MDPI

Article

Subjunctives in Romanian Languages: Micro-Parametric Variation in Complement CPs and the Periphrastic Future

Gabriela Alboiu [1] and Virginia Hill [2,*]

[1] Department of Languages, Literatures & Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies, Keele Campus, York University, Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada; galboiu@yorku.ca

[2] Department of Humanities and Languages, Faculty of Arts, Saint John Campus, University of New Brunswick, Saint John, NB E2L 4L5, Canada

* Correspondence: hillvirginia80@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper aims to (i) establish the micro-parametric variation in the development of the subjunctive CP in Romanian languages (Daco-Romanian/DR; Aromanian/AR; Megleno-Romanian/MR; Istro-Romanian/IR) and (ii) account for derivations in which the subjunctive is integrated into the formation of the periphrastic future in these languages. Briefly, the analysis points out that the subjunctive CP in Romanian languages can display a split Fin (unlike in other Balkan languages) and that the remerging of the split Fin finds itself at different stages: complete in DR, but incomplete at different degrees in AR, MR, and IR. The compatibility of the subjunctive morphology with the derivation of the periphrastic future follows from the semantic bleaching and grammaticization of the volitional 'will' and 'have' verbs, together with the Balkan Sprachbund subjunctive mood marking, which combine in a monoclausal construction via a serial verb derivation to compositionally check a Fin marked [+finite, modal].

Keywords: Balkan Sprachbund; complement CP; grammaticization; micro-parametric variation; periphrastic future; Romanian languages; serial verb construction; subjunctive

1. Introduction

All Balkan languages (including Balkan Romance) have a preverbal morpheme to mark subjunctive mood (Mišeska-Tomić 2006). Variation in the Balkan Sprachbund occurs with subjunctive complements insofar as only Romanian languages may also display a complementizer of the 'that' type in addition to the subjunctive marker (Hill and Mišeska-Tomić 2009). An illustration of this contrast is provided in (1): 'that' is ungrammatical with Bulgarian subjunctive complements, but it is optional in the same environment in Aromanian (AR).

The 'that' type complementizer with subjunctive clauses is reminiscent of Romance *que* (e.g., in French or Spanish), whereas the preverbal subjunctive marker (i.e., AR *s'*; Bulgarian *da*; Greek *na*) is a Balkan Sprachbund property, as is the subjunctives replacement of infinitives (Mišeska-Tomić 2006).

The first objective of this paper is to account for the complementizer cooccurrence in (1b) and establish the micro-parametric variation in the development of the subjunctive CP in Romanian languages (Daco-Romanian/DR; Aromanian/AR; Megleno-Romanian/MR; Istro-Romanian/IR). The proposal is that, diachronically, the subjunctive marker in Old Romanian arises from a series of reanalyses by which the clause typing (Force) complementizer *să* ceases to be an operator in selected clauses and becomes specified for modality/mood and non-finiteness; i.e., it merges as a Fin [-finite, modal] complementizer in subjunctives. At a certain stage of reanalysis, props like 'that' were needed to clarify the status of *să* in Fin by splitting Fin over the two features (i.e., non-finite complementizer 'that' for Fin [-finite] and *să* for Fin [modal]). When sufficient learners adopt the analysis of *să* as both non-finite

and modal, Fin remerges, and the props are reduced or completely disappear. This process is implemented at a different pace in each Romanian language.

(1)   a.   Zapovjadax   **[(*če)**   (Marija)   da   dojde.]   **Bulgarian**
       ordered.1SG   that   Maria   SBJV   comes.PERF
       'I gave an order for Maria to come.'

  b.   Deade   naredba   **[(tă)**   (Maria)   s-   yină.   **AR**
       gave.3SG   order   that   Maria   SBJV   come.3SG.SBJV
       'I gave an order for Maria to come.' (adapted from Hill and Mišeska-Tomić 2008, 2009)

The second objective of this paper is to account for derivations in which the subjunctive is integrated into the formation of the periphrastic future in Romanian languages. Old Romanian and DR display two options for expressing the future tense: (i) the *analytic future* available to Romance languages more generally, consisting of an auxiliary followed by the infinitive form of the verb (i.e., *voi pleca* 'will.1SG go.INF'; and (ii) *the periphrastic future*, seen in Balkan languages, which consists of an auxiliary of the 'will' type followed by subjunctive complementation, as in (2). This is a Balkan Sprachbund property (Mišeska-Tomić 2006), with minimal variation arising from independent language-specific properties. For example, consider the Future Perfect data in (2) where, in Macedonian, perfectivity can be encoded either on the auxiliary, (2a), or on the verb, (2b), whereas in DR, it may occur only on the 'will' auxiliary, (2c), and not as the free morpheme 'be' (2d), typically associated with perfectivity on the verb in other DR contexts.

(2)   a.   Nema**še**   da   dojdam/dojdeš/dojde.   **Macedonian**
       not.will.IMPERS.PAST   SBJV   come.1/2/3SG.PERF.PRES
       'I will not have come.'

  b.   Nema   da   dojdev/dojde**še**.
       not.will.IMPERS   SBJV   come.1/2/3SG.PERF.PAST
       'I will not have come.' (from Hill and Mišeska-Tomić 2009)

  c.   O/   are**/avea**   să   devină   scriitor.   **DR**
       will   have.FUT/have.FUT.PERF   SBJV   become.3SBJV   writer
       'He will/will have become a writer.'

  d.   *O/are   să   **fi**   devenit   scriitor
       will/ have.FUT   SBJV   be   become   writer
       Intended: 'He will have become a writer.'

The observation is that the contrast between (2a, 2b) and (2c, 2d) arises from distinct underlying structures, which are biclausal in (2a, 2b) but monoclausal in (2c, 2d). In Macedonian, there are two TP fields available for encoding perfectivity, whereas in DR, there is only one TP field. We show that tests of scopal properties and constituent movement confirm the monoclausal structure of the periphrastic future.

The data in this paper come from corpora of AR and IR listed in the References section, which consists of texts transcribing oral narratives by native speakers. For MR, we used data arising from the interviews of native speakers recorded by Olga Mišeska-Tomić between 2008 and 2009. For DR, the native judgments of the authors are the main source. The Old Romanian discussion is based on the corpus of texts and tests in Hill and Alboiu (2016).

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a list of theoretical tools (Section 2.1) and a summary of the properties of subjunctive clauses in Old Romanian, which are relevant to the foregoing discussion (Section 2.2). Based on this background, Section 3 offers an analysis of subjunctive complements in Romanian languages. Section 4 introduces the periphrastic future constructions in Romanian languages, which receive a formal analysis in Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Background

2.1. Theoretical Framework

In this paper, we work within a feature-checking version of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001, 2004, 2007, 2008) across the clausal spine. This framework assumes a bottom–up approach to structure and, in principle, allows for as much structure as economically necessary. The standard minimalist CP > TP > vP nucleus is insufficient to map all relevant features present with Romanian subjunctives, so we employ the cartographic mapping of Rizzi's (1997, 2004) system, which splits the CP/left-periphery of the clause into several heads. In this system, a low/Fin and a high/Force C head sandwich discourse features, such as Topic and Focus. This clause hierarchy is given in (3), with (3) also showing that we expect to group the Romanian languages with Romance more generally, where the highest verbal element moves to some Infl/T head (Verb Raising),[1] and Neg signals the border between C and T (Zanuttini 1997).[2]

(3)　　　　　$[_{\text{ForceP}}\ [_{\text{TopP}}\ [_{\text{FocP}}\ [_{\text{FinP}}\ [_{\text{NegP}}\ [_{\text{TP}}\ V\dots]]]]]]$

Nonetheless, we depart slightly from Rizzi's feature mapping system. First, Rizzi (1997) has a lower TopP (familiar) between FocP and FinP, which is excluded from (3) because there is no evidence for it in Romanian languages, so (3) is rather similar to the proposal in Benincà (2001, 2006). Second, we follow D'Alessandro and Ledgeway (2010), who split modality and mood between Fin and T, respectively, arguing that Fin encodes only semantic modality, while grammatical [mood], as an inflectional property of the verb, is {XE "features:[mood]"} associated with T.

