

# CLAUSAL *DE*-SUPINES IN MOLDOVAN: THE STATE-OF-THE-ART

ȘTEFANIA COSTEA<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** Although the presence of a *DE*-‘supine’ which can combine with pronominal clitics, the negative marker, and clitic adverbs was previously noted in the language spoken in the Republic of Moldova, a thorough analysis of the phenomenon is still necessary. Starting from empirical facts, this paper puts forward a comparative analysis of *DE*-‘supine’ with both regular supines and *SĂ*-subjunctives in Moldovan. As a consequence of the resemblance with the latter, *DE*-‘supine’ was relabeled *clausal DE-supine*. However, it is vital to note that clausal *DE*-supines are generalized (and only employed with) (PRO) arbitrary subjects, whereas *SĂ*-subjunctives are used with lexical subjects. Interestingly, clausal *DE*-supines have started to influence other *DE*-structures in the language spoken in the Republic of Moldova, such as the *DE*-supine that follows aspectuals/inflected *HAVE*, inasmuch as the latter has started to develop a (full) IP/CP structure, hence being able to host negation, pronominal clitics, and clitic adverbs.

**Keywords:** supine, subjunctive, (PRO) arbitrary, complex predicates, Moldovan (i.e. Romanian spoken in the Republic of Moldova).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper focuses on the investigation of *DE*-‘supines’ encountered in the Romanian spoken in the Republic of Moldova (henceforth, simply Moldovan), which have developed a full clausal spine, being now able to host negation, pronominal clitics, and clitic adverbs, as well as topicalized and focalized constituents (cf. (1) below).<sup>2</sup> Notably, these *DE*-structures are only employed with a (PRO) arbitrary subject.

- (1) *Trebu(ie)*<sup>3</sup> [<sub>Forcep</sub> *ca*    [<sub>TopP</sub> *pe cei mai slabi*    [<sub>FocP</sub> *mereu*  
 must.IND.PRES CA            DOM the.weaker.ones            always  
 [<sub>FinP</sub> *de-[CIPi*            [<sub>IP</sub> *ajutat*            *să*            *crească.*]]]]]]  
 DE.SUP=CL.ACC.M.3PL            help.PPLE            SĂ.SUBJ grow.SUBJ.PRES.3PL  
 ‘One should always help those weaker than oneself to grow (stronger).’  
(Moldovan)

<sup>1</sup> University of Cambridge, Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics/St John’s College, sc2078@cam.ac.uk.

<sup>2</sup> I adopt the structural assumptions generally put forward for Romance, i.e. a split-CP (cf. Rizzi 1997), adapted for Moldovan in (i) below.

(i) [<sub>Left Periphery</sub> Comp<sub>1</sub> (*că/ca*) [<sub>TopP</sub> Top [<sub>FocP</sub> Foc [Comp<sub>2</sub> (*să/de*) [Core ...]]]]]] (adapted from Ledgeway 2016: 1014)

<sup>3</sup> Native speakers of Moldovan frequently employ, in colloquial speech, the shortened version of *trebuie* (must.IND.PRES.3SG), i.e. *trebu*.

The data used for the analysis put forward in this paper are extracted from different corpora (e.g., spontaneous conversations between native speakers of Moldovan), as well as from the material recorded by the author during several fieldwork sessions held between 2017 and 2019. Alongside the (re)checking of examples recorded during fieldwork against native speakers, a further test was used whereby speakers were given specific contexts (e.g., general directives vs personalized instructions) and asked to choose between SĂ-subjunctives and clausal DE-supines.

## 2. SYNTACTIC (RE)ANALYSIS

### 2.1. The story as it was told

Unlike the (standard) Romanian supine, which is made up of a prepositional complementizer, e.g. *la* (= ‘to’), *pentru* (= ‘for’), *de* (= ‘of’), and the masculine form of the participle (GR: 233), and which cannot host pronominal clitics or clausal negation or combine with clitic adverbs (2), a specific form of the Moldovan ‘supine’, consisting exclusively of the complementizer DE (void of semantics) and past participle, may host pronominal clitics and the clausal negator *nu* ‘not’ and combine with clitic adverbs (3) (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016: 9).<sup>4</sup>

(2) <i>de/ la/</i>	<i>pentru</i>	<i>(*nu)</i>	<i>(*le)</i>	<i>(*mai)</i>	<i>citit</i>	
DE to	for	NEG	CL.ACC.F.3PL	(any)more	read.PPLE	
(3) ( <i>trebuie</i> )	<i>de/ *la/</i>	<i>*pentru</i>	<i>(nu)</i>	<i>(le)</i>	<i>(mai)</i>	<i>citit</i>
must DE	to	for	NEG	CL.ACC.F.3PL	(any)more	read.PPLE

