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Abstract
The following paper focuses on the syntax and semantics of the Romanian non-finite supine form, used as a complement, alternating with the infinitive. We comment on the nature of the supine-varieties and differentiate between a fully nominal construction and a verbal supine-construction, introduced either by lexical prepositions with θ-marking properties, or by the functional preposition de, interpreted as a complementizer. We focus then on the verbal de-supine, discussing its general syntactic properties: the realization and case properties of the external and the internal argument, negation, tense and modality. In spite of its reduced functional structure, the supine shows several interpretations. All the properties of the supine clause are derived from the properties of the supine morpheme. The homonymy of the supine and the participle is not accidental, both are aspectual morphemes, yet contrast in the perfectivity reading. We also discuss the alternating nominal versus verbal behaviour of the supine, as well as the obligatory presence of the preposition when the supine is verbal and takes an Accusative IA. To account for this alternating behaviour, we propose that the supine’s “mixed” verbal-nominal nature simply lies in the fact that its φ-features are “unspecified”, being neither verbal, that is, uninterpretable [uφ], nor nominal, that is interpretable [iφ], but simply being [oφ-features]. It is the next functional category above the supine (a nominalizer, a preposition) with which the supine agrees, that determines the (un)interpretable nature of the supine’s φ-features, and therefore its nominal or verbal syntax.


1 Preliminaries
This paper aims at contributing to the discussion of non-finite forms with dual properties in German and Romanian. We continue the topic dealt with in

1 Romanian is traditionally described as featuring four non-finite forms: the infinitive, the past-participle, the gerund and specifically the supine. The regression of the infinitive and its replacement
Schlothauer/Zifonun/Cosma (this volume), discussing the supine, a form which alternatively exhibits either verbal or nominal properties. In an investigation of Balkan languages, Joseph (1983: 161) considers the supine to be a non-finite form with an „infinitival“ function, in the sense that the contexts of use for the Latin infinitive have become contexts of use for the subjunctive (a finite mood), for the infinitive and for the supine in Romanian. The particular feature of Romanian is that it has developed not only a subjunctive counterpart for the relative loss of the infinitive, but also a specific non-finite form, the supine, displaying a complex syntax. The Romanian supine shows different degrees of nominalization ranging from a purely nominal form, to forms that have been described as showing a mixed verbal-nominal behaviour, up to verbal clausal constructions, as recently shown in detail by Pană Dindelegan (1992, in GALR 2005/2008), Soare (2002), Dragomirescu (2011b, cartea). Throughout the paper, it will be seen that the German equivalent of the Romanian supine is the infinitive, in all of its forms. More generally, the literature on the German zu-infinitive has identified patterns of organization in the data, which are similar to those of the Romanian verbal supine: for instance, both the German infinitive and the Romanian supine clauses appear in restructuring and raising constructions (see for this parallelism Bech 1955/1957, von Stechow 1990, Kiss 1995, Zifonun et al. 1997, Wurmbrand 2001, 2004, 2007 etc. for German, Cornilescu/Cosma (to appear) for Romanian).

This paper focuses on the verbal supine and discusses its general properties. We rely on important previous work in Pană Dindelegan (2010), Hill (2002), Soare (2002), Giurgea/Soare (2010), Dragomirescu (2011 a, b). The outline of the paper is as follows: section 2 presents the structure of the supine on a morphological level, distinguishing it from the homonymous past participle. In the same section we discuss the properties of nominal and verbal supines, further distinguishing between prepositional and complementizer supines. Section 3 starts an extended discussion of the general properties of the supine clause, focusing on its external argument. Section 4 discusses the syntax of the internal argument, describing the case licensing strategies of the supine verb. Section 5 concentrates on the parameter of negation, considering typological properties of the Romanian negation and the negation in finite and non-finite clauses. The next section argues that the supine has a reduced functional structure and discusses tense in the supine clause, whereas section 7 concentrates on the semantic versatility of the supine with respect to the modal interpretation. Section 8 presents final conclusions.

by the finite subjunctive, a feature shared by Balkan languages, is restricted in Romanian mainly to argument positions (complement clauses), yet even in this case not entirely, for the infinitive is still widely present in adjunct clauses, complement clauses of nominalizations and some other contexts (see GALR 2005/2008, Jordan 2009 etc.).

\(^2\) To the extent that the supine is always dependent on another predicate, it is always partly nominal.
2. The structure of the Romanian supine

From a morphological perspective all the varieties of the supine share the fact that they are marked by the suffix -(v)T-(v)S, attached to the verbal stem. The particular morpho-phonological realization of the supine varies with respect to verb classes (traditional conjugations and their subclasses), as shown in (1) from GALR (2005/2008):

(1) I, II: -a  a cânta – cânt-ăt  'to sing – sung'
    a lucru – lucr-ăt  'to work – worked'

III: -i  a coborî – cobor-ăt  'to descend – descended'

IV, V, VI: -î  a diferî – difer-ăt  'to differentiate – differentiated'
    a sări – săr-ăt  'to jump – jumped'
    a ciît – ciîr-ăt  'to read – read'

VII: -î  a hotărî – hotăr-ăt  'to decide – decided'

VIII: -ea  a vedea – văz-ăt  'to see – seen'

IX: -e  a face – făc-ăt  'to make – made'

X: -e  a merge – măr-ăt  'to go – gone'

XI: -e  a fierbe – fier-ăt  'to boil – boiled'

Even at the morphological level, the supine differs from the past participle, in that while the participle shows φ-features (2a), everywhere except for the compound perfect, the supine never has gender number marking; in other words, it is not endowed with φ-features (2b).

(2) a. O consider (ca) deja concediată.
    CL.3SG.F.ACC consider.1SG (as) already fired.F.SG
    'I consider her as already fired.'

b. O consider de neangajat.
    CL.3SG.F.ACC consider.1SG DE not-hire.SUP
    'I consider that she cannot be hired.'

In our opinion, the homonymy of the supine and the past participle is significant, all of the properties of the supine clause can be derived from the properties of the supine-participle morpheme. The participle and the supine share the important property of being aspectual morphemes, as noticed for the participle by Avram (1999). As aspectual morphemes, the past participle and the supine contrast with respect to perfectivity, as evidenced by minimal pairs of the following type:

---

3 We hereby present the verb classes as presented in GALR (2005/2008). There are many classification attempts, ranging from a number of 4 up to 38 verb classes. Some inflection classes share the same infinitival suffix (-a/-i/-î/-e), but differ among other in the way they form the paradigm of the present. We will focus only on the participial/supine form.
The contrast that emerges is aspectual, the past participle being unmarked (see, for instance, Dima 2010) or [+ perfective] in certain contexts, while the supine is [-perfective]. The participle may be bounded or resultative, the supine is unbounded (undetermined and unrealized). Unlike the past participle, however, the supine lacks φ-features. The absence of φ-features bears on the supine’s (in)ability to value case (see section 3.2).

As to the syntax of the supine morpheme, a natural hypothesis is that it enters syntax in the same manner as the past participle. Adopting the analysis of the past participle in Collins (2005), MacDonald (2008) a.o., we will assume that the supine morpheme heads a functional projection placed above the lexical VP and below the light verb phrase, vP, as shown below in (4). Since the supine is [u-perfective], it will value this feature against a(n) [i-perfective] grammatical Aspect head. Therefore, all supine constructions, nominal ones included (Cornílescu 2003b), are at least Aspect Phrases.

