂ acasă.
      să rflx return3.sg herself.Nom/*Acc alone.fem.Nom/*Acc home
      ‘Radu convinced Mara to return home alone (by herself).’
   b. Radu₁ a convins-o₂ pe Mara₂ PRO₂
      R.Nom has convinced- her P Mara.Acc
      a se₂ întoarce ea însăşi₂ singură₂ acasă.
      to rflx return herself.Nom/*Acc alone.fem.Nom/*Acc home
      ‘Radu convinced Mara to return home alone (by herself).’
   c. Radu₁ a convins-o₂ pe Mara₂ PRO₂ să fie
      R.Nom has convinced-her P M.Acc să be.3sg
      tratată₂ la spital.
      treated.fem.Nom/*Acc at hospital
      ‘Radu has convinced Mara to be treated at the hospital.’
   d. Radu₁ a convins-o₂ pe Mara₂ PRO₂ a fi
      R.Nom has convinced-her P M.Acc to be
      tratată₂ la spital.
      treated.fem.Nom/*Acc at hospital
      ‘Radu convinced Mara to be treated at the hospital.’
   e. L₁- am sfătuit PRO₁ să fie om₁ bun₁.
      cl.Acc- have.1sg advised să be.3sg man.Nom/*Acc good
      ‘I advised him to be a good man.’
   f. L₁- am sfătuit PRO₁ a fi om₁ bun₁.
      cl.Acc- have.1sg advised to be man.Nom/*Acc good
      ‘I advised him to be a good man.’

(50)  Dative object controller – nominative PRO
   a. Radu₁ i₂- a cerut Marei₂ PRO₂
      R.Nom cl.Dat- has asked M.Dat
      să stea singură₂ acasă.
      să stay.3sg alone.fem.Nom/*Dat home
      ‘Radu asked Mara to stay home alone.’
   b. Radu₁ i₂- a cerut Marei₂ PRO₂
      R.Nom cl.Dat- has asked M.Dat
      a sta singură₂ acasă.
to stay alone.fem.Nom/*Dat home
‘Radu asked Mara to stay home alone.’

c. Radu₁ i₂- a cerut Marei₂ PRO₂
R.Nom cl.Dat- has asked M.Dat
să fie pregătită₂ pentru petrecere
to be.3sg prepared.fem.Nom/*Dat for party
‘Radu asked Mara to be prepared for the party.’

d. Radu₁ i₂- a cerut Marei₂ PRO₂
R.Nom cl.Dat- has asked M.Dat
a fi pregătită₂ pentru petrecere
to be prepared.fem.Nom/*Dat for party
‘Radu asked Mara to be prepared for the party.’

e. Mara₁ i₂- a cerut lui₂ Radu₂ PRO₂
M.Nom cl.Dat has asked cl.Dat Radu
să fie politicos₂
să be.3sg polite.masc.Nom/*Dat
‘Mara asked Radu to be polite.’

f. Mara₁ i₂- a cerut lui₂ Radu₂ PRO₂
M.Nom cl.Dat has asked cl.Dat Radu
a fi politicos₂
to be polite.masc.Nom/*Dat
‘Mara asked Radu to be polite.’

(51) Quirky subject (dative) controller – nominative PRO

a. Marei₁ îi₁ e rușine PRO₁ să înoate goală₁
M.Dat cl.Dat is shame să swim.3sg naked.Nom/*Dat
‘Mara is ashamed to swim naked.’

b. Lui₁ Radu₁ îi₁ e frică PRO₁
cl.Dat Radu cl.Dat is fear
a se₁ rade el însuși₁
to rflx shave himself.Nom/*Dat
‘Radu is afraid to shave with a knife.’

c. Marei₁ îi₁ e dor PRO₁
M.Dat cl.Dat is longing
să fie dansată₁ toată noaptea.
să be danced.Nom/*Dat all night
‘Mara longs to have someone take her dancing all night.’
Any of the examples above can be replicated with PRO displaying any person or number, not only third person singular. The PRO in the next two examples is first person (52) and second person (53) and the agreeing elements are MPs. Example (54) shows that the nominal predicate in an indicative embedded clause bears exactly the same gender, number, and case agreement as in the infinitive OC structure of (53).

\[(52)\quad \text{Mi}_1 \quad \text{ai} \quad \text{cerut} \quad \text{PRO}_1 \quad (1\text{sg.Nom}) \text{ displays}\]
\[
\text{cl.1sg.Dat-} \quad \text{have.2sg} \quad \text{asked} \\
\text{a} \quad \text{fi} \quad \text{pregătită}_1 \quad \text{pentru petrecere} \\
\text{to be prepared.fem.Nom/*Dat} \quad \text{for} \quad \text{party} \\
\text{‘You asked me to be prepared for the party.’}\]

\[(53)\quad \text{Nu ştim} \quad [\text{că vă}_1 \quad \text{e ruşine} \quad \text{PRO}_1 \quad (2\text{sg.Nom}) \quad \text{not} \quad \text{knew.1sg} \quad \text{that you.pl.Dat-is shame} \\
\text{a} \quad \text{fi} \quad \text{săraci}] \\
\text{to be poor.pl.masc.Nom/*Dat} \\
\text{‘I didn’t know that you are ashamed to be poor.’}\]

\[(54)\quad \text{Nu ştim} \quad [\text{că vă}_1 \quad \text{e ruşine} \quad \text{PRO}_1 \quad (2\text{sg.Nom}) \quad \text{not} \quad \text{knew.1sg} \quad \text{that you.pl.Dat-is shame} \\
\text{că} \quad \text{sunteţi} \quad \text{săraci}] \\
\text{to are.2pl} \quad \text{poor.pl.masc.Nom/*Dat} \\
\text{‘I didn’t know that you are ashamed to be poor.’}\]

B&H’s (2006) claim that no structural case is possible in an infinitival clause is extended to the overt subject of the infinitival adjunct clause of (55). While it is plain that the nominative
case of subjects in adjuncts and complements is the same (structural), the difference in lexicalization must be traced to some other (non-case) factors. (55) actually shows that if a lexical subject marked nominative is possible in infinitive constructions case is not necessarily associated with verbal agreement\(^7\). (55) also demonstrates that there are sources for structural nominative in infinitive clauses, contrary to B&H’S (2006:601) claim in reference to Icelandic infinitival clauses “as there is no source for structural nominative in the embedded clause”.

\[
(55) \quad \text{Radu}\ a\ \text{plecat}\ \text{înainte}\ \text{de}\ \text{a}\ \text{veni}\ \text{Mara}. \\
\text{R.Nom}\ \text{has}\ \text{left}\ \text{before}\ \text{de}\ \text{to}\ \text{come}\ \text{Mara.Nom} \\
\text{‘Radu left before Mara arrived’}
\]

In addition, there is considerable support for the existence of non-finite case assigners as revealed in various studies like Babby (1991), Schütze (1997), Petter (1998), and especially Harbert & Toribio’s (1991) crosslinguistic evidence that non-finite Infl can assign nominative.