The atypical use of the ‘supine’ in the language spoken in (the Republic of) Moldova has previously been noted in the literature (Sandfeld and Olsen 1936: 281; Marin et al. 1998: 115–116; Gabinschi 2010; Dragomirescu and Hill 2014; Dragomirescu 2015; Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016; Hill and Alboiu 2016: 292–295). In short, it is noted that, unlike the (standard) Romanian supine, it can follow, among others, impersonal modal verbs such as *trebuie* ‘must/it is necessary’ and *se poate* ‘it is possible’ (Marin et al. 1998: 115–116), it has developed a full clausal spine, i.e. with projection of CP, IP, and vP (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016: 12), and it can be replaced in all contexts by a SĂ-subjunctive (Hill and Alboiu 2016: 293).

Nevertheless, little to no explanation to justify the syntactic behaviour of the Moldovan ‘supine’ has been offered to date. Dragomirescu (2015) argues that the development of this verbal form in Moldovan cannot be explained either through inheritance from old Romanian, where it is not found hosting negation or pronominal clitics, or through linguistic contact with Russian, in which constructions containing a modal verb followed by a preposition and a non-finite verb form are completely absent. On the other hand, Hill and Alboiu (2016: 295) try to compare the Moldovan ‘supine’ with its

<sup>4</sup> The combinations presented under (2) are also possible in Moldovan, though they do not have the same syntactic features as DE-‘supines’, i.e. *pentru* (= ‘for’) or *la* (= ‘to’) are never followed by pronominal clitics or clausal negation.

(standard) Romanian counterpart, concluding that it simply instantiates ‘a potential option which has remained unexploited [in (standard) Romanian.]’

## 2.2. Syntactic behaviour and semantic consequences

One of the reasons why this verbal form has remained a grey area is, I argue, its label. While it is true that it superficially resembles the (standard) Romanian supine, its syntactic distribution and features clearly point towards a greater similarity with the (standard) Romanian subjunctive.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, although this was previously touched upon by Hill and Alboiu (2016: 293), a clear-cut (semantico-)syntactic analysis was not put forward, as they simplistically regard SĂ-subjunctives and clausal DE-supines being in free variation in Moldovan.

Whilst both SĂ-subjunctives and clausal DE-supines display IP-domains, in that they are able to combine with clausal negation, pronominal clitics, and clitic adverbs (4) (cf., among others, Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016), and have left peripheries<sup>6</sup> in Moldovan (5), it has never been pointed out before that native speakers only select clausal DE-supines in specific contexts, i.e. when they want to refer to an arbitrary subject. It is important to add that, although the *prima facie* impression might be that Moldovan clausal DE-supines always license a passive reading given the presence of the past participle, the fact that they can also be constructed with intransitive verbs (see (6) below) proves that this is not the case.

- (4) a. *Trebu(ie)*<sub>[FinP să</sub>      [<sub>NegP</sub> *nu* [<sub>CIP</sub> *le*                      [<sub>IP</sub> *mai crezi.*]]]]  
 must      SĂ.SUBJ    NEG    CL.ACC.F.3PL    anymore believe.SUBJ.PRES.2SG  
 ‘You should stop believing them.’
- b. *Trebu(ie)*<sub>[FinP de</sub>      [<sub>NegP</sub> *nu* [<sub>CIP</sub> *le*      [<sub>IP</sub>      *mai dat apă.*]]]]  
 must      DE.SUP    NEG    CL.ACC.F.3PL    anymore give.PPLE water  
 ‘One should stop giving them water.’

<sup>5</sup> Henceforth I will refer to DE + the so-called ‘supine’ in Moldovan as the ‘clausal DE-supine’.

<sup>6</sup> Hill and Alboiu (2016: 292) discuss an ‘extension’ of the CP domain in the case of clausal DE-supines, departing from the example in (i). Nevertheless, all Moldovan native speakers assume here *trebuie* (= ‘it is necessary’)-ellipsis (which is not uncommon even for (standard) Romanian; see GR: 243 for a discussion on supines found in imperative sentences with an unspecified addressee, when the meaning of ‘recommendation’ and ‘urge’ is the result of the ellipsis of deontic adverbials in impersonal structures; cf. [~~*E-necesară*~~] *de reținut ultimul argument!* (is.necessary DE.SUP retain.SUP the.last.argument) ‘(One should) keep in mind the last argument!’); thus the untruncated utterance is the one presented under (ii). All in all, *cum* ‘how’ and DE belong to different CP-domains, i.e. matrix and embedded.

