

2. Verbal functional categories: Tense, Aspect, Mood

CARMEN DOBROVIE-SORIN, ANAMARIA FĂLĂUȘ, ION GIURGEA

- 1. The Syntax of Verbal Functional Categories. The Verbal Cluster** (Ion Giurgea & Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin)
- 2. The Semantics of Verbal Functional Categories** (Anamaria Fălăuș)

1. The Syntax of Verbal Functional Categories. The Verbal Cluster

1.1 Inflectional Functional Categories

Like in other modern Indo-European languages, in Romanian the grammatical meanings associated to verbs (Tense, Mood, Aspect) can be expressed both by inflections and by independent grammaticalized words – auxiliaries and particles (e.g., *să* and *a* for the subjunctive and infinitive, see §§1.3 and 1.4.2.4 below):

- (1) a. a fugit (indicative perfective past, 3rd singular)
has run.PPT
'(S)he ran'
b. fugea (indicative imperfective past, 3rd singular)
run.IND.IMPF.3SG
'(S)he was running / used to ran'

Both inflectional morphemes and auxiliaries will be analyzed as *functional categories*, i.e., items that head their own phrase and take the verb phrase (or another verbal functional category) as complement. In synthetic forms, functional categories can be uncovered by morphological decomposition: the verbal root or stem corresponds to the lexical category V and the inflectional morphemes can be associated to functional categories, as shown in (2), where T stands for the functional category Tense (on the precise way of achieving this association, see § 1.4.1 below):

- (2) [v_{fug}][_Tea]

Characteristic of Romanian is that the grammaticalized words that realize Tense, Aspect and Mood – in *analytic forms* – are not totally independent words (in contrast with the English auxiliaries *have* or *will*), but rather behave as *clitics*, forming together with the lexical verb and other clitics a complex constituent that will be referred to as *the verbal cluster* in what follows. The term 'verbal complex' can also be found in some of the current linguistic literature on Romanian.

We will call *inflectional categories* those functional categories that are realized inside this verbal cluster, either by inflections (*synthetic forms*) or by clitics (yielding analytic forms). This chapter is only concerned with inflectional verbal functional categories. For other verbal functional categories, see chapter 10 [or 10-11?] (for Complementizers), 4 (for Voice), 15 (for peripheral categories such as Topic or Focus).

1.2 Inflectional features and inflectional categories

Not all inflectional features of verbs are necessarily correlated to a distinct functional category; in other words, not all inflectional features head their own syntactic projection. Among the inflectional features of verbs, *number* and *person* are always realized inflectionally and necessarily attach to other functional categories. Moreover, they are not independently interpreted, but are correlated via agreement with an argument of the verb. For these reasons, it is unclear whether these features head their own syntactic projection, labeled AgrP, as proposed in some studies. Therefore, we will not make this assumption here.

Agreement features are of two types: certain verb forms have the set *person+number* – these are called *finite* or *personal forms*. Among non-finite forms, the participle has an

agreement set consisting of *gender*, *number* and *case*, like adjectives (participles are verb forms with an adjectival syntax and morphology, see §1.8.1 below).

Besides agreement features, verbs have inflectional features that express **mood**, **tense** and **aspect**, which are uncontroversially assumed to be functional categories.

Some inflectional features are traditionally included under ‘mood’, although they are not associated to the semantics of modality: the infinitive, the gerund (or active participle), the participle, the supine. All these inflectional forms lack number and person, cannot appear as predicates of main clauses (hence the label ‘**non-finite**’) and do not enter mood oppositions. Since their defining features are not related to modality, we will not use the label ‘mood’.

Inflectional verbal categories are highly dependent on each other, in the sense that tense oppositions differ across moods and aspect oppositions depend on tense. Moreover, non-finite forms lack any tense/mood/aspect opposition with the exception of infinitives, which have a binary relative tense opposition.

The table below presents the interdependencies between the verbal categories and their realization (synthetic or analytic), with examples taken from the verb *scrie* ‘write’ (in the finite forms, all in 3rd person singular, except the imperative which is 2nd singular):

Table I: Inflectional Verbal Functional Categories

Mood	Tense	Aspect / Relative Tense	Realization	Examples
Indicative	Present	-	synthetic	<i>scrie</i>
	Past	Perfective - ‘Compound’ - ‘Simple’	analytic	<i>a scris</i>
			synthetic	<i>scrise</i>
		Imperfective Pluperfect (anterior to the past)	synthetic	<i>scria</i> <i>scrisesese</i>
	Future	-	analytic	<i>va scrie</i> <i>o să scrie</i> <i>are să scrie</i>
Future Perfect(anterior to the future)		analytic	<i>va fi scris</i>	
Imperative			synthetic	<i>scrie!</i>
Subjunctive	Non-Past		analytic	<i>să scrie</i>
	Past (Anterior)		analytic	<i>să fi scris</i>
Conditional	Non-Past		analytic	<i>ar scrie</i>
	Past		analytic	<i>ar fi scris</i>
Presumptive	Non-Past		analytic	<i>o scrie</i>
	Present		analytic	<i>o fi scriind</i> <i>va fi scriind</i>
		Past		analytic
Non-finite forms				
Infinitive	Non-Past		-bare (synthetic) -analytic (+ <i>a</i>)	<i>scrie</i> <i>a scrie</i>
		Past (Anterior)	analytic	<i>a fi scris</i>
Passive Participle			synthetic	<i>scris, scrisă, scriși, scrise</i>
Gerund			synthetic	<i>scriind</i>
Supine			analytic (+ <i>de</i> or Prep.)	<i>de scris</i> <i>(la) scris</i>
Forms only occurring inside the verbal cluster				
Past Part./			synthetic	<i>scris</i>

Supine			
--------	--	--	--

1.3 The structure of the verbal cluster

The verbal cluster is made up of the lexical verb and various other elements which behave as clitics having the verb as their host. Evidence for the clitic status will be presented in § 1.5. In this section we present the components of the verbal cluster and their order.

Some positions in the cluster are obligatory, others are optional. Negation, pronominal and adverbial clitics are optional. Complementizer/mood particles (CM) and auxiliaries are obligatory for certain verbal forms. Among the elements that belong to the verbal cluster, those which historically come from verbs are called auxiliaries. They can but need not be inflected for person+number. There are two invariable auxiliaries: the infinitive *fi* (indicating anteriority) and *o*, which in combination with a subjunctive form indicates future tense; the latter optionally has a specially marked 3rd person plural.

(a) We start by giving the most developed verbal clusters, those built with auxiliaries. Most of them have the lexical verb in a non-finite form. Those that have Aux+Finite Form (subjunctive) will be presented later (see Table IX):

Table II: verbal clusters with auxiliaries + non-finite lexical verb

Complementizer /Mood	Negation	Pronouns	Aux+Agr	Adverb	Inf./Part. V, or:			Pronoun <i>o</i>
				Adv.1	Aux. <i>fi</i>	Adv.2	Part./Ger.	
1. With agreeing auxiliaries								
(i)	<i>nu</i> not	<i>l-</i> 3MS.ACC	<i>aş</i> would.1S	<i>mai</i> again	<i>fi</i> be.INF	<i>şi</i> also	<i>luat</i> taken	
'I wouldn't have also taken it/her anymore'								
(ii)	<i>nu</i> not	<i>i</i> 3S.DAT	<i>-am</i> have.1	<i>mai şi</i> more also	<i>dat</i> given			<i>-o</i> 3FS.ACC
'I didn't also give it/her to him/her anymore'								
(iii)	<i>n</i> not		<i>-aş</i> would.1S	<i>mai</i> again	<i>lua</i> take.INF			<i>-o</i> 3FS.ACC
'I wouldn't take it/her anymore'								
(iv)	<i>nu</i> not	<i>l-</i> him-	<i>o</i> may.3S	<i>mai</i> more	<i>fi</i> be.INF	<i>şi</i> also	<i>plăcând</i> liking	
'I suppose (s)he doesn't like him after all this'								
2. Without agreeing auxiliaries								
(v) <i>să</i> SUBJ	<i>nu</i> not	<i>-i</i> 3S.DAT		<i>mai</i> again	<i>fi</i> be.INF	<i>tot</i> on- and-on	<i>adus</i> taken	<i>-o</i> 3FS.ACC
'that I/you/he/she/we/they shouldn't kept bringing it to him/her anymore'								
(vi) <i>a</i> to	<i>nu</i>	<i>-i</i> 3S.DAT		<i>mai</i> more	<i>fi</i> be	<i>şi</i> also	<i>spus</i> said	<i>-o</i> 3FS.ACC
'to have not also told it to him/her'								

(b) We present now verbal clusters in which the lexical verb bears the finite (agreeing) inflection. We add *a*-infinitives without auxiliaries because the structure of the cluster is identical:

Table III: verbal clusters without auxiliaries

Complementizer/ Mood	Negation	Pronouns	Adverbs	V+Agr or infinitive V
(vii)	<i>nu</i> not	<i>-l</i> 3MS.ACC	<i>prea mai</i> too more	<i>vedeam</i> see.IMPV.1
'I/We almost didn't see him/it anymore'				
(viii)	<i>nu</i> not	<i>mi-l</i> me.DAT-3FSG.ACC	<i>mai</i> more	<i>arătați</i> show.IMPV/PRES.2PL
'Don't show it/him to me anymore!/ You aren't showing it/him to me anymore'				
(ix) <i>să</i> SUBJ	<i>n-</i> not	<i>-o</i> 3FS.ACC	<i>mai și tot</i> more also on-and-on	<i>văd</i> see.(PRES/SUBJ).1SG
'that I shouldn't also see her/it all the time anymore'				
(x) <i>a</i> to	<i>nu</i> not	<i>-l</i> 3MS.ACC	<i>mai tot</i> more on-and-on	<i>necăji</i> pick-on.INF
'to not keep on picking him on any longer'				

We can see that clitic adverbs always immediately precede the lexical verb, and therefore they follow the agreeing element if it is an auxiliary (see table II) but precede it when it is the lexical verb (see Table III), whereas pronominal clitics always precede the agreeing element. Note also that the clitic pronoun *o* may have a special position in clusters with auxiliaries (see Table II and §1.4.2.6 below).