Consequently, the attempt to show by B&H’s assumptions that the OC PRO does not have structural case when nominative fails for Romanian in exactly the same ways it fails for Icelandic. Their claim that agreement is what sets apart default nominative from structural nominative does not hold, as also pointed out by Sigurðsson (2008): “However, if the notion of ‘default nominative’ is to make sense as a different notion than ‘structural nominative’, one would expect it to differ from the latter precisely in being an elsewhere case, invisible to agreement.”

One can only conclude that the infinitive triggers the same agreement as in finite clauses and the subject of an infinitive, lexical (55) or not, has the same structural nominative as any subject marked nominative in finite contexts. Thus, these nominative PROs are instances of “true structural nominative” in B&H’s (2006:595) own words. In sum, the facts illustrate the

\(^7\) Bejar & Massam (1999:77) observe that nominative case and agreement are not “crucially intertwined”.
existence of an independent source for structural nominative in infinitive and OC clauses in general in Romanian.

Once PRO bears structural case it is frozen for purposes of A-movement. Chomsky (1995, 2001) rules out raising from a case-marked position to another case-marked position by his claim that case on a noun is deleted or erased once checked. B&H (2006) also abide by this principle. They mention that the embedded null subject must not get structural case locally in order to be able to move to the matrix case position.

If the MTC applies to the OC sentences included in this subsection, we will get into B&L’s ‘lexicalization problem’ or Sigurðsson’s (2008) ‘silence problem’, hence a sentence like (56) will be wrongly predicted (where the silent embedded subject gets lexicalized).

(56) *Mara₁ i²- a cerut lui₂ Radu₂ PRO₂
    M.Nom cl.Dat has asked cl.Dat Radu
    a fi Ion politicos₂
to be Ion polite.masc.Nom/*Dat
    *Mara asked Radu to John be polite

In the end, B&H (2006) would probably admit that the OC structures discussed in this subsection might not be suitable for the MTC.

5.3.4 Default Case

Recall that B&H’s second argument to sustain the non-structural nature of OC PRO case in Icelandic is the idea that an SP could be marked either nominative or accusative and the nominative is the marked case. Based on this markedness, they further conclude that this nominative is also a default case and as such is also nonstructural. As already discussed, the markedness of nominative and the idea that it is default and consequently nonstructural has been disproved for Icelandic.
In Romanian case variation hardly ever occurs. For instance, there is no case variation in the embedded clause on any of the examples of (57, 58, 59). In fact, case variation may only occur with certain verbs, specifically, the three verbs meaning *to accuse*.

The verb *a acusa* ‘to accuse’ (and synonyms *a blama/a învinovăți* ‘to blame/to accuse’) when used reflexively can trigger either nominative or accusative agreement on emphatic pronouns. If case alternation occurs in this particular environment it is possible in any structure, finite or nonfinite, as reflected by the following examples: indicative (57); subjunctive object control (58a); infinitive object control (58b).

(57) Radu crede că Mara se acuză
Radu Nom believes that M.Nom rflx acuses ea însăși/ pe ea însăși de ceva.
herself.Nom/ herself.Acc of something
‘Radu believes that Mara accuses herself of something.’

(58) a. Radu a rugat-o pe Mara
Radu has asked-her P Mara.Acc să nu se acuze ea însăși/ pe ea însăși de ceva.
să not rflx accuse.3sg herself.Nom/ herself.Acc of something
‘Radu asked Mara not to accuse herself of something.’

b. Radu a rugat-o pe Mara
Radu has asked-her P Mara.Acc a nu se acuza ea însăși/ pe ea însăși de ceva.
to not rflx accuse herself.Nom/ herself.Acc of something
‘Radu asked Mara not to accuse herself of something.’

The embedded accusative is not necessarily transmitted as implied by the examples of (58). The controller in the next example is nominative, but the nominative-accusative alternation is still possible (59).

(59) (Eu) încerc să nu mă acuz
(I).Nom try să not rflx accuse.1sg eu însămi/ pe mine însămi de ceva
myself.Nom/ myself.Acc of something
‘I am trying not to accuse myself of anything.’
As expected, a possible main predicate remains nominative shown on the past participle of the indicative sentence of (60) and the OC structure of (61). More important is the unavailability of accusative in these sentences, suggesting that nominative is the winner. Indeed, nominative is the norm or strongly preferred (or out for some speakers) in the above examples.

(60) a. Radu a fost acuzat el însuși /*pe el însuși
R.Nom has been accused.masc.Nom himself.Nom/*Acc
de ceva
of something
‘Radu has been accused (himself) of something.’

(61) (Eu) am reușit PRO1 a nu fi blamat1
I have managed to not be blamed.masc.Nom
eu însumi/*pe mine însumi1 pentru accident.
myself.Nom/*Acc for accident
‘I managed not to be blamed for the accident.’

Since B&H assume that the more marked option is the default, then accusative would have to be the default in this instance, as it is for the language as a whole (as also indicated in Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:209, fn 26). The fact that nominative is the preferred form means it cannot be the default case. As argued above, it behaves in all ways like a structural case.

Consequently, the nominative in these examples is not marked or default, and is therefore structural by B&H’s own assumptions.8

The idea that nominative on a DP would not be structural because it does not trigger agreement with MPs or because it may be marked/default does not stand, as demonstrated.

Since it has been made clear that PRO bears structural case when marked nominative and it cannot be default since accusative is the default case, the case of PRO in (62) must be structural nominative, either as independently assigned locally or transmitted from the matrix subject (controller). The nominative form of the nominal predicate further indicates that the case

8 This objectionable formulation of structural nominative and default case is exclusively that of B&H (2006).
of PRO in (62) is structural nominative. (The default case is not possible here since the accusative form of the reflexive is not permitted).

(62) Radu1 a încercat PRO1 a fi R.Nom has tried to be el însuşi/*pe el însuşi1 soţ1 bun. himself.Nom/*Acc husband.Nom good

‘Radu tried to be a good husband.’

Case transmission occurs from a higher position to a lower position, e.g., from the matrix controller to PRO, in the opposite direction of case preservation, that is. Case transmission is subject to crosslinguistic variation and it is not easy to account for case transmission vs. internal nominative case marking, as there is no universal test that works across languages (Landau, 2007). According to the standard analysis of case transmission and Landau (2007), the most favorable conditions for obligatory⁹ case transmission to occur are: OC structures with subject control and no lexical complementizer (and in purpose clauses without lexical complementizer). However, as Landau argues, the combination of these conditions does not necessarily result in case transmission.