- (i) *Să vedem*                      [<sub>InIP</sub> *cum* [<sub>FinP</sub> *de*      [<sub>IP</sub> *studiat*                      *această situație.*]]]  
 SĂ.SUBJ    see.SUBJ.PRES.1PL    how    DE.SUP    analyse.PPLE                      this                      situation  
 (Moldovan, adapted from Hill and Alboiu 2016: 292, *apud* Gabinschi 2010: 45)
- (ii) *Să vedem* [<sub>InIP</sub>      *cum* [<sub>IP</sub> *trebuie* [<sub>FinP</sub> *de*      [<sub>IP</sub> *studiat*                      *această situație.*]]]]  
 SĂ.SUBJ    see.SUBJ.PRES.1PL    how    must                      DE.SUP    analyse.PPLE                      this                      situation  
 ‘Let’s see how one should analyse this situation.’                      (Moldovan)

- (5) a. *Trebuia* [ForceP *ca* [TopP *pe mine* [FocP *mereu* [FinP *să*  
 must.IND.IMPF CA DOM myself.ACC always SĂ.SUBJ  
 [CIP *mă* [IP *supere copilul.*]]]]]]  
 CL.ACC.1SG upset.SUBJ.PRES.3SG child.DEF  
 ‘My child somehow managed to always upset me.’
- b. *Trebu(ie)* [ForceP *ca* [TopP *pe cei mai slabi* [FocP *mereu*  
 must.IND.PRES CA DOM the.weaker.ones always  
 [FinP *de*-[CIP *i* [IP *ajutat să crească.*]]]]]]  
 DE.SUP=CL.ACC.M.3PL help.PPLE SĂ.SUBJ grow.SUBJ.PRES.3PL  
 ‘One should always help those weaker than oneself to grow (stronger).’  
 (Moldovan)

What examples (3) and (4) clearly show is that *de* is inserted in the rightmost edge of the left periphery, i.e. in Fin, rigidly preceding IP-related negation and pronominal clitics<sup>7</sup>, but following topics and foci. In this respect, it patterns not only with Romanian SĂ, but also with its Italian counterpart DI (= ‘of’) (Rizzi 1997: 288; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2007; 2009; Ledgeway 2012: 170; 2016: 1015), and, up to a certain point, with its Shkodër (a Geg variety of Albanian) counterpart MË (= ‘with’).<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, its resemblance to Romance reflexes of DE or Balkan particles such as MË is only partial, given that, unlike its Romance and Balkan counterparts, it is used, in an overwhelming majority of situations, after impersonal raising predicates,<sup>9</sup> such as *trebuie* ‘must/it is necessary’, *se poate* ‘it is possible’, *(se) merită* ‘it is worthwhile’, and only when the subject is arbitrary (6).

When clusters made up of impersonal verbs and clausal DE-supines combine with a lexical subject, ungrammatical utterances are obtained (7), which leads us to assume that neither impersonal raising verbs nor DE-supines are able to assign nominative Case in Moldovan. This situation is not encountered when the same raising verbs combine with SĂ-subjunctives (hence suggesting that in utterances like (8) nominative Case is licensed in the embedded clause, although the subject may not be spelt-out, and the raising of the embedded subject before the matrix verb has purely pragmatic, i.e. related to visibility, reasons).

From a more theoretical perspective (*à la* Chomsky and Lasnik 1995; Martin 2001; Pesetsky and Torrego 2004), it can be argued that, when employed, DE-supine has an [*u*T] feature, hence PRO cannot check its [*u*T] feature in the embedded clause. As a consequence, PRO raises to matrix CP, where the impersonal verb, bearing an [*i*T] feature, allows it to check the relevant [*u*T] feature, hence attributing a null Case (as it is unable to license nominative, as it was shown above) to PRO. The relevant arbitrary reading is thus

<sup>7</sup> Cf., a.o., Nicolae (2019: 12ff.), who convincingly argues for an IP-placement of clitics in modern Romanian (viz. NegP > Cl(itic)P > IP >...). The same assumptions hold true for Moldovan. Hence, the fact that Moldovan clausal DE-supines accept pronominal clitics shows once again that they do present an IP-domain.

<sup>8</sup> The preposition/complementizer MË (= ‘with’) is followed in Shkodër by an invariable participial form, as in Moldovan. The structure MË (= ‘with’) + participle occurs in Shkodër, among others, in control contexts with modals and aspectuals, mirroring the subjunctive (consisting of the particle TË and a finite form of the verb) from standard Albanian (including Tosk varieties) (Manzini and Savoia 2007: 264–275).

<sup>9</sup> But see the discussion regarding some control verbs followed by DE + (pronominal clitics) + past participle below, in §4.

simultaneously provided by both *DE*-supine, which does not have phi- or tense-feature, and the impersonal verb, which, although bearing an [*i*T] feature (as proved, among others, by its possibility to combine with pronominal clitics; cf. *Îmi trebuie timp*. (CL.DAT.1SG need time) ‘I need time.’), does not have intrinsic phi-features. Thus, in the absence of any markers for person, the obtained reading is an arbitrary one.

