TEMPORAL SPECIFICATION AND SUBJECT REFERENCE IN ROMANIAN SUBJUNCTIVE COMPLEMENTS

Maria Aurelia Cotfas

Abstract: The paper looks at the dependency of Romanian subjunctive complements on the semantic class of the matrix verb. It shows that different types of temporal dependency trigger different identity relations between the null embedded subject and the (subject) antecedent in the main clause (cf. Farkas 1984). Volitional verbs are also looked at in terms of the restrictions they impose on the subjunctive complements they subcategorize for. Finally, following Landau's (1999) classification of infinitive complements in English, Romanian subjunctives are argued to fall into two distinct classes exhibiting different properties in terms of subject reference and temporal dependency.

Keywords: subjunctive / conjunctiv, infinitive, control, subject, anaphoric

1. Introduction

The paper starts from the basic assumption that the temporal value of the subjunctive complement depends on the matrix tense for its specification, underlining that this dependency is in turn established function of the semantic class the predicate belongs to. Thus, Section 2 discusses different types of temporal dependencies of subjunctive complements in Romanian on the model proposed by Farkas (1984), pointing out that not only temporal value, but also subject reference is determined via the matrix verb. In Section 3 I will show that Motapanyane's (1995) distinction between the *tense features* of the Indicative and the *temporal features* of the Subjunctive, as well as her suggestions regarding the selectional properties of the volitional *a vrea* 'want' run into some theoretical as well as empirical problems. Finally, Section 4 will integrate part 1 and 2 into the wider frame offered by Landau (1999, 2000), who discusses two types of control configurations for English infinitive complements. I suggest (along the lines of Krapova 1998 for Bulgarian) a possible distinction between two types of subjunctive complements in Romanian on the basis of Landau's theory. It will be shown that the two configurations exhibit similar properties to their English infinitival counterparts with respect to temporal relations and (lack of) subject co-reference.

2. Intensionality, control and temporal dependency

Farkas (1984) argues that all subjunctive complements in Romanian have dependent time reference and that this dependency is gradable function of the semantics of the main verb. This means that while certain verbs impose relations of strict temporal dependency, others require that the complements be only partially dependent on matrix tense.[1]

Of all the (classes of) verbs discussed, the ones that are of interest for our purposes will be grouped in two main classes: (i) intensional verbs and (ii) control verbs.

2.1. Intensional verbs

Intensional verbs are further divided in two subclasses: A.1. strong intensional (*a vrea* 'want'*, a cere* 'ask', *a ruga* 'ask, beg', *a ordona* 'order') and A.2. weak intensional (*a şti*

[1] For reasons of economy, I will only discuss those classes which are relevant for the present analysis, even though Farkas' inventory is significantly richer.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

'know', *a crede* 'believe', *a visa* 'dream', *a imagina* 'imagine'). While the former exclusively take subjunctive complements (being thus evaluated against a set of possible worlds), the latter may take both subjunctive and indicative complements and are evaluated in a single possible world.

In what follows I shall briefly focus on the properties of strong intensional verbs (class A.1) and the volitional *a vrea* 'want' in particular, leaving aside the other class (A.2.) as well as the other A.1. verbs.

A vrea 'want' is a strong intentional verb (A.1) whose subjunctive complement exhibits specific characteristics regarding (i) the reference of the null subject and (ii) temporal dependency on matrix tense:
(i) the (null) subject of the subjunctive can be either co-referent with (S1 = S2) or disjoint from the matrix subject (S1≠ S2), cf. (1):

(1) a. Maria$_i$ vrea să plece pro$_i$
Maria want-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES-3SG
'Maria wants to leave.'
b. Maria vrea să plece [toți musafirii].
Maria want-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES-3PL [all guests]
'Maria wants all the guests to leave.'
c. Vrea pro$_i$ să plecăm pro$_j$ devreme.
s/he want-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES-1PL early
'S/he wants us to leave early.'

(ii) the temporal specification of the complement does not depend on ST, but on the ET of the matrix predicate – *without being identical to it* – since the subjunctive clause allows time adverbials introducing a distinct ET from that of matrix tense, cf. (2):

(2) *Acum* vreau să plec la Chicago *pe 14 aprilie*. (Farkas 1984: 362)
now want-PRES-1SG să leave-PRES-1SG to Chicago on 14 April
'Now I want to leave for Chicago on April 14th . '

2.2 Control verbs

Control verbs can be further divided into two subclasses: B.1. Obligatory subject control verbs (*a încerca* 'try', *a ezita* 'hesitate', *a continua* 'continue', *a începe* 'start') and B.2. Obligatory direct/indirect object control verbs (*a ajuta* 'help', *a pregăti* 'prepare, get ready', *a sfătui* 'advise', *a propune* 'suggest').

Again, the B.2. class is not directly of interest for the present analysis, so only the first class will be looked into in more detail.

Verbs of obligatory subject control (B.1.) subcategorize for subjunctive clauses whose properties in terms of (i) reference of the embedded subject and (ii) temporal dependency on matrix tense set them apart from the A.1 class discussed above:
(i) the null subject of the subjunctive *must always be identical* to that of the matrix
(S1 ≡ S2), cf. (3):

(3) a. Am încercat pro$_i$ să cânt.pro$_i$ // Am început pro$_i$ să citesc pro$_i$.
try-PERF-1SG *să* sing-PRES-1SG // begin-PERF-1SG *să* read-PRES-1SG
'I tried to sing'. // I began to read.'