Beyond this common element, supine constructions are quite diverse. Several syntactic supine structures have been acknowledged (Pană Dindelegan 1992, Soare 2002, GALR
There is first a fully nominal construction, which is identified by the obligatory presence of an article and of an internal argument in the Genitive case. The supine nominalization parallels the German nominal infinitive (see Schlotthauer/Zifonun/Cosma in this volume):

(5) a. dărămatul brutal al bisericiilor\(^5\)
   demolish.SUP brutal ART GEN churches.GEN DEF
   ‘the brutal demolishing of the churches’

GER b. das gewaltsame Abreißen der Kirchen
   the brutal demolish the.F GEN churches
   ‘the brutal demolishing of the churches’

Notice that the nominal supine may, but need not, be introduced by a preposition:

(6) a. Spălatul rufelor o enervează.
   wash.SUP DEF laundry.PL GEN DEF CL 3SG F ACC make mad.3SG
   ‘Washing the laundry makes her mad.’

GER Wäschewaschen nervt sie.
   laundry-wash make mad.3SG she ACC
   ‘Washing the laundry makes her mad.’

b. Se gândeşte la spălatul rufelor.
   SE think.3SG at wash.SUP DEF laundry.PL GEN DEF
   ‘He/she is thinking of washing the laundry.’

GER Er/sie denkt an Wäschewaschen
   he/she think.3SG at laundry-wash
   ‘He/she is thinking of washing the laundry.’

In all of the other supine constructions, the supine must be introduced by a preposition. It is customary to distinguish two prepositional supine constructions. In the first case, the supine is introduced by a lexical preposition, which has ð-marking abilities. The lexical preposition is often c-selected by a verb (a se gândi la copit fructe, GER denken, Früchte zu backen - ‘to think of baking fruit’; a trăi din cântat, GER vom Singen leben - ‘to live on singing’), by an adjective (doritor ‘eager, desirous’, sătul ‘fed up’ etc.: doritor de văzut filme, GER darauf versessen sein, Filme zu sehen - ‘eager to see movies’), by a noun (dorinţa de scris articole bune, GER der Wunsch, gute Aufsätze zu schreiben - ‘the wish to write good articles’). The supine preposition (la ‘to, at’, pentru ‘for’, de ‘of’ etc.) may introduce adjuncts, both adverbial adjuncts and nominal modifiers ((7), (8)). See, for instance, the descriptions of supine adjuncts introduced by

\(^4\) We will focus in our analysis on the external argument (EA) and on the internal argument (IA).

\(^5\) For a description of this form see among many Cornilescu (2003a).
the preposition la in Dragomirescu (2011b). The German correspondent of the prepositional supine is an infinitive with or without the infinitival marker zu, as can be noticed from the examples:

(7) A plecat la vânătoare.
    have.3SG gone to hunt.SUP ducks
    ‘He went about hunting ducks.’

GER Er ging Enten jagen
    he go.PAST.3SG ducks hunt
    ‘He went about hunting ducks.’

(8) mașina pentru tocăt carnea
    machine for mince.SUP meat
    ‘machine for mincing meat’

GER Gerät zum Fleisch hacken
    machine to-the.DAT meat mince
    ‘machine for mincing meat’

A different situation is that of the supine introduced by the preposition de, but selected by transitive verbs. In such cases, the preposition is functional (it has no special semantic interpretation) and it is a member of the supine clause.

(9) Am terminat de fumat.
    have.1SG finished DE smoke.SUP
    ‘I have finished smoking.’

GER Ich habe aufgehört zu rauchen.
    I have.1SG finished to smoke
    ‘I have finished smoking.’

The introductory preposition de has been viewed as a functional preposition (implicitly in Pană Dindelegan 2010 and GALR 2005: 513), or more frequently as a complementizer (Hill 2002, Soare 2002, Dye 2006) or even a mood particle, as in Giurgea/Soare (2010: 78). This is the construction that this paper is about. It will be shown that the de-supine is non-unitary and has a broad distribution in Romanian. There are several varieties of the verbal supine, differing through their internal structure; these will be discussed in further chapters of the present paper.

We claim, however, that even when de is a functional element, a complementizer in our interpretation, it continues to have prepositional properties. It is a „prepositional complementizer”, involved in case assignment, like the other prepositions which introduce the supine. There is therefore a considerable degree of similarity between the prepositional supine and the complementizer de-supine. In the first part of the paper, we
endeavour to shed light on the general properties of the supine clause, irrespective of whether it is introduced by a lexical preposition or by the functional prepositional complementizer de. What binds these forms is the supine verb’s ability to assign case, if it is „supported” by the preposition. We will refer to all of these constructions as verbal supine constructions, considering that the main divide in the syntax of the supine refers to the realization of the internal argument as a Genitive (the nominal supine) or as an Accusative (the verbal supine). In Cornilescu/Cosma (to appear) we further detail the syntax of the complementizer construction, acknowledging several different kinds of Accusative assignment, depending on syntactic processes like restructuring, raising etc.

The distinction between the prepositional and the complementizer construction remains, however, clear cut. At least the following syntactic tests show this difference:

a. Substitution

In the prepositional construction, the supine clause alternates with a PP, with the same preposition followed by a DP (10a). In the complementizer construction the de+ supine clause is substituted by a bare DP, since the introductory de is a constituent of the subordinate clause (10b).

(10)  a. S-a apucat [pp de [SQ>Citit piesele lui Shakespeare]] / S- have.3SG started DE read.SUP plays.DEF of Shakespeare

       De this

       „She/he has started to read Shakespeare’s plays// She/he has started this.’

b. Am terminat [sup de citit piesele lui Shakespeare] / have.1SG finished DE read.SUP plays.DEF of Shakespeare

   am terminat [to>asta],

   have.1SG finished this

   „I have finished reading Shakespeare’s plays// I have finished it.’

b. Extraction

Expectedly, extraction is not possible out of PPs, but is possible out of CPs (Soare 2002).

(11)  a. *Ce ai plecat la cules, mere sau nuci? (PP)

what have.2SG gone at pick.SUP apples or walnuts

b. Umblă întotdeauna după agăţat fete.

   look.3SG always after pick.SUP girls

   „He is always trying to pick up girls.’

c. **Pe cine umblă după agăţat?

   PE who look.3SG after pick.SUP
(12) a. Ce ai terminat de citit? (cărți) (CP)
   what have.2SG finished DE read.SUP? (books)
   ‘What did you finish reading?’

   b. N-ar fi rău de întâmpinat musafirii la gară.
      not-AUX.COND.3SG be bad DE welcome.SUP guests.DEF at station
      ‘It would not be bad to welcome the guests at the station.’

   c. Pe cine n-ar fi rău de întâmpinat la gară?
      PE who not-AUX.COND.3SG be bad DE welcome.SUP at station
      ‘Who(m) would it not be bad to welcome at the station?’

Against this general background, the paper will pursue several more specific objectives. We will uncover and describe the functional structure of the verbal supine construction, with an emphasis on the complementizer *de*-construction. The following elements will be taken into consideration: the subject of the supine clause, case assignment and realization of the internal argument, negation of the supine clause, the tense and mood interpretation of the supine clause. This discussion will allow us to show the unity of the verbal supine construction. The following sections therefore focus on the general properties of the supine verbal construction.

3. On the subject of the supine clause

Unlike other non-finite complements of Romanian (the infinitive, the gerund) the supine is unable to have an overt Nominative subject (with very limited and well understood exceptions in an infrequent class of relative clauses, as described in Cornilescu/Cosma 2010, Dragomirescu 2011a). Compare the supine (13a) with the equivalent subjunctive clause (13b) and infinitive clause (13c).

(13) a. *Ar fi important/bine de citit Ion cărțile astea
      AUX.COND.3SG be important/good DE read.SUP Ion books.DEF these

   b. Ar fi important să citească Ion cărțile astea.
      AUX.COND.3SG be important SĂ read.SUBL.3SG Ion books.DEF these
      ‘It would be important for Ion to read these books.’

   c. Ar fi important a se citi cărțile astea.
      AUX.COND.3SG be important A SE read books.DEF these
      ‘It would be important to read these books.’

