

# Diachronic Change and Feature Instability: The Cycles of Fin in Romanian OC

## 1 Introduction

Generative grammar studies on constructions with obligatory control (henceforth, OC) have long signalled a typological contrast in the derivational patterns in Balkan versus Romance languages (see the overview in Rivero and Ralli 2001). Generally, these analyses try to explain how, in OC contexts, the Balkan subjunctive, which displays finite (i.e., [+Agr]) verb forms, conforms to the same underlying configuration as the Romance infinitive, which displays a non-finite (i.e., [-Agr]) verb form (e.g., Terzi 1992, Krapova 1999, etc.). This chapter revisits the issue from the perspective of Old Romanian data and diachronic changes in Romanian.<sup>1</sup>

First, we suggest that the parametric divide between Romance and Balkan OC is deeper than previously proposed. Landau (2013) argues that OC is forced in complement clauses when either semantic tense is missing (i.e. [-T]/anaphoric) or when morphological agreement is absent (i.e. [-Agr]). While Romance and Balkan languages both involve anaphoric tense with OC, they have other opposing properties (Kempchinsky 2009, Hill and Alboiu 2016). In particular, Romance OC involves a full-fledged/phasal clause (i.e., ForceP of Rizzi 1997), with [-T,-Agr] and PRO subjects, while Balkan OC involves a truncated/non-phasal subjunctive complement (i.e. FinP), with [-T,+Agr] and no PRO. We show that this property has remained unchanged in the history of Romanian. We also show that, instead of PRO, there is evidence for DP raising in Old Romanian, as proposed for Modern Romanian in Alboiu (2007), following Hornstein (1999).

Second, we argue that Old Romanian is forced to adopt certain syntactic innovations in order to accommodate the tension between the underlying Balkan OC structure and the syntactic properties of the Romance morphology that feeds it. In particular, the intrinsic [Force] formal properties of Romance complementizers are at odds with the [Fin] cartography we argue for in Old Romanian OC (i.e. the Balkan pattern of derivation) and this leads to synchronic variations and diachronic changes that reflect repeated reanalyses of complementizers and [Agr] feature values. In this respect, we identify the emergence of a systematic cycle of change by which a C head is split when a new spell out is introduced, only to be remerged once the new spell out stabilizes its morpho-syntactic properties.

The chapter is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the data and related questions. The investigation is couched in the framework of the minimalist program, which is expanded with cartographic tests to help diagnose the size of complement clauses, as outlined in section 3. Section 4 starts with the typological contrast for OC in Balkan versus Romance languages and continues with an overview of OC in Old Romanian. Section 5 shows that, in Old Romanian OC constructions, the parametric setting for the Balkan pattern of syntactic derivation conflicts with the syntactic properties of its morphological inventory, which is of Romance origin. This typological mix results in a continuous cycle of syncretic to split to remerged C, affecting Fin, the selected C head in OC constructions. Section 6 concludes that the parametric setting for Balkan OC remains unchanged in Romanian at the price of changes in the micro-parameters for the mapping of C features and the spell out of embedded T.

---

<sup>1</sup> Old Romanian - sometimes also referred to as ‘Early Modern Romanian’ to match the timeline of other Romance languages - is the language of the earliest Romanian manuscripts (16<sup>th</sup> -18<sup>th</sup> century). For more information on the text chronology in Old Romanian, see Hill & Alboiu (2016) and Timotin (2016).

## 2 Data and questions

Old Romanian displays four types of complementation in OC contexts, as in (1).<sup>2</sup> In (1a-d), the matrix verb is constant and has the same reading (i.e., ability versus inferential). This indicates free alternation of these constructions, a fact further reinforced by the possibility of conjoining two different inflectional types, as in (1e-f), with coordination between the indicative and subjunctive, and subjunctive and infinitive, respectively.<sup>3</sup>

- (1) a *numai iscălitura învățasă [de o făcea]* **de-indicative**  
 only signature.DEF learned.PS.3 DE her= made.IMPF.3  
 ‘he only learned to sign his name’ (Neculce {93})
- b *au început a învăța [cărți a scrie]* **a-infinitive**  
 has= began.PP A learn.INF letters A write.INF  
 ‘he began learning to write letters’ (CM II {278})
- c *de oaste au învățatu [să să grijască]* **să-subjunctive**  
 of army has= learned.PP SA REFL take.care.SUBJ.3  
 ‘he learned to take care of the army’ (Ureche {73})
- d *le-au învățat [toate de covârșit]* **de-supine**  
 them=has= learned.PP all.F.PL DE improved.SUP  
 ‘for she learned to improve everything’ (Filerot {213})
- e *că lasă oile lor de le mănâncă lupii și să junghe și să piarză.*  
 for allow.3 sheep.the their DE them= eat.IND.3 wolves  
 and SA slaughter.SUBJ.3 and SA lose.SUBJ.3  
 ‘for they allow for their sheep to be eaten by wolves, and to be slaughtered, and to be lost’ (Antim {135})
- f *când va cineva să știe tocmi și a chema oamenii cătră credință*  
 when wants someone SA know. SUBJ.3 negotiate and  
 A call.INF men.the towards faith  
 ‘when someone wants to be able to negotiate and summon people to their faith’  
 (Coresi EV {426})

In contexts involving verbs with optional control (henceforth, NOC)<sup>4</sup>, only *de*-indicatives and *să*-subjunctives display free alternation, as in (2), with *să*-subjunctives being the preferred

<sup>2</sup> The data come from our manual search of a digitized corpus of Old Romanian texts made available to us by the “Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics in Bucharest.

<sup>3</sup> Abbreviations in glosses: DEF = definite article; DOM = differential object marker; F = feminine; IND = indicative; IMPF = indicative imperfective; INF = infinitive; PL = plural; PP = indicative present perfect; PS = indicative simple past; REFL = reflexive; SUBJ = subjunctive; SUP = supine.

<sup>4</sup> We use the label NOC to refer to constructions where verbs with optional control appear in their non-control version. This is different from Landau’s (2013) NOC, which covers contexts with non-anaphoric clausal

option. *De*-supines are absent from NOC contexts, because they cannot license subjects (Giurgea and Soare 2010, among others). *A*-infinitives are also absent from NOC contexts in the corpus, but this is due to chance, as these clauses can license (lexical or null) subjects in both Old and Modern Romanian (see footnote 11 and Nedelcu 2016, among others). We attribute the low occurrence of *de*-indicatives and lack of *a*-infinitives in NOC in our corpus to an aggressive replacement process by the *să*-subjunctives in these configurations, a process which was arguably in the final stages at the time of the attested texts (Frâncu 1969).