If nominative case transmission in (62) were possible, it would occur in the manners described in Sigurðsson (2008), either in syntax or post syntax. The author argues that if case is decided in syntax, before the transfer to the interfaces, case transmission would have semantic correlates and it would also involve backtracking, thereby violating cyclicity (Chomsky 2005) which forbids acyclic insertion. In this situation, basic nominative case would be assigned in the infinitive to the MP and to the PRO since its case is considered concord. When a nominative controller is merged later in the derivation the computation needs to go back down into the infinitive to overwrite the original infinitive case with the case of the controller.

---

⁹ Optional case transmission may happen in object OC structure. In Icelandic the controller’s structural accusative case is optionally transmitted to PRO.
In the post-syntax approach “case may markedly drip down from the controller to the non-quirky PRO and further to the infinitival predicate”. Sigurðsson (2008) concludes: “More commonly PRO and hence its predicate gets independent nominative case.”

Whether there is room for the MTC to apply in such contexts, is for B&H (2006) to decide.

5.3.5 Quirky Case

This subsection highlights the differences between OC structures and raising structures in regard to quirky/inherent dative subjects. (I use the term quirky/inherent as also used by B&H, 2006, and B&L, 2007). Recall that quirky case manifests preservation in A-movement, but is independent in control. Recall also that, for examples like (63), B&L (2007) see two possible scenarios if the MTC were to be applied. If quirky/inherent case can be assigned to a DP, then the null controlled element will become lexicalized and the sentences will crash. (The higher subject in (64) below is assigned quirky/inherent case). If quirky/inherent case cannot be assigned, then case preservation of the quirky case should take place and the matrix subject should be also marked quirky dative, hence (63) should not be possible.

(63) a. (Eu)₁ am încercat PRO₁ să-mi înving țeama.
   I.Nom have tried să -cl.Dat overcome.1sg fear.the
   ‘I tried to overcome my fear.’

   b. (Eu)₁ am încercat PRO₁ a-mi învinge țeama.
   I.Nom have tried to-cl.Dat overcome fear.the
   ‘I tried to overcome my fear.’

Let’s see what happens when the matrix subject is a quirky dative DP. In the OC examples of (64) the matrix subject is a (quirky) dative experiencer accompanied by its (doubling) clitic whose presence is mandatory.

(64) a. Nouă₁ ne₁ e rușine PRO₁ să înotăm goi₁.
   we.Dat cl.Dat is shame să swim.3sg naked.
   ‘We are ashamed to swim naked.’
Any attempt to construct the corresponding raising sentences of (64) fails. The examples of (65a,b) are ungrammatical, despite the use of the verb in the impersonal form *pare* ‘it seems’ or the form that agrees with the DP *nouă* ‘to us’ in person and number, *părem* ‘we seem’. As B&L (2007) observe, although the matrix case assigners under the MTC assumptions must assign structural case to an OC controller, the same assigners are not able to assign quirky DP to the subject of a raising verb in an A-movement configuration like (65a,b).

(65) a  *Nouă₁ ne₁ pare/părem să înotăm bine.
we.Dat cl.Dat seems/seem.1pl sā swim.1pl well
‘We seem to swim well.’

b. *Nouă₁ ne₁ pare/părem a înota bine.
we.Dat cl.Dat seems/seem.1pl to swim well
‘We seem to swim well.’

In addition, if (65) were grammatical, they would have been instances of obligatory control. The structure-type of (65) is available in Spanish (66) and Italian (67) as obligatory control structures. Park & Park (2004) explain that in (66,67) the embedded nominative DP cannot undergo Move over the dative experiencer, the matrix subject that is5, thus these

---

10 In Italian, the embedded nominative may move across a dative experiencer to the nominative subject in the matrix, when the dative experiencer is an oblique. The dative DP (clitic) is not part of the A-chain with nominative traces/copies. The Romanian version is shown in (ii).

(i) Gianni₁ gli₂ sembra [TP t₁ essere stanco]
G.Nom them.Dat seems to-be tired
‘To them, Gianni seems to be tired.’

(ii) Radu₁ imi₂ pare [t₁ a fi obosit.
R.Nom cl.Dat seems to be tired
‘To me, Radu seems to be tired./It seems to me that Radu is tired.’
representations are OC⁶. (Note in passing the presence of the Italian infinitival complementizer *di* in (67), which never occurs in real raising structures).

(66)  A Emilio₁ le₁ parece t₁ [CP PRO₁ haber jugado bien]
Emilio.Dat cl.he.Dat seems have.Inf played well
‘Emilio seems to himself to have played well.’
Park &Park (2004:218)

(67)  Mi₁ sembra t₁ [CP di PRO₁ avere dormito bene]
I.Dat seems Comp have.Inf slept well
‘I feel that I have slept well.’
Park &Park (2004:219)

The meaning in (66,67) can be conveyed with the indicative in Romanian. The Romanian version of the Italian example (67) is constructed with indicative (68).

(68)  Îmi pare [că am dormit bine]
me.Dat seems that have slept well
‘I feel that I slept well.’

In sum, when *pare* takes a subjunctive or infinitive complement, this verb is not able to have an experiencer subject marked with quirky dative. If that were possible, as in Spanish and Italian, the respective structures would have been instances of obligatory control (on a par with the Spanish and Italian counterparts).

It follows that the MTC plays no role in the OC structures of (64). For one thing, in such examples the embedded nominative is structural, as demonstrated in ‘5.2.3’, and raising is not allowed from a (structural) case position, as also assumed by B&H (2006). Moreover, the ungrammatical raising examples of (65) constitute evidence that A-movement is not possible when the embedded subject is nominative and the matrix subject position is a quirky dative.

---

11 Interestingly, Park & Park (2004) never considered the embedded nominative in (66) and (67) as nonstructural or that these sentences are a reflex of movement. On the contrary, A-movement is not an option for these examples simply by being OC structures.
Taking into account examples like (63) with embedded quirky dative and matrix nominal DP and the examples like (64) where the cases are inverted (the embedded subject position is nominative and the matrix subject position is quirky dative), we can further conclude that in an OC structure if one subject position is marked quirky dative, A-movement is not an option. If raising is A-movement and control is A-movement, it is mysterious that only control permits case mismatches.

Quirky DPs appear in constructions with a părea, but since they could be subjects as well as obliques (as also pointed out by Zaenen et al, 1985, and Schütze, 1993) it is important to distinguish between them. For instance, the dative DP is a subject in (64) but a goal in (69) below. Copiilor ‘to the children’ may be misinterpreted as the subject in (69a). However, changing the number on the verb a părea renders the sentence ungrammatical (69b). Replacing dulciurile ‘the sweets’ with a singular noun (and keeping the plural verbal agreement) the derivation crashes (69c). This shows that the matrix verb agrees with toate dulciurile ‘all sweets’, which is the subject. The dative argument does not trigger number agreement on the verb. This is clearer in (69d).