- (6) a. PRO<sub>arb</sub> *s- poate* [<sub>FinP</sub> *de* [<sub>IP</sub> *mers* pro [<sub>VP</sub> *mers* *în* *Egipt*  
CL.REFL.ACC=can DE.SUP go.PPLE in Egypt  
*cu* *pașaport* *biometric?*]]]  
with passport biometrical  
‘Is it possible (for one) to go to Egypt with a biometrical passport?’
- b. PRO<sub>arb</sub> (*se*) *merită* [<sub>FinP</sub> *de* [<sub>IP</sub> *revenit* PRO  
CL.REFL.ACC is.worth DE.SUP return.PPLE  
[<sub>VP</sub> *revenit* *acasă?*]]]  
home  
‘Would it be a good thing (for one) to come back home?’
- (7) a. \* *Eu* *trebuie* [<sub>FinP</sub> *de* [<sub>IP</sub> *făcut* *eu* [<sub>VP</sub> *eu* *făcut* *asta*.]]]  
I must DE.SUP do.PPLE this  
(intended meaning) ‘I need to do it.’
- b. \* *Eu* *trebuie* [<sub>FinP</sub> *de* [<sub>IP</sub> *mers* *eu* [<sub>VP</sub> *eu* *mers* *acasă*.]]]<sup>10</sup>  
I must DE.SUP go.PPLE home  
(intended meaning) ‘I need to go home.’
- (8) a. *El s-poate* [<sub>FinP</sub> *să* [<sub>IP</sub> *fi* *greșit*  
he CL.REFL.ACC=can SĂ.SUBJ be.INF be.wrong.PPLE  
*et* [<sub>VP</sub> *et* *greșit* [<sub>CP</sub> *când* *te-a* *sunat*.]]]  
when CL.ACC.2SG=AUX.PERF.3SG call.PPLE  
‘He might have been wrong when he called you.’
- b. (*Se*) *merită* [<sub>FinP</sub> *să* [<sub>IP</sub> *încercăm* (*noi*)  
CL.REFL.ACC is.worth SĂ.SUBJ try.SUBJ.PRES.1PL we  
[<sub>VP</sub> *încercăm*.]]]  
try.SUBJ.PRES.1PL  
‘It may be a good thing for us to try.’
- (Moldovan)

### 3. EXPRESSING ARBITRARINESS: FROM OLD ROMANIAN TO (STANDARD) ROMANIAN AND MOLDOVAN

Although the situation encountered in Moldovan, i.e. having different syntactic strategies to express PRO<sub>arb</sub> and lexical subjects, may seem exceptional, a closer look at old Romanian, and even (standard) Romanian proves the contrary. Thus, earlier Romanian

<sup>10</sup> The same ungrammaticality obtains when an IO is inserted before *trebuie* ‘it is necessary’ (see (i) below).

(i) \* *Îmi* *trebuie* [<sub>FinP</sub> *de* [<sub>IP</sub> *mers* PRO<sub>i</sub>.]] // [<sub>FinP</sub> *de* [<sub>IP</sub> *făcut* PRO<sub>i</sub> *asta*.]]  
CL.DAT.1SG need DE.SUP go.PPLE DE.SUP do.PP this  
(intended meaning) ‘I need to go.’/‘I need to do it.’

texts witnessed a tendency to choose infinitives (9) over subjunctives (10) in structures with impersonal raising verbs, when the subject was arbitrary (Nedelcu 2013: 134-137; SOR: 241). Moreover, after 1700, structures containing supines also developed their ability to license PRO<sub>arb</sub> subjects (11) (SOR: 255), proving that signaling PRO<sub>arb</sub> subjects through the (morpho)syntax of the verb (viz. morphologically non-finite verbal forms were specialized in the expression of PRO<sub>(arb)</sub> subjects), was a productive mechanism. Nevertheless, this must be taken as a tendency, and not as a strict syntactic requirement, as both infinitives (12) and (rarely) supines (13) also presented the option of having lexical subjects.