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

b. *Am încercat pro_i să cântați pro_j. // *Am început pro_i să citești pro_j.
try-PERF-1SG *să* sing-PRES-2SG // begin-PERF-1SG *să* read-PRES-2SG
'I tried (for) you to sing'. // I began you to read

(ii) the temporal specification of the complement clause depends on the ET of the matrix, *being identical to it* – since the subjunctive clause does not allow time adverbials (or the perfect subjunctive):

(4) a. Am început **ieri* să citesc **azi / mâine.*
begin-PERF-1SG yesterday *să* read-PRES-1SG today/tomorrow
'Yesterday I began to read today/tomorrow.'
b. Am încercat **ieri* să vin **azi / mâine.*
try-PERF-1SG yesterday *să* come-PRES-1SG today/tomorrow.
'Yesterday I tried to come to today/tomorrow.'
c. *Încerc să fi citit cartea. // Am început să fi citit cartea.
try-PRES-1SG *să* read-PERF-1SG the book//begin-PERF-1SG *să* read PERF--1SG the book
'I try/am trying to have read the book.' // 'I began to have read the book.'

2.3 Conclusion

Subjunctive complements in Romanian have dependent time reference. Function of the semantic class of the predicate, this time reference is of two types:

a. *restricted time reference*, specific to the subjunctive complements selected by strong intensional / volitional verbs such as *a vrea* 'want'(class A.1). The temporal specification of these clauses *depends but is not / need not be identical* to the ET of the matrix.
b. *unspecified time reference*, characteristic of subjunctive complements selected by subject control verbs (B.1.). The temporal specification of these clauses *depends entirely and must always be identical* to that of the matrix.

3. Tense features and temporal features

3.1 Tense features vs. temporal features

According to Motapanyane (1995), the mechanism for conveying the tense value of the clause is twofold. It can be achived either a) by means of specific morphemes on the verb, or b) as an abstract inflectional feature which gives the verb its temporal interpretation. She thus distinguishes between two types of features on T:

a. *tense features*, i.e. specific morphemes bound on the verb, which indicate moments of past, present and future in Indicative, allowing such verbs to be discourse-free and have independent time reference

b. *temporal features* specific to 'modal' verbal forms[2] (subjunctive, conditional, gerund, infinitive, supine, etc), allowing such verbs – which are discourse dependable in point of temporal specification – to aquire temporal interpretation in relation to elements outside the clause (Motapanyane 1995: 62)

[2] and represented in syntax by relevant functional projections, i.e. TP, MP.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

3.2 Mood and modality

The opposition tense / temporal features at work in the above analysis also involves the notion of mood (modality), pairing temporal and modal features on the one hand and distinguishing them from tense features on the other.

The opposition Subjunctive / Indicative is thus obtained not only by distinct features on T, but also via the opposition modal / non-modal, contrary to current assumptions in the literature, which analyze all clauses / utterances as modal, including the ones with *realis* time (i.e. indicative). The difference however between clauses in the indicative and those in the subjunctive is that they express different attitudes of the speaker as to the truth value of the proposition *p* expressed, the former being viewed as certainty, the latter as possibility or wish.

Since indicative sentences express a certainty, they are evaluated in the real world and express *realis* time. Referring as it does to possibilities (hence the traditional term of '*irrealis*' ascribed to it), the subjunctive cannot be evaluated in the real world, but in at least one alternative world (i.e. weak intensional verbs in Farkas 1984) or a set of such worlds (strong intensional verbs in Farkas 1984, i.e. volitionals).

Drawing on Kratzer's (1991) possible world semantics, Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) design a realistic / non-realistic dichotomy to distinguish between indicative and subjunctive, starting from the assumption that any conversation develops against a certain *conversational background/common ground* that includes the set of *propositions* the speakers share and hold true. They thus propose two parameters essential in the understanding of modality:

- *the modal base*, i.e. the set of possible worlds where *p* is evaluated

and

- the *ordering source*, i.e. the set of principles which order the worlds in the modal base according to how close they come to the ideal set by the source.

Function of the relation between the common ground of the conversation and the set of possible worlds where *p* is evaluated (i.e. the context of evaluation), the authors identify four types of modal bases:

(i) *totally realistic*, where the (set of shared propositions in the) common ground coincides with the set of propositions in the context of evaluation. This is the case of indicative sentences, perceived as 'modal' in that they have a totally realistic modal base, that is they are evaluated in the real world.

(ii) *realistic*, where the common ground includes the set of propositions in the context of evaluation. (i.e. the set of possible worlds is a subset of the common ground). This is the case of epistemic modals, which are not discussed in this paper.

(iii) *weakly realistic*, where the propositions in the two sets (the common ground and the context of evaluation) are intersected, i.e. the *intersection* between them is *non-null*. This characterizes *verba dicendi*, which in Romanian take both indicative and subjunctive complements with change of meaning (*affirm / profess* with the indicative and *order / command* with the subjunctive). These are not discussed in the present paper.

(iv) *non-realistic*, where the common ground never intersects the context of evaluation, i.e. the *intersection* between them is *null*. This is the case of volitionals.

On the basis of the two parameters (presence/absence of an ordering source and realistic/non-realistic modal base) the following hierarchy is proposed:

Non-null » non-realistic » weakly realistic » realistic » totally realistic
(ordering source) (modal base) (modal base) (modal base) (modal base)

The presence of an ordering source (the normative component) always determines a non-realistic context, hence the choice of subjunctive. When such a source is not available,

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

languages differ in their choice of subjunctive function of the second parameter (type of modal base).

The relation between grammatical mood and modality is thus interpretive: sentences are classified based on the type of modal base they introduce. When they are sufficiently close to a (totally) realistic one, the indicative will be chosen; when sufficiently remote from it, they select the subjunctive.