- (2) a *păn' au vrut Dumnedzău de s-au tocmit așa*  
 until has= wanted.PP God DE REFL=have.3PL= negotiated.PP thus  
 ‘until God willed it that they thus come to terms’ (Ureche 101)
- b *de veri vrea Mihaiu voievod să fac pre fiu-tău*  
 if will.3SG want Mihai king SA make.1SG DOM son.DEF=your  
*craiu în Ardeal*  
 prince in Ardeal  
 ‘if King Michael wants me to make your son prince in Ardeal’  
 (DÎ 9, Trans. XXXII, 1600)

In the presence of the complementizers *a* and *să*, (N)OC data as in (1) and (2) also allows for double complementizers. Specifically, infinitive *a* may be preceded by *de*, while subjunctive *să* may be preceded by either *de* or *ca*, the latter complementizer being specialized for subjunctives. This is shown in (3).

- (3) a *Văzu Lia cum au stătut de a mai naște* OC  
 saw.PS.3 Lia that has= stopped.PP DE A more= deliver.INF  
 ‘he saw that Lia stopped giving birth’ (BB {21})
- b *e acesta face-i de să se pocăiască* OC  
 and this.one makes=them DE SA REFL= repent.SUBJ.3  
 ‘and he makes them repent’ (Coresi EV {56})
- c *nu vrea de să-l știe cineva* NOC  
 not wants DE SA=him know.SUBJ.3 anybody  
 ‘he does not want anybody to know him’ (Coresi EV {77})
- d *Ai pohtit ca să mergi la casa* OC  
 have.2SG= desired.PP CA SA go. SUBJ.2SG to house.DEF  
*tătâni-tău*  
 father=your  
 ‘you wished to go to your father’s house’ (BB {23})
- e *Văzându Craiul atâta cuvinte rele la dânsul și de* NOC  
 seeing prince.DEF many words bad at him and from

---

complements to a variety of verbs (e.g., desideratives etc.). In this paper, we do not discuss subject clauses, where *a*-infinitives can license subjects in Nominative Case in Romanian.

*oastea sa, să temu ca să nu-l părăsască*  
 army.DEF his REFL feared.PS.3 CA SA not=him abandon.SUBJ.3  
 ‘the prince<sub>j</sub>, hearing such bad language from him<sub>k</sub> and his<sub>k</sub> army, feared that  
 he<sub>k</sub> might abandon him<sub>j</sub>’ (Ureche {35})

Most double complementizers as in (3) occur in OC versus NOC contexts. For example, in the first hundred pages of *Biblia* ‘The Bible’ (1668), we found 18 *ca să*-subjunctives in OC, and none in NOC. However, single *să*-subjunctives appear beyond the (N)OC contexts, as complements to non-thematic verbs or as subjects to copula ‘be’-predicates.<sup>5</sup> Thus, although *ca să* is compatible with NOC (see 3e) and other selected clauses, such occurrences are very rare, the strong preference being for OC contexts.

This observation also holds for *de să* and *de a*. The Old Romanian texts indicate that the less productive *de a* infinitives show up exclusively in OC contexts; in fact, some OC verbs, such as *lăsa* ‘quit’/‘stop’ have a strong preference for *de a* infinitives. Selected *de să* subjunctives are found in the 16<sup>th</sup> century texts, but these disappear by the 17<sup>th</sup> century and a comparison between *de să* versus single *să*-subjunctives shows that only the latter are productive. For example, in Coresi’s Gospel (EV), there are 24 *de să* subjunctive complements and over 200 *să*-subjunctive complements. Crucially, 23 out of the 24 *de să* subjunctive complements occur in OC contexts, whereas selected *să* subjunctives are well represented in various configurations: (N)OC, subject clauses, constructions with raising verbs, among others.<sup>6</sup>

In light of these data, we raise two questions: (i) What allows both NOC and OC complements to share the same mood and complementizer type? This forces a new take on the typological difference between Balkan and Romance OC. (ii) Why are double complementizers present and highly correlated with OC contexts? This brings up the replacement cycles occurring at the level of C and T heads in Old Romanian OC. Before answering these questions, the next section introduces the cartographic approach to clause structure.

### 3 Cartography and minimalism

In Rizzi’s (1997, 2004) system, the CP field is split over several heads, flanked by two complementizer heads: Force, the upper C head, is associated with the clause typing feature, and Fin, the lower C head, is associated with finiteness (phi/agreement and temporality) and mood/modality. These are the heads that qualify as goals for c-selection by a matrix head. Between Force and Fin, discourse features may also be mapped to Top(ic) and Foc(us) but these are irrelevant to c-selection. The clause hierarchy is given in (4).

(4) [ForceP [TopP [FocP [FinP [NegP [TP V [vP ... tv ...]]]]]]]]]

The mapping in (4) serves as an assessment tool for linearization and the location of (N)OC complementizers, while also showing that (Old) Romanian has verb raising. NegP signals the border between CP and TP, following tests in Zanuttini (1997), which groups Romanian together with Romance languages like Italian, Spanish and Portuguese. For the constructions investigated here, the clausal negation *nu* ‘not’ is considered a free morpheme.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> In the same text, we found 61 single *să*-subjunctives in (N)OC.

<sup>6</sup> Coresi’s Gospel has over 7,400 sentences.

<sup>7</sup> Dobrovie Sorin (1994) and Giurgea (2011) consider *nu* ‘not’ as a clitic, on grounds of it being obligatorily adjacent to the clitic cluster on the verb in T. However, Isac and Jakob (2004) and Hill and Alboiu (2016), among others,

D'Alessandro and Ledgeway (2010) further refine this system by showing that Fin encodes only semantic modality, while the grammatical mood is associated with T (versus Fin), since it belongs to the inflectional properties of the verb. We adopt this distinction between mood and modality and take the Fin feature [modal] to express properties such as (*ir*)*realis*, deontic and epistemic readings, whereas the T feature [mood] to reflect infinitive, indicative, subjunctive, etc. However, since Fin selects T, the features of Fin may restrict the type of grammatical mood in T.