(c) In affirmative imperatives, the finite lexical verb precedes clitic pronouns. The position of clitic adverbs wrt. the lexical verb remains the same – they precede it.

Table IV: the verbal cluster in affirmative imperatives

Clitic adverb	Inflected lexical V	Pronouns
(xi) <i>mai</i> more	<i>arătați</i> show.IMPV.2PL	<i>-mi-o</i> me.DAT-3FSG.ACC
'Show it/her to me again / Continue to show it/her to me!'		

This reversal between the right-hand part of the verbal cluster (adverbial clitics + lexical V) and the left-hand part is also found in constructions with auxiliary inversion, in frozen constructions or as archaisms – these constructions were productive in Old Romanian and are still found in regional (mostly north-western) varieties. As in the case of imperatives, negation is ruled out:

Table V: the verbal cluster with auxiliary inversion

Adverb	Inf./Part. lexical V	Pronouns	Inflected Auxiliary
(xii) <i>mai</i> more	<i>lua-</i> take.INF	<i>te-</i> you.ACC	<i>ar</i> would.3
'May... take you now!'			

(d) Gerunds also have postverbal clitic pronouns, but differ from affirmative imperatives by the fact that they allow negation, realized by a bound morpheme *ne-* (in which case the only clitic adverbs allowed are *mai* and *mai+tot*):

Table VI: the verbal cluster in gerunds

Negation	Adverbs	Lexical Verb	Pronouns
(xiii) <i>ne-</i> NEG-	<i>mai-tot-</i> more - on-and-on	<i>criticându-</i> criticizing	<i>i</i> 3.MPL.ACC
'not criticizing them over and over any longer'			

(e) Supines only have the Complementizer/Mood position filled by the particle *de* (which alternates with prepositions: *la* 'to', *pentru* 'for'). No clitic pronoun, adverb or auxiliary is allowed. The bound negation *ne-* is only allowed in certain types of supines (see chapter 10/11 §x), in which case the clitic adverb *mai* is also sometimes allowed (see (xv)):

Table VII: the verbal cluster with supines

Complementizer/Mood	Negation	Clitic Adverb	Lexical V
(xiv) <i>de</i> SUP			<i>realizat</i> realize.SUP
(xv) <i>de</i> SUP	<i>ne-</i> NEG-	<i>mai-</i> more	<i>arătat</i> show.SUP
'(something) not to be shown again'			

(f) Passive participles only allow the bound negation and, in its presence, the clitic *mai*:

Table VIII: the verbal cluster with negated passive participles

	Negation	Clitic Adverb	Lexical V
(xvi)	<i>ne-</i> not-	<i>mai-</i> more-	<i>vândută</i> sold.FSG
'never sold before / still not sold'			

(g) Future forms based on subjunctives involve a cluster enlarged with Neg and Aux positions to the left of the subjunctive particle; the part following the subjunctive particle is identical to the one in Table III modulo the impossibility of negation:

Table IX: verbal clusters in subjunctive-based futures

Negation	Auxiliary	Complementizer/Mood	Clitic Pronouns	Clitic Adv.	Inflected lexical V
(xvii) <i>n-</i> not	<i>o</i> will	<i>să</i> SUBJ	<i>-l</i> 3MS.ACC	<i>prea mai</i> too more	<i>vadă</i> see.SUBJ.3S
'(s)he/they will not see him/it too much anymore'					
<i>n-</i> not	<i>ai</i> have.2SG	<i>să</i> SUBJ	<i>-i-o</i> 3S.DAT-3FS.ACC	<i>mai</i> more	<i>dai</i> give.2SG
'you will not give it/her to him/her again'					

1.4 Syntactic analysis of the verbal cluster

1.4.1 How the verbal cluster is built by selection

All the components of the verbal cluster are *heads*, rather than phrasal constituents. Some of these constituents are verbal functional heads, which participate in selectional relations that end into the category V (e.g. CM > Mood > T > Asp > v > V). Others are dependants of the verb or of the clause (complements or adjuncts) which occur inside the cluster in virtue of their clitic status – clitic adverbs and pronouns. Negation can be considered an optional verbal functional category, rather than a clitic adverb.

The internal structure of the cluster reflects the selectional relations between the various functional categories. We describe the formation of the verbal cluster as follows: when a functional head is specified as clitic or affix, it combines with the head of the selected category, forming a constituent that is itself a head and as such can be selected by another head specified as clitic or affix:

- (3) [H₁ [H₂ [H₃ H₄]]]
 e.g. [_{Neg} nu [_{Mood} aș [_T fi [_{Asp} adus]]]]
 ‘I wouldn’t have brought’

The complex functional head shown in (3) needs to combine with the verb phrase. In order to achieve this, we assume two distinct Merge (combining) operations: one with the verb and one with the entire VP. In order for the head-merge operation (i.e. Merge of V and the functional head inside the cluster) to take place, the head of the vP is copied and erased from the VP – in other words, it is *extracted* or *moved* from the VP to its position in the cluster. The selectional feature +VP is not satisfied by this operation and requires a further merge of the vP from which V has been extracted (here and elsewhere, the erased copies, also called traces, are notated t_X = “trace of X”) – see the general pattern in (4) and the example in (4)’, where we also have the reversal of the order between H and V, due to the affixal feature of V:

- (4) [HP [H H V] [VP ... t_V ...]]
 (4)′ [_{AspP} [_{Asp} V-Asp][VP .. t_V ...]]

By this procedure, a complex head is formed due to functional subcategorization (when the ‘selector’ or ‘subcategorizer’ is specified as clitic or affix). By recursively applying this operation, adding heads specified as clitics or affixes, larger complex heads are formed:

- (5) [_{H1P} [_{H1} H₁ [_{H2} [_{H3} V]]] [_{H2P} ... t [_{H2} [_{H3} V]] ... [_{H3P} ... t [_{H3} V] [_{vP} ... t_V ...]]]]]
 e.g. [_{NegP} [_{Neg} Neg [_{Mood} Mood [_T T [_{Asp} V-Asp]]]]] [_{MoodP} ... t [_{Mood} [_T [_{V-Asp}]]] [_{TP} .. t [_T [_{V-Asp}]] [_{AspP} ... t [_{V-Asp}]] [_{vP} ... t_V ...]]]]]

- ❖ In the case of the Romanian verbal cluster, it is not clear whether the intermediate projections H₂P, H₃P etc. are necessary – i.e., phrasal constituents labeled by categories intermediate between the highest category in the cluster and the VP. Therefore, we may assume that the phrasal-merge operation only takes place once, at the top of the cluster – between the entire [H₁[H₂[H₃V]] complex head and VP.

In § 1.7 below we will present evidence for verb movement from the VP into its position in the cluster, supporting the representations in (4)-(5).

1.4.2 The functional heads of the verbal cluster

We will now show how the features of Mood, Tense and Aspect are associated to the positions in the verbal cluster, based on which we will label the positions of the cluster.

The correspondence is not straightforward because (i) a single, non-decomposable element can realize more than one feature and (ii) one and the same feature can be spread over several elements. However, we observe a general hierarchy Mood > (Absolute) Tense > Aspect/Relative Tense. Feature syncretism and spreading only involve adjacent features in this hierarchy. When several features occur in a single morpheme, we assume a syncretic head, e.g. M+T or T+Asp.

