LARISA AVRAM

A MIRATIVITY SUBJUNCTIVE IN ROMANIAN

1. Introduction

The relatively marginal subjunctive construction illustrated in (1) signals surprise and incredulity on the part of the speaker with respect to the state of affairs expressed by the subjunctive:

(1) Crin să învețe sintaxă?! Nu apucăm noi ziua aia!
Crin SUBJ learn-3rd syntax not get we day that
'Crin learn syntax?! We won't live to see that day!'

In terms of conversational use, the Romanian subjunctive construction is similar to root infinitives in several languages, known in the literature as 'mad magazine sentences'[1] (Akmajian 1984), as 'incredulity response constructions' (Lambrecht 1990), or as 'infinitival exclamatives' (Grohmann 2000). They express 'surprise, disbelief, skepticism, scorn, and so on, at some situation or event' (Akmajian 1984, p. 2). One central question of the studies which looked into the properties of these non-canonical non-finite constructions has been to what extent they represent a distinct sentence type with a unique discourse function (Akmajian 1984, Lambrecht 1990, Grohmann 2000, Etxepare–Grohmann 2003, 2005). One can identify two main investigation directions. According to one of them, infinitival exclamatives do not represent a distinct clause type. They have the same formal properties as imperatives; the differences between them follow from pragmatic principles (see, for example, Akmajian 1984). A different analysis is put forth by Lambrecht (1990), who argues that these clauses represent 'a formal type in its own right', which he defines as a type of topic-comment construction.

In this paper I extend the investigation to the mirativity subjunctive constructions (MSC) in Romanian, illustrated in (1), focusing on one question: do they represent a clause type in its own right directly associated to their pragmatic use or do they have the formal properties of other clauses, with their conversational function deriving from other factors? On the empirical side, the paper offers a description of the structure and the semantics of these non-canonical constructions in Romanian, with a view to identifying the contribution of both their syntactic structure and their compositional semantics to their use, *i.e.*to our understanding of the extent to which their discourse function can be related to their structure.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I discuss the main syntactic properties of the Romanian MSCs. In Section 3, their semantic

[1] Such a construction is illustrated for English in (i) below. The infinitival exclamative has been bolded.

(i) A: John may wear a tuxedo at the ball.
B: What? **Him wear a tuxedo at the ball?!** Impossible.

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

properties are compared to those of two other apparently non-embedded subjunctive constructions. Section 4 summarizes the main findings.

2. MSCs in Romanian

2.1. Main ingredients

The MSC is placed in a well-defined context whose main ingredients are similar to those of 'infinitival exclamatives' in other languages. The whole construction is made of three distinctive parts: the 'context' sentence (A in 2 below), the subjunctive construction itself, and the coda ('Imposibil' in B in 2):

(2) A: Se pare că Vasilică a plagiat.
'It seems that Vasilică has plagiarized.'
B: Ce? Vasilică al nostru să plagieze?! Imposibil!
what Vasilică AL our SUBJ plagiarize$_{3RD\ SG}$ impossible
'Our Vasilică plagiarize?! Impossible!'

The MSC itself can be preceded by a lexical expression of surprise (e.g. *What?* in B above) and it is followed by a coda which contributes the incredulity flavour, disconfirming or casting doubt on every alternative introduced by the subjunctive clause. It encodes surprise at the state of affairs denoted by the subjunctive, a state of affairs which does not correspond to the speaker's general knowledge or expectations. In this respect, it can be analysed as an expression of mirativity (Peterson 2013 and references therein). Given, however, the fact that the subjunctive clause does not seem to be alone in conveying surprise, incredulity, unexpectedness, etc. within this conversational exchange, in order to understand how its form relates to its use it is important to identify its own syntactic and semantic contribution to the resulting interpretation.