Following Chomsky (2007, 2008 et seq), A-related properties (i.e. Case and phi-features) are assumed to be a property of the phase. So, empirically, independent lexical subjects, which require Case, need a phasal C/Force; however, phi-features (instantiated as agreement) are irrelevant to syntactic Case (Alboiu 2006, 2009).<sup>8</sup> In particular, despite the invariable form of the verb, many languages (including Old and Modern Romanian) allow for the licensing of lexical subjects on condition that a Force/phasal C is present (e.g. infinitive or gerund clauses; e.g., Alboiu 2006, Ledgeway 1998, Sitaridou 2002). Nonetheless, Case-less domains, such as those involved in obligatory control and raising, involve phi-features yielding agreement in a variety of unrelated languages, including the Balkan Sprachbund and Zulu (Zeller 2006). Since, the presence or absence of inflectional morphology on the verb stem is not a reliable criterion for independent lexical subjects (i.e. obviation), phi-features cannot be assumed to be Force/phase-related. In fact, under a split C, phi-features are a property of Fin, which is not a phase head. However, these are transferred to T (see also Alboiu and Hill 2019) giving the apparent impression that they are T properties (as assumed in earlier generative accounts). Their presence yields moods with inflectional agreement in T, while their absence yields uninflected T, as follows: [+Agr] in indicatives and subjunctives, [-Agr] in supines, infinitives, and gerunds.

Thus, while we use Fin as the head where finiteness and modality are syncretically mapped, we take 'finiteness' to stand for temporality (i.e., either the deictic or the anaphoric typing of T), but to be independent of presence versus absence of phi-features/agreement in Romanian. Crucially, the agreement specification of T is a reflection of modality in Fin given the matching requirement imposed by the c-selectional relationship between Fin and T. We argue that it is this very property that creates tension in Fin and forces it to split and accommodate dual complementizers in Old Romanian.

#### 4 OC in Romanian and beyond

This section shows that Romance and Balkan languages employ different structures in OC contexts: the former project a full-fledged CP, whereas the latter involve truncated CPs in these configurations on a par with raising contexts. Despite the availability of Romance verb inflection, Romanian follows the Balkan truncated clause derivation and does not make a distinction in clause size between subject OC and subject raising contexts. As a corollary, we show that with Balkan OC a subject raising analysis is better for explanatory adequacy than a PRO analysis.

---

argue that *nu* 'not' is a free morpheme, as it can stand by itself in answer to a question, it supports TP ellipsis, and it blocks verb movement; for the latter authors, the obligatory adjacency is independently derived (i.e., from the non-projection of Spec,TP in VSO languages, following Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998).

<sup>8</sup> Here, we follow the general assumption that, cross-linguistically, root, subject, and adjunct clauses, all of which are strong islands for movement (Cinque 1990), instantiate fully fledged/phasal CP domains. These, together with complement CP phases, are the domains that ensure Case.

#### 4.1 OC theory

Classical assumptions in generative grammar assume that both OC and raising constructions involve non-finite complementation, but that the size of the clause differs: control involves CPs, whereas raising verbs select IPs (Rizzi 1982, Borer 1989), labelled TP<sub>s</sub> in minimalism (Bošković 1997, 2002) and FinP/truncated CPs, in cartography (Roussou 2001).<sup>9</sup> With OC, an argument from the matrix clause obligatorily controls/co-refers with the subject of the embedded clause, the standard assumption being that the embedded subject is PRO (Chomsky 1982); see (5b) representing (5a).

- (5) a *She wants to go.*  
 b [CP<sub>matrix</sub> [TP DP-she<sub>j</sub> V<sub>finite</sub> [CP<sub>selected</sub> [TP PRO<sub>j</sub> V<sub>non-finite</sub>]]]]

Landau (2013) argues that OC occurs in complement clauses when either semantic tense is missing (i.e., [-T]/anaphoric tense) or when morphological agreement is absent (i.e., [-Agr]). In both English and Romance, this prediction is implemented through CP non-finites with anaphoric tense and PRO, so [-T, -Agr]. In NOC, however, Romance languages depart from English, as obviation requires [+Agr] in the former but not the latter (Ledgeway 1998). Balkan languages challenge this analysis since the embedded verb has [+Agr] specifications in both types of control (Krapova 1999, 2001; Dobrovie-Sorin 2001; Roussou 2001). For example, Bulgarian does not change the subjunctive grammatical mood on the verb when it changes from OC (6a) to NOC (6b), unlike French, which switches from infinitive to subjunctive in equivalent contexts, as in (7).

- (6) a *Iskam da dojda.*  
 want.1SG SUBJ come.1SG  
 ‘I want to come.’  
 b *Iskam da dojde.*  
 want.1SG SUBJ come.3SG  
 ‘I want for him/her to come.’ (adapted from Krapova 1999: 239)

- (7) a *Je veux partir.*  
 I want go.INF  
 ‘I want to go.’  
 b. *Je veux qu’il parte.*  
 I want that=he leave.SUBJ  
 ‘I want for him to leave.’

Importantly, as further shown in (8) for Bulgarian, constructions with raising verbs in Balkan languages also involve subjunctive clauses.

- (8) a *Sluchi se, che studentite doidokha navreme.*  
 happens REFL that students.the came in.time

<sup>9</sup> While nowadays the non-finiteness complementation requirement has relaxed, it is still widely accepted that clauses involved in OC are structurally more ample than those involved in raising (Landau 2013).

‘It happens that the students came in time.’

- b *Studentite se sluchikha da doidat navreme.*  
 students.the REFL happened.3PL SUBJ come.3PL in.time  
 ‘The students happened to come in time.’

Several studies on Balkan languages have provided evidence that the clausal complement in (6a) and (8b) is truncated in size as compared to the NOC or the non-raising alternatives, respectively (e.g., Boskovic 1997, Roussou 2001). Crucially, in (8b), the agreement inflection of the subjunctive (i.e., [+Agr]) is ineffective in blocking subject raising to the matrix clause (see also Terzi 1992; Motapanyane 1994). As mentioned, Alboiu (2006) points out that the [+/-Agr] asymmetry is irrelevant to subject licensing, and further shows that wherever subject raising applies, C is absent and embedded tense is anaphoric on tense in the matrix.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, the subjunctive mood form is compatible with both NOC (which involves a full-fledged CP with potentially distinct T from that of the matrix, but with tense dependency due to its *irrealis* status, see Alboiu 2006) and OC and raising verbs (which select a truncated CP with anaphoric tense) (Terzi 1992; Roussou 2001, etc.). Accordingly, a generalization can be drawn, whereby in Balkan languages (Romanian included), subject OC verbs and subject raising verbs trigger selection of a truncated CP, with anaphoric tense and subject raising, as shown in Alboiu (2006, 2007) for Modern Romanian. In particular, ‘subject raising’ in this context is to be understood as equivalent to cross-clausal A-chain formation: with subject OC, this A-relationship involves the highest matrix theta-position (i.e. Hornstein’s 1999 Movement Theory of Control, henceforth ‘MTC’), while with raising it does not, the A-relationship established by the embedded subject DP being strictly with matrix T.