Finally, irrealis modality, as defined in Bybee and Fleischman (1995), is mapped to Force (not to Fin) as a clause typing operator, such as conditional (e.g., Haegeman 2010) or directive, in imperatives (e.g., Han 1998). These clause-typing operators further map a modal feature on the selected Fin, which ensures a compatible verb inflection by selecting T with an agreeing [mood] feature. Alternatively, in selected contexts, the modality feature of Fin does not reflect the properties of an unselected clause typing operator; rather, it reflects the semantics of the matrix verb requiring an irrealis modality connoting wishes, beliefs, and attitudes instead of conditions, options, and commands (Saeed 2003), with the same effects on T selection. In particular, Fin has an underspecified [modal] feature that can be valued as realis or irrealis. For the irrealis value, the exact reading arises compositionally from the sentence. Accordingly, Corbeanu and Hill (this volume) consider that the configuration for this mapping has the hierarchy in (4).

(4)　　　　　V/OP > Fin[modal] > T[mood]

Lastly, we follow previous work in Alboiu and Hill (2021) and Hill and Alboiu (2016) and take the notion of *finiteness* to correlate with temporal deixis/[+finite] (a property of the Force/phasal C head), or anaphoric tense/[-finite] (a property of Fin), rather than with the presence of phi-features on the verb form. Consequently, we take phi-features to be a T property (rather than a Fin property) since they depend on types of mood instantiation, which is also a T property: [+Agr] in indicatives and subjunctives; [-Agr] in supines, infinitives, and gerunds in Old Romanian. Nonetheless, given the matching requirement imposed by the Fin-T selectional relationship, the agreement specification of T reflects the syncretic mapping of finiteness and modality in Fin.[3]

Unlike in other Romance languages, the presence or absence of inflectional morphology on the verb stem is not a reliable criterion for independent lexical subjects (i.e., obviation) and Case in Romanian. Alboiu (2006, 2007, 2009) shows that the latter properties correlate with the presence of a phasal C head and trigger non-obligatory control. In obligatory control structures, a full-fledged CP/ForceP domain is never projected. Specifically, complements to obligatory control predicates are untensed (i.e., bear anaphoric tense), on par with other Balkan languages (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Farkas 1984, for Romanian; Krapova 2001, for Bulgarian; Landau 2004, for Balkan languages more generally), so are

FinP domains (Alboiu 2007, inter alia).[4] Hill and Alboiu (2016) show that this also holds true of Old Romanian, while Corbeanu and Hill (this volume) show this for IR. Crucially, in obligatory control contexts (where obviation is excluded), Fin has an anaphoric tense, so it is non-finite, regardless of the presence or absence of phi-features/agreement in T (i.e., subjunctive inflection).

2.2. Old Romanian Să

The micro-variation in the syntax of subjunctive complements has its source in the distribution and use of *să* and of the subjunctive verb in Old Romanian. Disparities arose because Romanian languages split from Old Romanian at some point after the Balkan Sprachbund template for subjunctive clauses had emerged in the language, but at a time when their relation to *să* and to the existing types of clausal complements and adjuncts was still fluid. The point of population and, therefore, language splitting would be no later than the 10th century for AR (Vrabie 2000), around the 10th–11th centuries for MR (Capidan 1925), and the latest by the 13th century for IR (Lozovanu 2008). DR developed within the same geo-ethnical area as Old Romanian.

The Balkan subjunctive template had been adopted since Proto-Romanian when the speakers of the Romance language north of the Danube coexisted for centuries with the Bulgars (Turkic semi-nomadic warrior tribes), who were spread above and below the Danube (around the 5th–8th centuries), a situation conducive to language contact and bilingualism. Relevant to this paper is that during this balkanization of the language, the Latin morphemes *si* or *sic* became a homophonous *să* whose syntactic status was ambiguous.[5]

The earliest Old Romanian texts preserved date from the mid-16th century, which is too late to capture the emergence and early development of subjunctive clauses. However, even in the 16th century, the syntactic status of *să* was unstable. It occurs in root clauses that qualify as surrogates for imperatives, in prepositional adjunct clauses, in conditional protasis, and in selected complement clauses. Hill and Alboiu (2016) capture this distribution under the analysis of *să* as a Force complementizer with operator features, such as needed for imperatives and non-selected subordinate clauses, including conditionals. The use of *să* in the CP field of selected complement clauses must, then, be the result of a reanalysis of *să* from a Force complementizer to a Fin one by gradually stripping it of the operator feature and of the clause typing feature. The detailed gradual process of *să* reanalysis is summarized in Corbeanu and Hill (this volume).

The important observation is that AR, IR, and MR split from Old Romanian long before the 16th century, that is, at a time when *să* and the subjunctive paradigm were even more unstable than attested in Old Romanian. The development of these constructions occurred not only in isolation from Old Romanian but also under language contact and bilingualism with Balkan Slavic, Albanian, or Greek. Predictably, variation is expected in the syntax of subjunctive complements. Even more variation is expected in the emergence and development of the periphrastic future, as shown in (2c) since there is no evidence for such a construction in Proto-Romanian. The construction is barely attested in the 16th-century texts (SOR 2016); so its presence or productivity in the previous centuries is doubtful. At the time of the split, the productive mechanism for the expression of future tense in Old Romanian was the analytic future (i.e., auxiliary + infinitive verb; *voi pleca* 'will.1SG go.INF'), which follows the Romance template.

3. Subjunctives across Romanian Languages

3.1. Morphology

All Romanian languages have preverbal subjunctive markers based on Old Romanian *să*, as shown in Table 1. Only IR displays an alternative marker that is replacing *să* (i.e., *neca*; see Corbeanu and Hill, this volume). The inflection of the verb related to *să* varies very slightly for the present subjunctive (see Mišeska-Tomić 2006): In AR, DR, and MR, the forms are identical to the indicative for the first and second person but display specific

endings in the third person. This contrast is similar to Old Romanian paradigms. In IR, the subjunctive is completely parasitic on the indicative paradigm (except for the inflection of 'be').

Table 1. Complementizers.

	Indicative 'That'	Subjunctive 'That'	Subjunctive Mark
Aromanian	*ca*	*tă*	*s-*
Daco-Romanian	*că*	*ca*	*să*
Istro-Romanian	*che*	*che*	*se, neca*
Megleno-Romanian	*ca*	*ca*	*si*

Remarkably, *să* is specialized for subjunctive only in DR. In AR, IR, and MR, *să* is also used as a conditional marker, with verbs inflected for conditional mood, as was the case in the 16th-century Old Romanian texts. This use is very productive, to the extent that *s-* is obligatory with the conditional inflection in AR (e.g., AR *s-cântárim* vs. **cântárim* 'I would sing'; Vrabie 2000).[6]

In subjunctive complements, *să* may be preceded by a 'that' complementizer, whose spellout may or may not be identical to the 'that' complementizer of indicative complements. Table 1 introduces the 'that' complementizers comparatively between indicatives and subjunctives, together with the *să* variant specific to each language.

The next section will assess the syntactic behavior of these complementizers.

3.2. Syntax

In general, the syntax of subjunctive complements displays sensitivity to referential control over the embedded subject. In Romance languages, this involves subject obviation with subjunctive complements but obligatory control with infinitive complements (see references in Landau 2013). In the Balkan Sprachbund, including Romanian (Farkas 1984, a.o.), both types of referential assignment ares compatible with subjunctive complements. However, the left periphery cartography of the clause is not identical for the two options: subject obviation entails a more complex CP than obligatory control, as outlined in Section 2.1. To recap, for Old Romanian, Hill and Alboiu (2016) have argued that the subject obviation option involves a ForceP structure, whereas the obligatory control option involves a FinP, that is, a truncated option with an unprojected ForceP level. This same correlation is argued for in Alboiu (2007) for DR.

Keeping this structural contrast in mind, we can proceed to tests of word order that clarify the status of each item in Table 1 within the subjunctive CP. Let us focus on the location of negation in relation to the subjunctive marker. Following (3), NegP is linearized between FinP and TP; hence, in (5), the subjunctive *să/se/s-* is in Fin because it precedes negation.

(5) a.

Tsă	dzǎsh	s-nu	yuvuseshci!	AR
CL.2SG.DAT	say.1SG.AOR	SBJV-not	read.2SG	

'I told you to not read.' (from Mišeska-Tomić 2006, p. 565)

b.

Ţi-am	spus să	nu	citeşti.	DR
CL.2SG.DAT-have.1	said SBJV	not	read.2SG	

'I told you to not read.'

c.