Even if an overt subject is not available in the supine clause, there are theoretical and, more importantly, empirical grounds to claim that the supine subject is projected. Theoretically, given Burzio’s generalization and the fact that the Accusative case is regularly assigned by the supine verb, it follows that the subject is projected and θ-marked. Since the null subject of the supine is not replaceable by an overt lexical subject, it has correctly been concluded that the subject of the supine clause is always
PRO (Hill 2002, Dragomirescu 2011a). This raises several problems: what is the case of PRO, how the case feature of PRO is valued, and also, why it is the case that a lexical subject is never available in the supine clause. We will briefly address all of these problems. We follow recent research (Landau 2006) on PRO, claiming that like any other DP, PRO has standard case, rather than the null case proposed in early minimalist syntax (Chomsky/Lasnik 1993).

If PRO bears standard case, then one must determine which case is assigned to PRO and how PRO’s case feature gets valued. To determine which is the case of PRO and thus to prove that PRO is case-marked, we will rely on the phenomenon of case concord. In Romanian, as well as in many other languages, items like secondary predicates, emphatic reflexive pronouns, floating quantifiers are inflected for case. Case concord is clause bound. Thus, when any of these items are subject-oriented, they agree with the subject for case and become reliable detectors for the case of PRO. In supine clauses such elements have Nominative case, indicating that the PRO subject, with which they agree, also has Nominative case, as apparent in the examples below. In (14) the secondary predicate singură (‘alone, on one’s own’) modifies the supine verb and exhibits case and φ-features concord with the PRO subject. In (15), the PRO subject case- and φ-licenses an emphatic pronoun, while in (16) it licenses a floating quantifier (toţi ‘all’, fiecare ‘each’).

(14) predicate:
   a. Are de făcut toate calcululele astea singură.
      have.3SG DE do.SUP all.F.PL calculations.DEF these alone.F.SG
      ‘She has to do all these calculations on her own/all alone.’
   b. Au chef de făcut toate astea singuri.
      have.3PL mood DE do.SUP all.F.PL these alone.M.PL
      ‘They feel like doing all of these on their own.’

(15) emphatic reflexives:
   Lui Ion i-ar prinde bine de rezolvat el însuşi/*lui însuşi mai multe probleme.
   for them AUX.COND.3SG be good DE solve.SUP he himself/*AUX.DEAT himself more many problems
   ‘It would do Ion good to solve several problems by himself.’

(16) floating quantifiers:
   a. Pentru ei ar fi bine de depus toţi
      for them AUX.COND.3SG be good DE lodge.SUP all.M.PL
      plângerile la Primărie.
      complaints.DEF at City hall
'It would be good for them to all lodge the complaints at the City Hall.'

b. Li s-a cerut de contribuit fiecare/*fiecăruia
CL.3PL.DAT SE-have.3SG asked DE contribute.SUP each/ each.DAT
cu 100 de lei pentru revelion.
with 100 of lei for New Year's Eve party
'They were required to each contribute 100 Lei for the New Year's Eve party.'

Before continuing any further, it is important to notice that the source of the Nominative of these modifiers must be the supine PRO-subject itself, since this Nominative case on PRO is often different from the case of the PRO-controller. Thus in (15) and (16b), the controller is in the Dative case, while the emphatic reflexive and the floating quantifier are in the Nominative case and a Dative is ruled out. This shows that PRO is case-marked clause internally, so that the hypothesis of case transmission from the controller is excluded. Rather, in the control case-typology proposed by Landau (2008:880), PRO shows Case-independence, potentially having a case different from that of the controller, as in (17) below:

(17) Case independence
   …DP [a-case]⋯⋯[ PRO [b-case]⋯]}

The examples given above illustrate the complementizer de-construction, but analogous illustrations may be given for the supine prepositional construction:

(18) a. Maria s-a pus pe cântat de una singură.
   Maria SE-have.3SG put PE sing.SUP by one alone.F.SG
   'Maria has started to sing by herself.'

   b. S-au apucat de rezolvat problemele fiecare cu metoda lui.
   SE-have.3PL started DE solve.SUP problems.DEF each with method.DEF he.GEN
   'They have started to solve the problems each after his own method.'

From what has been said so far, the null subject of the supine clause is PRO and PRO bears regular Nominative case. In Romanian, the supine clause is probably the clearest case of a non-finite clause whose subject is PRO. In contrast with the supine, the present participle (gerunzie) (19b) and the infinitive clause (19a) often have lexical Nominative subjects.

(19) a. Au făcut toate eforturile de a ajunge
   have.3PL done all.N.PL diligence.PL.DEF DE a reach
   fiul lor in fruntea departamentului.
   son.DEF their in front.DEF department.GEN.DEF
They have made every effort in order for their son to become head of the department.

b. **Ion** fiind plecat la București, Maria era tristă.

Ion be.GER gone to Bucharest Maria be.IMPF.3SG sad.F

'They have succeeded for Ion to remain president of the commission.'

The next problem to discuss is that of how the case feature of PRO is valued, since case transmission is not an option, given that the supine PRO-subject shows **Case independence** (in the sense of Landau 2008), its case being in principle different from the case of the controller. The problem is that the supine clause should be such that a lexical Nominative is not available, so that the only Nominative subject is PRO. Following tradition, like Landau (2004), we will assume that the local environment of the embedded subject must provide all the necessary information to determine whether it must, can or cannot be PRO. The relevant features of the environment are T and Agr (as inherited from C). We assume that only an Inflection head positively specified for both features [+T, +Agr] is able to license a lexical subject. By contrast, an Inflection head with any negative specification – [+T, -Agr], [-T, -Agr], [-T, +Agr] – will necessarily license PRO. In a real sense, as Landau (2006: 160) stresses, “PRO is the elsewhere case of lexical subject”. Since in embedded clauses, the Tense-Agreement properties of the clause largely depend on the semantics of the embedding predicate, it must be assumed the complementizer head, too, may be specified for [T] and [Agr]. However, while the temporal properties of the supine do vary with the embedding predicate, as will appear below, the supine tense is uniformly devoid of agreement features, i.e. the Tense head is [± T, -Agr]. Given this specification, the only realization of the Nominative valued by this Tense head is PRO.6

A supine vP thus has a standard form, as in Collins (2005). The light v standardly introduces the subject. There is Agree between the subject and Tense, so PRO is assigned Nominative case, while Tense inherits its properties from the complementizer7. Assuming, for the time being, that there is a Tense projection in the functional domain of the supine, the case of PRO is valued in the following configuration:

---

6 See Cotfas (2012) for a pendant description of the Romanian subjunctive which is always endowed with Agreement features [± T, +Agr], realizing an overt subject or pro and excluding PRO:

(i) Au reușit să rămână Ion președintelui comisiei have.3PL succeeded SĂ remain.SUBJ.3SG Ion president.DEF comission.DEF.GEN

‘They have succeeded for Ion to remain president of the commission.’

7 In (20) and elsewhere, only the relevant details of a phrase-marker are represented. For instance, in (20), we have not represented the grammatical aspect projection intervening between T and vP, and we also didn’t represent the aspectual features of the supine head, both of which are irrelevant in the licensing of the subject.
One problem we have not addressed is how the PRO subject gets its $\varphi$-feature specification, given that the $T$ in the supine clause lacks agreement. The theory that we assume in order to answer this question is Landau’s (2000) Agree theory of control. Intuitively, the features of PRO are “inherited” from the controller, when the derivation reaches the main clause cycle(s). Put simply, Agreement-features are transmitted from the functional head ($v, T, P$) that agrees with the controller to $C$ (the lower complementizer) and then to the supine clause Tense. PRO finally agrees with the supine Tense.