In sum, with OC constructions, there is a typological contrast between Balkan and Romance languages that concerns the size of the complement clause (truncated versus full-fledged CP) and the grammatical mood/phi-features of the embedded verb (subjunctive versus infinitive). In cartographic terms, Romance OC involves an infinitive ForceP with [-Agr] and PRO subjects whereas Balkan OC involves a subjunctive FinP (see Roussou 2001), with [+Agr] and raising lexical subjects.<sup>11</sup>

#### 4.2 Old Romanian

Hill (2013) and Hill and Alboiu (2016) show that Old Romanian displays the Balkan parametric settings for VSO and that, in selected CPs, the inflectional verb form is unaffected by CP size as ForceP or FinP. This is seen in (9-11), where the licensing of subjects (underlined> in NOC indicates a full-fledged CP, while OC denotes a truncated FinP.

- (9) a *Când voiaște omul [[gândului]<sub>FOC</sub> de-i dă loc] OC*  
 when wants man.the thought.the.DAT DE=to.it gives room  
 ‘When man wants to make room for his thoughts ...’ (CV 201 apud Sava 2012: 130)

<sup>10</sup> In principle, the subjunctive allows for the embedded T to be either [+/- tense], depending on the properties of the selecting verb (see also Landau 2013). The correlation between the values of T and the (N)OC configuration of a subjunctive has been discussed for Greek in Varlokosta and Hornstein (1993), for Bulgarian in Krapova (2001), and for Romanian in Alboiu (2007).

<sup>11</sup> Morphologically, the formula for the Balkan subjunctive involves an indicative verb form embedded under an invariable particle that functions as a subjunctive marker (e.g. Bulgarian *da*+indicative, Greek *na*+indicative); see Terzi (1992) for an overview.

- b *pân' au vrut Dumnedzău de s-au tocmi așa* NOC  
 until has=wanted God DE REFL=have.3PL=negotiated thus  
 ‘until God willed it that they thus come to terms’ (Ureche 101)
- (10) a *iar cealaltă tabără s-au făcut a fugi* OC  
 but the.other group REFL-has pretended A run.INF  
 ‘but the other group pretended to run’ (CM I {215})
- b *Și fură război foarte tare până seara, și făcură încă*  
 and was war very strong until evening and turned still  
a-i învinge Batâr Andreiaș *cu* NOC  
 A=them prevail. INF Bator Andrew with  
*ungurii, dar apoi Mihai-vodă cu muntenii.*  
 Hungarians.the but then Mihai-king with Wallachs.the  
 ‘And the war went strongly until the evening, and it looked like Andrew Bator and his Hungarians were prevailing, but then King Michael and his Wallachians did so.’ (CM I {134})
- (11) a *n-au vrut Domnul să surpe pre voi* OC  
 not=has wanted God.the SA ruin.SUBJ.3 DOM you  
 ‘God did not want to ruin you’ (BB {LegeaIIcapX})
- b *n-au vrut Sion, Împăratul Esevonului, să* NOC  
 not=has wanted Seyon emperor.the Ethiopia.GEN SA  
*treacem noi prentre-însul*  
 pass.SUBJ.1PL we through-it  
 ‘Seyon, the king of Ethiopia, did not want us to cross through his land’ (BB {126})

Note that in (9b), the compositional meaning of the sentence indicates that the matrix subject is *Dumnedzău* ‘God’, while the embedded subject is a 3.PL *pro*. In (10b) and (11b), the distinct matrix and embedded subjects are underlined.

The Balkan OC parametric setting is preserved in Modern Romanian: the size of any selected CP (indicative, infinitive, subjunctive) depends on the (N)OC environments (i.e., it is equivalent to the Balkan subjunctive). Lexicalization of an independent embedded subject (i.e. obviation) requires a phasal CP/ForceP.

### 4.3 Balkan OC: the derivational mechanism

Here we argue that OC in Old Romanian involves subject raising rather than PRO.<sup>12</sup> Alboiu (2007) argues for a raising analysis of OC in Modern Romanian based on the fact that the shared

<sup>12</sup> Dobrovie-Sorin (2001) also argues against PRO in Romanian OC, and for a typological contrast between OC in Balkan versus OC in Germanic and other Romance languages. However, she treats this contrast in terms of binding relations: the embedded subject is a contextual anaphor in Balkan languages, due to [+Agr] in subjunctives, but an intrinsic anaphor in Germanic/other Romance languages, due to [-Agr] in infinitives (in Borer 1989 the status of anaphor is assigned to a certain type of Agr). This is not a viable approach in light of our data – see (1) – since Romanian also displays [-Agr] in infinitive (Old/Modern) and supine (Old) complements.

DP argument can occur either in the matrix or in the embedded clause, depending on the options for packaging of information structure (i.e. movement is incumbent on semantico-pragmatic factors and not on A-related requirements).<sup>13</sup> Below we show that the same results obtain for Old Romanian. In the OC constructions in (9-11a), the DP subject that carries the shared theta-role appears in the matrix; in (12), we show that this DP may also surface post-verbally in the embedded clause.<sup>14</sup>

- (12) a *au apucat poarta de au închis siimenii*  
 have.3PL= managed gate.the DE have.3PL= closed soldiers.the  
 ‘the soldiers managed to close the gate’ (Neculce {78})
- b *începură a țiparea Creștinii de nevoia Turcilor*  
 started.3PL A cry.INF Christians.the from pressure.the Turks.the.GEN  
 ‘the Christians started shouting at the Turks’ oppression’(CM I {120})
- c *pohtiia atunce să desfacă el jitnița*  
 desired.3 then SA open.SUBJ.3 he granary.the  
 ‘and he wanted to open the granary then’ (CEV {449})

There are some interpretive differences arising from the variation in the high or low spell out of the relevant DP. We are not concerned here with the particulars of the interpretive effects, but with the fact that the optional spell out of the subject in the matrix or in the embedded clause is also a property of constructions with raising verbs, as shown in (13). We illustrate this with Modern Romanian as Old Romanian has homophony between singular and plural agreement for 3<sup>rd</sup> person, so the raising cannot be captured through morphological contrast.

- (13) a *Se pare că studenții au ajuns la timp.*  
 SE<sub>ARB</sub> seems that students.the have.3PL= arrived at time  
 ‘It seems that the students have arrived on time.’
- b *(Studenții/ei) par să fi ajuns*  
 students.the/they seem.3PL SA be.SUBJ.3 arrived  
*(studenții/ei) la timp.*  
 students.the/they at time  
 ‘The students seem to have arrived on time.’