ţezaru-l'	zite che	se	nu-l' hiie	rusire spure	IR
prince.the-CL.2SG.DAT	says that	SBJV	not- CL.2SG.DAT be. SBJV.3SG shame	say.INF	

'The prince tells her to not be shy to tell him' (SP 126,18)

d.	ăţ	ziş	s-nu	conţ!	MR
	CL.2SG.DAT	say.1SG.AOR	SBJV-not	sing.2SG	

'I told you to not sing.' (Mišeska-Tomić 2006, p. 547)

The word order in (5) locates the subjunctive *să* at the border between C and T, an insight first captured by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994). Perhaps unsurprisingly, its mapping has resulted in a variety of labels from a mood/I head (Alboiu 2002; Cornilescu 2000; Rivero 1994, a.o.) to a low C/Fin head (Alboiu 2007; Hill and Alboiu 2016) and the lowest Fin/Fin2 under a split Fin analysis (Alboiu and Hill 2021; Hill and Alboiu 2016). In sum, our current mapping of the subjunctive free morpheme in Fin is in line with previous analyses.

Crucially, as in (6), the subjunctive marker in Fin **cooccurs** with 'that' in AR, IR, and MR but not in standard DR.

(6)	a.	Pots	(tă) s-ti		duts.	AR
		can.2SG	that SBJV-REFL.2SG		go.2SG	
		'You can go.'				
	b.	Poţi	(*ca) să te		duci.	DR
		can.2SG	that SBJV-REFL.2SG		go.2SG	
		'You can go.'				
	c.	Póţi	(che)	se	åvzi.	IR
		can.2SG	that	SBJV	see.2SG	
		'You can see.'				
	d.	Poţ	(ca) s-ti		duţ.	MR
		can.2SG	that	SBJV-REFL.2SG	go.2SG	
		'You can go.'				

In (6), the verb 'can', which is adjacent to the subjunctive sequence, requires constructions with obligatory subject control. Hence, its complement can only be a reduced CP, as FinP (versus ForceP). Availability of 'that' and the subjunctive marker cooccurrence in AR, IR, and MR, as in (6), shows evidence for the necessity of a split FinP into Fin1 ('that') and Fin2 (SBJV), as in (7a).[7]

If we follow the hierarchy in (3), the subjunctive marker cannot be pushed down into TP because it is higher than negation, as shown in (5). Thus, a split Fin analysis follows, as in (7a), where Fin1 checks [finite] and Fin2 checks [modal]. Specifically, *să* was not initially capable of checking the [finite] feature of Fin and only checked irrealis modality (i.e., [modal] in Fin2). However, the optionality of 'that', as indicated by the brackets in examples, means that the alternative structure, with a remerged Fin, is also available, as in (7b): the subjunctive marker in Fin is also reanalyzed (upward reanalysis; Roberts and Roussou 2003) as being able to check [finite] in addition to [modal] (Alboiu and Hill 2021; Hill and Alboiu 2016). These are intra-language variations. Standard DR has lost the option in (7a) and generalized (7b).

(7)	a.	$V_{putea'can'}$ [$_{FinP1}$ 'that' [$_{FinP2}$ SBJV[$_{NegP}$[$_{TP}$….
	b.	$V_{putea'can'}$ [$_{FinP}$ SBJV [$_{NegP}$[$_{TP}$….

Comparing the cooccurrence of 'that'-SBJV in Romanian languages with Old Romanian, it appears that DR has not only generalized the remerging of subjunctive Fin but has also restricted the use of *să* to subjunctives. This is different from AR, IR, and MR, where *să* preserves an ambiguous status as either Force or Fin item, with or without subjunctive clauses (especially in IR; Corbeanu and Hill, this volume). Thus, the reanalysis of *să* is more advanced in DR than in other Romanian languages.

In constructions with subject obviation, as in (8), the situation remains similar in that there is a contrast between DR and the other Romanian languages.

(8)　a.　Narăncio　　(Maria) ca (Maria) si　　　vină　　　ună shi ună.　　MR
　　　　　order.3SG.AOR Maria that Maria SBJV come.3SG.SBJV one and one
　　　　　'(S)he asked/ordered for Maria to come immediately.'

　　　b.　Deade　　naredba (Maria) tă (Maria) s-　yină　　　tunoară　　　AR
　　　　　gave.3SG　order　　　　　　　　　　　　Maria that Maria SBJV- come.3SG.SBJV immediately
　　　　　'(S)he asked/ordered for Maria to come immediately.'

　　　c.　A　　　　cerut (*Maria) ca Maria să　　vină　　　imediat　　　　DR
　　　　　has asked Maria that Maria SBJV come.3SG.SBJV　　　immediately
　　　　　'(S)he asked/ordered for Maria to come immediately.'

In (8), the preverbal subject *Maria* may surface either before or after 'that' in AR and MR. Preverbal subjects in the CP field (i.e., higher than *să*) are in Spec,TopP, as a general Balkan Sprachbund rule, where the canonical order is VSO. Accordingly, when the subject is to the left of 'that', Fin1 contains 'that', whereas Fin2 contains SBJV, and the clause typing feature of Force is checked by 'that' through a long-distance Agree, as in (9a). Alternatively, the subject, still in Spec,TopP, may surface between the two complementizers, which indicates the movement of 'that' from Fin1 to Force for feature checking, as in (9b). If 'that' is skipped (which is also possible), Fin is remerged, as in (9c), and *să* checks the features of Force through a long-distance Agree. The subject is banned from surfacing between *să* and the verb (i.e., Spec,TP is not available to subjects in Balkan languages; Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998).

(9)　a.　V$_{'order'}$ [ForceP [TopP Maria [FinP1 **'that'** [FinP2 **să** SBJV[NegP[TP….
　　　b.　V$_{'order'}$ [ForceP **'that'** [TopP Maria [FinP1 <'that'> [FinP2 **să** SBJV[NegP[TP….
　　　c.　V$_{'order'}$ [ForceP [TopP Maria [FinP **să** SBJV[NegP[TP….

In DR (8c), the subject *Maria* in Spec,TopP can only follow 'that'. Consequently, 'that' must be assumed base-generated in Force, denoting that Fin1 and Fin2 are no longer distinct head options and that the subjunctive particle is mapped in a remerged Fin head, as in (10).

(10)　　　　　V$_{'order'}$ [ForceP **'that'** [TopP Maria [FinP **să** SBJV[NegP[TP….

For IR, the situation is more complex since the subjunctive morpheme *se/neca* is still analyzed as a Force complementizer in free alternation with split Fin or remerged Fin. For example, it can precede wh-elements in Spec,FocusP, as seen in (11).

(11)　　　A　　　　lui　　　　zapisęit　　　**neca** če-m　　　då
　　　　　has CL.3SG.DAT　　　wrote　　　　SBJV what-CL.1SG.DAT give.2SG
　　　'He wrote to him what you should give to me' (TC, 143)

No other Romanian language allows for the order of complementizers in (11). The test of subject placement on the template in (8) is, thus, unreliable in IR, given the unstable featural make-up associated with *se/neca* in selected clauses (i.e., [+/− operator]; [+/− fin]). Thus, a lexical subject may not be allowed in the CP field for independent reasons (e.g., operators force postverbal placement of subjects). Although there are instances that attest to the possibility of split Fin with 'that' in IR subjunctive complements, as in (5), the variable status of *se/neca* is such that its cooccurrence with 'that' in contexts with subject obviation (i.e., with ForceP) may allow for either Force or Fin reanalysis of this item.

The data discussed in this section indicate the following direction of development for the subjunctive marker: Considering the distribution and properties of *să* in the 16th-century Old Romanian texts, the reanalysis it underwent up to the 20th century is subject to micro-variation, as follows:

(i)   In standard DR, *să* has been completely reanalyzed as a remerged Fin complementizer dedicated to subjunctive clauses. Conditional *să* was productive in Old Romanian before the 16th century but showed a decrease later, being replaced with *de*, and was eliminated from conditional CPs in DR;

(ii)   In MR, *să* follows the same direction of reanalysis as in DR, but at a slower pace since there is still evidence of a split Fin. Also, the conditional use of *să* in Old Romanian is still present in MR, but it has strong competition from *aku* 'if' ([Mišeska-Tomić 2006](#), p. 557);

(iii)   In AR, *să* seems to be at the same stage of reanalysis as in MR insofar as split/remerged Fin is concerned in subjunctive complements. However, the use of *să* in conditionals is very productive and unopposed; in fact, *să* has spread as a conditional marker on verbs ([Vrabie 2000](#));

(iv)   In IR, *să* is lexically replaced by *neca* in subjunctive clauses (a process still ongoing) but remains productive in conditionals. IR strongly preserves the specialization of *să* for conditionals to the extent of eliminating it from subjunctive clauses. The subjunctive replacement by *neca* indicates that the stage of reanalysis as a Fin complementizer (i.e., either remerged or split) is comparable to that seen in MR and AR. At the same time, *neca* also displays instances of direct merge in Force in selected subjunctive clauses, unlike in the other modern Romanian languages where *să* never undergoes first merge higher than Fin.