(69) a. Copiilor par să le placă toate dulciurile.
children.Dat seem.3pl să cl.3pl.Dat like.3pl all sweets.the.Nom
‘All sweets seem to please the children.’/It’s the children all sweets seem to please.’

b. *Copiilor pare să le placă toate dulciurile.
children.Dat seem.3sg să cl.Dat like.3sg/pl all sweets.the.Nom

c. *Copiilor pare să le placă filmul.
children.Dat seem.3pl să cl.Dat like.3pl movie.the,Nom
‘The movie seems to please the children.’

d. Toate dulciurile par să le placă copiilor.
all sweets.Nom seem.3pl să cl.Dat like.3pl children.Dat
‘All sweets seem to please the children.’
We have seen that (64) contains a quirky subject, but (69) in no way involves quirky case subject. *Copiilor* appears to be in a subject position, but in reality it is inherent case associated with the experiencer role of *a plăcea* ‘to please’ in a focus position.

The representations of (70) are OC structures where the upstairs and the downstairs subject positions are both marked inherent/quirky dative. The impossibility of the corresponding raising structures (71) is quite significant. It shows that even if both dative clitics have the same form/case the derivations are still ruled out. This suggests that an A-chain with two case positions is not allowed in raising. The occurrence of two clitics in the same sentence does not affect (70) because it involves two separate A-chains, one in the embedded clause, one in the matrix.

(70) a. Fetelor1 le1 e jenă PRO1 să le1 fie rău la petrecere girls.Dat cl.Dat is shame să cl.Dat be.3sg sick at party ‘The girls are ashamed of getting sick at the party.’

       b. Fetelor1 le1 e jenă PRO1 a le1 fi rău la petrecere girls.Dat cl.Dat is shame to cl.Dat be sick at party ‘The girls are ashamed of getting sick at the party.’

(71) a. *Fetelor1 le1 pare să le1 fie rău la petrecere girls.Dat cl.Dat seems să cl.Dat be.3sg sick at party to the girls seems shameful to get sick at the party

       b. *Fetelor1 le1 pare a le1 fi rău la petrecere girls.Dat cl.Dat seems to cl.Dat be sick at party to the girls seems shameful to get sick at the party

Again, the MTC cannot be applied to OC structures of the type represented in (70) despite the idea that multiple inherent/quirky case represents “the connection between theta-role and inherent case” in OC (B&H, 2006:597).

The sentences in (70) may also be instances of inherent/quirky case transmission, implying that case transmission does not distinguish between structural and inherent case. B&L
observe that if inherent/quirky case manifests case transmission, inherent/quirky case is not identical/reducible to a theta role. The matrix quirky case is transmitted to PRO but the theta role is not.

In this subsection it has been shown that if an inherent/quirky case marks one or both of the subject positions in an OC structure, A-movement is not possible, thus the MTC is not an option for such structures. Romanian data confirm the crucial difference between raising and control, that a case mismatch is possible in the latter but not in the former. Even in (subject) case matching contexts with clitic doubling, like (70) above, raising is not possible because the clitics are case marked indicating a separate A-chain for each clitic (71).

5.3.6.  PRO is not a Trace

All the examples of OC configurations presented above that are not compatible with the MTC show that PRO is not a trace/copy. PRO is not a copy of the controller, merged in [Spec,vP] and then moved to the subject position of the matrix. PRO is a separate entity belonging only to the embedded clause. Next, I consider two more constructions that also argue against the property of PRO being a trace.

5.3.6.1  Se-reflexivization

The examples in (72) and (73) from Rizzi (1986b) via Landau (2003) are translated and adapted for Romanian. (72a,b) feature raising constructs in subjunctive and infinitive contexts and their OC corresponding constructs are given in (73a,b). In (72), the reflexive ăşi is the dative form of se meaning ‘to each other’. The subject ‘the two candidates’ is a nominative DP.

(72)  
\begin{itemize}
    \item a. *Cei doi candidați ăşi par ă să poată învinge the two candidates rflx.Dat seem ă be-able win.Inf
         ‘The two candidates appear to each other to be able to win.’
    \item b. *Cei doi candidați ăşi par ă putea învinge the two candidates rflx.Dat seem to be-able win.Inf
         ‘The two candidates appear to each other to be able to win.’
\end{itemize}
Apparently, the ungrammaticality in (72) is caused by candidați ‘candidates’ moving over or skipping the reciprocal position coindexed with it. The OC examples (73) are grammatical because without movement, which is not necessary, no chain is formed to include the reflexive.

(73) a. Cei doi candidațiși au promis PRO₁ să fie leali. The two candidates rflx.Dat have promised să be loyal.pl
   ‘The two candidates promised each other to be loyal.’

   b. Cei doi candidați și au promis PRO₁ a fi leali. The two candidates rflx.Dat have promised to be loyal.pl
   ‘The two candidates promised each other to be loyal.’

As Landau observes, the question here is why the MLC is violated in (72) but not in (73). Evidently because the moved NP in A-movement (72a,b) cannot skip a position coindexed with it. In Landau’s view, the contrast (72a,b) – (73a,b) diagnoses NP-movement in raising but not in control. Therefore, PRO is not a trace.

5.3.6.2 Lexical complementizers

Recall that the infinitival complementizer de may be present or absent in infinitival complements (74), a phenomenon in effect throughout the existence of these structures.

The occurrence of subjunctive obligatory control clauses with the lexical complementizer ca is possible in OSR (76). In raising structures with either infinitive or subjunctive the respective complementizer is disallowed as the contrasts in (75) and (77) indicate.

Finally, the fact that lexical complementizers preclude raising but not obligatory control implies that there are two chains in the latter (and case is assigned separately in the matrix and the embedded clause), whereas the chain in raising cannot cross over C to get case and the derivations crash, as in (75a) and (77a).

(74) a. Radu₁ îndrăznește de PRO₁ a mă deranja. Radu dares de to me.Acc disturb
   ‘Radu dares to disturb me.’
(75) a. *Radu pare de a citi. 
Radu seems de to read

c. Radu pare a citi
Radu seems to read
‘Radu seems to read.’

(76) Mara_1 îndrăznește ca PRO_1 să mă supere. 
Mara dares that să me.Acc bother.3sg
‘Mara dares to bother me.’

Mara seems that să read.3sg

b. Mara pare să citească. 
Mara seems să read.3sg
‘Mara seems to read.’

In summary, the presence of an overt complementizer, along with the remainder of the evidence, indicates that obligatory control and raising are different structures, and that A-movement applies only to raising. Ultimately, then, in Romanian, as in Icelandic, PRO cannot be reduced to a trace or a copy in an A-movement chain.