The bare personal pronoun in (11c) and (12b) indicates that the subjects in (12) and (13) are Nominative (i.e., the Accusative requires the differential object marker *pe*). Alboiu (2007) shows evidence for a single Case licensing mechanism for the shared argument in OC (i.e., the matrix C-T domain). The same is shown to hold of raising predicates, in contrast to the situation in NOC where it is argued that the matrix and embedded CPs license independent Nominative Case.

<sup>13</sup> See also Cotfas (2012).

<sup>14</sup> Availability of the shared subject to lexicalize in the embedded clause rules out a standard analysis of control and forces adoption of Hornstein’s MTC. Note that, at least in (12a-b), unless we assume a unique DP that establishes cross-clausal A-relations, we would face with a Condition C violation. For further elaboration, see Alboiu (2007).

Since the spell out location of the shared DP is linked to information structure, one might surmise that lexicalization in the embedded clause denotes a non-argumental position. However, following Cinque (1990), the shared bare quantifier DP subject in (14a) rules out a displaced discourse related position, supporting instead the canonical VSO configuration (see also Alboiu 2007: 206, (38b)). Moreover, Wurmbrand's (2004) lexical restructuring analysis is also ruled out as clitic climbing is impossible with OC (Alboiu 2007: 191, (10b)); see also (14b) here.

- (14) a *N-a apucat [a cumpăra nimeni nici o carte.]*  
 not=has managed A buy.INF nobody not one book  
 'Nobody managed to buy any book.'
- b *Nu (\*i-)a apucat [a(-i) cumpăra nimeni cartea.]*  
 not to.him=has managed A=to.him buy.INF nobody book.the  
 'Nobody managed to buy him the book.'

To conclude, Old Romanian subject OC and subject raising constructions derive non-phasal/truncated, FinP, complements which allow for cross-clausal A-chains and exclude PRO. This truncation is also responsible for the fact that matrix clause negation can license NPIs in these embedded complements (Progovac 1994); see example (14) above.

Typologically, this singles Romanian out, since Romance OC systematically embeds CP infinitives, so non-truncated, [-Agr] complements. In sum, while the syntax of Romanian OC follows the Balkan paradigm (i.e. a FinP), the morphology shows a typological mix; specifically [-T, -Agr] with infinitives and supines, following the Romance featural specification, and [-T, +Agr] with indicatives and subjunctives, as in Balkan languages. This has interesting diachronic consequences as discussed in the next section.

## 5 Variation and change in the mapping and spelling of Fin features

This section argues that the parametric setting for the Balkan pattern of derivation (i.e., FinP for OC versus ForceP for NOC), is at odds with the Romance origin of the complementizer inventory. This results in repeated complementizer renewal and cyclic reanalysis of the Fin head as either split or merged.

### 5.1 Historical overview: free alternation of clause types

The free alternation for OC complementation in (1) is not equally productive synchronically (see Frâncu 2009, Todi 2001, and other philological studies). The inference is that a complementizer replacement cycle applies in Old Romanian.

The emergence of *de*-supines is well attested in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This construction is the most recent, replacing *a*-infinitives and *să*-subjunctives for certain classes of matrix verbs (especially deontic modals; Dragomirescu 2013). Equally well documented is the replacement of *a*-infinitives by *să*-subjunctives, which becomes aggressive around the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The periodization of *de*-indicatives and *a*-infinitives is more problematic, since both constructions appear in the first preserved texts, so must be assumed older. However, the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century texts show a preference for *a*-infinitives over *de*-indicatives, indicating that infinitives are relatively more recent. Thus, Hill and Alboiu (2016: 306, Table 10.2) argue for the replacement stages shown in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1

Table 1 shows that whenever a clause type is restricted to FinP (i.e., truncated), so cannot also be used in NOC contexts (i.e., it cannot derive a full-fledged CP), it is replaced with another clause type that can project up to ForceP. The former truncated construction is temporarily preserved in OC contexts but gradually becomes less productive. The crucial factor in the degradation of a clause type is the complementizer, which must ensure the checking and valuation of both Fin and Force features to suit the Balkan (N)OC paradigm; when a complementizer can only check the features in Fin, it signals semantic bleaching and eventually triggers replacement by a new complementizer that can satisfy all features of C. Since each complementizer selects a certain mood, empirically, we see the fluctuation among (un)inflected verb forms in (15b) matching the chronological order of (15a).

- (15) a *de*-indicatives > *a*-infinitives > *să*-subjunctives > *de*-supines  
 b [+Agr]<sub>(indicative)</sub> > [-Agr]<sub>(infinitive)</sub> > [+Agr]<sub>(subjunctive)</sub> > [-Agr]<sub>(supine)</sub>

In sum, OC contexts last after the morphology for the C/T system of NOC contexts has been degraded, so synchronically attest to diachronic changes. This explains why OC contexts preserve all four clause options as well as why they display double complementizers. We elaborate on this in the next sub-sections.

### 5.2 Split and remerged/syncretic Fin

Here we argue that each complementizer renewal involves a split Fin, resulting in double Fin complementation, as shown in (3). Split Fin is eventually remerged, with unified spell out of its features as a single complementizer, seen in (1). This ‘pull-and-push’ operation entails the cyclical [+/-Agr] change highlighted in (15b). The Old Romanian corpus attests to a stage where remerged Fin was practically generalized and where the traces of the initially split Fin only occur in OC configurations.

Splitting C heads is cross-linguistically unexceptional provided a head is associated with multiple features (Haegeman 2004).<sup>15</sup> Consequently, the double complementizers in (3) indicate a separate mapping/spell out of the [finite] and [modal] features of Fin. This account is supported by the linearization properties listed below.

Firstly, both single and double complementizers precede negation, so must be C items; see (16) for *a* and *să*, and (17) for *de a*, *de să* and *ca să*).<sup>16</sup>

- (16) a *începură* *a* *nu-l* *băgarea* *în* *seamă* *nicicât*  
 began.3PL A not=him take.INF in attention at.all

<sup>15</sup> Cognilio and Zegrean (2012) argue for a split Force in clauses that map speech act features in Modern Romanian; Hill and Alboiu (2016) show that Force could routinely split in embedded clauses in Old Romanian.

<sup>16</sup> These are not Mood heads, as proposed for Modern Romanian (e.g., Motapanyane 1991, Cornilescu 2000, Alboiu 2002, among others) and Balkan languages (Rivero 1994). Mood is an inflectional/T head, whereas Fin caters to C features. A Fin but not a Mood analysis makes the right empirical predictions; for example, the treatment of *a* and *să* as Mood heads predicts their obligatory presence with the verbs they embed, and obligatory adjacency in constituency tests, which contradicts the evidence from the texts. Furthermore, *a/să* block verb restructuring and clitic climbing, which is not expected of inflectional heads (especially if one takes them to be clitics, as in Dobrovie-Sorin 1994). A Fin/C analysis also explains why the clausal complement in OC can be fronted, an operation that is ruled out with Mood/TPs.