- (9) *den aceale una PRO<sub>arb</sub> trebuiaște* [CP *a o*  
of.those.F.ACC one.ACC must.IND.PRES.3SG A.INF CL.ACC.F.3SG  
*ținea* PRO cu mare grijă]  
keep.INF with great care  
‘we/one must obey one of these with great care’ (PO.1582: 6)
- (10) *trebuie* [CP *să domnească* PRO [CP *după cum*  
must SĂ.SUBJ reign.SUBJ.PRES.3SG after how  
*domnesc împărații*]  
reign.IND.PRES.3PL emperors.DEF  
‘he must reign as emperors’ reign’ (CC<sup>1</sup>.1567: 82<sup>f</sup>)
- (11) *unde PRO<sub>arb</sub> -i* [IP *de plătit* PRO]<sup>11</sup>  
where is(≈must) DE.SUP pay.PPLE  
‘where one should pay’ (CPV.~1705: 71<sup>v</sup>)
- (12) *Eu<sub>i</sub> trebuescu* [CP *de tine a mă boteza eu<sub>i</sub>*]<sup>12</sup>  
I have.to.IND.PRES.1SG by you A.INF CL.ACC.1SG baptize.INF  
‘I have to be baptized by you’ (CC<sup>2</sup>.1581: 505)
- (13) *loc* [IP *de cinat șase înș*]  
place DE.SUP dine.PPLE six people  
‘place for six people to dine in’ (CDicț.1691-7: 232)  
(old Romanian, *apud* SOR: 123; 560; 255; 244; 111)

<sup>11</sup> For arguments why (standard/old) Romanian verbal supines should be analysed as IPs, see GR (237–240) and Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2016: 11–12) (cf. also Ionescu 1990: 23; 26; Hill 2002; 2012; Soare 2007: 56; Dye 2006; Cornilescu and Cosma 2010; Dragomirescu 2015).

<sup>12</sup> Interestingly, *a trebui* ‘must, need’ followed by an infinitive (i) is regarded as highly ungrammatical by Moldovan speakers, although this syntactic possibility is available nowadays in (dialectal) Romanian, e.g. in Maramureș (Vulpe 1963: 128).

(i) \* *Trebuie a pleca repede.*  
must A.INF leave.INF fast  
‘One/I must leave fast.’

Hence, only clausal DE-supines (ii) and SĂ-subjunctives (iii) are employed after *a trebui* ‘must, need’.

(ii) *Trebu(ie) de plecat repede.*  
must DE.SUP leave.PPLE fast  
‘One must leave fast.’

(iii) *Trebu(ie) să plec repede.*  
must SĂ.SUBJ leave.SUBJ.PRES.1SG fast  
‘I must leave fast.’ (Moldovan)

Starting from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, which coincides to a certain extent with the separation of Moldova from the other Romanian-speaking communities, a progressive change in the syntactic behaviour of supines following impersonal verbs is observed in (standard) Romanian and Moldovan. Proof of a common starting point<sup>13</sup> is easy to find, given that a few (standard) Romanian impersonal raising verbs, such as *rămâne* ‘it remains to’<sup>14</sup>, can combine with both supines (with a raised PRO<sub>(arb)</sub> subject (14a)), and subjunctives (with raised lexical subjects (14b)) (see also the discussion in Dragomirescu 2011). In the case of (standard) Romanian impersonal raising verbs such as *trebui* ‘must/it is necessary’ or *merita* ‘it is worthwhile’, these combine with supines without the marker DE (Pană Dindelegan 2007: 171; 2011: 121; Dragomirescu 2015) in conjunction with a PRO<sub>(arb)</sub> subject (15); the fact that negation and pronominal clitics attach only to the first, i.e. impersonal, verb, alongside the disappearance of DE, points towards a restructuring process resulting in a complex predicate (see, among others, Guțu 1956; Rizzi 1976; 1978; 1982; Lehmann 1988; Monachesi 1998; Abeillé and Godard 2003).

- (14) a. PRO<sub>arb</sub> *rămâne* [IP *de mers* PRO].  
 remain.IND.PRES.3SG DE.SUP go.PPLE  
 ‘It remains for us/somebody to go.’  
 b. *Eu*<sub>i</sub> *rămâne* [CP *să merg* *eu*].  
 I remain.IND.PRES.3SG SĂ.SUBJ go.SUBJ.PRES.1SG  
 ‘It remains for me to go.’
- (15) *Nu trebuie mers devreme la facultate*.<sup>15</sup>  
 NEG must go.PPLE early to faculty  
 ‘One should not go early to the faculty.’

(standard Romanian)

On the other hand, Moldovan structures containing impersonal raising verbs and supines did not undergo the same restructuring process, showing quite the opposite syntactic behaviour. In particular, Moldovan supines enriched their IP- and CP-domains to perfectly mirror SĂ-subjunctives, thereby becoming clausal DE-supines (but cf., among others, Harris and Campbell 1995: ch. 7, who insist that such a process is unlikely to happen).

One way to explain this atypical evolution encountered in Moldovan is through Russian influence, given that Moldovan and Russian co-existed for (at least) 200 years between the Prut and Dnister rivers (i.e., where present-day Republic of Moldova is to be found). In short, under the influence of Russian deontic modal predicatives/predicates which take a CP-complement (which may have a PRO<sub>arb</sub> subject) (16) (cf. Burukina 2019: 16 n.12), Moldovan turned all the complements of impersonal raising verbs into CPs.