3.3 Positive and negative temporal features

Modality issues aside, besides the distinction that Motapanyane (1995) draws between the tense features of the Indicative and the temporal features of the Subjunctive, the latter are to be divided into:

a. positive temporal features that allow the verb to have its own time reference and appear in root clauses (subjunctives, gerunds and infinitives in Romanian) and
b. negative temporal features, on account of which the verb cannot have its own temporal specification or appear in root clauses (supine, participle)

While the verbs in a) project a TP due to their positive specification, those in b) do not.

3.4 Default subjunctive, *fi*-subjunctive and *concordantia temporum*

Motapanyane (1995) distinguishes between the present (*default*) and the perfect (*fi*) subjunctive in Romanian in terms of their distributional properties, claiming that while the former has default temporal features and anaphoric properties, copying the tense/aspectual value of the matrix IP[3] (5), the latter is restricted to contexts where the matrix verb is specified [+ past] and [– perfective] (see 6b vs. 6c below). As such, only the fi-subjunctive but not the default form yields effects of *concordatia temporum*:

(5) a. Vreau [să pleci].
want-PRES-1SG *să* leave-PRES-2SG
'I want you to go.'

b. Voiam [să pleci].
want-IMPEERF-1SG *să* leave-PRES-2SG
'I wanted you to go.'

c. Am vrut [să pleci].
want-PERF-1SG *să* leave-PRES-2SG
'I wanted you to go.'

d. Am fi vrut [să pleci]. (Motapanyane 1995: 71)
want-PERF COND-2PL *să* leave-PRES-2SG
'We would have wanted you to leave.'

(6) a. * Vreau [să fi plecat].
want-PRES-1SG *să* leave-PERF-1/2/3 SG/PL
'I want to have gone.// I want you/him/her/us/them to have gone', i.e.'I wish I/you/etc. had gone.'

b. Voiam [să fi plecat].
want-IMPERF-1SG/PL *să* leave-PERF-1SG/PL.
'I/we wanted to have gone.'

[3] cf. Terzi (1992), Raposo (1987)

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

c. * Am vrut [să fi plecat].
want-PERF-1SG/PL *să* leave-PERF-1SG/PL.
'I/we wanted to have gone.'

d. Aş fi vrut [să fi plecat] (Motapanyane 1995: 72)
want-PERF COND-1SG să leave-PERF-1/2/3 SG/PL
'I would have wanted to have gone.'// I would have wanted you/him/her/us/etc to have gone', i.e. 'I wished I/you/we/he/she/they had gone.'[4]

3.5 Volitional verbs in Romanian and the type of subjunctive they select

According to (5) and (6) above, *a vrea* 'want' has the configuration in (7), where [PRES] should be understood as the default form of the subjunctive (the present subjunctive) and [PAST] as the perfect subjunctive, since these are the only two possible forms in Romanian (unlike other Romance languages):

(7) a. PRES [PRES] : Vreau [să plec] // I want to go.
b. *PRES [PAST]: * Vreau [să fi plecat] // I want to have gone
c. PAST [PRES]: Vroiam [să plec]. / Am vrut [să plec].// I wanted to go
d. $PAST_{imperf.}$ [PAST]: Vroiam [să fi plecat] // I wanted to have gone
d'. *$PAST_{perf.}$ [PAST]: *Am vrut [să fi plecat]. // I wanted to have gone

There are however counterexamples to (7) if:

(i) *a vrea* 'want' is replaced by other volitionals in Romanian, i.e. *a dori* 'wish' / *a spera* 'hope' or if *a vrea* 'want' is present conditional. Thus, the ban on the perfect subjunctive selected by a present volitional in (7b) no longer holds, cf. (8) below

(ii) ii) the sentence is uttered in an adequate context (?) which might allow the perfect subjunctive to appear with a [+ past], [+perfective] volitional in the matrix, against (7d'), and cf. (9):

(8) a. Îmi doresc *(acum)* să fi plecat mai devreme de la petrecere (*aseară*).
wish-PRES-1SG now *să* leave-PERF-1/2/3/SG/PL earlier from the party last night
'(Now) I wish I/we/you/etc. had left earlier from the party (last night).'
Îmi doresc să nu-l fi cunoscut vreodată!
wish-PRES-1SG *să* not CL3rd M SG meet-PERF-1/2/3 SG/PL ever
'(Now) I wish I had never met him (before)!'

b. Sper să fi venit mama *deja* / să nu fi venit (mama) *încă*.
hope-PRES-1SG *să* come-PERF-3SG mother already/să not come-PERF-3SG yet
'I hope mother has already come / hasn't come yet.'

c. Aş vrea să -i fi spus adevărul (când l-am văzut *mai devreme*)
want-PRES COND-1SG să CL3sg.Dat. say-PERF-1SG the truth (when I saw him earlier)
'I wish I had told him the truth (when I saw him earlier).'

(9) a. A doua zi (după ce am aflat vestea) ?* am vrut / ne-am dorit.
second day (after find out-PERF-2PL the news) want-PERF/wish-PERF-2PL
să nu -l fi vizitat pe John (cu o săptămână înainte).
să notCL3SG M visit-PERF-1/2/3/SG/PL PE John (a week before)

[4] There seems to be a difference in English between *want* and *wish* and the type of complement they take, as well as the latter's temporal specification. More on this will be discussed briefly in the next section on volitionals in Romanian, where there verbs (*a vrea* 'want' and *a dori* 'wish') that display a similar behaviour.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

'The next day (after we found out the news), we wanted not to have visited (?)/ we wished we/you/they/s/he hand't visited John (a/the week before).

b. Când l- am văzut aseară la petrecere, mi-am dorit
when CL3SG M see-PERF-1SG last night at the party, CL1SG refl.wish-PERF
să nu -i fi scris scrisoarea(cu câteva zile înainte).
1SG *să* not CL3SG.Dat. write-PERF-1/2/3/SG/PL the letter (a few days before)
' When I saw him at the party last night, I wished I hadn't written the letter to him (just a few days before).'