‘they started not to pay attention to him at all’ (CM I {161})

- b *va ținea câtăva vreme să nu să priceștuiască*  
 will.3SG= hold for.some time SA not REFL confess.SUBJ.3  
 ‘he will resist not confessing for a while’ (Antim {237})

- (17) a *Frați cei săraci să fie siliți de a mărita pe*  
 brothers the poor SA be.SUBJ.3 forced DE A marry.INF DOM  
*surorile lor după puterea lor, ... adecă de a nu*  
 sisters.the their after ability.the their namely DE A not  
*le mărita după obraze proaste*  
 them= marry.INF after cheeks unworthy  
 ‘Brothers without means must be forced to marry their sisters according to their best abilities, namely, to not marry them to unworthy thugs’ (PCond {94})

- b *nu spunea de să nu fie scoși den besearecă*  
 not said.3SG DE SA not be.SUBJ.3 chased from church  
 ‘he did not say that they should not be chased from the church’ (Coresi Tetr 2 {214v})

- c *Iară neavuții și mișeii învață ca să nu cază den*  
 but poor.the and bad.the teaches CA SA not fall.SUBJ.3 from  
*meserătate în năpatea ceaia nespusa*  
 poverty in calamity.the the.one unfathomable  
 ‘But he teaches the poor and the wretched to not fall from poverty into that unfathomable calamity’ (Coresi EV {403})

Secondly, both single and double complementizers follow Topic and Focus constituents. See (9a) and (18) for single complementizers and (19) for double complementizers.

- (18) a *în acea vreme începură [[numele Domnului] a propovedui]*  
 in that time began.3PL name.the God.the.GEN A preach.INF  
 ‘in those times they started to preach God’s name’ (PO {24})

- b *evangheliștii vrură [[înșelăciunea drăcească și prilăstitura*  
 evangelists.the wanted.3PL deceit.the devilish and pretence.the  
*lor] [den rădăcină] să o rupă]*  
 their from root SA it= pull.out.SUBJ.3  
 ‘the evangelists wanted to eliminate their devilish deceit and pretence straight from the core’ (Coresi EV {421})

- (19) a *Iar turcii, cum au vădzut poarta cetății*  
 and Turks.the as have.3PL= seen gate.the fort.the.GEN  
*deschisă, au lăsat [pre moscali]<sub>kTOP</sub> de-a-i<sub>k</sub>*  
 opened have.3 stopped DOM Russians DE-A=them  
*mai gonire, ș-au început a intra în cetate.*  
 more= chase.INF and=have.3 started A enter.INF in fort

‘And the Turks stopped chasing the Russians and entered the fort, once they saw the opened gate.’ (Neculce 380)

- b *să fie volnic [[cu cartea domnii meale] de să-și*  
 IMP be.SUBJ.3 able with letter.the lordship.GEN my DE SA=REFL  
*ție a lui parte]*  
 keep.SUBJ.3 of his part  
 ‘he should be able to keep his function due to my lordship’s letter’  
 (BB, 45, 50 apud Frîncu 1969: 80/12)

- c *nu suferi, ce gândi [strîmbătatea sa] ca să o*  
 not accepted.3 but thought.3 injustice.the his CA SA it  
*răscumpere mai cu asupra*  
 repay.SUBJ.3 more with above  
 ‘he could not accept it, but thought to repay his injustice with added measure’  
 (Ureche {59})

The above facts are unsurprising since these examples involve Balkan OC, so are FinP domains (i.e., Force cannot project). We conclude that Fin hosts all complementizer occurrences in OC, both with single and double complementation (see also Hill 2013). In the latter case, the features of Fin are mapped to two separate Fin heads, ‘Fin1’ spelling out finiteness as [-finite], via *de* or *ca*, ‘Fin2’ spelling out [modal] via V-inflection (indicatives, supines), or *a* (infinitives), or *să* (subjunctives), as in (20).

(20) ([<sub>TopP</sub> ([<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>Fin1P</sub> **de/ca** [<sub>Fin2P</sub> **a/să** [<sub>NegP</sub> **nu** [<sub>TP</sub> V...]]]]]]))

(20) entails that neither *de* nor *ca* can check the [modal] feature in Old Romanian. This is further evidenced by the fact that, unlike in Romance, there is no *de*-infinitive in either Old or Modern Romanian and *a* is obligatorily present for [modal] checking; equally, absence of *ca*-subjunctives without *să* attests to the fact that *să* must check and value [modal].

### 5.3 Motivating the Fin split

Free variation of (un)split Fin begs the question of economy. Why would a grammar allow for more complex structure when a simpler structure would suffice? This section argues that splitting Fin was necessary due to the intrinsic operator properties of Romance complementizers adapted to accommodate the Romanian OC derivation.

Philological studies indicate that the Fin complementizers in (1) were inherited from Latin as Force operators/clause typers in non-selected clauses.<sup>17</sup> The texts attest that before their use for spelling a selected Fin, *de*, *a* and *să* were analyzed as complementizers in collapsed Force/Fin heads of adjunct clauses or conditional clauses. In these configurations, the complementizers are orthogonal to finiteness, since adjunct clauses are phasal. They gradually lost their inherent operator/clause typing feature, so they could spread to selected clauses where they were reanalyzed as markers of modality. For instance, *să* lost its conditional operator

<sup>17</sup> The Latin etymology of these items is irrelevant to the syntactic change in the 16<sup>th</sup> -18<sup>th</sup> centuries, reason why we do not discuss it here. Learners were unaware of etymologies and proceeded to the feature (re)analysis of these items only according to the syntactic information available in the primary linguistic data.

feature, gradually disconnected from Force, and specialized as a marker of *irrealis*, spreading to imperatives and, eventually, selected clauses.<sup>18</sup> Crucially, while this specialization allowed for the merge of *să* in selected Fin heads, this item was initially unable to check the [finite] feature. Therefore, items like *de* or *ca* initially provided that checking operation in Fin1.

There is evidence that *să* has been reanalyzed further, since in Modern Romanian, it has lost its exclusive *irrealis* value, pushing *ca* from Fin1 to Force. As shown in (21), *să* can occur in *realis* contexts (21a), and constituents in TopP and FocusP can separate it from *ca* (21b).