In sum, the diachronic development contrasts DR with IR insofar as DR *să* is specialized for subjunctive CPs, whereas IR *să* is specialized for conditionals. In AR and MR *să* retains its earlier fluidity, preserving both the subjunctive and the conditional statuses from Old Romanian.

4. The Periphrastic Future across Romanian Languages

The periphrastic future is a Balkan Sprachbund property; so its presence in Romanian languages is unexceptional. This section looks at the syntactic mechanism that allows a subjunctive verb to derive this construction.

4.1. Old Romanian

The periphrastic future consists of an auxiliary of the 'will' type followed by a subjunctive verb string. In Old Romanian, the subjunctive is systematically present after the auxiliaries *are* (inflected), *va* (inflected up to the 18th century, then uninflected; [Mandić 2010](#)), or *o* (uninflected), as shown in (12).[8]

(12)   a. Ci   să   ştii,   logofete,   că   nu   **va**   să   se
            but   SBJV   know.2SG   judge.VOC   that   not   will   SBJV   CL.REFL.3
            aleagă   nimic   din   judeţ.   (DRH, 285)
            achieve.3SG.SBJV   nothing   from   judgment
            'But you should know, your Honor, that nothing will come out of this judgment.'

        b. să   fac   ispisoc   domnesc   şi   **o**   să   scriu
            SBJV   make.1SG   decree   royal   and   will   SBJV   write.1sg
            la   târgu   (DRH, 296)
            to   town
            'Let me issue a royal decree and I will write to the town.'

   c.

Să	se	ştie	ocina	Neanciului	ot Albeşti,
SBJV	CL.REFL.3	know.3SG	land.the	Neanciu.GEN	from Albesti
pre	unde	**are**	să	aibă	a	ţineare	Neanciul
on	where	will	SBJV	have.3SG. SBJV	to	hold	Neanciu
cu	feciorii	lui	ocină	în Neagreasca	şi	în Jilişte (DRH, 565)
with	sons.the	his	land	in Negreasca	and	In Jiliste

'Let it be known about the land of Neanciu from Albesti, where Neanciu and his sons will have to hold land in Negreasca and in Jiliste.'

Etymologically, *va* comes from the verb *vrea*, 'want' ([SOR 2016](#)), by grammaticalization from a lexical to a functional category. The Old Romanian texts attest to this transition as intra-language variation, as in (13).

(13) a.

cela	ce	nu-ş	**va**	să-ş
the.one	who	not-CL.REFL.3.DAT	will	SBJV-CL.REFL.3.DAT
împarţă	avuţiia	lui	(CEv, 345)	
share.3SBJV	wealth.the	his		

'The one who doesn't **want** to share his riches.'

   b.

Domnul	dentru	ea	**va**	să	se	nască	zise (CEv,554)
Lord.the	from	her	will	SBJV	CL.REFL.3.ACC	be.born	said

'He said that the Lord **will** be born from her.'

In (13a), *va* stands for the volition lexical verb 'want', whereas in (13b), *va* encodes the futurity of the event expressed by the lexical verb *nască*, 'be.born'. A volition reading cannot arise in (13b) because the verb lacks agentivity (the child to be born cannot be a volitional subject, so it must be theta-marked by the unaccusative *nască*, 'be.born'). According to philological studies, *va* has a strong epistemic modality in its initial stages of grammaticalization ([Niculescu 2011](#)), which lessens in time. Crucially, this item preserves the irrealis modality.

The alternate *o*, used as in (12b), is phonologically the most reduced future auxiliary. It is considered to be another result of the grammaticalization of *vrea*, 'want' ([SOR 2016](#)), which replaced *va* in modern DR with a similar distribution.

The option *are*, as in (12c), comes from the grammaticalization of the lexical verb *avea*, 'have', in contexts in which it has a deontic modality reading ([SOR 2016](#)). The difference between the future and the deontic modality reading is still ambiguous in Old Romanian. For example, in (14a), *are* has a future reading, while the deontic reading arises from the subjunctive *aibă* that follows it. However, in (14b), *are* is ambiguous between denoting futurity or necessity.

(14) a.

pre	unde	**are**	să	aibă	a	ţineare	Neanciul
on	where	have.FUT	SBJV	have.3SG. SBJV	to	hold	Neanciu
cu	feciorii	lui	ocină	în Neagreasca	şi	în Jilişte (DRH,565)	
with	sons.the	his	land	in Negreasca	and	In Jiliste	

'where Neanciu and his sons will have to hold land in Negreasca and in Jiliste.'

   b.

Că	acest	orb,	nimenea	nu	**avea**	să derepteaze	pre el (CEv, 496)
for	this	blind.man	nobody	not	have.PERF	SBJV guide.3	DOM him

'as for this blind man, nobody had to guide/will have guided him'.

In sum, the examples from (12) to (14) show that the periphrastic future in Old Romanian displays the following traits:

- When negation is present, as in (12a) and (14b), it precedes *va*, *o* 'want'/ *are* 'have', and takes scope over both the future and the subjunctive verbs;

- These constructions have a future tense reading, indicating that Fin is [+finite], inflectionally encoded on the 'will' verb;
- Since the construction is [+finite], *să* cannot merge as a Fin complementizer, or it would mark Fin as [-finite]; consequently, in these constructions, *să* merges lower, as an inflectional head, so is reduced to a [mood] marker.

Considering the timeline for the emergence of this construction in Old Romanian, its inheritance by DR is predictable, while its occurrence in some of the other Romanian languages is likely due to other factors. In particular, IR preserved the analytical future and did not develop the periphrastic one (Sârbu and Frăţilă 1998), but the construction occurs in AR and MR. Insofar as AR and MR are concerned, the inheritance of the periphrastic future from Old Romanian is questionable, and its occurrence is due, more likely, to the subsequent contact with Balkan languages that display the same template for expressing futurity. Thus, Mišeska-Tomić (2006) points out the similarities between MR and Macedonian in attributing the future reading only to negative *ari* with subjunctive complements. Also, Brâncuş (2007, p. 172) shows the similarities between Albanese Tosk and the AR variety of Fărşeroţi insofar as both dialects eliminate the subjunctive marker from the periphrastic future.

4.2. The Modern Romanian Languages

Similar to other Balkan languages, Romanian languages developed the periphrastic future on the basis of two properties: (i) the reanalysis of 'want' and/or 'have' as 'will' verbs with a reduced form (e.g., invariable); and (ii) the embedding of *să* subjunctive strings under this 'will' verb. This section provides an overview of the data.

DR uses the analytic future in the literary register but the periphrastic future, as in (15), in colloquial registers. For the latter, *o* and *are* constructions are productive, whereas *va* has disappeared with the subjunctive (or it occurs in the archaic register).

(15)　Mama　　**o/are**　　　să　　　plece　　　　devreme.　　　　DR
　　　mother　will/have.FUT　SBJV　leave.3SBJV　early
　　　'Mother will leave early.'

As already mentioned, in MR, only the invariant *ari* version is available, and its future reading is restricted to negative contexts, as in (16a, 16b). In the absence of negation, *ari* yields deontic obligation readings, as in (16c).

(16)　a.　　Nu **ari**　　　　si　　　　　vin.　　　　MR
　　　　　　not have.FUT　SBJV　　come.1SG
　　　　　　'I won't come.'

　　　b.　　Nu **ari**　　　　s-la　　　　　　　　leai.
　　　　　　not have.FUT　SBJV-CL.3SG.ACC　take.2SG
　　　　　　'You won't take it.' 548.

　　　c.　　Ari s-la lei!
　　　　　　have SBJV-CL.3SG.M.ACC take.2SG
　　　　　　'You have to take it!' (MT547).

Otherwise, the future is expressed by root subjunctives, as in (17) and (18). Arapi (2016) argues that this option has developed in MR under language contact with Buzuku (Albanian), where this *prospective future* is productive.