<sup>13</sup> Dragomirescu (2011) has convincingly shown that the verbal supine is the diachronic result of the verbalization of a noun in a P-ambiguous context.

<sup>14</sup> The same syntactic behaviour observed in the case of *rămâne* ‘it remains to’ also characterizes *tough*-constructions in both Moldovan and (standard) Romanian.

<sup>15</sup> The discussion can be further nuanced, as (standard) Romanian exhibits more than one situation in which *trebuie* ‘must/it is necessary’ is followed by a past participle. Due to space limitations, an example was chosen in which the past participle can unambiguously be regarded as a bare supine (i.e. without DE); for a complex analysis of the phenomenon, see Dragomirescu (2015: 40–41) and references therein.

- (16) [<sub>ModP</sub> *Nado* [<sub>CP</sub> *proiektu zakončit'sja k martu.*]]  
 necessary project.DAT complete.INF by March  
 'It is necessary to complete the project by March.'

(Russian, *apud* Burukina 2019:16)

#### 4. CRITICAL CASE: ASPECTUALS/INFLECTED *HAVE* + *DE* + PAST PARTICIPLE

When discussing the atypical use of (clausal) DE-supines in Moldovan (*viz.* its ability to combine with pronominal clitics), previous studies (Dragomirescu 2015: 45; Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016: 10) did not explicitly make a difference between raising and control verbs. While it is true that utterances containing aspectual verbs followed by a DE + (pronominal clitics) + past participle cluster can be found in Moldovan (17), their existence, albeit without the ability to host pronominal clitics, can be traced back to old Romanian (18) and observed even in (standard) Romanian (19).<sup>16</sup> Notably, in these combinations DE + past participle cluster does not have a PRO<sub>(arb)</sub> subject, its subject being instead controlled by that of the matrix predicate, given that in all old Romanian, (standard) Romanian, and Moldovan the cluster is part of a complex predicate (see, among others, GR: 196–197).

- (17) *Termin de (le) arătat casa.*  
 finish.IND.PRES.1SG DE.SUP CL.DAT.F.3PL show.PPLE house  
 'I finish showing them the house.' (Moldovan)
- (18) *și-l sfârșăște de fiert*  
 and=CL.ACC.M.3SG ends DE.SUP boil.PPLE  
 'and he stops boiling it' (old Romanian, CBuc.1749: 6<sup>v</sup>, *apud* SOR: 256)
- (19) *Termin de citit.*  
 finish DE.SUP read.PPLE  
 'I finish reading it.' (standard Romanian)

Nevertheless, I argue, these clusters should not be treated on a par with clausal DE-supines, which represent a true innovation of Moldovan. While it cannot be denied that situations in which DE + past participle (following aspectuals/inflected *HAVE*) combine with pronominal clitics are to be found in Moldovan, they are far from showing the same syntactic consistency as clausal DE-supines. In other words, native speakers who unanimously agree on the grammaticality of DE + (negation) + clitic + (clitic adverb) + past participle cluster(s) following raising impersonal verbs are reluctant and inconsistent when

<sup>16</sup> These observations hold also for the case of the dynamic and deontic modal verb *HAVE*, which appears in control structures in both Moldovan (see (i)) and (standard) Romanian (see (ii)) and the discussion in GR: 196–197; 211; 237–238; cf. also Dragomirescu 2011).

(i) *Avem de ne făcut mâncare.*  
 have.to.IND.PRES.1PL DE.SUP CL.DAT.1PL do.PPLE food  
 (Moldovan)

(ii) *Avem de făcut mâncare.* (standard Romanian & Moldovan)  
 have.to.IND.PRES.1PL DE.SUP do.PPLE food  
 'We have to cook (for ourselves).'

it comes to accepting different combinations of the same (functional) elements after aspectuals/inflected HAVE.<sup>17</sup>

With respect to aspectuals followed by DE + (negation) + clitic + (clitic adverb) + past participle, the acceptability seems to range from one verb to another (cf. the wide(r) acceptability of *încep* ‘I.start’ in (20) comparing to *termin* ‘I.finish’ in (21) below), not to say from one region to another.<sup>18</sup>

- (20) *încep* [de le arătat casa]  
 start.IND.PRES.1SG DE.SUP CL.DAT.3PL show.PPLE house  
 ‘I start showing them the house’

(OK (but rather marginal) in Ungheni, Soroca, and Bălți; \* in Chișinău and Basarabeasca)

- (21) *termin* [de le arătat casa]  
 finish.IND.PRES.1SG DE.SUP CL.DAT.3PL show.PPLE house  
 ‘I finish showing them the house’