- (21) a    *S-a*            *apucat*    *să*        *scrie*.  
           REL<sub>F</sub>=has= started    SA        write.SUBJ.3  
           ‘S/he started to write.’
- b    *A*        *vrut*        *ca*    [*măine*]<sub>TOP</sub>    [*MARIA*]<sub>FOC</sub> *să*        *plece,*        *nu*    *Radu*.  
           has    wanted    CA    tomorrow    Maria        SA        leave.SUBJ.3    not    Radu  
           ‘It was Maria that s/he wanted to leave tomorrow, not Radu.’

Once *să* loses its specialization for [modal], it can also check [finite]. This upward reanalysis (in terms of Roberts and Roussou 2003) allows (and, eventually requires) Fin1 and Fin2 to remerge as un-split Fin.

#### 5.4 Motivating complementizer renewal

It is well-known that Balkan languages lack infinitive complements. In Romanian, *a*-infinitives were largely replaced by *să*-subjunctives in complement clauses (Sandfeld 1930 a.o.). According to our analysis, this replacement would have involved a split Fin replacing a remerged Fin-*a* in (N)OC contexts. What would trigger this replacement, considering that *a*-infinitives could already satisfy the FinP requirement for Balkan OC derivations (see Hill and Alboiu 2016; Table 1)? And what would motivate a repeated renewal pattern given that *a*-infinitives had in turn replaced *de*-indicatives (Table 1)? Any account should also address the evidence that, in Modern Romanian, *de*-supines are replacing *să*-subjunctives in OC, especially in northern varieties.

We argue that the tension between the formal features of Romance complementizers and the Balkan paradigm for (N)OC is what forces this renewal pattern, in two stages.<sup>19</sup> First, the Romance complementizer of unselected clauses becomes compatible with selected CPs under pressure to accommodate the Balkan (N)OC derivation; it crucially merges in Fin (instead of Force) to allow for the truncated Balkan OC clause and, in NOC contexts, checks Force via long-distance Agree. Initially, these reanalysed complementizers cannot check both finiteness and modality, so Fin is forced to split, as discussed for (20). Second, the complementizer undergoes further reanalysis being now capable of checking both Fin1 and Fin2 and forcing a syncretic/remerged Fin. However, with upward reanalysis/grammaticalization comes further bleaching and eventually the complementizer loses its ability to check Force in NOC. This creates a gap in the (N)OC Balkan paradigm, so the complementizer in Fin is renewed and the

<sup>18</sup> Note that *să*-subjunctives only appear in *irrealis* contexts in 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> century texts (Frâncu 1969, 2009) when statistical data show that in (N)OC contexts, *să* appears under ‘want’ and verbs of ‘command’, with *a*-infinitive preferred for *realis* contexts (e.g., selected by ‘start’ and ‘finish’ in the past tense).

<sup>19</sup> A reviewer was concerned about morphology feeding syntax, at least apparently. That is not what we are arguing here. Rather, the issue is that these Romance complementizers with intrinsic [Force] features are mapped onto a Balkan cartography that stops at Fin, hence the tension and subsequent reanalysis triggering the cycles of change under discussion.

cycle repeats itself. This complementizer reanalysis in Romanian (N)OC contexts is summarized in Table 2.

## INSERT TABLE 2

Table 2 shows that only *să*-subjunctives can productively project to ForceP in Modern Romanian. The supine clause, which emerged around the 17<sup>th</sup> century and is the most recent reanalysis, is still at the stage of split Fin in standard Modern Romanian, cannot cater to features of Force, and is not used in NOC. However, in Bessarabian Romanian, *de*-supines have deontic modality so point towards a resemantization of *de* and the ability to check both features of Fin under a syncretic head.<sup>20</sup>

An important ingredient of the reanalysis is the mood form of the verb. As mentioned, each complementizer triggers a specific grammatical mood in T, which is intrinsically associated with an Agr value. Thus, the replacement cycle in Table 2 entails a cycle of change in the values of Agr, as indicated in (15b). All variants in (15b) are untensed, so, with a non-finite specification for [Fin]. However, there is evidence that the Agr values are relevant for how the complementizer fares upon reanalysis. For example, Table 2 shows that *de* fails to induce a remerged Fin with indicatives (i.e., [+Agr]) but such reanalysis arises with supines (i.e., [-Agr]). In both cases, *de* checks/spells out [-finite] Fin1, the [modal] Fin2 feature being checked by the verb. While textual evidence shows that *de*-indicatives initially occur with both (*ir*)*realis* contexts (Hill and Alboiu 2016: 180), they are not very productive in non-actualized situations and, by the 18<sup>th</sup> century, force exclusively *realis* values for [modal]. The [-Agr] supine form checks [modal] without valuing it, so the distribution of the supine clause remains more flexible, permitting a remerged Fin.

Crucially, Old Romanian also displays points of tension between the [modal] feature of Fin and the features of T in clausal complements. In this respect, [-Agr] yields better results than [+Agr] in configurations where it is involved in the checking of Fin [modal]; elsewhere (i.e., where Fin [modal] is checked by a complementizer), the [+/-Agr] value of the verbal inflection is orthogonal to the derivational process. Thus, untensed Fin domains are never stable in Romanian.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper we show that, diachronically, (Old) Romanian maintains the Balkan parametric setting for OC (i.e. cross-clausal A-dependencies akin to ‘raising’) at the price of variation in micro-parameters for the mapping of Fin features and the spell out of selected T as [+/-Agr]. With respect to the former property, both subject OC and subject raising systematically involve a truncated FinP structure (i.e. the absence of Force/phase-head). However, while in the Balkan Sprachbund this property correlates with exclusively [+Agr] features in T, in Romanian, there is constant fluctuation between [+/-Agr] in these configurations. We have argued that this is due to typological ambiguity (i.e. Romance complementizers with [Force] features attempt mapping in Fin, the highest available head in OC contexts in the Balkan Sprachbund). This tension creates pressure which affects Fin, which fluctuates from syncretic (i.e. one complementizer), to split, with two complementizers.

---

<sup>20</sup> There is also some evidence (Gabinschi 2010) that the remerged *de*-supine begins to project to ForceP (stage two of the reanalysis).

Crucially, since the embedded domain in OC lacks temporal deixis (i.e. are [-T]), Landau's (2013) requirement for OC is met regardless of the phi-feature status of the complement clause. In addition, we have seen that the insensitivity to [+/-Agr] is equally maintained with NOC configurations in Romanian. In sum, while Romance shifts from [-Agr] to [+Agr] when shifting from OC to NOC, Romanian simply changes clause size: from Fin (which fails to license a subject independently of an A-relationship with the matrix) to Force (which, as a complete domain, licenses its own subject and blocks this from being A-Probed from the matrix domain).