Given (8) and (9), the question that arises is why *a dori* 'wish' and *a spera* 'hope' are more permissive in their selection of the subjunctive than their volitional counterpart *a vrea* 'want'? One possible answer could be that while *a vrea* introduces a momentary wish and can only select subjunctive complements whose time specification must be posterior to the time of 'wanting' (see (5) above), *a dori* and *a spera* introduce an interval of 'wanting' and can as such be analyzed as more 'durative'. This could perhaps explain why the perfect subjunctive is not allowed with *a vrea* in the present (6a) (unlike *a dori* and *a spera* 8), but it can appear with *a vrea* in the past specified as [+ imperfective], i.e. [+ durative] (see 6b vs. 6c).[5]

3.6 Conclusions

So far I have discussed the temporal dependency of subjunctive complements in Romanian on the basis of two studies that attribute their anaphoric properties to the type of predicate in the matrix. Thus, while Farkas (1984) distinguishes between two types of time reference of subjunctives (*restricted reference* with volitionals or strong intensional verbs and *unspecified reference* with subject control verbs), Motapanyane (1995) only deals with the volitional *a vrea* and its restrictions on the type and temporal value of the subjunctive complement it selects, reducing the opposition Subjunctive / Indicative - contrary to current views in the literature - to that of modal vs. non-modal verbal forms (and temporal vs. tense features on the embedded IP)

The two studies converge however in their understanding of the subjunctive complements selected by volitionals, since the 'restricted time referenece' Farkas (1984) ascribes to them can be viewed as another label for what Motapanyane (1995) calls 'positive temporal features'. In both instances the complement can have its own time specification and can appear independently in root clauses.

4. (Obligatory) control configurations in English infinitives. (Possibile) subjunctive configurations in Romanian

Even though current debates in the literature are attempting to eliminate PRO from the theory of Control[6] (as well as *pro* as the null subject of languages with rich agreement), Landau's (1999) analysis rests heavily on the existence of the null category PRO, to which different properties are ascribed in different control configurations.

As such, when applying his findings to the Romanian data I will assume that besides the similarities in the behavior of infinitives (in English) and subjunctives (in Romanian) selected by the same classes of verbs, the two constructions are set apart by the nature of the

[5] This is only a speculation and does not claim to capture the whole complexity of the problems observed.
[6] see the Movement Theory of Control that attempts to reduce Control to Raising (Hornstein 1999, 2001 among others).

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

null subject in the complement clause, PRO for English infinitives and *pro* for Romanian subjunctives.[7]

4.1 Control in English. PRO and temporal dependency

Landau (1999) identifies two types of Obligatory Control in English, distinguished function of two main factors:

(i) the relation of identity between the null subject of the infinitive (analyzed as PRO) and the antecedent NP

(ii) the relation of identity (i.e. temporal dependency) between the infinitival complement and the selecting predicate

Different kinds of predicates allow for one or the other construction, imposing different restrictions with respect to (i) and (ii) above. Out of an inventory of seven semantic classes (modal, aspectual, implicative, volitional, interrogative, factive and prepositional), the first three select infinitive complements which exhibit distinct properties (regarding 1 and 2 above) from those selected by the last four.[8]

This is what enables Landau (1999) to propose the two distinguishing Obligatory Control patterns, as follows:

a. *Exhaustive Control* with aspectuals (*begin, continue, start*), modals *(have to, be able,* etc.) and implicatives (*manage, dare*, etc.) and

b. *Partial Control* with desideratives/volitionals (*want, prefer*), factives (*regret, hate*), propositionals (*claim, maintain*) and interrogatives (*ask, wonder*)

As said above, each of these configurations is expected to display different characteristics concerning 1. the reference of the null subject in the complement clause and 2. temporal dependency on matrix tense.

With EC verbs:
(i) the relation PRO - antecedent is one of *strict identity*, which amounts to the impossibility of the complement clause to host collective expressions such as *meet, convene, together*, etc. with an NP antecedent marked for singular (10). Otherwise put, if the antecedent is [+SG], PRO must also be [+SG] and if the antecedent is [+PL] PRO must be [+PL] as well.

(10) a. John$_i$ **began** [PRO$_i$ to read] // * John$_i$ **began** [PRO$_i$ to *debate* this question]
b. John$_i$ **had** [PRO$_i$ to leave] // *John$_i$ told Mary$_j$ he$_i$ **had to** [PRO$_i$ *separate*]
c. John$_i$ **managed** [PRO$_i$ to leave early]// *John$_i$ **managed** [PRO$_i$ to *meet* at 6]
c'. They$_i$ **managed** [PRO$_i$ to *meet* at 6] (adapted from Landau 1999: 39)

(ii) the relation infinitive complement – matrix tense is also one of *strict identity*, in the sense that the infinitive does not have independent time reference (i.e. it must copy the time specification of the matrix), given that it cannot host time adverbials introducing a distinct time interval from that of the matrix tense (11):

[7] cf. Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin (1994).