While in the infinitive clause a lexical Nominative is often available, in supine clauses the thematic argument assigned to the subject can be overt only if it is realized as an Agentive $de \ câtre$ (‘by’)-phrase, which is the reflex of a passive construction. As with finite passive constructions, $de \ câtre$ introduces any $\theta$-role that is assigned to the subject, not only an Agent, as shown for English in Collins (2005).

(21) a. Passive, Agent:

E bine de trecut notele la timp $de \ câtre \ toți$
be.3SG good DE register.SUP grades.DEF at time by all profesorii.
professors.DEF
'It is good for the grades to be registered in due time by all the professors.'

b. Passive, Experiencer
Ebine de ştiut adevărul de către toţi cei interesăţi.

'It is good for the truth to be known by all those interested.'

The domain of the de către-phrase is more extended than in other Romance languages. A remark that is often made (Cornilescu 1998) is that unlike other Romance languages, Romanian allows an agentive de către-phrase with reflexive and impersonal passives (22a, b). Moreover, de către also occurs with passives of unergative verbs (Dobrovie Sorin 1994) (22c).

(22) a. Se mănâncă la aceeaşi oră de către toţi turiştii.

'Dinner is eaten at the same time by all the tourists.'

b. Se ştie de către toţi cei interesăţi că măine este evenimentul.

'It is known by all those interested that the event will take place tomorrow.'

c. (?) E bine să se vorbească răspicat contra abuzurilor de către cei nemulţumiţi.

'It is good that all those who are discontent should speak up against abuses.'

All of the examples above have supine counterparts.

(23) a. Este important de luat masa la aceeaşi oră de către toţi turiştii.

'It is important for all the tourists to have dinner at the same time.'

b. Este bine de ştiut de către toţi participanţii că evenimentul are loc mâine.

'It is good for all participants to know that the event will take place tomorrow.'
c. (7) E bine de vorbit răspicat contra abuzurilor de către cei nemulțumiți.

It is good for all those discontent to speak up clearly against abuses.

In sum, there are two strategies of licensing the subject in the supine clause. When there is a controller, the subject is PRO and the clause is “active”. Using a de către-phrase is superfluous, even if not always impossible. Thus, exceptionally a controller and a by-phrase co-occur, if the latter is contrastively focused. If there is no controller, and the verb is transitive, a by-phrase may be licensed.

(24) a. Pentru Ion este ușor de tradus textul (*de către Ion)

Pentru Ion este mai ușor de scris textul încă odată de către el însuși.

For Ion it is easy to translate the text. (*by Ion)

b. Pentru Ion este mai ușor de scris textul încă odată de către el însuși.

For Ion it is easier to write the text once again by himself.

c. Textul este ușor de tradus de către Ion.

The text is easy to translate by Ion.

4. Licensing the internal argument

From a syntactic perspective, the most characteristic argument of the supine construction is the internal argument (IA), since it is basically the manner in which it is realized, which distinguishes between the different variants of the supine construction. While the IA occurs as a Genitive in the nominal supine construction (and the Genitive can be inflectional or prepositional) (25a, b), in verbal supine constructions (25c, d), the IA is realized as an Accusative.

The Accusative case may be assigned supine-internally, or it may be assigned by a functional head of the main clause. „The Accusative assignment parameter” is the main dimension of variation in the analysis of the clausal de-supine constructions, as shown in Cornilescu/Cosma (to appear).

(25) a. La puțin timp după aceasta, un om care se ocupă cu prinsul păsărilor a venit sub copacul de lângă râu.

at little time after this a man who s/he occupy IMPF.3SG with catch.SUP.DEF birds.GEN.DEF have.3SG have
'Short time after, a man who occupied himself with the catching of birds, came under the tree by the river.'

b. Omul se ocupa cu prinsul de păsări.

'The man occupied himself with the catching of birds.'

c. A plecat la prins păsări.

'The man occupied himself with the catching of birds.'

d. Are de prins aceste păsări până mâine.

'The man occupied himself with the catching of birds.'

In this section we focus on cases where the Accusative DP is and remains in the supine clause and is valued by a functional head of the supine clause. The examples have shown the well-known fact that in nominal supines the IA bears Genitive case, while in prepositional and complementizer supine clauses the IA bears Accusative Case (see (25b, c) and (25d)). A difference that is less apparent at first sight is that in the nominal supine construction, when the IA is in the Genitive case, an introductory preposition may appear as in example (25a or 26 b) above, but it is not obligatorily required (26a).

(26) a. Cântatul cocoșilor ne trezea devreme.

'The roosters' crowing woke us up early.'

b. Ne trezeam la cântatul cocoșilor.

'We woke up when the roosters were crowing.'

In contrast, in all the other supine constructions, the introductory preposition is obligatory for well-formedness, whether it is a lexical preposition or a functional prepositional complementizer, i.e. de. Hence, an important question is what makes the preposition obligatory in the non-nominal construction. An answer to this question will be suggested below, justifying the re-classification of supine constructions into two categories: fully nominal and fully verbal ones, the latter including prepositional supine clauses (supines introduced by lexical prepositions) and complementizer supine clauses (supines introduced by the complementizer de).

The presentation centers on two problems: a. constraints on the realization of the IA in the supine clause; b. the licensing of the IA in the verbal construction.
4.1 On the realization of the IA in the supine clause

While a majority of linguists agree that in the prepositional supine, the verb may take an Accusative object (Pană Dindelegan 1992, GLR 2005), in a monographic description of the Romanian supine, Soare (2002: 142) contends that in the prepositional construction the structural Accusative case cannot be assigned. To understand the author’s position one must recall that Romanian is a Differential Object Marking - language (DOM-language), which shows three types of Accusative DPs, as illustrated below:

   i. non-prepositional Accusatives,
   ii. pe-marked Accusatives, not resumed by clitics,
   iii. pe-Accusatives doubled by clitics.

(27)   a. A  văzut fantome.
    have.3SG seen ghosts
   ’He/she has seen ghosts.’
   b. Ion  nu mai iubeşte pe nimeni.
    Ion  not more love.3SG pe anyone
   ’Ion loves no one anymore.’
   c. I-am  întâlnit pe copii la operă.
    CL.3PL.ACC-have.1SG met PE kids at opera
   ’I have met the kids at the opera.’

In fact, what Soare (2002: pag) correctly notes is that not all three types of Accusatives are possible in the supine clause, and that there are also other restrictions on the IA, which she describes as follows:

- in the prepositional supine clause, the IA is adjacent to the verb (the adjacency constraint);
- the IA does not occur in the prepositional pe-Accusative;
- pronominal objects (IA) are impossible in the supine clause (the author claims that the object must be a lexical DP, preferably indefinite).

At a closer scrutiny, however, these conditions on the IA are too strong, the first two, at least being easily falsified. Thus, in the first place, the adjacency constraint is not more than a preference: adverbs, adverbia, argumental PPs etc. can easily occur between the supine verb and its argument. Thus, in examples (28-30), there is an adverb/PP between the supine verb and its object.

(28)  S-a apucat de ales repede firele de nisip de cele de mac.  
    SE-have.3SG started DEF separate.SUP quickly grains.DEF of sand from those of poppy
'He started to quickly separate the grains of sand from the grains of poppy.'

(29) **Harap Alb** plecă la cules fără de întârziere
Harap Alb leave.PF.3SG to pick up.SUP without of delay
toate sălăţile din Grădina ursului.
all lettuce.PL.DEF from Garden.DEF bear.DEF GEN

'Harap Alb left to pick up all the lettuce from the Bear’s Garden with no delay.'