(OK in Bălți; \* in Chișinău, Basarabeasca, Ungheni, Soroca)

- (22) *am* *început* [de le mai arătat casa]  
 AUX.PERF.1SG start.PPLE DE.SUP CL.DAT.3PL more show.PPLE house  
 ‘I started to show them the house (again)’

(OK (but marginal) in Soroca; \* in Chișinău, Basarabeasca, Ungheni, Bălți)

- (23) *am* *început* [de nu mai mers la piață în fiecare zi]  
 AUX.PERF.1SG start.PPLE DE.SUP NEG anymore go.PPLE to market in every day  
 ‘I started not to go to the market every day’

(OK (but very marginal) in Ungheni; \* in Chișinău, Basarabeasca, Soroca, Bălți)

The acceptability increases in the case of inflected HAVE followed by DE + (negation) + clitic + (clitic adverb) + past participle, although variation is still present. Note, however, that testing clusters resembling (26) proved extremely difficult, inasmuch as the generalized tendency is to place the negation before the matrix verb; hence, all my informants rejected (26) and utterances similar to this one.

- (24) *avem* [de ne pregătit mâncare]

<sup>17</sup> It is worth mentioning that the overwhelming majority of examples observed by Dragomirescu (2015) and Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2016) are with impersonal raising verbs, with very few examples of control verbs. As for the latter, the structures (still) show clear transparency effects (typical of complex predicates), as the clitic adverb *mai* ‘anymore’ raises up to the matrix predicate (see (i) below).

(i) *mai* *aveți* *de* *îi* *adus* *pe*  
 more have.to.IND.PRES.2PL DE.SUP CL.ACC.M.3PL bring.PPLE DOM  
*mama* *și* *tata*  
 mom.DEF and dad.DEF

‘you have to bring mom and dad too’ (Moldovan, *apud* Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016: 10)

<sup>18</sup> Native speakers of Moldovan from different counties, i.e. Chișinău, Ungheni, Basarabeasca, Soroca, and Bălți, were directly asked whether utterances in which DE-constructions following aspectual verbs/inflected HAVE can be labelled as ‘natural’. More than one construction was tested for every situation mentioned.

- have.to.IND.PRES.1SG DE.SUP CL.DAT.1PL cook.PPLE food  
 ‘we have to cook (for ourselves)’  
 (OK in Chișinău, Ungheni, Sorooca, Bălți; \* in Basarabeasca)
- (25) *avem* [*de* *mai* *încercat o dată*]  
 have.to.IND.PRES.1PL DE.SUP more try.PPLE one.more.time  
 ‘we have to try one more time’  
 (OK in Chișinău, Ungheni, Bălți; \* in Basarabeasca, Sorooca)
- (26) *avem* [*de* *nu* *ne* *mai* *scris*  
 have.to.IND.PRES.1PL DE.SUP NEG CL.DAT.1PL more write.PPLE  
*temele*]  
 homeworks  
 ‘we are not obliged to write our homeworks’  
 (\* in Chișinău, Ungheni, Bălți, Basarabeasca, Sorooca)

All in all, this state of affairs can be explained through the influence of clausal DE-supines on other contexts containing DE + past participle (and not the other way around). That is to say, native speakers have started to mimic the internal structure of clausal DE-supines (which can combine, for example, with pronominal clitics and clitic adverbs) in utterances with control verbs. The process is, however, far from being completed, as clearly shown by the oscillations regarding the grammaticality judgements of native speakers of Moldovan in the case of aspectuals/inflected HAVE followed by DE + (negation) + clitic + (clitic adverb) + past participle (viz. ‘classic’ DE-supines), which contrast with the much clearer views expressed in the case of impersonal raising verbs + DE + (negation) + clitic + (clitic adverb) + past participle (viz. clausal DE-supines). Nonetheless, the evolution encountered in the case of ‘classic’ DE-supines represents an interesting case of ‘splitting’ complex predicates.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

With respect to (standard) Daco-Romanian, Dragomirescu (2011) has shown that the verbal supine is the diachronic result of the verbalization of a noun in a P-ambiguous context. However, the evolution of this verbal form is strikingly different in (standard) Daco-Romanian and Moldovan: the verbal supine has a reduced functional structure, presumably being a *vP*, in the former, while, in the latter, on a par with *SĂ*-subjunctives, DE-supines developed a full clausal spine, i.e. with projection of CP, IP, and *vP*, hence being able to host both I-related elements, such as pronominal clitics, clitic adverbs, and negation, and C-related elements, such as topics and foci. More than that, the complementizer DE mirrors the syntactic distribution of the complementizer *SĂ*, showing the possibility of occurring after *ca* (which is merged in ForceP) (viz. [<sub>Left Periphery</sub> Comp<sub>1</sub> *ca* [<sub>TopP</sub> Top [<sub>FocP</sub> Foc [<sub>Comp</sub><sub>2</sub> (*să/de*) [<sub>Core</sub> ... ]]]]]). Nevertheless, the two constructions are not in free distribution, inasmuch as, although both *SĂ*-subjunctives and clausal DE-supines can follow impersonal raising verbs in Moldovan, the syntactic environments in which they occur are clearly different: the former is generally employed with lexical (non-arbitrary) subjects, while the latter is only used when the subject is arbitrary.