[8] Notice that of the seven classes discussed by Landau (1999), we have already looked at aspectuals and implicatives in Section 2 (the B.1. class - verbs of obligatory subject control of Farkas 1984), and at volitionals in both Section 2 and Section 3 (the A.1 class of strong intensional verbs discussed by Farkas (1984) in Section 2 and the volitionals *a vrea/a dori / a spera* whose behavior was analysed in Section 3). The distinction observed so far beween the complements selected by aspectuals and implicatives on the one hand and volitionals on the other matches Landau's (1999) findings on the behaviour of English infinitive complements selected by such verbs. How the Romanian data fit Landau's frame will be seen in the next subsection 4.2)

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

(11) a. * *Yesterday*, John **began** to solve the problem *tomorrow*.
b. * *Yesterday*, John **had to** solve the problem *tomorrow*
c. * John **managed** (*yesterday*) to solve the problem *next Monday*.
(Landau 1999: 71)

With PC verbs:
(i) the relation PRO – antecedent is one of superset – set, in the sense that the NP antecedent *need not be strictly co-referent* with PRO, but merely included in its reference**.** As such, the complement clause allows collective expressions *even with a singular antecedent* (the PC effect), see (12) below. In other words, if the antecedent is [+PL], PRO is also [+PL], but when the antecedent is [+SG], PRO can be either [+SG] or [+PL]

(12) a. The president$_i$ **wanted** [PRO$_{i+j}$ *to convene* during the strike]
b. John$_i$ told Mary$_j$ he$_i$ **preferred** [PRO$_{i+j}$ to *meet* at 6]
c. John$_i$ told Mary$_j$ he$_i$ **didn't know** [**whether** PRO$_{i+j}$ to *meet* at 6]
(adapted from Landau 1999: 57-62)

(ii) the relation infinitive complement – matrix tense is *not one of strict dependence* either; the infinitive can have its own time specification given that it allows time adverbials which introduce a temporal interval different from matrix tense (13):

(13) a. *Yesterday*, John **hoped** to solve the problem *tomorrow*.
b. *Yesterday*, John **wondered** how to solve the problem *tomorrow* (Landau 1999: 72)

It thus follows from (10-13) above that EC verbs select complements whose time specification depends entirely on that of matrix tense (i.e. is anaphoric) and that as such the whole structure counts as one single event ET. Syntactically, the fact that these complements are *untensed* (i.e. they lack the TP projection) does not trigger T→ C.

PC verbs on the other hand subcategorize for infinitive complements whose temporal specification can differ from that in the matrix clause and the phrase therefore counts as inscribing two distinct events ((ET1≠ET2), i.e. the time of "wanting" and the time of "meeting" or "convening" in (12) above). Syntactically, the presence of Tense triggers T→ C in order to check the [u]T in C[9].

4.2 Subjunctive constructions in Romanian. The null subjects of subjunctives and temporal dependency

Like their infinitive counterparts in English, Romanian subjunctives do not have a homogeneous behaviour (with distinct matrix selectors) in what concerns:
(i) the relation of identity between the null subject of the complement (*pro*) and the antecedent NP
(ii) the relation of identity (i.e. temporal dependency) between the subjunctive complement and the tense of the matrix predicate

In an attempt to integrate the distinction proposed by Farkas (1984) between strong intensional verbs (A.1) and verbs of obligatory subject control (B.1) on the one hand and the

[9] The formal analysis of the syntactic operations proposed by Landau (1999) for the two types of configurations is quite complex and not directly relevant for the purposes of the paper. What has been said so far suffices as background for the next subsection, which will look at the Romanian data and the extent to which they fit the English model.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

selection properties of volitionals in Romanian on the other into the more comprehensive frame of Landau (1999), and trying to apply the latter's analysis on the Romanian data, we will notice that:

a. subjunctive complements selected by EC verbs display similar properties to their English infinitival counterparts with respect to 1. reference of the null subject and 2. temporal dependency
b. subjunctive complements selected by PC verbs display similar properties to their English infinitival counterparts with respect to 1. reference of the null subject and 2. temporal dependency

Let us analyze each case in part and see how the data fare with the above claims:

a. Subjunctive complements selected by EC verbs (modals/aspectuals/implicatives) behave like their English EC infinitive counterparts in the sense that:

(i) the relation *pro* – antecedent is one of *strict identity*, which means that the complement clause can host neither pronouns or NPs that are distinct from the matrix subject nor collective expressions like *a se întâlni* 'meet', *împreună* 'together', etc. (14). This amounts to saying that just as in the case of EC PRO, if the antecedent is [+SG], pro must also be [+SG] and if the antecedent is [+PL], pro must also be [+PL].

(14) a. **Am încercat** pro_i să cânt pro_i . // **Am început** pro_i să citesc pro_i //**Pot** pro_i să citesc pro_i
try-PERF-1SG *să* sing-PRES-1SG// begin-PERF-1SG *să* read-PRES-1SG// can-PRES-1SG să read-PRES-1SG
'I tried to sing' // 'I started to sing.'// 'I can sing'

b. ***Am încercat** pro_i să cântați pro_j.//***Am început** pro_i să citeşti pro_j.//***Pot** pro_i să citeşti pro_j
try-PERF-1SG *să* sing-PRES-2PL// start-PERF-1SG *să* read-PRES-2SG // can-PRES-1SG *să* read-PRES-2PL

c. Ion_i **a reuşit/ a putut / a început** să citească pro_i.
John manage/can/start-PERF-1SG *să* read-PRES-1SG.
'John managed/could/started to read.'

d. *Ion_i **a reuşit/ a putut / a început** să citească el_j / $Maria_j$ / ei_j / *împreună.*
John manage/can/start-PERF-3SG *să* read-PRES-3SG/PL he/ Mary/ they/ together
'John managed/could/started him/them/Mary to read'/ …to read together.'

e. *Ion **a reuşit/a putut/a început** să *se întâlnească* la 6.
John manage/can/start-PERF-3SG să meet at 6
'John managed to meet at 6.'

(ii) the relation subjunctive complement – matrix tense is also one of *strict identity*, in the sense that the subjunctive does not have independent time reference and must copy the time specification of the matrix since it cannot host time adverbials distinct from the temporal value of the matrix tense or the perfect subjunctive (15). This time dependency can be rendered as an obligation on the subjunctive agreement to match that of the matrix predicate (Agr1 ≡ Agr 2).