(30) A plecat la cules şi ea merele din grădina vecinului.
have.3SG left at pick up.SUP and she apples.DEF from garden.DEF GEN

'She too left to pick up apples from the neighbour’s garden.'

Secondly, *pe*-Accusatives are possible and sometimes obligatory. For instance, *pe*-Accusatives necessarily occur with all indefinite pronouns ranging over humans. Since these *pe*-Accusatives are not clitic doubled, they are available in the prepositional supine clause:

(31) S-a ocupat de găsit pe cineva pentru orlele de engleză ale fiului său.
SE-have.3SG dealt DE find.SUP PE someone for
classes.DEF of English ART son.DEF GEN his/her

'He/she was in charge of finding someone for his/her son’s English classes.'

(32) Nu te apuca de promovat chiar pe oricine pe posturile astea.
not you.CL.REFL start DE promote.SUP right PE anyone on positions.DEF

'Don’t start promoting just anyone on these positions.'

The third restriction mentioned in Soare (2002) is that the Accusative in the supine construction should be lexical, rather than pronominal. This is indeed true only for personal pronouns which are not only obligatorily *pe*-marked, but also obligatorily clitic doubled in Romanian (33). In fact, it is pronominal clitics which cannot be hosted by the supine clause (34). The impossibility of the clitic entails the impossibility of personal pronouns, which must be clitic doubled.

(33) a. L-am convins pe el să meargă.
CL.3SG.M.ACC-have.1SG convinced PE he SĂ go.SUBJ.3SG

,'I have convinced him to go'
b. *Am convins pe el să meargă.
   have.1SG convinced PE he SĂ go.SUBJ.3SG

(34) *E greu de convins pe el să meargă.
   be.3SG hard DE convince.SUP PE he SĂ go.SUBJ.3SG

Other types of pronouns which are not both *pe-marked and clitic doubled, are expectedly available:

(35) a. M-am apucat de cumpărat/de spălat câte ceva de sărbători.
    me.CL.REFL-have.1SG started DE buy.SUP/DE wash.SUP something of holiday.PL.
    ‘I started to buy/to wash a few things for the holidays.’

b. S-a pus pe rezolvat mai multe decât putea să facă.
   SE-have.3SG set PE solve.SUP more than can.IMPF.3SG SĂ do.SUBJ.3SG
   ‘He set solving more than he could do.’

Summing up this discussion on the IA, there are no restrictions on the IA, except for the fact that pronominal Accusative clitics are not available. As a result, personal pronouns and possibly proper names, which are also doubled more often than not, do not occur in the supine clause. We claim, however that the supine assigns structural Accusative case, as apparent in examples of the following type, where the supine verb assigns Accusative to the subject of a small clause, not *θ-marked by the supine verb. It will be incumbent on us to account for the absence of clitics in the supine clause.

(36) Era imposibil de considerat [problema încheiată].
   be.IMPF.3SG impossible DE consider.SUP problem.DEF closed.F
   ‘It was impossible to consider this problem closed.’

4.2 Accusative case valuation in the supine clause: the double nature of the supine

A plausible account of case valuation in the supine clause ought to correlate several empirical facts.

a. The verbal supine must be introduced by a preposition. The preposition is either lexical (as in 37a) or, alternatively, it is the prepositional complementizer de. The complementizer de is very much like the English for in the English for-to construction, in as much as both are instrumental in case licensing an argument of the verb (though not the same argument, see below). As the ungrammaticality of (37c) shows, the preposition or the prepositional complementizer is obligatorily present.

(37) a. S-a dus la cules merele din livadă.
    SÉ-have.3SG gone at pick.SUP apples.DEF from orchard
    ‘He went to pick the apples in the orchard’
b. It is good to wash the laundry with soap.

(38) a. *E bine de şi cumpărat cartea cât se mai găseşte.
    be.3SG good DE also buy.SUP book.DEF while SE more find.3SG
    ‘He/she went there to pick up apples without delay’

b. The preposition immediately precedes the supine verb, no constituent may intervene between them, not even clitic adverbs. Thus, the clitic adverb şi (‘also’) is excluded in (38a).

c. It is thus a fact that all verbal supine constructions which license an Accusative internal argument must be introduced by a preposition. In contrast, in the nominal supine construction the supine is introduced by an article (most frequently the definite article) and the IA is in the Genitive case. Introductory prepositions are possible, but not obligatory:

(39) a. A mers acolo la cules mere.
    have.3SG gone there at pick.SUP apples
    ‘He/she went there to pick up apples’

b. A mers acolo la culesul grabnic al merelor.
    have.3SG gone there at pick.SUP.DEF quickly ART.GEN apples.DEF.GEN
    ‘He/she went there to pick up the apples without delay’

c. *Am mers acolo la culesul grabnic mere.
    have.3SG gone there at pick.SUP.DEF quickly apples

d. Culesul merelor îmi face plăcere.
    pick.SUP.DEF apples.DEF.GEN CL.1SG.DAT make.3SG pleasure
    ‘The picking of the apples gives me pleasure’

There is an unmistakable correlation between the presence of the preposition and the ability of licensing an Accusative IA. A legitimate question is why a preposition should be obligatory, when an Accusative argument is licensed. In principle, a preposition may serve one or more than one of the following functions. It may θ-mark a constituent, possibly in conjunction with the verb. Secondly, a preposition may value the case of a nominal constituent, since it is endowed with uninterpretable φ-features (and an interpretable Tense feature (Pesetsky/Torrego 2004, 2007)). In other words,
prepositions are predicative categories. Thirdly, traditionally, prepositions are selectors of nominal projections (i.e. they are [+\_N]); the preposition may indicate the presence of a nominal or nominalized constituent.

Hill (2002) explains the obligatory preposition in front of the supine clause in terms of the last property of the preposition mentioned above. Hill describes the supine as a defective (always) mixed [+N, +V] projection. The supine is never fully verbal, and its nominal feature is also defective, because the supine does not possess \(\phi\)-features. This turns the [+N] feature of the supine into an uninterpretable feature, in need of being valued and elided. In Hill’s interpretation, as a consequence of being [+V], the supine behaves like an active participle and is capable of assigning Accusative case. On the other hand, since the interpretable \(\phi\)-features are lacking, one must somehow identify and delete the uninterpretable [+aN] feature. As a result, the preposition is called for, acting as a nominalizer. In sum, in the interpretation of Hill (2002), the preposition is a means of valuing the [+aN]-feature of the verbal supine, the preposition being a nominalizer.

We share Hill’s (2002) view that the supine verb is somehow deficient, and that this is why the preposition is called for. We also agree that the supine resembles an active participle to an extent, in that it does not show agreement \(\phi\)-features. Observe the contrast between the supine and the active past participle (40a-b), in contrast with the passive past participle (40c), which is endowed with gender and number features:

(40)  

a. Consider problema de rezolvat urgent.  
consider.1SG problem.DEF DE solve.SUP urgently  
‘I consider that problem must be solved at once’

b. Au rezolvat problema urgent.  
have.3PL solved problem.DEF urgently  
‘They solved the problem at once.’

c. Consider problema deja rezolvată.  
consider.1SG problem.F.DEF already solved.F.SG  
‘I consider the problem already solved.’