To conclude this section, it has been shown that, when PRO in obligatory control does not bear dative case, it bears regular structural nominative. By B&H’s (2006) assumptions, it has been shown that the infinitive triggers the same agreement manifested in finite contexts. In addition, there is evidence for structural nominative in infinitive structures in Romanian (and across languages). The claim that nominative may be a default case has been also dismissed on the grounds that accusative is the default case in this language. Thus, nominative is a standard/structural nominative on PRO and there is no rationale for movement to the matrix subject position to get structural case. In addition, the MTC applies only if the moving element (controlee/PRO) is not in a case position (B&H, 2006) otherwise lexicalization problems arise (B&L, 2007b).
Regarding inherent/quirky subjects, there are OC configurations that cannot be replicated by raising configurations showing that OC and raising are not reflexes of the same (A-movement) operation.

Also, lexical complementizers and se-reflexivization disrupt the A-chain in raising, but have no effect on OC because no movement is involved in the latter.

The OC configurations found to be incompatible with A-movement are:

(78)  
   a. Nominative PRO under accusative object controller (49)  
   b. Nominative PRO under dative object controller (50)  
   c. Nominative PRO under quirky/inherent dative subject controller (51,64)  
   d. Quirky/inherent dative PRO under nominative controller (63)  
   e. Quirky/inherent dative PRO under quirky/inherent dative controller (70)  
   f. Se-reflexivization (73)  
   g. Any infinitive OC when introduced by the complementizer de (74)  
   h. Any subjunctive OC when introduced by ca in OSR (76)  

Technically, it may be possible to apply the MTC to a sentence like (62) repeated in (79a), where both the controller and controlee bear nominative case. However, since (79b) cannot involve raising over the overt complementizer de, any attempt to apply the MTC in (79a), e.g., by ignoring or overriding the structural nominative of PRO, would be quite unattractive.

(79)  
   a. Radu R.Nom a încercat PRO1 a fi R.Nom has tried to be el însuş/*pe el însuş1 sot1 bun. himself.Nom/*Acc husband.Nom good ‘Radu tried to be a good husband.’  
   b. Radu R.Nom a încercat de PRO1 a fi sot1 bun. R.Nom has tried to be husband.Nom good ‘Radu tried to be a good husband.’

Consequently, as it appears, PRO is not a trace/copy and obligatory control is not A-movement. PRO has its own standard case, the case any lexical DP would have in the same position. The controller is not selected by the embedded verb, does not belong to the embedded clause, is not c-commanded by the embedded verb and does not receive case from it.
5.4 Agreement Model of Obligatory Control

Landau (2000, 2004, 2006 and subsequent work) uses tense, phi-features and the domain of C to explain the properties of OC and NOC. As the tense domain of a clause, C contains tense information that needs to be matched with the I head of the (embedded) clause. As already mentioned (in 3.4), following Pesetsky & Torrego (2000, 2001), Landau assumes that C is the place for the uninterpretable [Tense] features and the matching interpretable [Tense] features are on I0.

Landau designs “The Agreement Model of Obligatory Control (OC)” where OC is a reflex of an Agree relation between the matrix functional head that licenses the controller and an [Agr] bearing element, the embedded C, or PRO. Thus, OC “exploits two routes”: a direct Agree relation with PRO or mediated by C (Landau, 2007).

Landau’s main assumptions about obligatory control are listed in (80),

(80) a. PRO, the silent subject of an OC complement, exists and is not a trace/copy in an A-chain;

b. PRO has standard case, thus the distribution of PRO should be divorced from case;

c. OC is not a reflex of A-movement; OC cannot be reduced to raising;

d. Lexical complementizers are possible in OC structures

In this section I recapitulate the salient features of the Agreement Model of OC with stress on its technicality, the “calculus of control”. I put together an inventory of all the features (interpretable and uninterpretable) for each of the involved heads. For clarity, all the uninterpretable features will bear the label \( u \) and the interpretable ones the label \( i \). For each diagram of the five Romanian complement types, I will show each Agree operation, the features involved and the outcome of the respective Agree operation.
5.4.1 Features Involved in Agreement Model of OC

5.4.1.1 [T]ense features

In Landau’s framework, tense and agreement have essential roles and the relevant
features are [T] and [Agr] on both C0 and I0. [T] is always interpretable on I0 and uninterpretable
on C0 and is checked between I0 and C0. Recall that OC-subjunctive and EC-infinitives have
anaphoric tense whose feature is [-T] and F-subjunctive and PC-infinitives have dependent tense,
represented by the feature [+T]. Both anaphoric tensed and dependent tensed complements have
a [T] feature on C0, showing that their tense is selected. The selecting head is the matrix
predicate. Thus, a feature [T] is on C0 when selected by the matrix predicate only.

Landau points out that Tense is semantic not morphological, thus OC-subjunctives are [-T]
although their verbs are morphologically marked, whereas PC-infinitives are [+T]. (For
independent (free) tense, unselected, the feature [+T] appears only on I0 – e.g., indicative). The
feature [T] for all five clause-types is given in Table 5-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C0</th>
<th>I0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC-subjunctive</td>
<td>u[-T]</td>
<td>i[-T]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC infinitive</td>
<td>u[-T]</td>
<td>i[-T]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-infinitive</td>
<td>u[+T]</td>
<td>i[+T]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-subjunctive+NOC</td>
<td>u[+T]</td>
<td>i[+T]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-subjunctive+OC</td>
<td>u[+T]</td>
<td>i[+T]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.1.2 [Agr] features

[Agr] feature is simply morphological, a bundle of phi-features, thus OC and F-
subjunctive complements are endowed with the feature [+Agr] on I0 because of the verbal
morphology (overt agreement). It follows that the I0 head of infinitive complements bears an
abstract [-Agr] feature – with no morphological realization. So, [+Agr] and [-Agr] can match in
their values of phi-features and enter an agree relation. PRO has no inherent phi-features, but it
has slots for number, gender and person to be valued under agreement with the controller. In
other words, PRO’s phi-features are initially unvalued. As a DP, PRO has an interpretable [+Agr] feature. Recall that PRO has its own structural case, which is clause bound, so it can be different from the case of the controller, that is, case is not included in [Agr].

Landau (2004) argues that Agr on C⁰ is not morphologically visible (except perhaps in cases of inflectional complementizers). He assumes that any kind of agreement on C⁰ visible or not is [+Agr]. He also assumes that [+Agr] is parasitic on [+T]. Thus, [-T] or lack of [T] on C⁰ entails lack of [Agr] on this head – the case for OC-subjunctives and EC-infinitives. Since F-subjunctives and PC-infinitives have [+T] on I⁰, they will also have [+Agr] on C⁰. [Agr] is uninterpretable on both heads. OC and EC clauses have no [Agr] on C⁰. The difference between [-Agr] and [+Agr] on I⁰ represents that difference in morphological realization. As abstract phi values, they are the same.