1.4.2.1 Inflected auxiliaries realize **Mood+Tense(+Aspect)** when Mood is indicative, otherwise they realize only **Mood**:

- Indicative inflected auxiliaries:

- (6) ‘Compound Perfect’ (interpreted as a perfective past)
am, ai, a, am, ați, au + Past Participle
e.g. *am plecat* ‘I/we left/have left’, *ați făcut* ‘you_{pl} did /have done’

The analytic form called *perfect compus* in Romanian (translated here as ‘Compound Perfect’) is formed with a past participle (which will be described immediately below) preceded by the auxiliary HAVE (note however the difference between the forms of the auxiliary HAVE shown in (6) and the forms of the lexical verb expressing possession, *am, ați, are, avem, aveți, au*). The meaning of the Romanian Compound Perfect is close to that of the French ‘*passé composé*’, which is currently translated into English as the ‘Present Perfect’. We have avoided this translation because the Romanian construction (on a par with its French analogue) does not have the interpretation of the English Present Perfect (except with certain adverbials, see §2.*+* below), but is instead interpreted as a perfective past (the event time (interval) is properly included in the reference time, as opposed to the imperfect, where the reference time is included in the event time; the reference time is past for both forms, as in the English Simple Past; see §2.*+* below).

The form called ‘past participle’ has a ‘past’ meaning only when it occurs inside the verbal cluster, combined with the auxiliaries *am/ai/a* ‘have’ and *fi* ‘be.INF’ (anteriority/past auxiliary). The same form occurs in supines, preceded by the particle *de* or by prepositions and, in adjectival environments, it functions as a passive participle, in which case it receives agreement morphemes (the bare stem is identical to the masculine singular form of the participle, as the masculine singular ending is Ø).

- (7) Future Indicative:
voi, vei, va, vom, veți, vor + Infinitive
e.g. *voi pleca* ‘I will go’, *vor face* ‘they will do’
- (8) Future Perfect Indicative (anterior to the future):
voi, vei, va, vom, veți, vor + *fi* + Past Participle
e.g. *voi fi plecat* ‘I will have left’, *vor fi făcut* ‘they will have done’
- (9) Conditional:
a. *aș, ai, ar, am, ați, ar* + Infinitive = Non-Past Conditional
e.g. *aș pleca* ‘I would leave’, *ar face* ‘he/she/they would do’
b. *aș, ai, ar, am, ați, ar* + *fi* + Past Participle = Past Conditional
e.g. *ai fi plecat* ‘you_{sg} would have left’, *ați fi plecat* ‘you_{pl} would have left’
- (10) Presumptive:
a. *oi, oi, o, om, oți, or* + Infinitive = Non-Past Presumptive
e.g. *o pleca* ‘he/she may/might go’, *or face* ‘they may/might do (in the future / now)’
b. *oi, oi, o, om, oți, or* + *fi* + Gerund = Present Presumptive
e.g. *o fi plecând* ‘he/she may be leaving’, *or fi făcând* ‘they may be doing’
c. *oi, oi, o, om, oți, or* + *fi* + Past Participle = Past Presumptive
e.g. *o fi plecat* ‘he/she may have left’, *or fi făcut* ‘they may/might have done’
d. *voi, vei, va, vom, veți, vor* + *fi* + Gerund = Present Presumptive (alternative form)
e.g. *va fi plecând* ‘he/she may be leaving’, *vor fi făcând* ‘they may be doing’
e. *voi, vei, va, vom, veți, vor* + *fi* + Past Participle = Past Presumptive (alternative form)

e.g. *va fi plecat* ‘he/she may have left’, *vor fi făcut* ‘they may/might have done’

1.4.2.2 Tense/Aspect oppositions inside the complement of the auxiliary: As can be seen in (9)-(10), a Tense opposition can be found inside the complement of the conditional and presumptive auxiliaries, expressed by the contrast Infinitive vs. *fi* ‘be.INF’ + Past-Participle vs. *fi* + Gerund (the latter, only for the presumptive, see (10)):

- (11) a. [_M aș [pleca]] ‘I would leave’
 b. [_M aș [fi plecat]] ‘I would have left’
 c. [_M o [scrie]] ‘(S)he might write / might be writing’
 d. [_M o [fi scris]] ‘(S)he might have written’
 e. [_M o [fi scriind]] ‘(S)he might be writing / might write’

Putting the gerund aside for the moment, note that this Tense opposition is poorer than the one encountered in the indicative (only non-past vs. past, whereas the indicative has past, present and future as absolute tenses). Moreover, the same Infinitive vs. *fi* + Past Participle opposition is found after the future auxiliary – see (7)-(8) – in which case it encodes *relative* tense (anteriority to another future event):

- (12) Când veți ajunge, eu voi fi făcut deja curat
 when will.2PL arrive I will *fi* made already clean
 ‘When you arrive, I will have already cleaned the house’

The same use of *fi* + Past Participle is found in clusters which lack inflected auxiliaries: in infinitives introduced by the C(omplementizer)/M(ood) particle *a* and in subjunctives introduced by *să*. In the former, it is opposed to the bare infinitive, just as in (7)-(9) and (11)a-d:

- (13) Infinitive:
 a. Non-Past (Non-anterior) [_{CM} a [pleca]] ‘to leave’
 b. Past (Anterior) [_{CM} a [fi plecat]] ‘to have left’
 (14) Past (Anterior) Subjunctive: [_{CM} să [fi plecat]] ‘(that) I/you/he/she/we/they should have left’

We conclude that the [*fi* + Past-Participle] sequence encodes [anterior]: whether this is absolute or relative Tense (i.e., relative to the speech time or to another reference time, see §2.*+*) is established by the selecting head (absolute with the presumptive, conditional and matrix subjunctive, relative with the infinitive, embedded subjunctive and future).

We will use the label T₂ for the functional category that encodes this binary temporal opposition, leaving the label T₁ for the (absolute) Tense realized syncretically with the indicative in (8) and (12).

Note now that the forms marked [anterior] comprise two head positions, one for the form *fi* and the other for the Past Participle (the two can be separated by clitics, see Table II in §1.3). It looks as though the feature [anterior] is split over two heads.

The Past Participle form also occurs, without *fi*, after the auxiliary HAVE in the ‘compound perfect’ (see (6)), which is normally interpreted as a perfective past. As anterior relative tenses are by default perfective, we may assume that the Past Participle represents a perfective Asp. Alternatively, we can give this head the purely descriptive label Part:

verbs *cere* ‘ask, demand’ and *spune* ‘say’). It can be noticed that the perfect stem occurs in perfective synthetic tenses (the so-called ‘simple perfect’, with the meaning of a synthetic perfective past, see the first row in the right part of Table X below, and the pluperfect, see the second row in the right part of Table X) and in the past participle form that is common to all analytic anterior forms (see previous sub-section, §1.4.2.2). We can thus assume that it represents an Asp marked [+perfective]:

Table X: The repartition of the two stems in the verb’s inflection

Present Stem		Perfect Stem	
Indicative Present and Subjunctive Present (1pl)	<i>cer-e-m</i> <i>spun-e-m</i>	Indicative Perfective Past (synthetic form) (1pl.)	<i>ceru-ră-m</i> <i>spus-e-ră-m</i>
Indicative Imperfective Past (1pl)	<i>cer-e-a-m</i> <i>spun-e-a-m</i>	Indicative Pluperfect	<i>ceru-se-ră-m</i> <i>spus-e-se-răm</i>
Imperative (2sg)	<i>cer-e</i> <i>spun-e</i>	Participle (Past Part., Supine and Passive Part. MSG)	<i>ceru-t</i> <i>spus</i>
Infinitive	<i>cer-e</i> <i>spun-e</i>		
Gerund	<i>cer-â-nd</i> <i>spun-â-nd</i>		

The only exceptions to this general association with perfective concerns forms outside the tense system – the supine and the passive participle. Crucially, in both synthetic and analytic tenses, the perfect stem is always correlated with perfective or anterior. In the previous sub-section, we have identified the past participle form occurring in analytic anterior tenses with perfective Asp. Here we propose that the perfect stem inside synthetic tenses represents the same perfective Asp. The two forms (the past participle and the perfect stem) are indeed identical when the stem ends in a consonant (see *spus* in table X), but differ when the stem ends in a vowel: in that case, the past participle is obtained by adding a *-t* (see *ceru-* vs. *cerut*). We can assume that *-t* is added to an Asp that constitutes an independent word by a special rule of the morphological component.

- ❖ Another difference between the Participle and the stem of perfective synthetic forms appears when the latter is sigmatic and the root ends in a labial or a velar that has a *-p* allomorph before *s* and *t*: in this case, *-s-* is added in synthetic forms, but *-t* for the participle (see (i)); this phenomenon occurs in some other roots in velars, in an unpredictable way (see (ii)):

- (i) *rup-s-e* ‘tore.3SG’ – *rup-t* ‘torn’, from *rup-e* ‘tear’,
coap-s-e ‘baked.3SG’ – *cop-t* ‘baked’, from *coac-e* ‘bake’
- (ii) *spar-s-e* ‘broke.3SG’ – *spar-t* ‘broken’, from *sparg-e* ‘break’,
frân-s-e ‘broke.3SG’ – *frân-t* ‘broken’, from *frâng-e* ‘break’, but
strâns-e ‘squeezed.3SG’ – *strân-s* ‘squeezed’, from *strâng-e* ‘squeeze’ (cf. also *plâng-e*,
plân-s-e, *plân-s* ‘cry’, *ling-e*, *lin-s-e*, *lin-s* ‘lick’)

A difference between these two set of forms also occurs in three irregular verbs:

- (iii) *fi* ‘be’ – *fu-i* ‘was.1SG’ – *fos-t* ‘been’
da ‘give’ – *dăd-u-i* ‘gave.1SG’ – *da-t* ‘given’
sta ‘stay, stand’ – *stăt-u-i* ‘stayed.1SG’ – *sta-t* ‘stayed’

Correlatively, the present stem (see *cer(e)*, *spun(e)* in Table X) can be analyzed as [-perfective] Asp. As this form occurs in forms unspecified for the (im)perfectivity opposition (not only in forms clearly imperfective such as the imperfect), we may consider that it represents an underspecified form.