(17)　şi　　　　ea　　　**să**　　　**rudească**　　　un il'iŭ　　　şa cum　　　aţi ţeri buricu　　　MR
　　　and　　she　　SBJV　produce.3.SBJV　a son　　　so as　　　her asks heart

　　　'and she will give birth to a boy as her heart desires'.　　　　　　　　(Arapi 2016)

(18) La ficioru **si**-ăi   **trimet**   pari   moini.

To boy.the SBJV-CL.3SG.DAT   send.1SG   money tomorrow

'To the boy I will send money tomorrow.' (Mišeska-Tomić 2006, p. 297).

AR uses the periphrastic future with both *va* and *are* in invariable forms. As with MR, in the absence of negation, *are* yields deontic obligation readings, while under negation, the reading is ambiguous between future event and injunction. Importantly, *are* futures allow for a 'that' complementizer with the subjunctive complement, as in (19). Notably, these forms do not appear in our AR corpus, which may signal that they are unproductive.

(19) **Nore**   (tă)   s-lu   ljai.   AR

not.have   that   SBJV-CL.3SG.M.ACC   take.2SG

'You won't take it.' (Mišeska-Tomić 2006, p. 566).

On the other hand, *va* futures are productive in the corpus, but their use differs from one variety of AR to another. For example, *va* combines with *să*-subjunctives to yield a future reading in the Grămosteni variety, as in (20a), but with a bare subjunctive (deletion of *să*) in the Fărşeroţi variety, as in (20b). For the latter variety, *va* with *să*-subjunctives yields only deontic readings (Nevaci 2012).

(20) a. Dzăk   ca   **va**   s-neg   AR   Grămosteni

say.1SG   that   will   SBJV-go.1SG

'I say that I will go.' (MT 562)

b. **Va**   ai. //   Va   s-ai.   AR   Fărşeroţi

will   have.2SG   will   SBJV-have.2SG

'you will have.' // 'You must have.'

In sum, the periphrastic future is a later innovation of Old Romanian, so it is expected that Romanian languages that split from the Old Romanian speaker community long before the 16th century may not have inherited this construction, while Daco-Romanian did, due to the language continuity. However, the presence of subjunctive complementation in these languages provided the means of either developing the periphrastic future as a language-internal construct or as transfer through language contact from other Balkan languages. The next section proposes a formal explanation of how this derivation could be implemented.

5. Formal Analysis of the Periphrastic Future in Modern Romanian Languages

In Section 5.1, we show that the periphrastic future is monoclausal in Romanian languages, and we engage with both verb restructuring and serial verb construction analyses (SVC). We propose that an SVC analysis is better equipped to handle the data and show sample derivations for DR in Section 5.2.

5.1. The Monoclausal Property

The first question to be addressed concerns the degree of grammaticalization of the verb form that stands for 'will', as this will further decide whether the construction is biclausal or monoclausal. Specifically, is the 'will' element a control verb on a par with 'can' in (5), or is it an auxiliary on a par with 'have' in present perfect paradigms?

The constructions with the complementizer 'that', as in the AR example in (18), receive a straightforward analysis as being biclausal since 'that' signals the presence of a split Fin. Hence, these are constructions with obligatory control, similar to the 'can' constructions in (5).

Conversely, two observations indicate that the other constructions are monoclausal: (i) negation systematically precedes the highest verbal head while scoping over both verbs; and (ii) the 'will' head behaves like a modal auxiliary rather than a matrix verb. For

example, in MR (16a, 16b), the subjunctive verb cannot be interpreted positively, and it is also not possible to include the negation on the subjunctive verb (Hill and Mišeska-Tomić 2009) or to have negation present twice. The same applies to AR and DR, as shown in (21), with negation in bold.

(21)　a.　Cum **nu** va　　　　s-ducî? A.34 // 　　*Cum va s-**nu** ducî? // 　　*Cum **nu** va s-**nu** ducî?^{Error! Reference source not found.} 　　AR

　　　　　how not will SBJV-go　how 　　　will SBJV-not go 　　　how not will SBJV-not go
　　　　　'How come s/he will not go?'

　　b.　Cum **n**-o să plece? // 　　　　　　　*Cum o să **nu** plece? // 　　*Cum **n**-o să **nu** plece? 　　DR
　　　　how not-will SBJV go 　　　　　　　　how will SBJV not go 　　　how not-will SBJV not go
　　　　'How come s/he won't go?'

Crucially, a single NegP indicates a single TP, a monoclausal structure.

The second observation concerns the status of the 'will' form, which only forms a constituent with the subjunctive. Specifically, in DR, *poate* 'can' may stand alone in answer to a question, whereas *o/are* may not, as shown in (22).

(22)　a.　Poate 　　　　　　　　　　　　　să plece?— 　　　Da, poate.
　　　　can.3SG 　　　　　　　　　　　　SBJV go.3 　　　yes can.3
　　　　'Can s/he go?'—'Yes, s/he can.'

　　b.　O 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　să plece?— 　　　*Da, o.
　　　　will 　　　　　　　　　　　　　SBJV go.3 　　　yes will

　　　　'Will s/he go?'—Intended: 'Yes, s/he will.'

　　c.　Are să plece?— 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*Da, are.
　　　　will SBJV go.3 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　yes will
　　　　'Will s/he go?'—Intended: 'Yes, s/he will.'

The 'will' forms in (22) behave as modal auxiliaries that cannot stand by themselves (see also Mandić 2010): they are monolithic with the subjunctive. Auxiliaries are functional versus lexical categories, so they cannot trigger biclausal structures.[9]

In fact, these auxiliaries are clitics on the subjunctive verb: nothing can intervene between these elements and the subjunctive marker. Non-clitic auxiliaries (e.g., in English) can be separated from the verb by subjects or adverbs. This is not the case with 'will' auxiliaries in Romanian languages, which is unexceptional since the auxiliaries used in present perfect and analytic futures are also clitics (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1990, 1994, for DR) in these languages.

In view of the properties above, one could be tempted to treat these monoclausal structures as instances of verb restructuring (Cinque 2004; Kayne 1991; Rizzi 1982; Roberts 1997, 2010, a.o.). Further support in this direction comes from another well-known property of restructuring discussed by Wurmbrand (2001) for Germanic: the availability of long passives, as in the DR data in (23).

(23)　a.　Emilia 　　　　　　　　are/o 　　　să 　　　scrie 　　　　o carte. 　　DR
　　　　Emilia 　　　　　　　　have/will.FUT 　SBJV 　　write.3SBJV 　　a book
　　　　'Emilia will write a book.'

　　b.　O carte 　　are/o 　　　să 　　　fie 　　　scrisă 　　　(curând). 　　DR
　　　　a book 　　have/will.FUT 　SBJV 　　be.PASS 　write.3SG.F.PRT 　soon
　　　　'A book is going to be written (soon).'

However, long passives are a necessary but not a sufficient diagnostic for verb restructuring, as this process is sensitive to verb semantics in Romance (see Cinque 2001 for Italian). The key diagnostic for verb restructuring is clitic climbing, which is absent in the Romanian periphrastic future. In examples that contain clitic pronouns, as in MR (16b), the clitic follows the subjunctive marker *să* and does not climb to the 'will' head. This is also systematically the case in AR and DR, as in (24).

(24) a.

Cred	că (*l)-o/am			să-l	invit.	DR
think.1SG	that him-will/have.FUT			SBJV-him	invite.1SG	

'I think I'll invite him.'

b.

tini	nu (*l'i)	va	l'i	dai	A.34	AR
you.DAT	not you.DAT-it	will	you.DAT-it	give.3.SBJV		

'S/he won't give it to you.'

Another approach takes the serial verb perspective. Aikhenvald (2006, p. 22) defines SVC as containing two verb roots that have the meaning of one word. These constructions can be of two types: symmetric (i.e., each verb has full lexical features associated with sequential activities); and asymmetric (one of the verb slots is restricted to a certain class of grammaticalized verbs). Following Aikhenvald (2006), the periphrastic future discussed in this paper qualifies for asymmetric SVC.

The general consensus in the literature is that SVCs are monoclausal, without any marker of clausal connection (e.g., no complementizers; Riis 1854, p. 103). Following Lovestrand (2021), the main criteria for establishing the monoclausal status of SVCs are as follows: (i) location and scope of negation; (ii) shared TAM field; (iii) shared argument structure; (iv) single event conceptualization. Periphrastic future constructions meet all these criteria. The location and scope of negation are discussed for the examples in (21): the single negation is high and scopes over both verbs.