The table 5-2 shows that the combination [+T], [+Agr] on I⁰ stands for no control in F-subjunctive+NOC. The subject of this clause is a lexical DP or pro, thus having an interpretable [+Agr] feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C⁰</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>I⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC-subjunctive</td>
<td>u[-T]</td>
<td>i[+Agr]</td>
<td>i[-T] u[+Agr]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC infinitive</td>
<td>u[-T]</td>
<td>i[+Agr]</td>
<td>i[-T] u[-Agr]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 5-2 shows that the combination [+T], [+Agr] on I⁰ stands for no control in F-subjunctive+NOC. The subject of this clause is a lexical DP or pro, thus having an interpretable [+Agr] feature.
5.4.1.3 [R] features

Landau “exploits” the referential distinction between PRO and lexical DPs and encodes this distinction as an interpretable feature [R]. Thus, lexical DPs and *pro* are encoded [+R], and (nonreferential) PRO [-R], which requires an antecedent for identification.

Consequently, the empty subject (PRO) of EC and PC-infinitives and OC subjunctives is [-R], while the subject of F-subjunctive clauses is [+R] for NOC contexts and [-R] for OC contexts. Both values of [R] are interpretable on nominals (DP, *pro*, and PRO) and uninterpretable on functional heads: I⁰ and C⁰ (Landau 2004:841).

The “interface” between the clause type features and the DP features is stated in an R-assignment Rule (Landau 2004:842). According to this rule, if I⁰ or C⁰ are specified for [+T, +Agr], the respective head will bear [+R]; any other combination, containing a negative value, leads to [-R]. For instance, F-subjunctives have [+T, +Agr] on both C⁰ and I⁰, due to their dependent tense and overt morphology on the verb. All the features and their loci involved in the respective embedded clauses are given in Table 5-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C⁰</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>I⁰</th>
<th>DP/pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

DP/pro also have i[+Agr]

As can be seen, only the combination [+T,+Agr] results in [+R] on C⁰ and I⁰, according to the R-assignment rule. What is important in Landau’s framework is that any negative specification of [T] or [Agr] on I⁰ licenses PRO. He points out that the syntactic environments that require a lexical subject form a natural class. “PRO is the elsewhere case of lexical
subjects”. PRO does not belong to its own natural class (Landau, 2006:8). This is the distribution of PRO.

The matrix controller, as a DP, has the features i [+R ,+Agr]. The controller is represented by the functional head (F) that licenses the controller. F inherits the features [+/-R] from the controller (Landau, 2006:11). The matrix F has uninterpretable phi-features (Landau, 2000:65). The feature [R] on F, a functional head, is also uninterpretable. In case of subject control, the value of [R] on F is positive when F is the T head. The value of [R] is negative in case the controller is a PRO. F in object control is little v, in which case there is no [R] value; The F head would have only u[+Agr] feature.

5.4.2 Landau’s Mechanism of Computation

Following Chomsky (2000, 2001) obligatory control falls under the operation Agree, involving feature matching, checking, and deletion.

It is assumed that the checked features persist to the end of their phase so that the DP controller does not consume the features of the functional (matrix) head completely. Thus, the features can enter another checking relation before being erased.

The goal of the operation Agree in OC is either PRO (yielding EC) or embedded Agr (yielding PC). Agr is a potential goal because of its uninterpretable features that need to be erased. PRO is a potential goal because of its anaphoric feature [-R]. This [-R] gives the direction to coindex the phi-features of PRO with those of an antecedent. Thus, PRO establishes an Agree relation with the matrix antecedent.

The probe of the operation Agree is the matrix functional head F. F enters an agree relation with the controller DP from which it inherits the features [Agr] and [R]. F then enters a second agree relation with PRO, either directly, or through C⁰. Agree delivers the phi features that F inherited from the matrix argument (controller) to PRO. This way, the features of PRO are
valued by the controller, via F, which explains why PRO and the matrix controller have the same identity.

Licensing of the subject (PRO) means checking off whatever uninterpretable features I₀ and C₀ may bear. The features of PRO are interpretable and never erased.

5.4.3 Subjunctive and Infinitive Complements

For each of the five structures in the tables above, I will include one illustrative sentence, a tree diagram of the embedded clause, and a diagram with all the involved elements with their respective features, all the agree operations, and the erasure of the uninterpretable features. The shaded features show that they enter a second agree relation.

The sentences have a lexical complementizer in parentheses to show that *ca* is possible in all subjunctive complements in OSR and that *de* is possible in infinitive complements.

For Romanian, the domain of I needs to be split into M₀ from (M)oodP headed by să (for subjunctive complements) or a (for infinitival complements) replacing I₀, and T, in order to provide a landing site for the moved verb, subjunctive or infinitive.

5.4.3.1 F-subjunctive clauses: NOC

As established, in F-subjunctive contexts (81) there are an interpretable [+T] feature on M₀ (I₀) and a uninterpretable [+T] feature on C₀. Also [+Agr] appears on both heads, which makes them both to be associated with [+R], according to the R-assignment Rule.

The difference between OC-subjunctive clauses and F-subjunctive clauses is the lack of feature [Agr] on C and the negative [Tense] feature on the former. OC-subjunctives and F-subjunctives yielding obligatory control are similar in that they have PRO subject with its interpretable features [-R], [+Agr].

(81) a. Radu₁ vrea (ca) să gătească Mara₂.
Radu wants (that) să cook.3sg Mara ‘Radu wants Mara to cook.’
For the first agree operation in the F-subjunctive NOC of (80), the lexical DP or pro (the embedded subject) checks the features [+Agr], [+R] on M⁰ under Agree 1. The same features on M⁰ (shaded) are still available to check their counterparts on C⁰, so M⁰ enters a second agree relation with C⁰. It is assumed that the checked features are still accessible (for another checking) and only at the end of the phase become inaccessible (Chomsky 2000, 2001). So, M⁰ and C⁰ enter an agree relation and the uninterpretable features on both heads get erased – Agree 2.

Finally, Agree 3 between the matrix DP and F leads to the erasing of the uninterpretable features of F.
5.4.3.2  F-subjunctive clauses: OC

$C^0$ and $M^0$ have the same features in both F-subjunctive with no control and with OC. In an F-subjunctive with OC like (82) however, there is PRO with the interpretable feature [-R] and [+Agr].

(82) a. Mara$_1$ speră (ca) PRO$_1$ să plece (ea însăși$_1$) curând.
Mara hopes sá leave.3sg (herself) soon
‘Mara hopes (for herself) to leave soon.’

b. DP…F….CP
   |   |
   C (ca)  MP
   |
PRO  TP
|
M  vP
   |
plece  v
   |
tplece  v'
   |
v
   |
AdvP
   |
tplece
   |
curând

In (82), PRO enters an agree relation with $M^0$ with the feature [+Agr] under Agree 1.

Through Agree 2, the identical features $u[+R]$ on $M^0$ and $C^0$ check and cancel each other off. The feature $u[+Agr]$ of $M^0$ enters a second agree relation, at this time with $C^0$. Also, the interpretable [+T] feature of $M^0$ checks off its uninterpretable counterpart on $C^0$.
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Agree 3 occurs between the matrix (controller) DP and the functional head F which enters an agree relation to evaluate de features u[+Agr, +R] on F. These features are not erased right away, but remain accessible for another agree relation.