2.2. MSCs as non-embedded subjunctives

Let us first examine to what extent MSCs represent a distinct clause type. The Romanian subjunctive is temporally deficient and it typically occurs in embedded contexts (Frâncu 2010, Cotfas 2012). The use of the subjunctive in MSCs is non-canonical but not singular. There are other contexts in which the subjunctive clause is (at least at first sight) non-embedded, among which surrogate imperatives (Isac–Jakab 2004, Manea 2008) (3) and 'interrogative dubitatives' (Manea 2008, p. 387) (4):

(3) Să plece imediat!
SUBJ leave$_{3RD\ SG}$ immediately
'(S)he must/ should leave immediately!'
(4) Să plece (oare) la mare duminică?
SUBJ leave$_{3RD\ SG}$ (maybe) at seaside Sunday
'Is it possible that s/he should go to the seaside on Sunday?'

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

As can be seen, the subjunctive occurs in imperatives, interrogatives and (interrogative-)exclamatives, *i.e.* clauses which encode different types of force[2]. For subjunctive constructions like the one in (2) the proposal has been made that they have the same structure as true imperatives, *i.e.* the ones with imperative morphology, and as other surrogate imperatives (infinitive and indicative constructions). D. Isac and E. Jakab (2004) argue that all these imperatives have the same syntactic structure. Adopting L. Rizzi's (1997) split-CP hypothesis, they analyse them as clauses which contain a Mood Phrase (MoodP), lower than the Force Phrase (ForceP), in which the imperative feature is checked:

(5) $[_{CP}\,[_{MoodP}\,[_{IP}\,\ldots..]]]$.

What differs is the way in which feature checking is implemented. In the case of the subjunctive used as a surrogate imperative, checking is implemented via Merge of the subjunctive particle *să*, analysed as a mood marker, in the head of a MoodP.

At first sight, the three root subjunctives (RS) mentioned above seem similar in that they all contain the particle *să* and they all have modal value. The analysis proposed for the surrogate imperatives could be extended to the other RS clauses. But, as the examples in (1) – (3) show, the force properties of the three clauses are different. The three RSs might check the mood feature in a similar way but one still has to account for the realization of the different force types.

In what follows, I will be examining the syntactic properties of MSCs with a view to identifying whether their syntactic structure is similar to or different from that of other RSs.

2.3 The subjunctive particle

There is no consensus in the literature with respect to the categorial status of the subjunctive particle *să.* While there is agreement with respect to its status as a mood marker which heads a functional projection (Avram 1999, Isac–Jakab 2004), only some researchers assume that *să* also behaves like a complementizer (Farkas 1984, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994), possibly moving to the C-domain in the absence of overt material in the head of the CP (Motapanyane 1995). In recent studies (Alboiu 2002, Hill 2004), the subjunctive clauses which lack an overt complementizer were argued to be Mood Phrases devoid of a C-projection. This seems to be exactly the situation of the RSs under investigation.

What seems to be obvious at this point is that the presence of *să* signals that the clause projects at least a MoodP, headed by the subjunctive particle, with an Agr/ TP as a complement which hosts the displaced lexical verb:

(6) $[_{MoodP}\,[_{AgrP/TP}\,\ldots..]]$.

However, whether *să* remains in Mood or moves to C is difficult to decide empirically (see also Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 for a similar point of view); the decision

[2] For a detailed inventory of non-embedded subjunctives in Romanian see Frâncu 2010.

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

depends on various assumptions with respect to several relevant factors, among which the structure of the C-domain, the position of complementizers and that of clitics. In order to investigate whether the MSC also projects a CP we have to examine other phenomena.

2.4 Topicalization

In Romanian, pre-verbal lexical subjects occupy a position in the C-layer of the clause (Avram 1992, Cornilescu 1997)[3], where they move in order to check a topic feature. As can be seen in (7) below, MSCs allow both post-verbal and pre-verbal subjects[4]:

(7) a. **Crin** să bea bere belgiană?! E prea fraier!
Crin SUBJ drink$_{3RD\ SG}$ beer Belgian is too stupid

b. Să bea **Crin** bere belgiană?! E prea fraier!
SUBJ drink$_{3RD\ SG}$ Crin beer Belgian is too stupid
'Crin drink Belgian beer?! He's too stupid!'