As for the TAM properties, the subjunctive is devoid of any tense feature. Although subjunctives are associated with the [-finite] feature elsewhere, here, the periphrastic future has a [+finite] feature associated with the 'will' auxiliary. Accordingly, *să* lacks the property that would qualify it as a Fin element, and its function is reduced to marking the inflectional [mood] in the TP field. When it comes to aspect, this can only be marked once (recall (2c) for DR repeated here as (25a)). Equally important is the fact that (2d) for DR, repeated here as (25b), shows that there is no Asp field independently projected in the subjunctive, so the DR canonical perfective marker *fi* 'be' is ruled out. Crucially, (25) further signals the sharing of a single inflectional field.

(25) a.

O/	are/**avea**	să	devină	scriitor.	**DR**
will	have.FUT/have.FUT.PERF	SBJV	become.3SBJV	writer	

'He will/will have become a writer.'

b.

*O/are	să	**fi**	devenit	scriitor	
will/have.FUT	SBJV	be	become	writer	

Intended: 'He will have become a writer.'

Furthermore, stripping *să* of its complementizer features makes it possible to delete it—a phenomenon seen in AR, as shown in (20b). In sum, the criteria for SVC proposed in Riis (1854) are met: there is no clausal linker between the two verbal heads.

In the periphrastic future, the argument structure is determined by the properties of the subjunctive verb. The 'will' auxiliary has functional but not lexical features, so it is not involved in argument selection. Thus, the construction also meets the criterion of single-event conceptualization and qualifies as a macro-event. Lovestrand (2021) points out that construction has the macro-event property if temporal operations such as time adverbials, temporal clauses, and tenses necessarily have scope over all subevents encoded

by the construction. This is the case for the periphrastic future in Romanian languages, as shown in (26).

(26) a.

Chiruta	nu-şi	şti	că	tora	va-l'	tal'u	AR
old.the	not-REFL.DAT	know	that	now	will-her.DAT	cut.1.SBJV	
caplu			(from Vrabie 2000)				
head							

'The wretched woman doesn't know that now I'll cut off her head.'

b.

Bine	că	acum	o	să-l	văd.	DR
well	that	now	will	SBJV-him	see.1	

'It is good that now I'll see him.'

c.

Nu	ari	si	vin	moine.	MR
not	will	sbjv	come	tomorrow	

'I will not come tomorrow.'

The adverbs in (26) scope over both verbal forms, with no possibility of separate readings with each verb.

In sum, in the absence of clitic climbing with the periphrastic future in Romanian languages, we adopt an SVC analysis, where the higher verbal head is merged as a T [future] head selecting a low subjunctive MoodP with phi-features capable of hosting clitics.

5.2. Syntactic Derivations

Avram (1999, p. 43) mentions the well-known fact 'that future forms represent highly modalized means of describing possible courses of affairs.' Consequently, the availability of *să* subjunctives with future denotation should come as no surprise considering the intrinsic [modal] nature of *să*. However, as previously noted, its intrinsic [-finite] specification prevents *să* from merging as a Fin head in the periphrastic future. Consequently, we propose that nothing merges in the Fin head in these constructions and that the [+finite, modal] features of Fin are satisfied compositionally as a result of long-distance Agree operations established with two distinct inflectional heads: T, on the one hand, and mood, on the other.

Along these lines, the periphrastic future in DR has the CP structure shown in (27a) and the IP structure shown in (27b). This analysis adopts Cinque's (1999) proposal of two T heads in the inflectional clause hierarchy and Ledgeway's (2018) proposal that a low position for clitics is exploited in Romance languages. Corbeanu and Hill (this volume) identify this low clitic position to be the second T head in Romanian languages (i.e., higher than 'in-situ' postverbal subjects).

(27) a.

CP:	Force > …	Fin	> IP
	[+finite]	[+finite, modal]	
că	Ø		
that			

b.

IP:	(Neg) >	T$_1$	> Mood > T$_2$		> <v> > <V>
		[FUT, φ$_1$]	[SBJV]	[φ$_2$],verb	
	(nu)	*o/are*	*să*	**(CL)**	V
	not	will/have.FUT	SBJV	(DAT-ACC), verb.SBJV	

The Fin head in (27a) checks its features compositionally by probing twice: T$_1$ for finiteness and mood for [modal]. The phi-features are transferred from Fin to each T head. More precisely, Fin [+finite] is checked via long-distance Agree against T$_1$ [FUT].

Since reduced *o* (< 'will') is too semantically bleached to also check the [modal] feature of Fin, while *are* (< 'have') lost its modality in this context, Fin [modal] is checked by the subjunctive mood marker *să*, also via long-distance Agree. None of these auxiliaries can move to Fin since they are clitics, so obligatorily hosted by the lexical verb moved to T_2 (i.e., <…> indicate copies of moved lexical verb). This also explains why negation precedes both auxiliaries.

Since these clauses are finite, phi-features are available and transferred to the probed domains, as also indicated by the DR data, where the modal *are* shows subject-verb agreement, as in (28).

(28)   a.   Eu o/**am**   să plec.
              I will/have.1SG.FUT   SBJV go.1SG
              'I will go.'

       b.   Ea o/**are**   să plece.
              She will/have.3SG.FUT   SBJV go.3SG
              'She will go.'

Linearly, in the periphrastic future, pronominal clitics do not raise above the lower T_2 arguably because [mood] is also independently probed for by Fin discharging another φ domain (i.e., $φ_2$). Consequently, the low IP position for clitics (cf. Ledgeway 2018) is exploited by the object clitics.[10]

Lastly, a special note is required for the DR form *avea*, which denotes the future perfect, as in (25a). While this form is an auxiliary on par with *o/are*, it is not a clitic. Thus, it can be separated from the subjunctive string, as in (29a), whereas this is not possible with *o/are* (29b).

(29) a.   (Toţi)   aveau   (**toţi**)   să (*toţi) plece (toţi).
          all   will.have   all   SBJV all go.3.SBJV
          'All (of them) will have left.'

       b.   (Toţi)   or/au   (***toţi**)   să (*toţi) plece (toţi).
          all   will/have.3PL.FUT   all   SBJV all go.3.SBJV
          'All (of them) will leave.'

Nonetheless, constructions with *avea*, which occur only in DR, are still monoclausal: on a par with *o/are* futures, periphrastic future with *avea* allows for long passives, as in (30a), and negation is high, and scopes over both the auxiliary and the subjunctive, as in (30b).

(30) a. O carte   avea   să   fie   scrisă   (curând).
         a book   have.FUT.PERF   SBJV   be.PASS   write.3SG.F.PRT   soon
         'A book was going to be written (soon).'

      b. (Toţi)   **nu**   aveau   (**toţi**)   să   (***nu**)   (*toţi)   plece   (toţi).
         All   not   have.FUT.PERF   all   SBJV   not   all   leave   all
         'Not all (of them) would have left.'

The perfective reading of *avea* arises, on the one hand, from the relation between the Reichenbach (1947) event time (ET) and reference time (RT) being expressed by the past participle (cf. Giorgi and Pianesi 1989), while, on the other hand, the relation between speech time (ST) and RT is expressed by the T_1 head hosting *are* 'have.FUT'. Hence, formally, we maintain the structure in (27), enhanced as in (31) to include aspectual properties on the lower T_2 head, and account for (29b) as a matter having to do with the non-clitic nature of *avea*: in particular, its non-clitic status does not require T_1-mood adjacency. Lastly, the relationship between T_1 and T_2 is also one of long-distance Agree.

(31) a. **CP**:

Force > …		Fin	> IP
[+finite]		[+finite, modal]	
că		Ø	
that			

  b. **IP**:

(Neg) >	T$_1$ >	Mood >	T$_2$	> <v> > <V>
	[ST/RT:FUT, φ$_1$]	[SBJV]	[ET/TR:PERF, φ$_2$]	
(nu)	*avea*	*să*	**(CL)**	**V**
not	have.PST	SBJV	(DAT-ACC),verb.SBJV …	

Note that Avram (1999) shows that while both *avea* 'have' and *fi* 'be' can mark perfectivity, these are not interchangeable in DR. In particular, the author suggests that *avea* is marked for realis contexts, while *fi* is marked for irrealis. Since the future is, by its very nature, irrealis, *fi* might be expected across the board. This is, indeed, the case with the analytic, Romance type, 'will' + INFINITIVE future in DR, as seen in (32).