(15) a. ***Am încercat** să fi cântat. // * **Încep** să fi citit. // ***Pot** să fi cântat.
try-PERF-1SG *să* sing-PERF-1SG // begin-PRES-1SG *să* read-PERF-1SG // can--PRES-1SG *să* sing-PERF-1SG
'I tried to have sung' // I'm beginning to have read.'// 'I can have sung.'

b. ***Am încercat** *ieri* să cânt *mâine*.//***Încep** *azi* să citesc *mâine*.//* *Ieri* **am putut** să
try-PERF-1SG yesterday *să* sing-PRES-1SG tomorrow // begin-PRES-1SG today *să* read-PRES-1SG tomorrow // yesterday can-PERF-1SG *să*

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

cânt *azi* la concert
sing-PRES-1SG today at the concert
'Yesterday I tried to sing tomorrow.'// I'm beginning today to read tomorrow.'//
'Yesterday I could sing today at the concert'.

b. Subjunctive complements selected by PC verbs (volitionals, interrogatives, prepositionals and factives) behave similarly to their English infinitive PC counterparts in the sense that:
(i) the relation pro – antecedent is *not* one of *strict identity*, i.e. *pro can* (the default reading) *but need not be* (the 'marked' reading) *co-referent with the matrix subject* NP or pronoun[10]. As such, the subjunctive complement can host both pronouns or NPs that are disjoint in reference from the matrix subject and collective expressions like *a se întâlni 'meet'*, *împreună 'together'* (16). In other words, when the antecedent is [+SG], pro can be either [+SG] or [+PL], and when the antecedent in [+PL], pro can again be [+PL] or [+SG].

(16) a. Maria$_i$ **vrea** să plece pro$_i$. (default reading)
Mary want-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES-3SG
'Mary wants to go'
a'. Maria$_i$ **vrea** să plece pro$_j$. (marked reading)
Mary want-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES-3SG/3PL
'Mary$_i$ wants her$_j$/him/them to go.'
b. Maria **vrea** să plece toți musafirii.
Mary want-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES-3PL all the guests.
'Mary wants all the guests to leave.'
c. Maria$_i$ i-a spus lui Ion$_j$ că **vrea** pro$_i$ [să meargă pro$_{i+j}$ *împreună* la concert].
Mary tell-PERF-3SG Ion that want-PRES-3SG *să* go-PRES-3PLtogether at concert
'Mary told John that she wanted to go to the concert together.'
d. **Mă întreb** pro$_i$ cum să încep pro$_i$ articolul.
wonder-PRES-1SG how *să* start-PRES-1SG the article.
'I wonder how to start the article.'
e. **Nu ştiu** pro$_i$ cum/ce să facem pro$_j$.
not know-PRES-1SG how / what *să* face-PRES-2PL
'I don't know what to do/we should do about it.'

(ii) the relation subjunctive complement – matrix tense is *not* one of *strict identity/dependency* either: the subjunctive can have its own time specification given that it allows the perfect subjunctive and time adverbials which introduce a temporal interval different from matrix tense (17). As such, there is no obligation for the subjunctive agreement to match that of the matrix verb (it can be both similar to or different from it, i.e. Agr1 = Agr2 // Agr1≠Agr2)

[10] The difference between PC PRO (in English) and the so-called PC *pro* in Romanian is that while the former *obligatorily* contains the antecedent in its reference (without having to be strictly identical to it, i.e. antecedent$_i$ > PRO$_{i+j}$), the latter either matches the reference of its antecedent (in the default reading, i.e. antecedent$_i$ > pro$_i$) or must be separate from it (marked reading, i.e. antecedent$_i$ > pro$_j$). That is why I have used '=' for cases of co-reference between (PC) pro and antecedent (default reading) but '≡' for the strict identity between (EC) pro and its antecedent. (the notation is kept for agreement relations as well, see below). In light of this, '=' presupposes '≠' while '≡' rules out any subject or temporal interpretation mismatch between complement and matrix.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

(17) a. *Acum* **vreau** să plec la Chicago *pe 14 aprilie*. (Farkas 1984:362) (= (2))
b. Îmi doresc să fi plecat la Chicago mai devreme.
wish-PRES-1SG *să* leave-PERF-1/2/3 SG/PL to Chicago earlier
' I wish I had left for Chicago earlier.'
c. M **-a întrebat** (*ieri)* cum să resolve problema *mâine*.
CL1SG.Acc ask-PERF-3SG (yesterday) how *să* solve-PRES-3SG/PLthe problem tomorrow
'He asked me (yesterday) how to solve the problem tomorrow.'
d. **Mă întrebam** dacă să-i fi spus
CL1SG.refl. ask-IMPERF-1SG whether *să* CL-3SG.Dat. tell-PERF-1/2/3SG/PL
mai din timp (despre….)
earlier. (about …)
'I was wondering wether I should have told him earlier (about….)

So far we have seen PC configurations in English (examples 12-13 in 4.1) and their subjunctive equivalents in Romanian (examples 16-17 in 4.2) with only two of the four classes of verbs assumed to select PC constructions, namely volitionals and interrogatives.

What about propositional and factive verbs? Do they exhibit similar behaviour in the two languages under discussion, as their volitional and interrogative counterparts?

The following examples from English and Romanian show that these verbs behave the same at least in their selection of complements, being less restrictive in the type of complement they subcategorize for. Thus, while propositional and factive verbs in English often select that-complements or gerunds instead of infinitives, in Romanian they allow both subjunctive and indicative complements (unlike volitionals and interrogatives, which only select the former[11]) with slight changes in meaning (prepositional verbs) or more often than not preferring the latter (factives).