To conclude, the M or M+T head is the head that hosts agreement features and pronominal clitics, both in synthetic and in analytic forms.

1.4.2.4 Complementizer/Mood particles and the CM position

Two of the moods of Romanian involve a position higher than M or M+T. This is the position that was labeled Complementizer/Mood in Tables II-IV above, to which we will refer as CM.

The subjunctive is distinctively marked by the CM particle *să*, which is an obligatory component of the subjunctive verb forms. Verbal endings distinguish the present subjunctive from the indicative present only in the 3rd person (with the exception of the irregular verb *fi* ‘be’, which has different roots in the two moods):

- (21) a. Present Indicative: *fac, faci, face, facem, faceți, fac* ‘do.1SG,2SG,3SG,1PL,2PL,3PL’
b. Present Subjunctive: *să fac, să faci, să facă, să facem, să faceți, să facă*

This particle, which comes from a complementizer, still keeps some complementizer features: thus, it does not require the insertion of a complementizer when it occurs in the beginning of a subordinate clause (see chapter 11 §*+* for details) – see (22)a. We may say that in such cases CM functions as a syncretic head which realizes both Mood and the subordinating C. When a constituent occurs before the verbal cluster, a complementizer *ca* may (and for most speakers must) be used, see (22):

- (22) a. Vreau [să plece toată lumea]
want.1SG SUBJ leave.3.SUBJ everybody
b. Vreau [ca toată lumea să plece]
want.1SG that everybody SUBJ leave.3.SUBJ
‘I want everybody to leave’

Besides *ca*, there are other elements placed on the Complementizer-level with which *să* may co-occur: the indirect interrogative complementizer *dacă* ‘if, whether’, relative and interrogative wh-phrases:

- (23) a. Nu știu dacă să rămân sau să plec.
not know.1SG if SUBJ stay.1SG or SUBJ leave.1SG
‘I don’t know whether I should stay or I should leave.’
b. Ne trebuie cineva care să vorbească germana.
us.DAT needs somebody which SUBJ speak.3.SUBJ German-the
‘We need somebody who can speak German.’
c. Cine să rămână?
who SUBJ stay.3.SUBJ
‘Who should stay?’

Besides adjacency with the other elements of the verbal cluster, *să* also differs from complementizers by the fact that it shows clitic behavior with respect to coordination (it must be repeated before coordinated verbs), which clearly indicates that it belongs to the verbal complex head (the difference between (24)a-b cannot be due to phonological weakness, because *că* and *să* cannot be distinguished in phonological terms, they are both unstressed monosyllables):

- (24) a. Sper că [[se va întoarce] și [ne va spune]]
hope.1SG that REFL will.3SG turn and us will.3SG tell
‘I hope that he will come back and tell us’
b. Sper să se întorcă și *(să) ne spună

hope.1SG SUBJ REFL turn.3.SUBJ and (SUBJ) us tell.3.SUBJ
 ‘I hope that (s)he will come back and tell us’

We conclude that the subjunctive Mood feature is realized both in CM and M+T. Since subjunctive mood often signals modal dependency on a superordinate clause, it is not unexpected that it involves a C-related position.

The subjunctive can appear inside a bigger verbal cluster, taken as a complement by the future auxiliaries *o* and *am* (see Table IX above):

- (25) Colloquial Future I: *o, o, o, o, o, o(r)* + Present Subjunctive
 n-o să-l mai iau
 not-will SUBJ-3.MS.ACC more take.1SG
 ‘I won’t take it/him again’
- (26) Colloquial Future II: *am, ai, are* + Present Subjunctive (only singular)
 n-am să-l mai iau
 not-have.1 SUBJ-3.MS.ACC more take.1SG
 ‘I won’t take it/him again’

These configurations involve two M+T-heads: the present subjunctive one, selected by *să*, hosts subject agreement and pronominal clitics; the auxiliaries that selects *să* also represent M+T, encoding indicative future:

- (27) [(Neg) [M+T [(pron.) CM [[adv.] V-Asp]-M+T]]]

The features of the lower M+T, dependent-modality and non-anterior, do not conflict with the features of the higher M+T. The auxiliary *o* is mostly uninflected, but a special 3rd plural form is sometimes used. The auxiliary *am*, which does agree, is only used in the singular in the contemporary standard language.

The subjunctive that constitutes the lower part of the cluster in these environments differs from other subjunctive clusters by lacking negation (see (28)). The only admissible position for negation is above the higher M+T (see (25)-(26)). Since negation generally occurs above M+T (see Tables II-III), this order supports the analysis of the auxiliaries as M+T. Clitics do not attach to them because they attach to the closest M+T target they encounter, which is the lower head.

- (28) * o să nu-l mai iau
 will SUBJ not-3MS.ACC more take.1SG

❖ *Să* can also be used with the complex sentential negation *nu cumva*, which occurs outside the verbal cluster. See Chapter 6 §5 for this construction.

CM particles also occur in two non-finite forms – the infinitive and the supine (see Tables II, III and VII):

- (29) a. fără [a ne mai aștepta]
 without to us more expect.INF
 ‘without expecting us’
 b. Am terminat [de vorbit]
 have.1 finished SUP talk.SUP
 ‘I/We finished talking’

In these cases, the label CM is justified by the subordinating use of the particles, which is clear.

A position lower than the C of finite clauses has been proposed for the non-finite complementizers of other Romance languages (It. *di, a*, Fr. *de, à*). We may identify the CM position of Romanian with this position, labeled Fin in the cartographic literature.

Infinitives differ from supines by allowing clitics, the clausal negation *nu* and tense oppositions (see also the rows (vi) and (x) of the tables in §1.3, vs. (xiv)-(xv)):

- (30) a nu se mai {obosi / fi obosit}
 to not 3.REFL.ACC more tire *fi* tired
 ‘not to {make / have made} any effort any longer’

This means that the infinitive has a full-blown cluster, including the M+T head that hosts pronominal clitics. The infinitival inflection can be considered as the realization of this head; the only difference wrt. finite environments is that this head does not host subject agreement.

- (31) [CM ([Neg] [[M+T] [V+Asp]]]]]

The supine lacks all the intermediate functional heads between CM and v (i.e. M, T, Asp). See chapter 12 §2 for an analysis.

The past – or rather anterior – tense of the subjunctive resembles the infinitive by lacking subject agreement. Nevertheless, it behaves like finite forms with respect to the possibility of occurring in main clauses.

- (32) Să-l fi văzut!
 SUBJ-3MS.ACC *fi* seen
 ‘If only I/you/he/she/we/they had seen him/it!’

Since *fi* + Past Participle is the form that occurs in all non-indicative past/anterior analytic tenses, we can assume that in the cluster in (32) the M position, which hosts agreement, is empty, *fi* occupying the same lower position as in analytic modal anterior/past tenses:

- (33) a. [CM să [M [[CI -l][MØ] [T2/Asp *fi* [Asp/Perf văzut]]]]]]
 SUBJ 3MS.ACC *fi* seen
 b. [[M [CI l- [M am]] [T2/Asp *fi* [Asp/Perf văzut]]]]]]
 3MS.ACC-would.1PL *fi* seen
 ‘We would have seen him/it’

1.4.2.5 Verb movement to the CM-position

In affirmative imperatives, the [Adv+Inflected V] sequence shows a reversed order with respect to pronominal clitics (see table IV):

- (34) mai arată-mi-l
 more show.2SG.IMPV-me.DAT-3MS.ACC
 ‘Show it/him to me more/again!’

Since pronominal clitics are attached to the left of M(+T), the order in (34) can be assumed to indicate that the [(Adv)+V_{Imperative}] head has moved to the CM position. As the verb bears agreement, which is a feature on M, the moved imperative verb must contain the M head.

A first indication supporting a movement analysis is the postverbal position of pronominal clitics, which can be explained in two ways: either the smallest possible M-head moves (containing M and its host, the [(Adv)+V] head), leaving behind the clitics attached to the vacated M-position, or clitics attach to a distinct head F that intervenes between CM and M.

(35) [CM [CM mai arată] [M/F mi-l [M mai arată]]]

Further evidence for movement comes from several facts: (i) Negation blocks this order reversal, leaving the V in the normal position after pronominal clitics. Notice also that V bears in that case a different inflection in the singular (identical to the infinitive):

(36) nu [mi-l [mai arăta / arătați]]
 not me.DAT-3MS.ACC more show.INF show.2PL
 ‘Don’t show it/him to me any more!’ (you_{sg} / you_{pl})

This might be explained if imperative CM attracts the closest head: when Neg is present, it is Neg that moves to CM, instead of the M head.