Though the availability of pre-verbal subjects could signal the existence of a topic projection in the C-domain, the fact that bare quantifiers, which generally make bad topics (Cinque 1990), can occur as pre-verbal subjects in MSCs, weakens the argument:

(8) a. **Nimeni** să nu ştie răspunsul?! Nu cred![5]
nobody SUBJ not know$_{2ND\ SG}$ answer.the not believe$_{1ST\ SG}$

b. Să nu ştie **nimeni** răspunsul?! Nu cred.
SUBJ not know$_{2ND\ SG}$ nobody answer.the not believe$_{1ST\ SG}$

The ungrammaticality of (9) provides further evidence that the Romanian MSCs are devoid of a topic phrase. Topicalization of direct objects is not possible with MSCs; a sentence like the one in (9) is acceptable only as an interrogative-dubitative subjunctive, but not as a MSC:

(9) ??/*Ziare să citească Vasilică?! Imposibil!
newspapers SUBJ read$_{3RD\ SG}$ Vasilică impossible
'Newspapers Vasilică read?! Impossible!'

2.5. Contrastive focus

Sentences with a fronted contrastive focus are also unacceptable as MSCs:

[3] See, however, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 and Alboiu 2000 for a different point of view, according to which the pre-verbal subject surfaces in Spec IP even when it is a topic.

[4] MSCs accept exclusively overt subjects. But this condition on subject overtness has to be correlated with the interpretation and the discourse function of the clause and not with its syntax. This issue will be addressed in section 3.

[5] For the evaluation of several structures used in the study I use the results of an acceptability sentence questionnaire from 16 native speakers of Romanian (age 20–30).

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

(10) ??/*ZIARELE să le citească Vasilică?! Imposibil!
newspapers.the SUBJ them read$_{3RD\ SG}$ Vasilică impossible
'The newspapers Vasilică read?! Impossible!'

Assuming that contrastively focused constituents move to a designated focus projection in the C-layer (Rizzi 1997), sentences like the one in (10) provide evidence that such a projection might be unavailable in MSCs.

Romanian subjunctive complements are of two types: (i) complements with an overt complementizer, the so-called *ca*-subjunctives, and (ii) complements with no overt complementizer, the *ca*-less subjunctive clauses. Hill (2004) shows that the former allow both pre- and post-verbal subjects as well as fronting to focus. With the latter, fronting to focus is odd and subjects can only occur in post-verbal position. The MSCs under investigation seem to have hybrid properties. As shown in (7) and (8), they accept both pre- and post-verbal subjects. In this respect they behave like *ca*-subjunctives. But they also disallow fronting for focus (as shown in 10), as *ca*-less subjunctives.

The subject, however, can be focalized with a limited number of emphasis adverbs, such as *tocmai*, *taman* 'exactly, precisely', *chiar* 'even' (see Neamţu–Házy 1981 for an analysis of these adverbs). But, as shown in (11), such focalized subjects can appear both pre- and post-verbally, which suggests that their presence does not force movement to a designated focus position in the C-domain:

(11) a. **Tocmai Crin** să bea bere belgiană?! E prea fraier!
exactly Crin SUBJ drink$_{3RD\ SG}$ beer Belgian is too stupid

b. Să bea **tocmai Crin** bere belgiană?! E prea fraier!
SUBJ drink$_{3RD\ SG}$ exactly Crin beer Belgian is too stupid
'Crin be the one who drinks Belgian beer?! He's too stupid!'

2.6. Speaker-oriented adverbs

Evidence from the distribution of adverbs in MSCs also suggests that a C-layer may be unavailable in this clause type. In Romanian, speaker-oriented modal adverbs have been argued to be placed at the left periphery of the clause, in the CP domain (Protopopescu 2012). Their use is odd in MSCs:

(12) A: **Evident** Crin o să înveţe sintaxă. 'Obviously Crin will learn syntax.'