(32) a. Va   veni.
          will   come.INF.
          'S/he will come.'

  b. Va   fi   venit.
      will   be.INF   come.PST.PRT.
      'S/he will have come.'

So, what we see is that both analytic and periphrastic futures may express perfectivity in a monoclausal structure. The encoding of perfectivity is, however, distinct, requiring *fi* in the analytic future but surfacing directly on the modal auxiliary in the periphrastic future. In light of the structures proposed in (31b), it means that the perfectivity feature is on T$_2$ with the analytic future but on T$_1$ in the *avea* periphrastic future. The relevant point is that perfectivity is mapped only once, unlike what happens in Macedonian biclausal structures (2a, 2b). The exclusion of T$_2$ as a head for perfectivity with *are* futures has to be related to the fact that T$_2$ is not available for association with perfectivity, as this head has the phi-features responsible for hosting pronominal clitics and the subjunctive verb.

The periphrastic future in AR and MR are sub-cases of the DR structures shown in (27), as long as the structure is monoclausal. Thus, the AR biclausal constructions with *nore*, as in (19), do not qualify for this analysis but for an analysis with obligatory control verbs. On the other hand, the AR constructions with the modal auxiliary *va*, such as seen in (20), conform to the template in (27). The micro-variation here is that the subjunctive marker is optional. When *s-* is present, as in (20a), the checking operations proceed exactly as in (27) for DR. When the subjunctive marker is absent, as in (20b), the verb moves to T2 to check [mood] and [modal] in Fin through a long-distance Agree.

On par with AR, MR periphrastic future conforms to the pattern in (27), the variation arising from the pairing of lexical items with the relevant functional features. In particular, the negative constructions in (16a, 16b) versus (16c) indicate that the subjunctive marker is unable to check [modal] in Fin at long distance, so a modal item, such as the negation, is obligatory to take over this task. Alternatively, the subjunctive marker can check all the relevant features when it is in Fin, as in (17), where the modal auxiliary is excluded. The variation here is that MR *si/să* is strongly associated with conditional CP and, hence, with the [+finite] feature, whereas the same association disappeared in DR and is weak in AR. The future tense interpretation arises from the context, through the principle of compositionality, in such constructions.

In sum, subjunctive complements could be used for periphrastic future derivations because of the following: (i) the subjunctive is used for the encoding of irrealis modality; (ii) the subjunctive marker has been associated interchangeably with +/− finiteness and

modality, being also paired with a specific grammatical mood; and (iii) the subjunctive marker can be used to check all the afore-mentioned features or only some of them, depending on whether other elements may take over some of the checking function compositionally. In most periphrastic futures, the modal auxiliary takes over the checking of finiteness, so the subjunctive marker is confined to mood and modality. Formally, the structures in (27) equally underly the periphrastic future in AR, DR, and MR, although each Romanian language variety developed this construction independently. Thus, micro-variation is expected, but it concerns only the options for feature checking, not the featural make-up of the syntactic derivation.

6. Conclusions

This paper discusses subjunctives in Romanian languages in connection to Old Romanian and the Balkan Sprachbund. It traces the diachrony of selected subjunctives in DR, AR, MR, and IR and explores the micro-parametric variation in their CP fields, as well as the potential for *să* subjunctives to derive periphrastic futures in these languages.

As part of the Balkan Sprachbund, Romanian languages have a preverbal morpheme that marks subjunctives, in addition to various degrees of inflectional morphology on the verb. Importantly, unlike in other Balkan languages, but on par with Romance, subjunctives also allow for a complementizer of the 'that' type in certain contexts. The subjunctive CP in Romanian languages projects fully (i.e., a ForceP domain) with subject obviation but only partially (i.e., a FinP domain) in control contexts, following the Balkan Sprachbund template resulting from the loss of infinitival complements. However, unlike other Balkan languages, Romanian languages allow for a split Fin at various historical stages. While standard DR has completely remerged this split Fin, DR *să* currently being able to satisfy both [finite] and [modal] features of Fin, this process is currently incomplete in AR, MR, and IR.

With respect to futurity, Romanian languages developed the periphrastic future with subjunctive morphology, as in other Balkan languages, in addition to allowing for the Romance analytic future with the infinitive in some cases (i.e., Old Romanian, DR). We argue that this was the result of two factors: (i) lexical 'want' and/or 'have' undergoing semantic bleaching and grammaticizing into T heads denoting [future]; and (ii) embedding of *să* subjunctives under these reanalyzed 'will'-type auxiliaries. We show that these Romanian periphrastic futures have a monoclausal, as opposed to biclausal, structure that is best captured under a serial verb construction of the asymmetric type. The [+finite, modal] Fin specification in these derivations is satisfied compositionally via long-distance Agree, with two distinct inflectional heads: 'will' T [future] checks [+finite], while *să* in mood checks [mood] and [modal]. The splitting of Fin feature checking is forced by the intrinsic [-finite] property of *să*, which is blocked from merging as a Fin complementizer in these derivations (hence, the monoclausal status of the periphrastic future).

In periphrastic futures, micro-variation arises, first, from the degree of grammaticalization undergone by the modal 'will'/'have' as an element signaling future events: it could be a verb with obligatory control (i.e., in AR) yielding biclausal structures; or a modal auxiliary (clitic or non-clitic), yielding monoclausal structures, which is the default option in AR, DR, and MR. Although the underlying configuration is the same for these constructions in the three languages (i.e., identical list and distribution of formal features), micro-variation arises in the implementation of feature checking.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, G.A. and V.H.; methodology, G.A. and V.H.; software, G.A. and V.H.; validation, G.A. and V.H; formal analysis, G.A. and V.H.; investigation, G.A. and V.H.; resources, G.A. and V.H; data curation, G.A. and V.H.; writing—original draft preparation, G.A. and V.H.; writing—review and editing, G.A. and V.H; visualization, G.A. and V.H.; supervision, G.A. and V.H.; project administration, G.A. and V.H.; funding acquisition, not applicable. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Notes

[1]   For Verb Raising in Romance, see Belletti (1990), Emonds (1978), Pollock (1989), and Suñer (1994, a.o.), For Verb Raising to some Infl head in Romanian/DR, see inter alia Alboiu (2002), Cornilescu (1997), Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Motapanyane (1995), and Ştefănescu (1997). Corbeanu and Hill (this volume) show that Verb Raising in IR can target either T or Asp, a property correlated to the availability of scrambling;

[2]   Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) considers Romanian/DR *nu*, 'not', as a clitic on the grounds of it being obligatorily adjacent to the clitic cluster on the verb in T. However, Isac and Jakab (2004) and Hill and Alboiu (2016), among others, argue that *nu* 'not' is a free morpheme, as it can stand by itself in answer to a question, it supports TP ellipsis, and it blocks verb movement; for them, the obligatory adjacency is independently derived (i.e., from the non-projection of Spec,TP in VSO languages, following Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998);

[3]   Alboiu and Hill (2021) argue that it is this very property that creates tension in Fin and forces it to split and accommodate dual complementizers in Old Romanian;

[4]   In the 1980s, the standard assumption in generative grammar was that both OC and raising constructions involve non-finite complementation but that the size of the clause differs: control involves CPs, whereas raising verbs select IPs (Rizzi 1982; Borer 1989), labeled TPs in minimalism (Bošković 1997, 2002) and FinP/truncated CPs, in cartography (Roussou 2001). It is by now well known that in the Balkan Sprachbund, both OC and raising involve similar types of (non-)finite truncated structures, while NOC involves a complete/phasal CP/ForceP domain (see Alboiu and Hill 2021; Landau 2013).

[5]   Phonetic variations exist, but each of them stands for *să* in all its distribution;

[6]   Some philologists argue that *să* has a different etymology in conditional versus subjunctive clauses, e.g., Lat. *si*-conditional, Lat. adv. *sic,* or Lat. verb *sit* (see (Sava 2012) for overview and references). This is irrelevant to the learners from the 10th century on: the available input data provide a homophonous complementizer within irrealis contexts, and its (re)analysis is constrained by the syntactic configuration, not by the etymology;

[7]   Other Romance languages show CPs with double complements, generally due to recomplementation (i.e., *que* in Force and in Fin) or double-filled COMP in interrogatives/relatives (Poletto 2000; Wolfe 2018, a.o.). To our knowledge, split Fin is peculiar to Old Romanian;

[8]   DR *avea* in (2c) is the perfective instance of *are*.

[9]   Avram (1999) also argues for the monoclausal status of the *o* periphrastic future in DR.