As for the properties characteristic of PC constructions (i.e. the possibility of disjoint referenece between embedded and matrix subject and independent temporal specification), we shall see that at least for factive verbs in Romanian (which, as already mentioned, prefer the indicative) Landau's theory is more difficult to accommodate.

Factive and propositional verbs in English

In English, both factives and propositional verbs select infinitive or gerundial complements whose *realis* time specification precedes that of the matrix verb (18):

(18) a. *Today*, John **regretted** having kissed/kissing Mary *last week*.
b. *Today*, John **claimed** to have lost his car keys *last week*. (Landau 1999: 72)

Factives usually select that-complements, some of them preferring the gerund to the infinitive while still displaying the PC effect (plural interpretation of PRO in spite of a [+SG] antecedent):

(19) a. The president$_i$ **hated** [PRO$_{i+j}$ *gathering* without a concrete agenda].
b. John$_i$ told Mary$_j$ he$_i$ **hated** [PRO$_{i+j}$ *to be gathering*…]
c. Maryi said that John$_j$ **regretted** [PRO$_{i+j}$ working *together*].
(adapted from Landau 1999:58)

[11] cf. (i) * Vreau că plec. vs. Vreau să plec.
(ii) * Mă întreb dacă că plec. vs. Mă întreb dacă să plec.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

The only propositional verb in English that selects infinitive or gerundial complements is *claim*, with PC effects:

(20) a. The president$_i$ **claimed** [PRO$_{i+j}$ to have *gathered* early this morning]
b. John$_i$ said Mary$_j$ **claimed** [PRO$_{i+j}$ to have slept *together*] (adapted from Landau 1999:60-61)

Factive and propositional verbs in Romanian
In Romanian, both verbs select subjunctive and indicative complements, cf. (21-22) below:

(21) a. Regret pro$_i$ că au plecat pro$_j$ (*ieri*)
regret-PRES-1SG that leave-PERF-3PL all (yeasterday)
' I regret that they left yesterday'
b. Regret pro$_i$ că plec pro$_i$ mâine.
regret-PRES-1SG that leave-PRES-1SG tomorrow.
'I regret to be going away tomorrow.' / I regret that I am leaving tomorrow.'
c. Regret pro$_i$ să -ți dau pro$_i$ așa o veste tristă.
regret-PRES-1SG *să* CL-2SG.Dat. give-PRES-1SG such news sad.
'I regret to tell you / be telling you this…'
d. ? Regret pro$_i$ să plec pro$_i$/ să plecăm pro$_j$ așa devreme.
regret-PRES-1SG *să* leave-PRES-1SG/1PL so early.
'I regret to leave / be leaving so early.'
e. ?* Regret pro$_i$ (*acum)* să fi plecat pro$_{i/j}$ (*ieri)* devreme.
regret-PRES-1SG (now) *să* leave-PERF-1/2/3 SG/PL (yeasterday) early
'I now regret having left early yesterday.'

(22) a. A pretins/Pretinde pro$_i$ că a spus pro$_{i/j}$ adevărul // Pretinde pro$_i$ claim-PERF-3SG/PRES-3SG that say-PERF-3SG the truth // claim-PRES-3SG că e deşteaptă pro$_{i/j}$. // Pretinde pro$_i$ că vine pro$_{i/j}$ mâine.
that be smart-PRES-3SG // claim-PRES-3SG that come-PRES-3SG tomorrow
'S/he claimed that s/he told the truth//'S/he claims s/he's smart.'//'S/he claims s/he will come tomorrow.'
b. A pretins *(ieri)* să -i dau cartea *(mâine)*//
claim-PERF-3SG (yesterday) *să* CL-3SG.Dat.give-PRES-1SG the book tomorrow
'Yesterday she claimed that I should give her the book tomorrow.'
? A pretins să -mi fi adus aminte de ea.
claim-PERF-3SG să CL-1SG.relf. remember-PERF-1SG her
'She claimed that I should have remembered her.'
c. Pretinde pro$_i$ să plece pro$_i$ azi // Pretinde pro$_i$ să plecați pro$_j$ azi.
claim-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES-3SG today // claim-PRES-3SG *să* leave-PRES--2SG today

Preferring as they do indicative complements, the factive verbs in (21) sound rather awkward with the subjunctive in Romanian (21d and e) and do not seem to display the PC effect ((21d) sounds equally strange with co-referent or disjoint subjects, while (21e) is proof that different time adverbs or the perfect subjunctive are not felicitously accepted either). Both (21d) and (21e) would become fully acceptable if the indicative were used instead of the subjunctive, cf. (23):

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

(23) a. Regret că plecăm aşa devreme (mâine)
regret-PRES-1SG that leave-PRES-1SG so early (tomorrow)
'I regret that we (have to) leave so early tomorrow.'
b. Regret că am plecat aşa devreme ieri
regret-PRES-1SG that leave-PERF-1SG so early yesterday.
'I regret that we left so early yesterday.'

However, the subjunctive in (21c) seems somewhat more acceptable (to my ear) than in (21d), perhaps because of the immediate equivalent structure in English, where an infinitive is used instead of a gerund to describe simultaneity or – more likely – posteriority in relation to the main verb:

(24) a. I regret to tell you that…. (infinitive, future-oriented) vs.
b. I regret telling / having told him that… (gerund, past-oriented)

As for the propositional *a pretinde* 'claim', it selects indicative complements whose time specification can be anterior / posterior to or simultaneous with that of the matrix predicate (22a), as well as subjunctive complements whose time interpretation can differ from that of the main clause (22b – with distinct time adverbials and perfect subjunctive in the embedded clause) and whose null subject can be disjoint from the matrix subject (22c). By this token, *a pretinde* 'claim' can be claimed (!) to display the PC effects discussed at length above.