B: ?? **Evident** Crin să înveţe sintaxă?! Nu cred!
obviously Crin SUBJ learn$_{3RD\ SG}$ syntax not believe
'Crin obviously learn syntax?! I don't believe it!'

2.7. Wh-questions

Wh-questions involve overt displacement of the *wh*-constituent to a position in the C-domain in Romanian (Alboiu 2002). The impossibility of *wh*-question

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

formation in MSCs provides further evidence that such clauses are devoid of a C-layer. The response in (13) is ungrammatical as a MSC:

(13) A: Crin a citit ziarul. 'Crin read the newspaper.'

B: ***Ce** să citească Crin?! Imposibil!
what SUBJ read$_{\text{ERD SG}}$ Crin impossible
'What Crin read?! Impossible!'

2.8. Temporal-aspectual modification

Both aspectual and temporal modification are allowed (14), providing evidence for the corresponding functional phrases:

(14) a. A: Cred că Vasile citeşte adesea ziarul. 'I think Vasile often reads the newspaper.'

B: Ce? Vasile să citească **adesea** ziarul? Visezi!
what Vasile SUBJ read$_{\text{3RD SG}}$ often newspaper.the dream$_{\text{2ND SG}}$
'What? Vasile often read the newspaper?! You must be dreaming!'

b. Să citească Crin romane (**cînd era) în facultate**?! Glumeşti!
SUBJ read$_{\text{3RD SG}}$ Crin novels when was in college joke$_{\text{2ND SG}}$
'Crin read novels when he was a student?! You must be joking!'

2.9. Conclusions so far

The few data presented so far indicate that in Romanian MSCs lack a C-domain; they do not allow topicalized or contrastively focused constituents moved to sentence initial position, or modal speaker-oriented adverbs. Temporal-aspectual modification is allowed. Building on these data, I suggest that the structure of MSCs is the one in (15):

(15)[$_{\text{MoodP}}$ … [$_{\text{AgrP/TP}}$ …[$_{\text{AspP}}$ … [$_{\text{VP}}$ …]]]].

They are Mood Phrases, as previously assumed for *ca*-less subjunctives in general (Motapanyane 1995, Alboiu 2002). But, at the same time, it is obvious that their interpretation as well as their force are different from those of embedded or other non-embedded subjunctives. In what follows I will be looking into the possible source of this difference.

3. On the interpretation of root subjunctives

MSCs evaluate the proposition denoted by the context sentence, signaling surprise on the part of the speaker at its content. The basis for the evaluation is compound: a particular individual and a particular property assigned to it, *i.e.* the evaluation targets the argument and the predicate together (Lambrecht 1990).

In most cases, the surprise is a reaction to the speaker's expectations given some previous knowledge with respect to a general property of the referent of the subject. Hence the generic indefinite flavour of the MSC. The surprise is not exclusively at

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

the referent of the subject, but at the association between the property expressed by the predicate and this particular referent. This may explain why the subject has to be overt[6]. It is also reflected in coordination structures like the one in (16), where the subject is linked to the predicate by a coordinating conjunction, *şi* 'and':

(16) A: Crin e mulţumit.
B: Crin **şi** (să fie) mulţumit ?! Nu apucăm noi ziua aia!
Crin and SUBJ be pleased not $get_{1ST\ PL}$ we day.the that
'Crin be pleased?! We will not live to see that!'

The generic indefinite flavour of the MSC also explains why an episodic interpretation is at least odd if not altogether unacceptable; specific temporal location is banned in MSC:

(17) A: Crin a citit ieri ziarul. 'Crin read the newspaper yesterday.'
B: Ce? ??/*Crin să citească **ieri** ziarul?! Nu se poate!'
what Crin SUBJ $read_{3RD\ SG}$ yesterday newspaper.the not refl $can_{3RD\ SG}$
'What? Crin read the newspaper yesterday?! Impossible!'