As for the possible explanations of this evolution in Moldovan, it may be the case that, under the influence of Russian, whereby deontic modal predicatives/predicates take a CP-complement (which may have a PRO<sub>arb</sub> subject), Moldovan turned all the complements of impersonal raising verbs into CPs.

An interesting consequence of having clausal DE-supines is that complex predicates containing aspectual verbs/inflected HAVE and a DE-supine show a tendency to ‘split’. In short, DE-supines from the latter contexts are now able (albeit marginally) to host negation, pronominal clitics, and clitic adverbs, under the influence of clausal DE-supines (which can generally host these I-related elements).

#### REFERENCES

- Burukina, I., 2019, *Mandative verbs: between obligatory control and overt embedded subjects*. Ms. [lingbuzz/004468].
- Chomsky, N., H. Lasnik, 1995 [1993], “The Theory of Principles and Parameters”, in N. Chomsky (ed.), *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, MA/London, MIT Press, 13–127.
- Cornilescu, A., R. Cosma, 2014, “On the functional structure of the Romanian *de*-supine”, in R. Cosma et al. (eds), *Komplexe Argumentstrukturen. Kontrastive Untersuchungen zum Deutschen, Rumänischen und Englischen*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 283–336.
- Demonte, V., O. Fernández-Soriano, 2009, “Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system”, *Probus*, 21, 23–50.
- Dragomirescu, A., 2012, *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Supinul*, București, Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.
- Dragomirescu, A., 2015, “Utilizări dialectale ale supinului”, in R. Zafiu, I. Nedelcu (eds), *Variația lingvistică: probleme actuale. Actele celui de al 14-lea Colocviu al Departamentului de Lingvistică*, București, Editura Universității din București, 39–48.
- Dragomirescu, A., V. Hill, 2014, “A diachronic perspective on *de*-supine complements” (paper presented at ACED, University of Bucharest, 5–7 June 2014).
- Dragomirescu, A., A. Nicolae, 2016, „Originea formelor verbale «nonfinite» cu flexiune: infinitiv vs supin”, *Diacronia*, 4, 1–16.
- Dye, C., 2006, “A and A-bar-Movement in Romanian Supine Constructions”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 37, 665–674.
- Gabinschi, M., 2010, *Formele verbale nepredicative nonconjunctivale ale limbii române (pe marginea tratării lor în gramatica oficială)*, Chișinău, Institutul de filologie al AȘM.
- GR. Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), 2013, *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hill, V., 2002, “The gray area of supine clauses”, *Linguistics*, 40, 495–517.
- Hill, V., 2012, *The emergence of the Romanian supine*. Ms. University of New Brunswick.
- Hill, V., G. Alboiu, 2016, *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ionescu, R., 1990, *Romanian supine constructions*, University of Ottawa, doctoral thesis.
- Ledgeway, A., 2012, *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, A., 2016, “Clausal complementation”, in: A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1014–1028.
- Manzini, M., L.M. Savoia, 2007, *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax. Investigations into Romance and Albanian dialects*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Marin, M. et al., 1998, “Graiuri românești din Ucraina și Republica Moldova”, *Fonetică și dialectologie*, 17, 69–155.
- Martin, R., 2001, “Null Case and the Distribution of PRO”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32, 141–166.

- Nedelcu, I., 2013, *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Infinitivul*. București, Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.
- Nicolae, A., 2019, *Word Order and Parameter Change in Romanian. A Comparative Romance Perspective*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pesetsky, D., E. Torrego, 2004, “Tense, case, and the nature of syntactic categories”, in: J. Guéron, J. Lecarme (eds), *The Syntax of Time*, Cambridge Massachusetts/London, MIT Press, 355–426.
- Rizzi, L., 1997, “The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery”, in: L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 281–337.
- Sandfeld, Kr., H. Olsen, 1936, *Syntaxe roumaine. Emploi des mots à flexion*, Paris, E. Droz.
- Soare, E., 2007, “Morphosyntactic Mismatches Revised: the Case of Romanian Supine”, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 54, 1–19.
- SOR. Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), 2016, *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Vulpe, M., 1963, “Repartiția geografică a construcțiilor cu infinitivul și cu conjunctivul în limba română”, *Fonetică și dialectologie*, 5, 123–156.