[10] We remain agnostic as to whether the presence of *să* in mood itself blocks clitic movement to φ_1. Since clitics target phi-domains and locality is defined in terms of feature identity, it should be a head with phi-features (i.e., φ_2 here) blocking any pronominal clitic from reaching φ_1 rather than a verbal head.

References

Primary Sources

Aromanian corpus references:
Capidan, Theodor. 1931. *Fărşeroţi.* Cluj: Dacoromania VI.
Papahagi, Pericle. 1905. *Basme aromâne.* Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.
Saramandu, Nicolae. 2005. *Structura aromânei actuale*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.
Istro-Romanian corpus references:
Cantemir, Traian. 1932–1933. *Texte istro-române*. Cluj: Editura Academiei.
Puşcariu, Sextil. 1906–1926. *Studii istro-române. I. Texte.* Bucureşti: Analele A.R., Tom 28.

Secondary Sources

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Edited by Alexandra Aikhenvald and Robert M. W. Dixon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–68.
Alboiu, Gabriela. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: The University of Bucharest Press.
Alboiu, Gabriela. 2006. Are we in Agreement? In *Agreement Systems*. Edited by Cedric Boeckx. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 13–39.
Alboiu, Gabriela. 2007. Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising. In *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*. Edited by William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 187–213.
Alboiu, Gabriela. 2009. Null expletives and Case: The view from Romance. In *Romance Languages: Structure, Interfaces, and Microparametric Variation*. Edited by Pascual Masullo. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1–19.

Alboiu, Gabriela, and Virginia Hill. 2021. Diachronic Change and Feature-al Instability: The Cycles of Fin in Romanian OC. In *Syntactic Features and the Limits of Syntactic Change*. Edited by Thórhallur Eythórsson and Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 64–84.

Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, V-Movement and EPP-Checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 491–539. [CrossRef]

Arapi, Ina. 2016. The Relation between Subjunctives and Infinitives of the Old and New Gheg Varieties of Albanian. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/41503795/The_relation_between_subjunctives_and_infinitives_of_the_old_and_new_Gheg_varieties_of_Albanian (accessed on 8 September 2023).

Avram, Larisa. 1999. *Auxiliaries and the Structure of Language*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii Bucureşti.

Belletti, Adriana. 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement*. Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier.

Benincà, Paola. 2001. The position of Topic and Focus in the left periphery. In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 39–64.

Benincà, Paola. 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of Medieval Romance. In *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*. Edited by Raffaella Zanuttini, Hector Campos, Elena Herburger and Paul Portner. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 53–86.

Borer, Hagit. 1989. Anaphoric AGR. In *The Null Subject Parameter*. Edited by Osvaldo A. Jaeggli and Ken J. Safir. Dordrect: Kluwer, pp. 69–109.

Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bošković, Željko. 2002. On certain differences between Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian C(P). *Balkanistica* 15: 35–48.

Brâncuş, Grigore. 2007. *Studii de istorie a limbii române, Volume 1*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Bybee, Joan, and Suzanne Fleischman. 1995. Issues in Mood and Modality. In *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Edited by Joan Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1–14.

Capidan, Theodor. 1925. *Meglenoromânii: Vol I, Istoria şi graiul lor*. Academia Română: Studii şi Cercetări, 7. Bucharest: Cultura Naţională.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries: The framework. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Edited by Roger Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 89–147.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Edited by Michael Kenstowicz. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1–52.

Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond Explanatory Adequacy. In *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Edited by Adriana Belletti. Oxford: Oxford University Press, vol. 3, pp. 104–32.

Chomsky, Noam. 2007. Approaching UG from Below. In *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?: Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*. Edited by Uli Sauerland and Hans-Martin Gartner. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1–29.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roget Vergnaud*. Edited by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 133–67.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2001. Restructuring and the order of aspectual and root modal heads. In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Giampiero Salvi. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 137–55.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 1997. Some Notes on the Syntax of the Subject. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* XLII: 101–47.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000. The double subject construction in Romanian. In *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*. Edited by Virginia Motapanyane. Dordrecht: Elsevier, pp. 83–134.

D'Alessandro, Roberta, and Adam Ledgeway. 2010. At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese Complementation. *Lingua* 120: 2040–60.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1990. Auxiliaries and the Sentence Structure in Romanian. In *Grammar in Progress*. Edited by Juan Mascaró and Marina Nespor. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, pp. 101–13.

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

Emonds, Joseph. 1978. The Verbal Complex V'-V in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 151–75.

Farkas, Donka. 1984. Subjunctive complements in Rumanian. In *Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages 12*. Edited by Philip Baldi. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 355–72.

Giorgi, Alessandra, and Fabio Pianesi. 1989. Towards a syntax of temporal representation. *Probus* 3: 187–213. [CrossRef]

Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. The Movement Derivation of Conditional Clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 595–621. [CrossRef]

Han, Chung-hye. 1998. The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in UG. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

Hill, Virginia, and Gabriela Alboiu. 2016. *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hill, Virginia, and Olga Mišeska-Tomić. 2008. Subjunctive complements to V and N in Balkan Romance. In *Proceedings of FASSBL 6*. Edited by Marko Todić. Zagreb: University of Zagreb Press, pp. 26–41.

Hill, Virginia, and Olga Mišeska-Tomić. 2009. A typology of subjunctive complements in Balkan languages. *University of Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* XI: 197–208.

Isac, Dana, and Edith Jakab. 2004. Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkans. In *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Edited by Olga Mišeska-Tomić. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 315–38.

Kayne, Richard. 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–87.

Krapova, Iliyana. 2001. Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek. In *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. Edited by María Luisa Rivero and Angela Ralli. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 105–26.

Landau, Idan. 2004. The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811–77. [CrossRef]

Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in Generative Grammar: A Research Companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2018. Parallels in Clausal and Nominal Structures: Romanian Clitic Placement. In *Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives on Romance Syntax*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula and Alexandru Nicolae. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 23–52.

Lovestrand, Joseph. 2021. Serial Verb Constructions. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 7: 109–130. [CrossRef]

Lozovanu, Dorin. 2008. Populația Românească din Peninsula Balcanică. Studiu uman Geographic. Ph.D. dissertation, Universitatea Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iaşi, Romania.

Mandić, Mirjana. 2010. Contact-Induced Grammaticalization with Particular Reference to Balkan Sprachbund Future Tense. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/4094135 (accessed on 8 September 2023).

Mišeska-Tomić, Olga. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-Syntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.

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

Nevaci, Manuela. 2012. Cercetări recente de teren la aromânii din peninsula balcanică. *Fonetică și Dialectologie* XXXI: 63–78.

Niculescu, Dana. 2011. The grammaticalization of future tense forms in 16th century Romanian. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LVI: 421–40.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365–424.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. New York: MacMillan Co.

Riis, Hans Nicolaus. 1854. *Grammatical Outline and Vocabulary of the Oji-Language*. Basel: Bahnmaier.

Rivero, Maria-Luisa. 1994. The Structure of the Clause and V-Movement in Languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 63–120. [CrossRef]

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*. Edited by Liliane Haegeman. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281–337.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. On the Cartography of Syntactic Structures. In *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Edited by Luigi Rizzi. Oxford: OUP, vol. 2, pp. 3–16.

Roberts, Ian. 1997. Restructuring, Head Movement and Locality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 423–60.

Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and Head Movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roussou, Anna. 2001. Control and Raising In and Out of Subjunctive Complements. In *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. Edited by Maria-Luisa Rivero and Angela Ralli. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 75–105.

Saeed, John. 2003. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sârbu, Richard, and Vasile Frăţilă. 1998. *Dialectul istro-român*. Timişoara: Editura Amarcord.

Sava, Cristinel. 2012. Between C and I: The Romanian subjunctive particle să. Ms. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/55505601/Between_C_and_I_the_Romanian_subjunctive_particle_s%C4%83 (accessed on 22 July 2023).

SOR. 2016. *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suñer, Margarita. 1994. Verb Movement and the Licensing of Argumental WH-Phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 335–72. [CrossRef]

Ştefănescu, Ioana. 1997. *The Syntax of Agreement in Romanian*. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics #14. New York: City University of New York.

Vrabie, Emil. 2000. *An English-Aromanian (Macedo-Romanian) Dictionary: With Two Introductory Sketches on Aromanian*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press.

Wolfe, Sam. 2018. *Verb Second in Medieval Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zanuttini, Raffaela. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.