The subjunctive in (17) is acceptable with an interrogative-dubitative interpretation, e.g. 'Is it possible that Crin read the newspaper yesterday?', but not as an incredulity response. Replacing the present subjunctive with the perfect subjunctive, which expresses anteriority (see, for example, Neamţu 1998), will result in the same difference: the sentence allows the dubitative interpretation but not the miratívity one:

(18) A: Crin a citit ieri ziarul. 'Crin read the newspaper yesterday.'
B: Ce? ??/*Crin să fi citit ieri ziarul?! Nu se poate!'
what Crin SUBJ be read-past part. yesterday newspaper.the not refl $can_{3RD\ SG}$
'What? Crin read the newspaper yesterday?! Impossible!'

Actually, the perfect subjunctive is acceptable in interrogative-dubitative RSs, but incompatible with either MSCs or subjunctives used as surrogate imperatives. On the other hand, the surrogate imperative and the interrogative-dubitative RSs are both compatible with an eventive episodic reading. The overtness condition on the subject holds only of the MSC.

The few data discussed in this section reveal differences between the three RSs. It is plausible to assume that they all check their mood feature in Mood, *i.e.* they all project a MoodP; but their interpretation, though modal in nature across structures, is different.

The temporal composition of subjunctives is usually derived from the higher verb. But when the subjunctive is, at least at first sight, non-embedded, one would expect its temporal interpretation to be computed as with root clauses and all RSs

[6] Notice that this condition does not constrain the subjunctive used as a surrogate imperative or the interrogative-dubitative one.

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

should have the same temporal properties. However, the comparison of the temporal interpretation of MSCs to other types of RSs reveals further differences.

The subjunctive in surrogate imperatives has, like any imperative, future tense interpretation (19), which explains the incompatibility with the perfect subjunctive (20):

(19) (Crin) Să plece (Crin) imediat!
Crin SUBJ leave $_{3RD\ SG}$ Crin immediately
'Crin should leave immediately!'

(20) *Să fi terminat pînă mă întorc!
SUBJ be finished until me return$_{1ST\ SG}$
'You should have finished by the time I return!'

The 'interrogative dubitative' subjunctive, on the other hand, can be interpreted as present, past or future:

(21) a. Să plece (oare) (Crin) la mare mîine?
SUBJ leave$_{3RD\ SG}$ maybe Crin at seaside tomorrow
'Is it possible that Crin should go to the seaside tomorrow?'

b. Să fi plecat (oare) (Crin) la mare ieri?
SUBJ be left maybe Crin at seaside yesterday?
'Is it possible that Crin should have gone to the seaside yesterday?'

c. Să fie (oare) (Crin) la mare acum?
SUBJ be $_{3RD\ SG}$ maybe Crin at seaside now
'Is it possible that Crin should be at the seaside now?'

These data show that RSs do not have the same temporal composition in spite of the fact that they have the same functional structure. The question which arises is what exactly causes this difference.

The temporal properties of subjunctive clauses are determined by the verb in the matrix, the aspectual class of the predicate and the time adverbials in the subjunctive clause (if any). The subjunctive in (22a) is interpreted as expressing a present situation, the ones in (22b-c) have an obvious future orientation. In (22d) the subjunctive refers to a past situation:

(22) a. E capabil să vorbească vreo 10 limbi.
is able SUBJ speak$_{3RD\ SG}$ about 10 languages
'He can speak about 10 languages.'

b) Eşti capabil să termini luna viitoare?
are able SUBJ finish$_{2ND\ SG}$ month.the next
'Can you finish it next month?'

c. Promit să te ajut.
promise$_{1ST\ SG}$ SUBJ you.$_{ACC}$ help$_{1ST\ SG}$
'I promise I will help you.'

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

d. Anul trecut au reuşit să ia notă bună la sintaxă.
year.the last have managed SUBJ take$_{3RD\ PL}$ grade good at syntax
'Last year, they managed to get good grades in syntax.'