The OC parameter is constant (i.e. truncated/FinP clause), so no diachronic change in C size, whereas the feature specifications involved in the C/T/Agr feature system are in constant flux. These findings support the Borer-Chomsky Conjecture (BCC) that sees variation as being restricted to formal features of functional heads (Baker 2008), while also aligning with Biberauer and Walkden's (2015) observation that diachronic syntax has shifted from the "macro" to the "micro" level.

## References

- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: EUB.
- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2006. 'Are we in Agreement?', in C. Boeckx (ed), *Agreement Systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 13-39.
- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2007. 'Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising', in W. D. Davies and S. Dubinsky (eds), *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*. Dordrecht: Springer. 187-211.
- Alboiu, Gabriela and Virginia Hill. 2019. 'Narrative Infinitives, Narrative Gerunds, and the Features of the C-T System.' *Journal of Historical Syntax* 3(3): 1-36.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18148/hs/2019.v3i3.16>
- Alexiadou, Artemis and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. 'Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, Verb-Movement and EPP-Checking', *Natural Languages and Linguistic Theory* 16: 491-539.
- Baker, Mark. 2008. 'The Macroparameter in a Microparametric World', in: T. Biberauer (ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 351-373.
- Biberauer, Theresa and George Walkden. 2015. 'Introduction: Changing views of syntactic change', In T. Biberauer and G. Walkden (eds.), *Syntax over time: Lexical, morphological and information-structural interactions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-13.
- Borer, Hagit. 1989. 'Anaphoric Agr', in O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 69-109.
- Bošković, Željnek. 1997. *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željnek. 2002. 'A-movement and the EPP', *Syntax* 5: 167-218.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Binding*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2007. 'Approaching UG from Below', in Uli Sauerland and H.-M. Gartner (eds), *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-29.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. 'On Phases', in R. Freidin, C. P. Otero & M. L. Zubizarreta (eds), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 133-167.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A' dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cognilio, Marco and Iulia Zegrean. 2012. 'Splitting up Force: evidence from discourse particles', in L. Aelbrecht, L. Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds), *Main Clause Phenomena*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 229-256.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000. 'The double subject construction in Romanian', in V. Motapanyane (ed), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*. Oxford: Elsevier. 83-134.
- Cotfas, Maura. 2012. On the Syntax of the Romanian Subjunctive. PhD dissertation, University of Bucharest.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta & Adam Ledgeway. 2010. 'At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation', *Lingua* 120: 2040-2060.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2001. 'Head-to-Head merge in Balkan subjunctives and Locality', in M. L. Rivero and A. Ralli (eds.), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press. 44-73.
- Dragomirescu, Adina. 2013. *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Supinul*. București: Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 1969. 'Cu privire la uniunea lingvistică balcanică. Înlocuirea infinitivului prin construcții personale în limba română veche', *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară* 20: 69-116.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 2009. *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521-1780)*. Iași: Demiurg.
- Gabinschi, Marcu. 2010. *Formele verbale nepredicative nonconjunctivale ale limbii române*. Chișinău: Institutul de filologie al AȘM.
- Giurgea, Ion. 2011. 'The Romanian verbal cluster and the theory of head movement', in Julia Herschensohn (ed.), *Romance Linguistics 2010*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 271-286.
- Giurgea, Ion and Elena Soare. 2010. 'Predication and the nature of non-finite relatives in Romance', in Ana-Maria Di Sciullo and Virginia Hill (eds), *Edges, Heads and Projections: Interface Properties*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 191-214.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2004. 'Topicalization, CLLD and the Left Periphery', in B. Shaer, W. Frey and C. Maienborn (eds.), *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop*. Berlin: ZAS. 157-192.
- Hill, Virginia. 2013. 'The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive', *The Linguistic Review* 30 (4): 1-37.
- Hill, Virginia and Gabriela Alboiu. 2016. *Verb movement and clause structure in Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. 'Movement and Control', *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1): 69-96.
- Isac, Dana and Edith Jakab. 2004. 'Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkans', in O. Mišeska-Tomić (ed), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 315-338.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 2009. 'What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive?', *Lingua* 119: 1788-1810.
- Krapova, Iliyana. 1999. 'Subjunctive complements, null subjects and case checking in Bulgarian', in Kenesei, Istvan (ed.), *Crossing Boundaries: Advances in the theory of Central and Eastern European languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 239-262.

- Krapova, Iliyana. 2001. 'Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek', in Maria Luisa Rivero and Angela Ralli (eds), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press. 105-126.
- Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in Generative Grammar: A Research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1998. 'Variation in the Romance infinitive: the case of the Southern Calabrian inflected infinitive', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96: 1-61.
- Motapanyane, Virginia. 1991. *Theoretical Implications of Complementation in Romanian*. PhD thesis, University of Geneva. Published in 1995 by Unipress, Padova.
- Motapanyane, Virginia. 1994. 'An A-position for Romanian subjects', *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25: 729-734.
- Nedelcu, Isabela. 2016. 'The infinitive and the infinitival construction', in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed), *The syntax of Old Romanian*, chapter 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. *Negative and positive polarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivero, Maria Luisa. 1994. 'Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12. 63-120.
- Rivero, Maria Luisa and Angela Ralli. 2001. 'Introduction', in M.L. Rivero and A. Ralli (eds), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press. 3-16.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. 'The fine structure of the left periphery', in L. Haegeman (ed), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 281-339.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. 'Locality and left periphery', in Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3. New York: Oxford University Press. 223-251.
- Roberts, Ian and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roussou, Anna. 2001. 'Control and Raising in and out of subjunctive complements', in M. L. Rivero and A. Ralli (eds.), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press. 74-104.
- Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930/1968. *Linguistique balcanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Klincksiek.
- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2002. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of Romance Infinitives with Nominative Subjects*. PhD thesis, University of Manchester.
- Terzi, Arhonto. 1992. Licensing of PRO and the languages of the Balkans. Ph.D. dissertation, City University of New York.
- Timotin, Emanuela. 2016. 'Introduction', in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-11.
- Todi, Aida. 2001. *Elemente de sintaxă românească veche*. Iași: Editura Paralela 45.
- Varlokosta, Spyridoula and Norbert Hornstein. 1993. 'Control complements in Modern Greek', *Proceedings of NELS* 23: 507-521.
- Wurmband, Susi. 2004. 'Two types of restructuring: Lexical vs. functional', *Lingua* 114(8): 991-1014.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zeller, Jochen. 2006. 'Raising out of finite CP in Nguni: The case of fanele', *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24 (3): 255-275.