Significantly, the meaning of the verb with the two types of complement is different, i.e.:

- *pretinde că* ('claim' +IND) = maintain, make a claim, insist that something is the case

- *pretinde să* ('claim' + SUBJ) = ask, demand, make a demand, (a slight order or command)[12]

In conclusion, of the four types of verbs that select PC infinitive complements in English, only volitionals, interrogatives and propositional verbs have been shown to select subjunctive complements with similar properties in Romanian regarding the reference of the embedded subject and temporal dependency. Factives seem to represent the odd case, possibly on account of their propensity for indicative complements over the subjunctive.

4.3 Conclusions

The chart below summarizes the Romanian data discussed in the preceeding pages, showing that it is possible to distinguish between two types of subjunctive contructions in the language, based on the semantic class of the matrix predicate and Landau's model of classification for infinitives in English.

The *first class* of subjunctives are those selected by EC verbs (modals /aspectuals /implicatives), which impose *strict restrictions* on their complements, drawing them closer to their infinitival counterparts in English and other Romance languages.

[12] The distinction can also be observed in English: when used with the meaning of 'maintain, affirm, insist', *claim* usually selects indicative that-complements (i); when used with the meaning of 'ask, demand', it usually selects infinitives or the analytic subjunctive (ii):
(i) She claims he hurt her / He claims to be very sensitive/ She claims she will break up with him.
(ii) She claims to be given all the money. / She claimed to leave at once / She claimed to be let go at once/ They claim that we should depart as soon as possible.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

The *second class* of subjunctives are those selected by PC verbs (volitionals /interrogatives/propositionals). These predicates are less restrictive in their relation to the complement, whose properties resemble those of subjunctive constructions in Romance as well as English.

Subjunctive complements selected by EC verbs (modal / aspectual / implicative) have the following characteristics:	**Subjunctive complements selected by PC verbs** (volitional/interrogative/propositional) have the following characteristics:
1.**SU1 ≡ SU2 (strict identity)** → the obligatory subject co-reference effect characteristic of infinitive complements in English and Romance → *pro* (Rom.) ≈ PRO (En.) ≈ anaphoric element subject to Principle A of GB	**1. SU1=SU2 / SU1≠SU2 (optional identity)** → the disjoint reference effect characteristic of subjunctive complements in Romance (and English) → *pro* (Rom.) ≈ pronominal element subject to Principle B of GB
2. unspecified time reference (Farkas 1984) or negative temporal features (Motapanyane 1995), i.e.: → no distinct time adverbials or perfect subjunctive in the complement clause → no independent temporal interpretation → ? no T→ C (cf. Landau 1999) >> **AGR1 ≡ AGR2**	**2**. restricted time reference (Farkas 1984) or positive temporal features (Motapanyane 1995), i.e.: → distinct time adverbials and perfect subjunctive in the complement clause → independent temporal interpretation (i.e. distinct from matrix) → ? T→ C (cf. Landau 1999) >> **AGR1 = AGR2 / AGR1 ≠ AGR2**
3. free alternation with infinitives[13]	**3.** no free alternation with infinitives in present-day Romanian

Maura Cotfas
"Languages and Cultural Identities" Doctoral School
University of Bucharest
maura_cotfas@yahoo.com
maura.cotfas@gmail.com

[13] Of the three classes of EC verbs, the modal *a putea* 'can' freely alternates subjunctive and infinitive complements in present-day Romanian (i), the infinitive being less frequent (and limited to archaic usage) with the other two classes (ii) as well as the PC verbs (iii):

(i) Pot **să vorbesc** engleza fluent. // Pot **vorbi** engleza fluent.
can-PRES-1SG să speak-PRES-1SG English fluently // can-PRES-1SG speak-INF.PRES English fluently
'I can speak English fluently.'

(ii) Am început **să citesc**.// Şi când a început odată **a ţipa**…
'I started to read' // 'And when he suddenly started to scream…'
Am reuşit **să termin** cartea.// Oricât a încercat, n-a izbutit **a**-l **prinde.**
' I managed to finish the book.' // 'Try as s/he might, s/he didn't manage to catch him.'

(iii) Nu a voit **a pleca** cu una, cu două.
'He wouldn't leave unless we made him.'
Nu ştim unde **a înnopta** / Nu ştiu cum **a**-i **spune** vestea.
'We don't know where to camp for the night. // I don't know how to tell him the truth.'
Pretinde **a** i se **da** cinstea cuvenită.
'S/he pretends to be given the due care and attention'

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)

References

Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian. Comparative Studies in Romance*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Farkas, D. 1984. Subjunctive complements in Romanian. In P. Baldi (ed.), *Papers from the 12th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, 354-372. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Giorgi, A, Pianesi, F. 1997. On the morphosyntax of tense and mood selection. Ms., University of Bergamo and IRST.

Hornstein, N. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96

Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Krapova, I. 1998. Subjunctive complements, null subjects and case checking in Bulgarian. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 8 (2): 73-93.

Kratzer, A. 1991. Modality. In A. von Stechow and D. Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantik/Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, 639-650. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Landau, I. 1999. Elements of Control. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Motapanyane, V. 1995. *Theoretical Implications of Complementation in Romanian*. Padova: Unipress.

Raposo, E. 1987. Romance infinitival clauses and case theory. In C. Neidle and R. Nunez-Cedeno (eds.), *Studies in Romance Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Terzi, A. 1992. PRO in Finite Clauses. A Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages. PhD dissertation, CUNY.

BDD-A9813 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:13:57 UTC)