- ❖ In the hypothesis that clitic pronouns attach to a distinct head F, the blocking effect of negation, as opposed to the head F, may be explained by assuming that Neg and M are possible goals for attraction by CM, by virtue of a feature they possess, whereas F is not.

(ii) The same order reversal is found in the so-called *să*-less subjunctive: a 3rd person subjunctive form, the only form inflectionally marked as subjunctive, may occur before pronominal clitics, and in this case *să* cannot appear:

(37) a. ducă-se! / * spună-se! / *cânte-se! ...
 bring.3.SUBJ-3REFL.ACC say.3.SUBJ-3REFL.ACC sing. 3.SUBJ-3REFL.ACC
 ‘(S)he may well go!’
 b. să se ducă / spună / cânte !
 SUBJ 3.REFL.ACC bring.3.SUBJ say.3.SUBJ sing.3.SUBJ
 ‘Let him/her/it go! / Let it be said! /
 c. * Îl las ducă-se
 him let.1SG bring.3.SUBJ-3REFL.ACC

This construction, which is no longer productive, but limited to a few fixed expressions, has properties very similar to imperatives: it is only found in main clauses – yielding an optative reading – and is incompatible with negation.

The restriction to main clauses indicates that inversion is triggered by an element expressing illocutionary force, which should belong to the C domain (the clause typing domain). This supports the idea that inversion is triggered by the CM head, which attracts the head that contains the lexical verb.

(iii) Another obsolete construction, now restricted to fixed expressions (mostly imprecations), clearly shows raising of the lexical V above the M-position: this is the auxiliary inversion construction (see table V), which differs from the ones examined before in that the element hosting agreement features is not moved:

1.4.2.6 The special position of the feminine singular accusative clitic *o*

Whereas all the orders discussed so far are determined by abstract or syntactic features of the heads in the cluster (e.g. features such as ‘affix’, pronoun, auxiliary or ‘subjunctive’), there is one pronominal clitic, the feminine singular accusative clitic *o*, whose position at the end of clusters with inflected auxiliaries depends on extra-syntactic features:

- (45) The FSG.ACC clitic *o* is obligatorily placed at the end of the cluster iff the normal clitic position in the cluster is to the left of an auxiliary beginning in a vowel (auxiliaries beginning in a vowel are *am*, *aş*, *oi*)

The following examples illustrate this rule:

- (46) a. *l-aş aduce* (normal position of clitics)
 3MS.ACC-would.1SG bring.INF
 b. **o aş aduce / b'. aş aduce-o* (application of rule (45))
 3FS.ACC would.1SG bring.INF would.1SG bring.INF-3FS.ACC
- (47) a. *i-am văzut* (normal position of clitics)
 3MP.ACC-have.1SG seen
 b. **o am văzut / b'. am văzut-o* (application of rule (45))
 3FS.ACC have.1SG seen have.1SG seen-3FS.ACC

❖ Exceptionally, *o* appears at the end if the auxiliary is *voi* ‘will; may’, especially in past/anterior tenses:

- (i) *va fi făcut-o*
 will/may.3SG *fi* done-3FS.ACC
 ‘(S)he might/will have done it’

As it makes reference to the phonological properties of certain elements of the cluster (auxiliaries and clitic pronouns), this rule belongs to the component of the grammar that relates syntactic structure to its phonological realization:

- (48) $[[_{Cl} o] [[_{Y} V...] [X]]] \rightarrow [[_{Y} V...] [X]] -o$, where Y is a clitic category and V- stands for ‘vowel’

The motivation of the rule is euphonical: as *o* is the only clitic that consists in one vowel alone, this rule can be described as a euphony rule aimed at avoiding coalescence with a following vowel, which might result in reduced perceptibility of the clitic, especially if the following element itself is weak (clitic). Notice that the rule only applies when the following element is an auxiliary, i.e., a clitic itself. If the clitic position comes before a *lexical* verb beginning in a vowel, *o* is not moved:

- (49) *o aştept*
 3FS.ACC wait.1SG
 ‘I’m waiting for her’

❖ Euphonical considerations explain why the clitic placement was fixed in this way, but the historical explanation is more complex: Old Romanian had inversion with inflected lexical verbs (see (40)); probably from such constructions, it developed a post-cluster position for clitics even in constructions with auxiliaries:

- (50) va ceti-le (Palia de la Orăștie (1582), 6)
will.3SG read.INF-3FP.ACC

So at some moment clitics could appear either before Aux or after the lexical verb. The first alternative, which has always been predominant, was generalized, but the second one was specialized for *o* because of the euphonical pressure.

Another construction which arose from the Old Romanian variability in clitic positions is clitic reduplication: the clitics occur at the same time before the auxiliary and, repeated, at the end of the cluster. This construction survives in northern and western varieties of Romanian:

- (51) Ț-a da-ți (Northern Moldova, in *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, p. 230)
you.DAT-will.3SG give.INF-you.DAT

1.5 Evidence for the clitic status of auxiliaries, mood particles and negation

Functional words can be phonologically weak, i.e. lack word stress, without being syntactic clitics. For instance, the complementizers *că* and *ca* ‘that’ are unstressed, just like the subjunctive particle *să* and the auxiliaries *am*, *aș*, *oi* or *voi*, but do not show the same distributional restrictions as clitics. The clitic status of the elements that we have identified as components of the verbal cluster is based on the following evidence:

(i) *Adjacency*. The clitic elements of the cluster cannot be separated from the lexical verb by other elements except those that are themselves clitics, respecting the strict orders described in §1.3 above. This clearly differentiates Romanian auxiliaries from their counterparts in other Romance languages and Germanic languages:

- (52) a. am { *mereu / *adesea / *probabil / *repede / *deja } uitat
have.1 always often probably quickly already forgotten
b. J’ai toujours/souvent / probablement / vite / déjà oublié (French)

The impossibility of adverb interpolation in (52) is not due to the fact that these adverbs have obligatory positions above the auxiliary or below the position to which the lexical verb. Indeed, many adverb classes, among which those illustrated in (52)a, can freely occur before or after the verbal cluster, without one of the orders being clearly more marked than the other:

- (53) { mereu / adesea / probabil / deja } am uitat { mereu / adesea / probabil / deja } să...
‘I always/often/probably/already forgot to...’

The only adverbial elements that can appear inside clitic clusters form a closed class, counting just 5 items – *mai* ‘more, still, again’, *și* ‘also; already; immediately’, *tot* ‘on-and-on, over-and-over’, *cam* ‘quite, almost’, *prea* (used with negation: ‘quite’). These adverbs *must* occur inside the cluster (unless they have other meanings and/or other categorial status; see chapter 14 §*+* for details):

- (54) (*mai) l-a (mai) adus (*mai)
more 3MS.ACC-has more brought more
‘(S)he brought him/it again / (S)he has brought him/it before’

Such a restricted distribution is characteristic of clitics.

- ❖ When clitic adverbs co-occur, their order is normally rigid. See chapter 14 § *§x*.
- ❖ In substandard varieties, clitic adverbs, especially *mai*, can occur farther from the verb than other clitics, e.g. before pronouns and even auxiliaries (but never before negation). See chapter 14 § *+*.
- ❖ Certain adverbs and focal particles (e.g. *prea* with the meaning ‘too much’, *toctmai* ‘just’) are obligatorily placed immediately before the entire cluster. However, they do not qualify as clitics according to the coordination test given in (ii) below. See chapter 14 §*+*.

(ii) *Restrictions on coordination.* As we have seen in the discussion of the subjunctive marker *să* in §1.4.2.4 above (see (24)), the elements of the cluster cannot combine with a coordination of phrases, in contrast to words that are only phonologically weak (unstressed) such as complementizers and prepositions. Here are other examples of this constraint:

- (55) a. * Am [mers acolo și cercetat chestiunea]
 have.1 gone there and inquired issue-the
 b. * Vor [pleca și încuia ușa]
 will.3PL leave and lock door-the
 c. * Ar [veni și vorbi cu noi]
 would.3 come and talk with us
 d. * Ar fi [venit și vorbit cu noi]
 would.3 *fi* come and spoken with us
 e. * Nu [știam și/sau înțelegeam nimic]
 not know.IMPF.1SG and/or understand.IMPF.1SG anything
 f. A munci puțin și ??(a) câștiga bine era ce urmăreau toți
 to work.INF little and to earn.INF well was what be-after.IMPV.3PL all

Coordination is exceptionally allowed if what is coordinated are *heads* rather than phrases. The head status of the conjuncts is evidenced by the following constraints: nothing may intervene between the first head and the conjunction, and if something follows the second head, it must be a dependent of both verbs – i.e., a constituent shared by the two VPs, in a right node raising configuration (see **+** on right node raising). This is why (56)a, where *toate lucrările* is the object of both verbs, is accepted and (55)b, where *ușa* is the object of just the second verb, is not; in (56)b, *împreună* ‘together’ refers to both actions – reading and discussing:

- (56) a. Am [corectat și notat] toate lucrările
 have.1 revised and marked all papers-the
 ‘I revised and marked all the papers’
 b. Îl vom [citi și discuta] împreună
 3MS.ACC will.1PL read and discuss together
 c. Nu [vorbi și mânca] în același timp!
 not talk.IMPV.NEG.2SG and eat. IMPV.NEG.2SG in same time
 ‘Don’t talk and eat at the same time!’