The sentences in (22) show that the temporal composition of an embedded subjunctive is directly dependent on the lexical verb and the temporal interpretation of the matrix. The differences between the temporal composition of the three RSs, MSCs, surrogate imperatives and interrogative-dubitatives might reflect the availability of a covert matrix verb. Previous studies focusing on Ibero-Romance languages proposed that non-embedded subjunctives are actually embedded clauses 'in disguise', which contain an elided matrix verb (Badía-Margarit in Frâncu 2010: 166). The proposal which I am making is that the MSCs, subjunctives used as surrogate imperatives and as interrogative-dubitatives, are all Mood Phrases embedded under a covert modal verb or a modal verbal expression[7,8]. And it is precisely the nature of this overt modal expression which determines the different semantic composition of these RSs.

The surrogate imperative subjunctive is embedded under a covert deontic modal of necessity. As the sentences in (23) show, this analysis can account both for the deontic modal value of imperative constructions in general as well as for the semantic incompatibility with the perfect subjunctive. In (23b), where the perfect subjunctive is used and the situation is located in the past, the only possible reading is an epistemic one.

(23) a. (Trebuie) să pleci!
must SUBJ leave $_{2ND\ SG}$
'You must leave.'

b. Trebuie să fi plecat.
must SUBJ be left
'He must have left.' (only epistemic)

The interrogative-dubitative subjunctive is embedded under an epistemic modal expression of possibility. In this case, the complement has a higher degree of temporal independence:

(24) a. (Se poate) să fie oare acasă?
refl can$_{3RD\ SG}$ SUBJ be maybe home
'Could (s)he be at home?'

b. (Se poate) să plece oare mîine?
refl can$_{3RD\ SG}$ SUBJ leave$_{3RD\ SG}$ maybe tomorrow.
'Could (s)he be leaving tomorrow?'

[7] See Avram 1999 for an analysis of the categorial status of the complement of Romanian modal verbs.

[8] See Grohmann 2000 for a similar analysis for infinitival exclamatives in English, Spanish and German.

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

c. (Se poate) să fi plecat deja?
refl can$_{3RD\ SG}$ SUBJ be left already.
'Could (s)he have already left?'

The MSC is a MoodP embedded under a subject-oriented modal expression of possibility. This explains the incompatibility with the perfect subjunctive, since subject-oriented modals of possibility standardly have the same temporal value as their complement (Avram 1999). (25b) is acceptable only on an epistemic reading.

(25) a. Poate să danseze.
can$_{3RD\ SG}$ SUBJ dance$_{3RD\ SG}$.
'(S)he can/is able to dance.'

b. Poate să fi dansat.
can$_{3RD\ SG}$ SUBJ be danced.
'(S)he might have danced.' (only epistemic).

Summing up, the RS constructions which we investigated can all be analysed as Mood Phrases embedded under a covert modal expression, *i.e.* they are embedded clauses in disguise. MSCs, in particular, have the same functional structure as the dubitative and the surrogate imperative subjunctives. But they differ with respect to the covert modal expression whose complement they are. The nature of this modal expression can explain the meaning differences between the three RSs. Their modal value builds both on the fact that they are the complement of a modal expression and on the semantics of the subjunctive, the mood of irrealis.

Returning to MSCs, one property that we have not tackled yet is their encoding of mirativity. Mirativity can be defined as the linguistic expression of surprise at some information 'that does not fall in with the speaker's expectations' (Peterson 2013). According to T. Peterson (2013), mirativity is a linguistic universal which is manifested in different ways cross-linguistically. In some languages it can be a fully-fledged grammatical category; in others, it is implicated through various constructions which are used in specific contexts. In the MSC under investigation, it is obvious that it cannot be derived from either the modal feature checked by the particle *să* or from the meaning of the subject-oriented modal. The other RSs also have a modal feature checked in Mood but they do not encode mirativity. The subject-oriented modal has no mirativity component either. The element(s) which entail(s) surprise and incredulity must be searched somewhere else.