While the supine is “like an active participle”, one should recall that in the compound tenses, where the active participle occurs (the compound perfect), the active participle assigns Accusative only in conjunction with the auxiliary verb. In all the other situations, it is the agreeing past participle that occurs and the IA turns into a subject of the past participle. The intuition we pursue is that the supine verb is “deficient” and can value a nominal’s case only if it is helped by a preposition. The supine is deficient precisely because of its unspecified, mixed verbal-nominal nature that all researchers have stressed.
Technically, one may assume that the supine’s mixed nature lies in the fact that its $\phi$-features (i.e. the $\phi$-features of the supine affix) are ‘unspecified’; they are neither verbal, that is, uninterpretable [u$\phi$], nor nominal, that is [i$\phi$], but they are simply [$\alpha$$\phi$-features]. It is the next functional category above the supine, with which the supine agrees, that determines the (un)interpretable nature of the supine’s $\phi$-features. When the supine is nominalized, it is the nominalizing suffix, light $n$, which provides interpretable features. The supine turns into a noun and licenses a determiner and a Genitive IA as in (39b, d). Unlike the nominalizer, the preposition is a „verbalizer”, since it is inherently endowed with uninterpretable $\phi$-features. As a consequence, the prepositional construction has verbal properties, licensing an Accusative case. As long as the supine remains [u$\phi$], it cannot match the [i$\phi$]-features of its IA. This forces the supine verb (phrase) to raise to a position where it can agree with the preposition that introduces it or with the prepositional complementizer $de$, so as to get the necessary [u$\phi$]-features from the preposition through Agreement, and thus be able to subsequently license its own IA. Assume that the preposition or the prepositional complementizer $de$ is specified as [+u$\phi$, -u$V$], while the supine verb is [u$\phi$, i$V$]. What happens is that the supine agrees with the preposition, getting from the latter the $u\phi$-specification it needs.

One might wonder why Romanian should have developed a verbal case assigning strategy precisely in prepositional contexts, replacing the Genitive by the Accusative only when the preposition is present (see in contrast examples 39 c and d, above). The answer is not far to seek. It is only in prepositional contexts that verbal nouns may occur without the definite article. It is known that in Romanian, unmodified definite nouns occur without the article if preceded by a preposition (compare on the table/pe masă). The absence of the article allows (re)interpreting the supine as a verb, which licenses an IA in the Accusative case.

In a sense, the IA is actually case-valued by the prepositional complementizer. But this raises a locality problem, since the closest DP to a complementizer is normally the EA (the subject) in Spec vP, rather than the IA, which is the complement of V. To solve this problem, one may capitalize on the fact that the verb raises to the highest inflectional projection in Romanian (see e.g. Dobrovie Sorin 1994) and propose that in the supine clause, as well as in other types of non-finite clauses, the raising verb moves inside the VP, dragging the IA with it. In other words, in certain non-finite clauses, there is VP movement, rather than V-movement. This is a manifestation of the Pied-Piping Parameter described a.o. in Roberts/Biberauer (2005). If the VP moves to the highest specifier position within the inflectional domain, the IA ends up being in a position above the subject in Spec vP, so that it is the IA that will be the Goal for the P+V-probe. We assume that there is (at least) one projection between the prepositional complementizer and the supine vP, namely a Tense/Aspect-Phrase.
Consider now the process of Case valuation inside a supine clause introduced by the prepositional complementizer *de*, taking stock of all that has been said so far. The supine phrase is attracted to the Spec AspP position, therefore to the Spec position, immediately below the prepositional complementizer *de*. The prepositional complementizer is provided with \([u,p, uV]-\)features and acts as a Probe in search of matching Goals. First, there is Agree between the complementizer *de* and the supine verb, triggered by the complementizer’s need to value its \([uV]-\)features. As a result, the supine verb becomes \([u,p, iV]\), assuming that through Agree the unspecified supine verb \([\alpha p]\) is specified as \([u,p]\). At this point, the supine verb can value the case feature of the IA, the \([i\phi]-\)features of the IA must match the \([u\phi]-\)features of the C-Sup chain. The case valuation configuration for an example like (41) below is the following:

(41) Au hotărât de achiziționat cărți pentru bibliotecă.
    have.3pl. decided de: buy.Sup books for library
    ’They have decided to buy books for the library.’

The analysis is similar, in case the supine clause is passive. Provisionally adopting the analysis of Collins (2005), the Passive Phrase is right above the vP, and headed by the preposition *de către* (‘by’), which assigns case to EA. The IA travels inside the lower VP and is case valued in the same manner as above. The functional structure of the passive clause is as suggested below. What is different, is that the EA argument will be overtly realized (instead of PRO), since its case is valued by the preposition *de către* (‘by’), as in (44) below.

(42)

(43) C > T/AspP > PassP > vP > SupP > VP
    de               de către   EA    -vT/-vS   v    IA
In prepositional supine constructions, the preposition has the same role as that of the prepositional complementizer de, i.e. the preposition provides the necessary $[\text{wp}]$-features for the supine verb, provided that the supine verb phrase raises to a sufficiently local position.

Verbal prepositional supines may be analyzed as CPs headed by a null complementizer. The latter hypothesis would allow one to accommodate a null Tense operator in C, mediating Tense and Control relations between the two clauses.

One must stress that, at least in languages like Romanian, prepositions often subcategorize verbal projections, so that the presence of a preposition does not necessarily indicate a nominal (little n) head and the occurrence of a CP after a preposition is not unusual. For instance prepositions often precede infinitives (47a), and even subjunctives with an adverbial role (47b, c):

(47) a. fără a mai spune asta
    without a more say this
One more remark is in order before closing the section on the syntax of the IA. It was shown above that an XP may intervene between the supine verb and its IA. This might seem at odds with the provision that the supine moves as a phrase including the object, the expectation being that the object is adjacent to the verb. However, this need not be so, if the adverb modifies the lexical VP, and we recall that the first step in the supine derivation is precisely the formation of the supine verb through verb movement. Phrasal movement is movement of the SupP (see above), and the supine verb may leave behind any adverb that adjoins to the internal lexical VP. Here is an example of a derivation containing an intervening adverb:

(48)  

\[
\text{S-a pus pe numărat repede toți banii câștigați.} \\
\text{S-he/she has set on quickly counting all the earned money.}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{vP} \\
& \quad \text{PRO} \quad \text{v'} \\
& \quad \text{v} \quad \text{SupP} \\
& \quad \text{Sup} \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad -(v)T \quad \text{AdvP} \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{repede} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{număra} \quad \text{toți banii câștigați}
\end{align*}
\]

b. \quad \text{vP}
In (48a), there is a basic supine \( v \P \), with the adverb left-adjointed to the lower lexical phrase. When the supine verb is formed, the \( V \)-head left adjoins to the supine head. As a result of the raising of the \( V \)-head, the adverb now intervenes between the supine \( V \) and its IA. Further movement is phrasal movement of the supine phrase.

In conclusion, the analysis we proposed accounts for several important properties of the verbal supine.

a. It accounts for the supine’s ability to value Accusative case (the P/C-\( V \) chain), even if it is deficient, lacking \( \varphi \)-features.

b. It explains why the preposition is obligatory. In this analysis, the supine clause contains no internal nominal projection (such as the nominalizing head in the nominal supine). The preposition or prepositional complementizer \( de \) provides “case assignment” abilities, that is, it provides the verb’s missing \( \varphi \)-features. The supine clause is deficiently verbal, and to that extent, it may be described as partly nominal.

5. Negation of the supine clause

A highly relevant problem for understanding the internal structure of the supine clause is negation. On the basis of the syntax of negative supines, it will be concluded that verbal supines are reduced clauses which lack not only (a) Person-Phrase(s) hosting clitics (Șăvescu Ciucivara 2011), but also an independent Tense-phrase. Tense is fused with Aspect in the supine clause, i.e. the [+Tense, -Agr] feature which licenses the PRO-subject is one of the features in the Aspect head. Given the complexity of clausal negation, it is appropriate to start by comparing negation in finite and non-finite clauses.