We explain these data as follows: if both members of a coordination are heads, the whole complex [H_1 & H_2] can acquire a head status. This allows it to combine with a syntactic clitic, which requires combination with a head.

Subjunctive *să* appears to disallow even this type of coordination:

- (57) ?? I-am spus să [corecteze și noteze] toate lucrările
 3SG.DAT-have.1 told SUBJ correct.3.SUBJ and mark.3.SUBJ all papers-the

Like in other languages, even this head-coordination is forbidden in combination with an enclitic (compare (56)b with (58)):

- (58) * Am [citit și discutat]-o împreună / * am citit-o și discutat...
 have.1 read and discussed-3FSG.ACC together have.1 read-3FSG.ACC and discussed

(iii) As we have seen in the previous sub-section (§1.4.2.6), there is a special morphological rule that moves the clitic pronoun *o* at the end of the cluster, when the normal clitic position is to the left of an auxiliary beginning in a vowel. Such rules typically do not change the cliticization domain established in syntax (they operate on local domains that have the status of morphological words):

(59) [o [aș [fi dus]]] → aș fi dus-o
 3FS.ACC would.1SG *fi* brought

(iv) Finally, let us point out a property of Romanian auxiliaries which, although is not by itself an argument for cliticity, is correlated to their higher degree of grammaticalization with respect to their counterparts in other Romance languages and Germanic languages: they do not have the same forms as the lexical verbs they come from, as seen in the following tables (the auxiliary forms that are different are boldfaced):

Table XI: Auxiliaries and the corresponding lexical verbs

	<i>have</i> (IND.PRES)	PERFECTIVE PAST AUX.	<i>want</i> (IND.PRES)	FUTURE AUX. I	FUTURE AUX. II	PRESUMPTIVE AUX.
1SG	am	am	vreau	voi	o	oi
2SG	ai	ai	vrei	vei	o	oi
3SG	are	a	vrea	va	o	o
1PL	avem	am	vrem	vom	o	om
2PL	aveți	ați	vreți	veți	o	oți
3PL	au	au	vor	vor	o(r)	or

- ❖ The conditional auxiliary, *aș, ai, ar, am, ați, ar*, has not been included in the table because its origin is disputed: some studies derive it from *avea* ‘have’, based on the formal resemblance (compare the indicative present of *avea* in the table), others, based on data from the old language and dialects, trace it back to the imperfect of *vrea* ‘want’, which would fit well with the crosslinguistic parallelism in future and conditional formation (the conditional being formed from the past tense of a future auxiliary, see English *would* vs. *will*, Romance *-r-* futures and conditionals < *-ere-habeō* and *-ere-habēbam*).
- ❖ The non-finite auxiliary *fi* used in anterior/past tenses (in combination with an inflected auxiliary or a CM particle) is identical to the infinitive of the copula (cf. *(a) fi* ‘(to) be’).

Notice moreover that auxiliaries do not show tense oppositions, contrary to other Romance languages (see Fr. *a fait* ‘have.PRS.3SG done’, *avait fait* ‘have.IMPF.3SG done’, *aura fait* ‘have.FUT.3SG done’, *aurait fait* ‘have.COND.3SG done’) or Germanic (see Engl. *have/had, do/did*).

- ❖ The clitic status of auxiliaries was not yet completely attained in the oldest attested stage of Romanian: in XVIth century texts, adjacency with the lexical verb was only obligatory in inversion (the type Lexical Verb-Auxiliary), but in the Aux-V order, various constituents, including the subject, could intervene, e.g. *au Domnul cu noi făcut* ‘has Lord with us done’ (*Palia de la Orăștie* [1582], Exodus XIII, 8), *va toată legea feri* ‘will.3SG all law-the observe.INF’ (*Codicele Voronețean* [1563-83], 59v, 10-11).

1.6 Stress properties of the verbal cluster

Clitic elements generally do not have their own word stress. This holds for all the elements we have treated as clitics inside the verbal cluster with one exception, negation. The sentential negation *nu* bears the main stress of the cluster, and the accent of the lexical verb surfaces as a

secondary stress and may be deleted if it is too close to the negation (adjacent or after 1 syllable):

- (60) Clusters without negation: stress on the lexical verb
- a. *îl va fi a'dus*
 3MS.ACC will.3SG *fi* brought
- b. *mai lă'sați-mă*
 more let.2PL.IMPV-me.ACC
- c. *'lua-l-ar*
 take.INF-3.MS.ACC-would.3
- (61) Clusters with negation
- a. *'nu-l va fi a,dus*
 not-3MS.ACC will.3SG *fi* brought
- b. *'nu ,cântă / 'nu cân,tă / 'nu cântă*
 not sings not sang.3SG not sings / sang.3SG
- c. *să 'nu mi-l mai a,rate*
 SUBJ not me.DAT-3MS.ACC more show.3.SUBJ
 '(s)he/they should not show it to me anymore'

If negation is followed by a vowel, its final vowel *-u* may fall, in which case the stress moves to the following vowel (as we can see in (62) by comparing with the affirmative forms, this stress is not the stress of the verb, but the stress contributed by negation, moved to the vowel that replaces the vowel of *nu*). This phenomenon is particularly frequent with auxiliaries, as in (62)a, but is not excluded with lexical verbs, see (62)b.

- (62) a. *'n-am știut* vs. *am ști'ut*
 not have.1 known have.1 known
- b. *'n-arată* vs. *a'rată*
 not-shows shows

1.7 Evidence for verb movement

In the syntactic analysis developed in section §1.4, we have proposed that the verb moves from the VP to a functional projection realized inside the verbal complex, both in analytic and synthetic forms. The verb phrase is the domain in which the arguments of the verb are introduced. This corresponds to the general theoretical view according to which lexical categories first satisfy their argument selection properties, which are dependent on the lexical choice of the verb, and then combine with functional categories, which are uniform across verbal domains:

- (63) [Functional categories [_{VP} Subject [_V [V Complements]]]]

This general clause structure pattern is based on languages where auxiliaries take as complements VPs in which the lexical V remains in its base position. The existence of a VP constituent is much less clear in Romanian, where auxiliaries are clitics on the verb, which necessarily raises out of the VP. Therefore, empirical evidence is needed in order to extend the analysis in (63) to Romanian.

Some indirect evidence relates to the hierarchical relations between postverbal constituents. If the verb has moved, some of the constituents which appear postverbally in the

overt (surface) structure may have been generated (first merged) to the left of the original (base) position of the verb:

(64) [Aux+V/V+Inflection] XP YP t_V ZP

When two such constituents (e.g. XP and YP in (64)) are *stacked* (are in an asymmetrical hierarchical relation), the leftmost one will attach to a constituent formed by V in its base position and the rightmost one, i.e., it will be *higher* than the rightmost one:

(65) [Aux+V/V+Inflection] [XP [YP t_V]]

For a constituent attached to the right of the base position of the verb (ZP in (64)), we expect two possible hierarchical relations in stacking with respect to a constituent attached to the left of the base position of the verb:

(66) a. [Aux+V/V+Inflection] [XP [t_V ZP]]
 b. [Aux+V/V+Inflection] [[XP t_V] ZP]

Summing up, XP in (64), in case of stacking, is necessarily higher than YP and can be higher or lower than ZP.