The hybrid nature of the Romanian MSCs, exclamatory and interrogative, cannot pass unnoticed. They have a distinct intonational pattern. I suggest that the subjunctive clause encodes mirativity through intonational contour. Exclamatives can be mirative-like constructions (Zanuttini–Portner 2003) and both exclamatives and interrogatives denote a set of alternative propositions. But the former also carry a presupposition of factivity. When using an exclamatory sentence the speaker presupposes that the proposition is true. For interrogatives factivity has been discussed only in the context of complement interrogatives, and not without disa-

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

greement[9]. In MSCs, it is actually the context sentence whose proposition is presupposed to be true to the 'previous' speaker. The exclamatory intonation in the MSC signals surprise of the 'actual' speaker at this presupposition. The interrogative intonation casts doubt on this very presupposition, preparing the ground for the coda, which contributes the incredulity value. The coda overtly disconfirms every alternative introduced by the subjunctive clause, signaling that the speaker believes that the proposition is not true. The use of the subjunctive allows the shift from the *realis* of the indicative mood in the context sentence to the evaluative nature of the MSC, from the specific episodic nature of the context sentence to the generic indefinite nature of the MSC.

4. Conclusions

In this paper I offered an empirical description of the main properties of a Romanian non-canonical subjunctive: the mirativity subjunctive construction. The main goal of the analysis was to identify whether it represents a distinct clause type directly associated to its pragmatic use. The data which I examined revealed that mirativity subjunctive constructions have the same functional structure as other apparently root subjunctives: they are all Mood Phrases, headed by the subjunctive particle *să*, and are the complement of a covert modal expression. It is the nature of this modal expression which accounts for their different semantic properties. Mirativity subjunctives were argued to be the complement of a subject-oriented modal of possibility. Their core meaning, surprise, was argued to be encoded by their intonational pattern. It is the exclamatory intonation which signals surprise on the part of the speaker at the situation expressed by the context sentence. The incredulity value is entailed by surprise but it is also expressed by intonation and by the overt coda. The interrogative intonation questions every possible alternative introduced by the exclamative. The coda itself is the one which contributes the doubt and incredulity values.

The data showed that the pragmatic use of mirativity subjunctives in Romanian derives from factors other than their syntactic structure, such as intonational contour of the subjunctive clause itself and the coda. But the surprise-incredulity reading is possible in the context of a semantic shift from the indicative (in the context sentence) to the subjunctive (in the response). It is the compositional semantics of the clause which mediates the relationship between its form and its use.

REFERENCES

Akmajian 1984 = A. Akmajian, *Sentence types and the form-function fit*, in „Natural Language and Linguistic Theory", II, 1984, p. 1–23.

Alboiu 2002 = G. Alboiu, *The Features of Movement in Romanian*, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, Bucureşti, 2002.

[9] See Broekhuis–Nye 2009 for a detailed discussion on the controversy.