5.1 Typological properties of Romanian negation

In the typology proposed by Zeijlstra (2004), Romanian is a Negative Concord language (NCL), in the sense that two negations present in a sentence do not cancel each other, but yield one semantic negation. This is evident in the contrast between the Romanian (49a), which exhibits two negative constituents (\( nu \) ‘not’, \( nimeni \) ‘anyone,
nobody') and the English example (49b) below, which contains only one negative constituent (*not*), but the two sentences are semantically equivalent:

(49) a. Ion *nu* a telefonat nimănui.
    Ion not have.3SG telephoned anyone

b. John has *not* telephoned to anyone.

Furthermore, Romanian is a strict NCL, because even negative subjects preceding the verb must be licensed by a negative marker on the verb. In this, Romanian contrasts with non-strict NCLs, such as Italian, where a pre-verbal negative subject cannot co-occur with negative marking on the verb.

(50) a. Nimeni *nu* lucrează.
    nobody not work.3SG
    'Nobody is working.'

b. *Nimeni lucrează.
    nobody work.3SG

(51) a. Nesuno ha telefonato.
    nobody have.3SG called
    'Noone has called.'

b. *Nesuno non ha telefonato
    nobody not have.3SG called

Since, by assumption, the supine is a clausal construction, it is necessary to check whether the supine construction exhibits properties true of sentential negation, or whether the supine merely shows constituent or word negation. This question is particularly relevant in the case of the supine, since the negative marker of the supine clause is not the regular negative adverb *nu* (*'not'*), as in (50a) above, but it is the negative prefix *ne-* illustrated in a complementizer supine construction in (52a) and in a prepositional supine construction in (52b) below. We will argue that the negative prefix *ne-* is, in fact, a sentential negative marker (a clitic), when used in non-finite clauses, in particular, in the supine clause.

(52) a. Consider propunerea de *ne*acceptat.
    consider.1SG proposal.DEF DEF NEG-accept.SUP
    'I consider that the proposal CANNOT be accepted'

b. Se pricepe la nefăcut nimic.
    SE be good.3SG LA NEG-do.SUP anything
    'He/she is good at NOT doing anything'
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5.2. Negation in finite clauses

Previous work on Romanian (Dobrovie Sorin 1994; Cornilescu 1997; Avram 1999; Alboiu 2002; Isaac 2004) agrees on several points regarding the syntax of the Romanian clause. There is agreement on the fact that the functional domain of the verb includes (at least) the categories below, and there are characteristic heads which fill some of the different functional positions. Here are a few examples, mapped on this structure:

(53)  C > Mood P > Neg P > PersP > TP > AspP > vP > SupP/PrtP > VP

a. că să nu îl dăruiască ...
   să nu îl dăruiască ...

b. că să nu o fi repetat
   că să nu o fi repetat

c. că să în al dăruit
   că să în al dăruit

The hypothesized presence of a NegP is confirmed by Zeijlstra (2004), who claims that NCLs typically have pre-verbal negative markers, which are licensed in a negative phrase which is part of the functional domain of the verb and whose position may vary cross-linguistically.

The second generally accepted fact regarding Romanian verb syntax is that Negation is not only preverbal, but also above Tense, and there is reason to believe that the negative marker merges in the negative head and is interpreted there. From this point of view languages like Romanian contrast with Slavic languages, which are also NCLs with a negative phrase in their functional domain, but negation merges as adjoined to the verb and raises to its functional phrase position only at Logical Form (LF). Evidence for this contrast comes from the different interpretation of quantifiers which surface to the left of negation in Slavic vs. Romanian. In a Slavic language like Czech, the negative marker ne- is base-generated on the finite verb (cf. Zeijlstra 2004: 168), so that a quantifier like moc (‘much’) which precedes negation, remains under the scope of negation, as shown in the gloss and the translation of (54a), since negation raises past the quantifier to the Neg-phrase at LF. In Romanian, a clitic doubled quantifier, functioning as a direct object or indirect object and occurring in preverbal position must be understood out of the scope of negation, as apparent in the interpretation of (54b)
and (54c). For instance, sentence (54b) claims that the number of the cakes that I didn’t eat is large.

(54)   a. Milan moc nejedl.  
      Milan much NE.eat.PF  
      ‘Milan hasn’t eaten much.’  
      (Zeijlstra 2004: 168)  
  
     b. Multe prăjături nu le-am mâncat.  
      many cakes not CL.3PL.F-ACC-have.1SG eaten  
      ‘Many cakes I didn’t eat.’  
  
     c. Multora nu le-a dat ajutor.  
      many.DAT not CL.3PL.F-DAT-have.3SG given help  
      ‘To many he didn’t offer help’

However, if the object is merely pre-verbal, but not doubled by the clitic, the interpretation of the quantifier with respect to negation is ambiguous. It may be read inside negation, by reconstruction, as in (55a), or outside negation, given its surface position, as in (55b).

(55)   a. Multe nuci n-am mâncat, că nu mi-au plăcut.  
      many walnuts not-have.1SG eaten because not CL.1SG.DAT-have.3PL liked  
      ‘I haven’t eaten many walnuts, because I didn’t like them.’  
     
     b. Multe n-am înțeles, dar și multe am înțeles.  
      many not-have.1SG understood but also many have.1SG understood  
      ‘Many things I did not understand, but many I did.’

These data regarding the interpretation of doubled or non-doubled quantifiers can be accounted for if it is assumed that negation occupies its functional head position above Tense as early as it merges.

Thirdly, the syntax of the Romanian verb has unanimously been described as involving verb movement of the verbal head to the highest inflectional projection, which is the MoodP (it has been shown (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Cornilescu 2000, Alboiu 2002) that Romanian verbs do not raise to C, i.e. there are no residual verb second phenomena, unlike in Italian or French). The verb in its movement adjoins to the functional constituents, occupying the different functional heads, the result being a complex (functional) head. The order of the constituents in this complex derived head is indicative of the order of projections, which we assume to be as in (53). The negative marker nu (’not’) in particular is itself a head and enters this complex head formation process. The tensed verb adjoins to its right, as sketched in (56). The negative marker, nu (’not’) may be analyzed as a clitic, subcategorized for a (tensed) verb slot:
One characteristic property of Romanian is the existence of aspectual clitic adverbs (mai 'more, anymore', tot 'still, again', și 'also, already'), which cliticize on the verb as the verb raises through Aspect to Tense. Aspectual adverbs occur on the (finite) verb, lower than negation (57a, b) and lower than the subjunctive mood marker să. Examples (57c) and (57d) contrast in an interesting way: example (57c) contains the auxiliary fi ('be'), which marks the perfect subjunctive (AspP) and raises up to TP (as proposed in Dobrovie Sorin 1994). The auxiliary fi ('be') does not have agreement-features and does not raise further than Tense. In contrast, avea ('have') in the compound perfect clearly occurs higher than Tense, under PersonP, since it is highly inflected. Comparing now (57c) and (57d), it is apparent that mai ('more') cliticizes on the verb in Tense:

(57) a. Ion nu mai știa adevărul.
   Ion not more know.IMPF.3SG truth.DEF
   'Ion didn’t know the truth anymore.'

b. Ion să nu mai repete lecția.
   Ion SĂ not more repeat.SUBJ.3SG lesson.DEF
Given their aspectual interpretation, it is natural to assume that clitic adverbs merge as adjuncts to the Aspect Phrase. Clitic adverbs subcategorize a V-slot to their right and will move up and adjoin to the first verb that moves past them to the Tense position, as sketched below for the verb in (57a). A similar proposal regarding the final position of the clitic is made by Dobrovie Sorin (1994: 65), who proposes that adverbial clitics adjoin to Inflection (i.e. Tense).