If there is no movement at all, the hierarchical relations described above cannot be obtained: the only possibility to stack constituents after the verb is to attach them successively to the right, in which case the more to the right a constituent is, the higher it is:

(67) [[[V XP] YP] ZP]

Summing up, the movement analysis predicts the possibility of a hierarchical relation XP>YP in the order V-XP-YP, whereas an analysis without any movement predicts this relation to be impossible:

(68) [_{MP} [Aux+V / V+Inflection] [_{VP/VP} XP [(YP) t_V (YP)]]]

Hierarchical relations of the type in (68), with postverbal constituents to the left higher than those to the right, can be indeed observed with adverbs. The verb inside the verbal cluster can be separated from the object by more than one adverb; in this case, if a hierarchical relation between the adverbs can be established by independent means (semantics, crosslinguistic generalizations, see Chapter 14 §*+*), we usually find the hierarchical relation represented in (68) – the higher adverb is to the left of the lower one. Thus, temporal/aspectual adverbs and adverbial PPs such as *deja* ‘already’, *într-o clipă* ‘in a trice’, *de multă vreme* ‘long ago’ appear before manner adverbs such as *complet* ‘completely’, *serios* ‘seriously, carefully’ (see (69)a-c); speaker-oriented evaluative adverbials such as *din (ne)fericire* ‘(un)fortunately’ precede aspectual adverbs such as *iarăși* ‘again’ (see (69)d) as well as modal adverbs such as *probabil* ‘probably’, which in turn precede aspectual adverbs (see (69)e):

(69) a. *Și-a pierdut [deja / într-o clipă [complet rațiunea]].*
 3.REFL.DAT-has lost already in a trice completely reason-the
 ‘(S)he has already completely lost his/her judgment.’
 a'. **Și-a pierdut complet {deja / într-o clipă} rațiunea.*
 3.REFL.DAT-has lost completely already in a trice reason-the

- b. Ei au discutat [deja [serios chestiunea]].
they have discussed already seriously issue-the
'They've already seriously discussed the issue.'
- b'. *Ei au discutat *serios* *deja* chestiunea.
they have discussed seriously already issue-the
- c. Ei au discutat [de multă vreme [cu mare atenție chestiunea]].
they have discussed from much time with great attention issue-the
'They discussed the issue very carefully long ago.'
- c'. *Ei au discutat *cu mare atenție* *de multă vreme* chestiunea.
they have discussed with great attention from much time issue-the
- d. George va face [din fericire [iarăși gimnastică]].
George will do fortunately again gymnastics
'George will fortunately do gymnastics again.'
- d'. *George va face *iarăși* *din fericire* gimnastică.
George will do again fortunately gymnastics
- e. Îl vor angaja [din nefericire [probabil [din nou pe Mircea]]].
CL.ACC will.3PL hire unfortunately probably again DOM Mircea
'They unfortunately will probably hire Mircea again.'
- e. ' *Îl vor angaja *probabil* *din nefericire* pe Mircea.
CL.ACC will.3PL hire probably unfortunately DOM Mircea
- e. " *Îl vor angaja *din nou* *din nefericire* pe Mircea.
CL.ACC will.3PL hire again unfortunately DOM Mircea

With frequency adverbs, which yield different scope interpretations, we again find the same hierarchical relations. Thus, in (70)a *din nou* 'again' applies to the whole iterative event of 'passing sometimes', indicating that a similar event took place before, whereas in (70)b *uneori* 'sometimes' quantifies over events of 'passing again':

- (70) a. Trecea [din nou [uneori pe la mine]]
pass.IMPF.3SG again sometimes by me
'(S)he would again visit me sometimes'
- b. Trecea [uneori [din nou pe la mine]]
pass.IMPF.3SG sometimes again by me
'(S)he would sometimes visit me again'

Notice that if the verb appears in the passive participle form, which does not enter into the verbal complex and is not marked for Tense and Mood (see §1.8.1), the verb appears either *after* this sequence of adverbs or in front of the last adverb of the sequence:

- (71) a. Șansa este [deja [complet pierdută]]
chance-the is already completely lost
- b. Chestiunea a fost [deja [(serios) discutată (serios)]]
issue-the has been already seriously discussed seriously
- c. Latina este [din fericire [iarăși predată în școli]]
Latin-the is fortunately again taught in schools
- d. Mircea va fi [din nefericire [probabil [(din nou) angajat (din nou)]]]
Mircea will be unfortunately probably again hired again
- e. Eram [din nou [(uneori) întrebat (uneori)]]
was.1SG again sometimes asked sometimes

- f. Eram [uneori [întrebat din nou]]
was.1SG sometimes asked again

It is therefore reasonable to assume that when it occurs inside the verbal complex, as in (69)-(70), the verb moves from the position it shows in (71).

A similar conclusion can be reached by examining the position of arguments. Thus, it is widely held that the arguments do not all attach at the same level, but obey a hierarchy, which explains binding asymmetries and various crosslinguistic word order generalizations (see chapter 3 on Argument Structure). It is generally agreed that at least the subject is generated higher than the object and the other complements of the verb. Now, we observe that when the subject is postverbal, it often occurs before the object or other complements; it appears that this is the unmarked order between S and other complements, being the most natural in out-of-the-blue contexts (where the entire sentence is new information, see (72)) or when the subject and object are equally non-specific (see (73)).

- (72) a. Ia uitați! Vorbește președintele la televizor
look speaks president-the at TV
'Look! The president is speaking on TV!'
b. – Ce se aude? – Repară un instalator țevile
what REFL hears repairs a plumber pipes-the
'What's that noise?' 'A plumber is repairing the pipes'
- (73) a. N-a spus nimeni nimic
not-has said nobody nothing
b. Cred că a spus cineva ceva
think.1SG that has said somebody something
'I think somebody said something'

The VSO order is compatible with a higher base position of the subject wrt. the object if we assume verb movement:

- (74) [MP [Aux+V / V+Inflection] [v_P Subject [v_P t_V Object/Other complements]]]

Another argument in favor of the structures with verb movement in (68) comes from constituency tests: notice that an array of postverbal phrases forms a constituent under the analysis in (68) but not under the analysis in (67). A phenomenon which typically targets constituents is right node raising, in which a common constituent of two conjoined phrases appears at the end of the coordinate sequence. In (75)b, (76)b we see that the underlined sequence of postverbal phrases in (75)a, (76)a can occur in a right node raising configuration, thus behaving as a constituent (see (75)c, (76)c) (In these examples, we didn't use coordination of verbal clusters such as *am pus și vom mai pune* 'have.1 put and will.1PL again put' in order to rule out the possibility that what is coordinated are complex MT-heads).

- (75) a. Am pus flori în grădină.
have.1 put flowers in garden
'We planted flowers in the garden.'
b. Am pus și intenționez să mai punem [flori în grădină].
have.1 put and intend.1PL SUBJ more put.1PL flowers in garden
'We planted and intend to continue planting flowers in the garden.'
c. [MP [am pus] [v_P t_V flori în grădină]]

- (76) a. Au jucat românii cu englezii.
 have played Romanians-the with Englishmen-the
 ‘Romania played with England.’
 b. Au jucat și sper să mai joace [românii cu englezii].
 have played and hope.1SG SUBJ more play.3 Romanians-the with Englishmen-the
 ‘Romania played with England and I hope they will play again.’
 c. [MP [au jucat] [vP românii tV cu englezii]]

The following examples show that the sequence of postverbal phrases can be modified by a focal particle such as *doar* ‘only’, *și* ‘also’, which is also indicative of constituency; (77)c shows that this constituent can also be displaced (the scope of *doar* shows that the two phrases are not moved separately):

- (77) a. Au jucat doar [românii cu englezii].
 have.3PL played only Romanians-the with Englishmen-the
 ‘The only play was between Romania and England.’
 b. Voi pune și [note studenților].
 have.1SG put also grades students-the.DAT
 ‘I’ll also give grades to the students.’
 c. Doar [note studenților] mai trebuie să pun.
 only grades students-the.DAT still must SUBJ put.1SG
 ‘All I still have to do is to give grades to the students.’

1.8 Periphrastic constructions that do not constitute a verbal cluster

1.8.1 Passives

Traditional grammars include in a verb’s paradigm a *passive* conjugation, consisting of the copula *fi* ‘be’ and the passive participle. Note however, that the copula BE in the passive construction differs from the Tense/Mood auxiliaries examined in this chapter in that it does not form a verbal cluster with the participle, but instead takes a phrasal complement headed by the participle (more precisely, a small clause, see Chapter 13):

- (78) a. Chestiunea **fusese** deja [PartP abordată de specialiști].
 issue(F)-the be.PLPF.3SG already addressed.FSG by specialists
 ‘The issue had already been addressed by specialists.’
 b. De ce **au** **fost** atâtea lucruri [PartP eliminate din program]?
 why have.3PL been so-many things(N) removed.FPL from program
 ‘Why were so many things removed from the program?’

Unlike auxiliaries, which, as we have seen, represent functional categories morphologically and syntactically different from the lexical verbs they come from, *fi* ‘be’ used with the passive participle is nothing else than the copula that appears with adjectives and other non-verbal predicative constituents (PPs, nominals etc.; see Chapter 13 on copular constructions small clauses). *Fi* can combine with the passive participle not because of a special property of *fi*, but because of the distributional properties of the passive participle, which is a *verbal form with a (basically) adjectival distribution* (see also volume I chapter 7 §1.2.3). This is shown by the fact that it can be used as a noun modifier (see (79)a), it can occur in other small-clause environments than the postcopular one (as a complement, see (79)b, or an adjunct, see (79)c) and it agrees exactly like adjectives (see (78)-(79)):

- (79) a. chestiuni [importante] / [**abordate de multă lume**]
 issues(F) important.FPL addressed.FPL by many people
- b. Discursul era așa de bine reprodus din memorie încât părea [**citit**] /
 discourse-the was so well reproduced from memory that seemed.3SG read
 [mecanic].
 mechanical
 ‘The discourse was reproduced from memory so well that it seemed (to be) read /
 mechanical.’
- c. [**Admirată de toți în seara aceea**] / [Foarte frumoasă în seara
 admired.FSG by all in evening-the that very beautiful.FPL in evening-the
 aceea], Maria dansa cu multă pasiune.
 that Maria dance.IMPF.3SG with much passion
 ‘Admired by all that evening / Very beautiful that evening, Maria was dancing
 passionately.’