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

Avram 1992 = L. Avram, *On subject positions in Romanian*, in CLTA, XXXIX, 1992, p. 212–228.
Avram 1999 = L. Avram, *Auxiliaries and the Structure of Language*, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, Bucureşti, 1999.
Broekhuis–Nye 2013 = H. Broekhuis, R. Nye, *Factivity and interrogative complement clauses*; ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001773
Cinque 1990 = G. Cinque, *Types of A-bar Dependencies*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1990.
CL = Cercetări de lingvistică, Cluj, I, 1956 sqq.
CLTA = „Cahiers de linguistique théorique et appliqué", Bucureşti, I, 1962 şi urm.
Cornilescu 1997 = A. Cornilescu, *The double subject construction in Romanian. Notes on the syntax of the subject*, in RRL, XLII, 1997, nr. 3–4, p. 101–147.
Cotfas 2012 = M. A. Cotfas, *On the Syntax of the Romanian Subjunctive. Control and Obviation*. Phd dissertation, University of Bucharest, 2012.
Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 = C. Dobrovie-Sorin, *The Syntax of Romanian. Comparative Studies in Romanian*, Mouton–de Gruyter, Berlin–New York, 1994.
Etxepare–Grohmann 2003 = R. Etxepare, K. Grohmann, *Root infinitives: A comparative view*, in „Probus", XV, nr. 2, p. 201–316.
Etxepare–Grohmann 2005 = R. Etxepare, K. Grohmann, *Towards a grammar of adult root infinitives*, in J. Alderete *et alii*. (eds) *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics Project.* Sommerville MA, Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 2005, p. 129–137.
Farkas 1984 = D. Farkas, *Subjunctive Complements in Romanian*, in P. Baldi (ed.) *Papers from the 12th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1984, p. 354–372.
Frâncu 2010 = C. Frâncu, *Conjunctivul românesc şi raporturile lui cu alte moduri*, Casa Editorială Demiurg Plus, Iaşi, 2010.
Grohmann 2000 = K. Grohmann, *Null modals in Germanic (and Romance): Infinitival exclamatives*, in „Belgian Journal of Linguistics", XIV, 2000, p. 43–61.
Hill 2004 = V. Hill, *On left periphery and focus*, in Tomić (ed.) 2004, p. 239–254.
Isac–Jakab 2004 = D. Isac, E. Jakab, *Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkans*, in Tomić (ed.) 2004, p. 315–338.
Lambrecht 1990 = K. Lambrecht, *What, me worry? 'Mad magazine sentences' revisited*, in *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, 1990, p. 215–228.
Manea 2008 = D. Manea, *Modul*, in *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. I. *Cuvântul*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 2008, p. 358–393.
Motapanyane 1995 = V. Motapanyane, *Theoretical Implications of Complementation in Romanian*, Unipress, Padova, 1995.
Neamţu 1998 = G. G. Neamţu, *Segmente morfematice cofuncţionale în flexiunea verbal analitică*, in SCL, XLIX, 1998, nr. 1–2, p. 217–225.
Neamţu–Hazy 1981 = G. G. Neamţu, Şt. Hazy, *Adverbele modale. Distribuţie şi funcţii* (I), in CL XXVI, 1981, nr. 1, p. 35–41.
Peterson 2013 = T. Peterson, *Rethinking mirativity:. The expression and implication of surprise*; semanticsarchive.net/Archive/2FkYTg4O
Protopopescu 2012 = D. Protopopescu, *The Syntax of Manner Adverbs in English and Romanian*, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, Bucureşti, 2012.
Rizzi 1997 = L. Rizzi, *The fine structure of the left periphery*, in L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar. Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1997, p. 281–337.
RRL = „Revue roumaine de linguistique", Bucureşti, I, 1956 sqq.
SCL = „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice", Bucureşti, I, 1950 sqq.
Tomić (ed.) 2004 = O. M. Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 2004.
Zanuttini–Portner 2003 = R. Zanuttini, P. Portner, *Exclamative clauses: At the syntax semantics interface*, in „Language", LXXIX, 2003, nr. 1, p. 39–81.

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)

UN CONJUNCTIV AL MIRATIVITĂŢII ÎN ROMÂNĂ
(*Rezumat*)

Articolul cercetează proprietăţile sintactice şi semantice ale unei construcţii conjunctivale din limba română care exprimă surpriza, neîncrederea etc. Statutul sintactic al acestei propoziţii este cel de grup de mod, subordonat unui verb modal care este neexprimat la nivel fonetic. Mirativitatea asociată acestei construcţii este realizată prin intermediul intonaţiei. Sensul central este cel de surpriză; valorile semantice de îndoială, neîncredere derivă din valoarea de surpriză şi sînt exprimate printr-o codă.

Cuvinte-cheie: *conjunctiv*, *construcţie conjunctivală*, *mirativitate*, *intonaţie*.
Keywords: *subjonctive*, *subjunctive construction*, *mirativity*, *intonation*.

Universitatea din Bucureşti
Facultatea de Limbi şi Literaturi Străine
Bucureşti, str. Pitar Moş nr. 7–13
larisa.avram@lls.unibuc.ro

BDD-V423 © 2015 Argonaut
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 02:58:31 UTC)