The anaphoric nature of PRO requires identification with an antecedent. This is mediated by C in Agree 4. The [+Agr] on C⁰ is still accessible for a second relation with F to ensure the control relation. (F agrees with C⁰, which is coindexed with PRO via M⁰). This is possible because C is the head of the phase, so its features are deleted at the next phase up. The uninterpretable features being erased, and PRO is licensed.

5.4.3.3 OC-subjunctive clauses

An OC-subjunctive clause (83) has an interpretable [-T] on I⁰ and uninterpretable [-T] feature on C⁰, which leads to no [Agr] feature on this node. A feature [+Agr] appears only on I⁰. Under the R-assignment rule, I⁰ is associated with [-R]. There is no [R] value on C⁰ because of lack of [Agr]. PRO has the interpretable features [-R], [+Agr].

(83) a. Radu, încearcă (ca) PRO₁ să doarmă. Radu tries (that) să sleep.3sg
   'Radu is trying to sleep.'

b. DP…F….CP
   |   C (ca)
   |   PRO
   |   TP
   |   M să doarmă
   |   vP
   |   tPRO
   |   v
   |   vP
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In the context of (82), first PRO checks the features [-R] and [+Agr] on M. So, the eraser of [-R] on I is PRO: Agree 1. Then, M and C enter an agree relation and the uninterpretable [-T] feature on C is erased under the operation Agree 2. Under Agree 3, the DP controller values the features of F. The features on F are not used up, so they can enter another Agree relation (with PRO). As the anaphoric nature of PRO (being [-R]) requires an antecedent, PRO enters another agree relation with F to value its features: Agree 4.

5.4.3.4 EC-infinitive clauses

Like OC-subjunctives, an EC clause (84) has the feature [-T] on C and I and [-Agr] on I. Then [-T], [-Agr] on I leads to [-R] on this node. There is no [-R] value on C.

(84) a. Radu încearcă (de) PRO1 a dormi. Radu tries (de) to sleep
   'Radu is trying to sleep.'
Agree 1 takes place between M⁰ and PRO. Since there is no [R] feature on C⁰, the only eraser of u[-R] on M⁰ is PRO. [+Agr] of PRO can also erase u[-Agr] on M⁰.

Under Agree 2, between M⁰ and C⁰, the interpretable feature [-T] of M⁰ erases the uninterpretable feature [-T] of C⁰.

Agree 3, between the matrix DP and F valuate, the uninterpretable features of F, but they remain accessible for a new agree relation.

Agree 4. PRO enters an Agree relation with F for valuation/identification. PRO uses its feature [+Agr]. After that, the features of F are erased.

5.4.3.5 PC-infinitive clauses

The example (85) features a PC infinitive complement. Recall that PRO in PC structures includes the controller and some members of the group.

The tables above show that in PC-infinitives, C⁰ bears the features [+T], [+Agr], a combination associated with [+R] in conformity with the R-assignment Rule. The value of [R] on M⁰ is negative due to the negative [-Agr].

(85) a. Mara₁ știe că Mara knows that Radu₂ nu speră (de) PRO₂+ a se reuni curând. Radu not hopes (de) to rflx reunite soon ‘Mara knows that Radu does not hope to reunite soon.’ (i.e. ‘Mara knows that Radu does not hope that they will reunite soon.’)
M⁰ enters two Agree relations: with PRO and C⁰. [-Agr] of M⁰ takes place in both as allowed by Phase Theory. Thus, Agree 1 between PRO and M⁰ takes place with the participation of u[-Agr]. This feature remains accessible for a second agree relation (with C⁰).

C⁰ having the feature [+Agr] enters an agree relation with [-Agr] on M⁰ under Agree 2. ([+Agr] on C and [-Agr] on I⁰ constitute a match (in their values of phi-features) and enter an agreement relation (Landau 2004:839)). [-Agr] on C⁰ remains accessible for a second agree relation (with F).

Through Agree 3, between the matrix DP and F, the features of F are valuated but remain accessible for a second agree relation.
Finally, \( C^0 \) enters a second agree relation with the matrix head \( F \) (which inherits [+R] from the matrix DP) to get rid of its uninterpretable [+R], allowing PRO to be licensed: \textit{Agree} 4. Thus, PC infinitives are mediated by \( C^0 \), the second route in Landau’s Agreement Model of OC.

### 5.4.4 Moving PRO to the Subject Position

Chomsky (1972) defines EPP, Extended Projection Principle, as: "Every clause must have a subject". Then Chomsky (1995) redefines EPP as a strong D feature on T that triggers subject raising or expletive insertion in [Spec,TP]. That is, the subject position must be filled. According to this principle, moving PRO to the [Spec,TP] of a controlled clause would not be a problem for a language like English considered to have a strong D feature on T. Since the subject in Romanian can remain \textit{in situ}, where it is merged, the EPP is not a solution for moving PRO.

Landau (2007a) argues that PRO, as an element with no phonological realization, cannot satisfy the EPP, hence control clauses lack the EPP property, or the [P] feature, in Landau’s terms. The licensing feature of PRO, [-R], is considered by Landau to be a selectional feature of T. Being a selectional feature, it can only be satisfied locally. As the [P] of EPP drives the raising of an overt subject to [Spec,TP], [-R] drives the raising of PRO to [Spec,TP].

Agreement alone cannot drive movement and p(honological)-selection does not apply to PRO so, by elimination, s-selection by the T head is responsible for PRO in [Spec,TP]. In this configuration, the EPP is not involved. Landau (2007a) considers the EPP divorced from control because the EPP effects are restricted to P(honological F(orms).

This section has presented a detailed description of how Landau’s Agreement Model of OC can be applied to all instances of obligatory control in Romanian: EC and PC infinitives, OC-subjunctive, and OC in F-subjunctive. This framework, as illustrated in Landau (2004, 2006) can also accommodate the NOC variety of F-subjunctives.
However, one minor adjustment was necessary. What is the I head in Landau’s configuration becomes the M head of MoodP for Romanian, for the mood markers sâ and a. This way, IP is split into MP and TP. The T projection is considered the landing site for the moved verb.

A mechanism for moving PRO to the subject position, [Spec, MP] in Romanian, is provided by Landau (2007a), in which the feature [-R] triggers the raising of PRO to this position.

5.5. Conclusions

The task of this chapter was to provide a theoretical framework for the subjunctive and infinitival obligatory control structures in Romanian, in order to account for the characteristics of these structures as described in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

Based on B&H’s (2006) and B&L (2007) I showed that the MTC is not the best choice for OC clauses in Romanian, especially because of the case of PRO. Contrary to B&H’s assumptions, a nominative PRO bears a standard/structural case, as proven by the fact that an infinitive triggers the same agreement manifested in finite contexts, and by the availability of structural nominative in infinitive clauses. These facts are difficult to explain if case is assigned only once (in the matrix subject position) and PRO is a trace in an A-chain.