The specific properties of the passive participle, as well as some distributional differences wrt. adjectives, will be discussed in Chapter 4 §1.

In sum, contrary to a widely assumed view, *fi* is not a passive auxiliary, in the sense that the passive meaning is not contributed by *fi* itself, which instead functions as a simple copula.

1.8.2 Future in the past

The relative tense meaning, which can be expressed by inflections or auxiliaries belonging to the verbal complex (see the pluperfect – anterior to the past – and the future perfect – anterior to the future, see §1.4.2.1-1.4.2.2), can also be conveyed by lexical verbs. Thus, the verbs *avea* ‘have’ and *urma* ‘follow’ combined with a subjunctive clause express posteriority. *Avea* has this use only in the imperfect, which is thus specialized for the ‘future in the past’, and agrees with the subject of the embedded verb. *Urma* can also appear in other tenses and normally does not agree (it is an impersonal verb; however, agreeing forms as in (80)c often occur in the colloquial register):

- (80) a. Aveam, așadar, să-l reîntâlnesc peste șase luni
 have.IMPF.1 thus SUBJ-him meet-again.1SG after six months
 ‘Thus, I was going to meet him again after six months’
- b. Urma ca peste trei ani să ne revedem.
 follow.IMPF.3SG that after three years SUBJ us see-again.1PL
 ‘We would see each other again in three years.’
- c. Urmau în curând să nu mai fie vizibile.
 follow.IMPF.3PL soon SUBJ not more be.SUBJ.3 visible
 ‘They were soon going to be out of sight.’

The examples above show that these verbs do not form a cluster with the main verb (see the intervening constituents). Evidence for a bi-clausal construction is also provided by negation, which can appear on either one of the two verbs:

- (81) a. Nu aveam să-l mai văd niciodată / vreodată.
 not have.IMPF.1 SUBJ-him more see.1SG never / ever
- b. Aveam să nu-l mai văd niciodată.

have.IMPF.1 SUBJ not-him more see.1SG never
 ‘I never saw him again afterwards.’

Verbs with a temporal-aspectual meaning will be discussed in the chapter on aspectual and causative verbs (chapter 6).

1.8.3 Restructuring verbs

Some aspectual and modal verbs resemble auxiliaries in that they combine with a non-finite verbal form in constructions that can be described as monoclausal, due to the fact that they have only one position for sentential negation and clitic pronouns and adverbs (in the cluster of the matrix verb):

- (82) *putea* ‘can’ + Infinitive
 a. Nu-l mai pot vedea.
 not-him more can.1SG see.INF
 ‘I can’t see him anymore.’
 b. * Pot (nu) îl (mai) vedea.
 can.1SG not him more see.INF
- (83) *trebui* ‘must’ + (Passive) participle
 a. Îi / Nu (mai) trebuie dată asta.
 3SG.DAT not (more) must given.FSG this.F
 ‘This must be (also) given to him/her. / This doesn’t have to be given (anymore).’
 b. * Trebuie îi /nu /mai dată asta.
 must 3SG.DAT not more given.FSG this.F
- (84) *termina* ‘finish’ + *de*-Supine
 a. N-am (mai) terminat-o de scris.
 not have.1 (more) finished-3FSG.ACC SUP write.SUP
 ‘I haven’t finished writing it.’
 b. * Am terminat de (n-)o / mai scris.
 have.1 finished SUP not-3FSG.ACC more write.SUP

These constructions will be discussed in chapter 11. We mention them here in order to stress that none of these constructions constitutes a verbal cluster, as shown by the tests relying on adjacency and coordination:

- (85) a. Poate și el veni.
 can.3SG also he come.INF
 ‘He may come too.’
 b. Putem [[mânca mult] și [totuși slăbi]]?
 can.1PL eat.INF much and still lose-weight.INF
 ‘Can we eat much and still lose weight?’
 c. Trebuie toate astea strânse?
 must all these.F put-in-order(PTCP).FPL
 ‘Must all of this be put in order?’
 d. Am terminat de trei ore de vorbit la telefon.
 have.1 finished from three hours SUP talk.SUP on phone
 ‘I’ve finished for three hours talking on the phone.’

The modal/aspectual verb is a V that has its own verbal cluster. The monoclausality effects are due to the fact that this V selects a verb phrase that lacks the functional categories that host pronominal and adverbial clitics and sentential negation – Asp, T, Mood, Neg.

Regarding the clitics illustrated in (82)-(84), we should notice a difference between pronominal and adverbial clitics: whereas pronominal clitics are complements of the non-finite verb (they are displaced from the VP complement to the cluster of the matrix verb, a phenomenon known as *clitic climbing*), adverbial clitics can only modify the matrix verb, they never undergo ‘climbing’. This is shown by the following fact: an adverb that cannot be interpreted as modifying the matrix verb, such as the repetitive *tot* ‘on and on’ with *putea* ‘can’, cannot occur in this construction (see (86)a) – although it can, of course, occur in the complement of *putea* when this complement is clausal (see the subjunctive in (86)b).

- (86) a. * Tot poate scrie (fără să se întrerupă)
 on-and-on can.3SG write.INF without SUBJ 3.REFL interrupt.3
 b. Poate să tot poate (fără să se întrerupă).
 can.3SG SUBJ on-and-on write.3 without SUBJ 3.REFL interrupt.3
 ‘(S)he can write incessantly.’

This indicates that clitic adverbs are base-generated in the positions they occupy inside the cluster (they are not moved there, unlike pronominal clitics).

Literature

On the verbal cluster (the clitic status of auxiliaries, negation and mood particles, and various syntactic analyses of this property), see: Guțu-Romalo (1962), Dobrovie-Sorin (1994, 2001), Barbu (1999), Dobrovie-Sorin & Galves (2000), Giurgea (2011).

On the functional category of Aspect in Romanian verbal forms, see: Cornilescu (1997), Alboiu (2002).

For the explanation of the order Clitic Adv–Agreeing Inflected V (vs. Agreeing Auxiliary–Clitic Adv–Non-finite V), see Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) and Alboiu (2002).

On the categorial nature of the subjunctive particle *să*, see: Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Motapanyane (1995), Cornilescu (1997), Avram (1999), Alboiu (2002), Isac & Jakab (2004), Ronai (2015).

For an explanation of verb-auxiliary and verb-pronominal clitic inversion based on verb movement, see Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Rivero (1994, 1997), Alboiu (2002), Hill (2013).

For the idea that the perfect auxiliary *am* represents the result of moving the head realized by the auxiliary *fi* to a higher position, see Ledgeway (2014).

On arguments for V-movement and the existence of a VP-constituent in a VSO language, see McCloskey (2011).

For the proposal of V movement in Romance, based on the V-Adv-O order, see Emonds (1978), Pollock (1989).

References

- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
 Avram, Larisa. 1999. *Auxiliaries and the Structure of Language*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
 Barbu, Ana Maria, 1999. Complexul verbal. *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 50:1, 39-84.

- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 1997. Notes on the Syntax of the Subject. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 42, 101-147.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen & Charlotte Galves. 2000. Proclisis, enclisis and head-to-head merge. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 2(1): 35-51.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2001. Head-to-Head Merge in Balkan subjunctives and Locality. In Angela Ralli & María Luisa Rivero (eds.), *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*, 44-73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emonds, Joseph. 1978. The Verbal Complex V'-V in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 151-175.
- Giurgea, Ion. 2011. The Romanian verbal cluster and the theory of head movement. In J. Herschensohn (ed.), *Romance Linguistics 2010. Selected papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Seattle, Washington, March 2010*, 271-286. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Guțu-Romalo, Valeria. 1962. Forme verbale compuse. *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 13(2): 191-199.
- Hill, Virginia. 2013. *The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive*. *The Linguistic Review* 30(4): 547-583.
- Isac, Daniela & Edit Jakab. 2004. Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkan. In Olga M. Tomic (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, 315-338. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2014. Romance auxiliary selection in light of Romanian evidence. In Gabriela Pană-Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula, Alexandru Nicolae, Loise Esher (eds.), *Diachronic variation in Romanian*, 3-32. Newcastle-upon-Avon, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- McCloskey, James. 2011. The shape of Irish clauses. In Andrew Carnie (ed.), *Formal approaches to Celtic linguistics*, 143-177. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Motapanyane, Virginia. 1995. *Theoretical Implications of Complementation in Romanian*. Padova: Unipress.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365-424.
- Rivero, María Luisa. 1994. The structure of the Clause and V-movement in the Languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 63-120
- Rivero, María Luisa. 1997. On two locations for complement clitic pronouns: Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Old Spanish. In Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, 170-207. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ronai, Sandra, 2015. The Romanian *să* and the CP/IP contact zone. Talk given at the 17th Annual Conference of the English Department (ACED 17), June 4-6.