Splitting Fin in Romanian subjunctives

Data. The replacement of infinitives with subjunctives, as in (3), is a Balkan Sprachbund phenomenon that has a late start in Romanian (Rom) - i.e., in 16th – 17th c., compared to ≈13th c. in Bulgarian; 7th c. in Greek (Joseph 1980). Hence, it is well attested in Early Modern Romanian (EMR) texts. The unquestioned assumption in Balkan linguistics (Sandfeld 1930 a.o.) is that the trigger for this replacement is the same for all the languages involved and that it arises from the nominalization of infinitives (i.e., change from [V] to [N]), which further triggers a feature switch from [-] to [+finite] in complements with unvalued [tense] (Joseph 1983; Roussou 2009). A closer look at the Rom data indicates, however, a different situation in this language: long infinitives (e.g., *pascere* 'to guard') are replaced with short infinitives (e.g., *a pasce* 'to guard') (see 1), and with *de*-indicatives (see 2), long before the *să* subjunctive emerges (see 3).

(1)   duhulŭ   svîntŭ puse [cercetători **a**   **pasce** beserica   domnului]
        spirit.the holly   put   shepherds to.**INF** guard church.the Lord.the.GEN
        'The holly spirit put shepherds to guard the Lord's church.'(Frîncu 1969: 101/33)

(2)   pusără   [de **au**   **făcut** peciate ţării   Moldovei]
        put.3pl   de have.**IND.3PL** made emblem country.the.GEN Moldova.the.GEN
        'they put (them) to make an emblem for Moldova'(Ureche 1958: 72)

(3)   au pus craiul   [pe   oameni de ai lui **să-i**   **poruncească**]
        has put king.the DOM men   of the his **SUBJ**-to.him order.**SUBJ.3**
        'the prince put some of his men to order him around' (Costin 1979: 41)

Question. If the nominalization of long infinitives triggered the replacements in (1)/(2) early in the emerging Rom, why is it still the case that the subjunctive arises in EMR and replaces the replacements (i.e., both (1)&(2)), as in (3)? How was that implemented, technically?

Thesis. This paper argues that the switch to subjunctives in EMR is triggered by ambiguity in the marking of *irrealis* in the CP of selected clauses (not the need to replace the long infinitives, as in other Balkan languages). The target of re-analysis is the CP (i.e., the modal feature of Fin), and the side effect is the replacement of other sentential complements by the subjunctive.

Framework. We use Rizzi's (1997) articulation of the CP to grasp the changes in the sentential complements: clause typing [+/-qu]/[Op] are in Force; [finiteness], [modal] in Fin. Roberts' (2010) gradience/gradualness of feature change allows us to break down [modal] into [+/- realis] and [mode]; the latter is distinct from grammatical [mood], which is associated with T. [Mode] stands for the subtypes of irrealis modality, e.g., beliefs/wishes <u>vs</u> conditions (Saeed 2003).

Observations. Corpus search and secondary sources lead us to the *assessments* given in *italics*.

- Rom inherited subjunctive verb roots from Latin (Fischer 1985). These subjunctives occurred only in imperative and conditional clauses before the 16th c. *A subjunctive verb form is not sufficient to generate a subjunctive clause; the latter arises only after the emergence of a subjunctive mood marker (să).*

- Short infinitives display an infinitive mood marker *a* 'to' that precedes the infectum verb stem. It replaced the long infinitive in most contexts in pre-EMR (Frâncu 2009). *Notably, a 'to' infinitives precede să subjunctives by centuries, and the mood marker a is extended to the archaic long infinitives in order to block their re-categorization as nouns.*

- The subjunctive clause arises after the re-analysis of the <u>conditional complementizer **să**</u> as a subjunctive mood marker (Frîncu 1969). ***Să** is in complementary distribution with **de** as conditional complementizers before the time of re-analysis.*