Since OC and raising have been shown to have different properties in Romanian, it is not surprising that a case mismatch, e.g., when the controller or controlee bears inherent or quirky case, is possible only with an OC structure, not with a raising structure. Moreover, Matching inherent or quirky case upstairs and downstairs is not possible because the dative clitics can be shown to belong to separate chains. Finally, the fact that lexical complementizers can occur in OC but not in raising also demonstrates the absence of a chain in OC. If there were such a chain, a filled C should cause the derivation to crash, as it does with raising structures.
On many recent accounts, PRO has standard case, entailing that its distribution must be accounted for in some other manner. In this regards, the Agreement Model fits the Romanian data better than the MTC does. To demonstrate this, I have applied the Agreement Model to all of the relevant Romanian data, illustrating in detail the Agree operations involved in the licensing of PRO and the erasing of the intersecting uninterpretable features.
6.1 Summary and Findings

One of the major contributions of this study is the history of the Romanian infinitive, with a detailed account of its phonological, semantic, morphological and syntactic changes. This account differs from previous philological studies in including data from original written sources never before investigated.

My history of the infinitive documents the stages of development of this syntactic category and, additionally, provides valuable information about infinitival complement clauses in general. Finally, the wealth of data from the written sources used for my analysis of infinitival complement clauses has great value for future research on these constructions, which have all but disappeared from Contemporary Romanian.

The parallel analyses of subjunctive complement and infinitival complement clauses revealed a number of similarities between the two. First, OC-subjunctive clauses and EC-infinitival clauses are selected by the same semantic classes of verbs, and F-subjunctives and PC infinitives are also selected by their own types of matrix verbs. Furthermore, OC-subjunctives and EC-infinitives display anaphoric tense and F-subjunctives and PC-infinitives have dependent tense. While OC-subjunctives, EC-infinitives and PC-infinitives are obligatory control structures, F-subjunctives may be OC or NOC clauses, similar to the complements of English verbs prefer, want, etc which may either take OC or NOC complements.

---

1 To read and not to understand is to winnow the wind.
In this study, it has been finally demonstrated that the subjunctive particle să and the infinitival particle a are, without any doubt, mood markers, I/M elements, heading their own projection MP. It has also been argued that the infinitival particle de, never analyzed before, is a complementizer in general and an infinitival complementizer in particular in conformity to the presented evidence. In Romance in general, de/di is also an infinitival complementizer, as argued by Rizzi (1982), Kayne (1981, 2000) and others.

In spite of the subjunctive verbal morphology, the tense of subjunctive complement clauses is semantic, anaphoric for OC-subjunctives and dependent for F-subjunctives. And in spite of the person morphology, the null subject of subjunctive OC structures is PRO, resulting from the characteristics associated with this entity. This raises the question whether there is any evidence of the obligatory agreement beginning to disappear when the subject is PRO (and not lexical).

It is a general fact about Romanian that a clitic cannot climb over sentential functional heads, such as negation, M0, or C0. Moreover, a negation cannot cross over a complementizer or an M head.

Obviation, dubbed “general obviation” as in Romance when the embedded subject of a subjunctive complement is always disjoint in reference from the matrix subject does not occur in Romanian. Also, “reduced obviation” which occurs in the presence of certain elements, such as a complementizer is also absent from Romanian subjunctive complements.

Of great significance is the evidence that PRO has standard structural nominative, as demonstrated, or inherent or quirky dative when nominative is not assigned. PRO is indeed assigned the same case a lexical subject is assigned. Having its own standard case, PRO is not a trace in an A-movement chain, a fact further substantiated by the presence of lexical complementizers, which disallow movement across them. Inherent or quirky case in either of the
two subject positions of an OC sentence, or in both, proved to be fatal for movement. Clitic
doubling acts as palpable evidence that a case has been assigned in the respective clause, thus
indicating a separate chain for each clause.

Case is the main reason why the MTC is not appealing for Romanian OC structures. Since
the Agreement Model of OC divorces case from the distribution of PRO, and OC is not a reflex
of A-movement, this theory is better equipped for the OC in Romanian.

6.2 Suggestions for Future Research

It remains unclear why obviation does not occur in F-subjunctive complements. The
subjunctive particle sǎ and the visibility of the MoodP headed by the particle may be the cause,
although how this would work to prevent obviation needs to be determined. One idea can be
found in Martineau (1994) who suggests that the lack of obviation in Older French would be the
result of the visible MoodP, which restricts the binding domain to the embedded subjunctive
clause.

There is still a debate about the CP/IP type of these clauses resulting from the presence or
absence of a complementizer. Some researchers argue that a clause is a CP clause only when a
lexical complementizer introduces it, while other researchers argue that the presence of a
complementizer is not the sine qua non condition for a clause to be of the CP type. The latter
group also argues that subjunctive clauses should be CP clauses. Thus, it is necessary to find a
common ground of how to establish the type of clause in general and for Romanian and Balkan
subjunctives in particular.

Concerning the Romanian infinitive, many topics remain in need of analysis. First, the
elements of obligatory control in infinitival adjunct clauses are to be described and a theoretical
approach to account for such structures is to be established. An example of adjunct OC with
infinitive is given in (1).
Radu a plecat fără a spune la revedere
Radu has left without to say good-bye’
‘Radu left without saying good-bye.’

The temporal adjuncts of the type (2) are included with their Romance counterparts in the larger category called Personal Infinitives (Ledgeway, 1998, 2000). They also need to be analyzed and compared with other Romance corresponding structures.

Mara a terminat articolul înainte de a sosì Radu.
Mara has finished article before de to arrive Radu
‘Mara finished the article before Radu arrived.’

The list of predicates that can select de a-infinitive complements (Section 4.3) must be completed. In addition, the preposition de and other prepositions that appear to be different from the complementizer de found in infinitival complements must be analyzed.

Attention must also be paid to the relative function of de, which is moribund in indicative constructions as in (3).

Acei copaci de se văd în depărtare.
those trees which rflx see in the distance
‘Those trees which can be seen in the distance.’

Raising structures, particularly those constructed with subjunctive need to be thoroughly analyzed. For instance, a list of the raising predicates needs to be provided, and whether the subject raises for case or other reasons must also be established. Most importantly, the differences between raising and OC structures must be highlighted to avoid confusion between the two. In other words, some raising verbs may have double nature, i.e., they are able to take OC complements in addition to raising complements.

Finally, a comprehensive and precise account of case patterns in Romanian would be very useful, especially in situations where inherent or quirky case is assigned. This case can mark both subjects and objects and it seems hard to distinguish the two. Case transmission may
or may not occur in Romanian, but to determine this a language specific test is required (Landau, 2007).
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