- Statistics show that, by the end of the 18th c., 'want' verbs and impersonal verbs adopted the subjunctive complement (90%), whereas aspectuals were resistant to the switch (2.5%) (Frîncu 1969). *The subjunctive arises and thrives in selected clauses with irrealis modality, competing with **de**-indicatives and **a** 'to'- short infinitives, as in (1),(2),(3).*

Analysis. **(i)** In pre-EMR, *să* in Force spells out the conditional operator (Frâncu 2009), which has an intrinsic *irrealis* modality. Change occurs as a gradient distinction in features (conditional operator vs irrealis), and gradually, *să* loses the operator feature, but keeps the irrealis modality: *să* is re-analyzed in Fin versus Force. Evidence: (a) Topic and Focus constituents follow conditional *să* but precede subjunctive *să*; (b) Mood and finiteness are underspecified with conditional *să* (which combines with indicative, conditional, infinitive, subjunctive verbs), but valued with subjunctive *să* (only indicative or subjunctive verb forms). **(ii)** Grammatical [mood] is in T, which licenses subjunctive verb roots in conditional or imperative clauses before the emergence of subjunctive clauses. **(iii)** *de* is a wild card for EMR CPs, occurring as a Force operator (in reduced relatives, conditionals), or in Fin, with no predictable [finite] or [modal] values (e.g., it heads infinitives or indicatives, in both [+/-irrealis] contexts). Modern Rom has eliminated *de* from most constructions, and replaced it with less ambiguous complementizers. **(iv)** There is a short-lived transitional construction displaying the sequence *de să* in subjunctive complements. Word order indicates that both items are in Fin, i.e., above the Neg > T sequence, but lower than FocP. Hence, Fin has been split, with Fin *de* marking [+finite]/[-realis], and Mood *să* marking [mode] as a subset of *irrealis* (e.g., wishes/beliefs vs conditions/options). The split being a marked option in grammar, spell out is obligatory for [mode] but not for the super-ordinate [-realis]. Thus, *de* is dropped, and later (17th c.) it is replaced with *ca* 'that (optional). On the other hand, *de* becomes the default conditional complementizer, replacing *să.* **(v)** Subjunctive *să* and infinitive *a* 'to' clauses are analyzed as structurally equivalent (i.e. Force/FinP). Evidence: contexts where the infinitive does not qualify as Force/FinP do not undergo the replacement (e.g., *putea* 'can'+ bare short infinitives). The weakening of [+tense] in selected infinitives (i.e., less evidence for Nominative subjects in these clauses) leads to their replacement with the subjunctive (which maintains the finiteness of Fin).

Summary. In pre-EMR grammar, *de* spells out Fin syncretically ([+/- finite], [modal]), the values for [modal] being established contextually. At the same time, grammatical [mood] is associated with T, and has no consequences for the value of [modal]. *De* and *să* alternate as conditional complementizers; eventually, *de* becomes the preferred option as conditional Force, while *să* is re-analyzed as Fin. Gradually, *să* is re-analyzed as a certain type of Fin (i.e., subjunctive) outside the conditionals, and the new subjunctive clause replaces *de*-indicative complements. The replacement extends to the structurally equivalent infinitive complements, which were losing their finiteness. This re-analysis of *să* and the spread of the subjunctive clause are not isolated events: they occurs in the wider context of replacement or specialization of the ambiguous *de* in EMR CPs, a drift that starts around the 16th c. (e.g., the emergence of supine clauses has the same trigger, i.e. *de* in non-finite relatives; Hill 2013).

Conclusion. Gradience/gradualness of feature change (Roberts 2010) triggers the emergence of the subjunctive mood marker/clause in EMR: Fin is split in Fin-Mood. I.e., [Fin > Mood$_{să/a}$ > T] vs [Fin > T] in It. dialects (D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010). MoodP is defined as part of the CP field vs the IP field in previous analyses (Cornilescu 2000 a.o.).