(58) a.

```
T  AspP
  | [+past] AdvP AspP
  | mai Asp vP
V [-perf] stia
```

b.

```
T  AspP
  | Asp T AdvP AspP
  | V Asp [+past] mai AspP vP
Adv mai- stia
```

Only clitic adverbs have the distribution shown in (57). All other adverbs appear in post-verbal position or in initial position (i.e. they cannot „break” a complex head formed by verb movement).
(59) a. Ion nu (*atunci) știe adevărul atunci.
   Ion not then know.IMPF.3SG truth.DEF then
   'Ion didn’t know the truth by then.'

b. Ion să (*desecori) repete lecția deseori.
   Ion SĂ often repeat.SUBJ.3SG lesson.DEF often
   'Ion should repeat the lesson more often.'

c. Zilnic a (*zilnic) repetat lecția.
   daily have.3SG daily repeated lesson.DEF
   'Ion has repeated his lesson every day.'

Consider now the inversion structure in (60); it shows that mai (,more, anymore’) has cliticized on the past participle auzit (,heard’) under Tense, allowing the complex head mai auzit (,have you ever heard’) to invert with the auxiliary ai (,you have’). On the other hand, examples in (61) show that mai does not raise any higher than Tense. Thus, it is not possible to adjoin it to the auxiliary verb in (61b), assuming that the highly inflected auxiliary avea (,have’) is under the PersonP.

(60) Mai auzit-ai vreodată una ca asta?
   more heard-have.2SG ever one like this
   'Have you ever heard something like this?'

(61) a. Nu a mai venit.
   not have.3SG more come
   'He/she didn’t come anymore.'

b. *nu mai a venit
   not more have.3SG come

We have taken this detour into the syntax of clitic adverbs, since the clitic adverb mai interestingly combines with affixal negation in non-finite clauses, giving important clues regarding the internal syntax of non-finite clauses. Passing to the properties of sentential negation, the clausal negation nu (,not’) may license negative polarity items like para chioară (‘brass farthing’). Moreover, at least for negative raising verbs (e.g., a crede ‘believe’), negation in the main clause licenses polarity items in the subordinate clauses.

(62) a. Fără să muncească, Ion n-are para chioară.
   without SĂ work.SUBJ.3SG Ion not-have.3SG penny.DEF blind.F
   'Without working, Ion doesn’t have a brass farthing.'

b. *Fără să muncească, Ion are para chioară.
   without SĂ work.SUBJ.3SG Ion have.3SG penny.DEF blind.F
Furthermore, in Negative Concord Languages, negation on the verb licenses N-words. In contrast, a negative constituent in a sentence is not sufficient to permit N-words (e.g., nimeni (‘nobody’), nimic (‘nothing, anything’)). Thus nimic (‘nothing’), an N-word, is licensed by the clause mate sentential negative adverb nu (‘not’) on the verb, not by the negative adjunct neînvăţând (‘not learning’), which represents a different clause:

(64) a. Neînvăţând, Ion nu ştie nimic.
   not-learn.GER Ion not know.3SG nothing
   ‘Because he does not learn, Ion doesn’t know a thing.’

b. *Neînvăţând, Ion ştie nimic
   not-learn.GER Ion know.3SG nothing

It will be seen that negation in non-finite clauses, despite apparent differences, exhibits the same properties.

5.3. Negation in non-finite clauses

Negation in non-finite clauses is not homogenously realized. The infinitive clause uses the same negative marker nu (65a), while the gerundiu (present participle) (65b), the past participle (65c) and the supine (65d) use the affixal negation ne-.

(65) a. Dorea a nu fi văzut.
   wish.3SG A not be seen
   ‘He/she wished not to be seen.’

b. Ion nedorind să vină, trimise o scrisoare.
   Ion not-want.GER SĂ come.SUBJ.3SG send.PF.3SG a letter
   ‘Not wanting to come, Ion sent a letter.’

c. Am găsit rufele nespălate de trei zile.
   have.1SG found laundry.PL.DEF not-wash.PART.F.PL of three days
   ‘I have found laundry that has not been washed for three days.’

d. Ion este de negăsit de trei zile.
   Ion be.3SG DE not-find.SUP of three days
   ‘It has not been possible to find Ion for three days.’

The fact that negation is affixal, raises several problems:
i. what is the scope of ne-, is it phrasal or sentential?
ii. what are the consequences of the affixal status of ne-, i.e. where does it merge, how does it combine with the verb etc.?

We will turn to the properties of ne- in the supine clause, making reference to the other non-finite ne-moods only if a certain property cannot be (fully) illustrated by the supine. First, notice that the negative prefix ne- acts as a sentential negative marker. Thus, it is able to license negative polarity items (NPI) in the same clause, as well as in a lower clause. The NPIs para chioară (‘brass farthing’) and vreodată (‘ever’) are authorized by the negative prefix ne-.

(66) a. Neavând para chioară, trebuie să muncească to t mai not-have.GER penny.DEF blind.F must.3SG SĂ work.SUBJ.3SG still more mult. much
   ‘Not having a brass farthing, he/she must work even more.’
   b. Iată un adevăr de nespus vreodată cuiva. here’s a truth DE not-say.SUP ever anyone
   ‘Here’s a truth not to ever mention to anyone.’

Similarly affixal negation licenses N-words qualifying as clausal negation from this point of view as well.

(67) Se pricepe grozav la nefăcut nimic. SE be good.3SG awesome at not-do.SUP nothing
   ‘He/she is very good at not doing anything.’

The sentential negation status of ne- is also confirmed by some of Klima’s (1964) classical tests, such as the (not) even-tag test, or the too-either coordination test. Thus, in the negative gerund sentence (68a) nici măcar (‘not even’) is made possible by the verbal negation ne-. In contrast, in the affirmative gerund sentence (68b) it is the corresponding non-negative măcar (‘even’) that shows up. A similar pair, with a supine clause, is offered in (69). The too-either coordination test functions as expected: Ş nici (‘either’) is impossible in the affirmative gerund clause and felicitous in the negative one (examples in (70)). Therefore it may be tentatively concluded that ne- is a sentential negative marker.

(68) a. Nevenind nimeni, nici măcar Ion, nu s-a putut ține lecția not-come.GER noone not even Ion not SE-have.3SG could hold lesson.DEF
   ‘Noone having shown up, not even Ion, it was not possible to give the lesson.’
b. Venind o parte, (*nici) măcar Ion și Petre, se poate ține

\[ \text{lecția.} \]

\( \text{Some having shown up, at least Ion and Petre, the lesson can now be given.} \)

(69) a. S-a pus pe nesfăcut nimic, nici măcar patul dimineață.

\[ \text{SE-} \text{have.3SG put on} \text{ not-do.SUP} \text{ nothing not even bed.DEF} \text{ morning} \]

\'He/she has set on not doing anything, not even making his bed in the morning.'

b. S-a pus pe făcut câte ceva, (*nici) măcar patul dimineață.

\[ \text{SE-} \text{have.3SG put on do.SUP} \text{ some} \text{ not even bed.DEF} \text{ morning} \]

\'He/she has set on doing something, at least making his bed in the morning.'

(70) a. Lui Ion neplăcându-i supa, și nici lui Petre,

\[ \text{ART.DAT} \text{Ion not-like.GER-CL.3SG.DAT} \text{ soup.DEF} \text{ and neither ART.DAT} \text{ Petre not-have.3PL eaten only course.DEF two} \]

\'Ion disliking the soup, as well as Petre, they only ate the second course.'

b. Lui Ion plăcându-i fetele Mariei, și (*nici) lui

\[ \text{ART.DAT} \text{Ion like.GER-CL.3SG.DAT girls.DEF Mary.DAT and neither ART.DAT} \text{ Petre la fel, între ei s-a născut o rivalitate.} \text{SE-} \text{have.3SG born a rivalry} \]

\'Ion liking Mary’s girls and Petre, too, there was a rivalry born between them.'

On the syntax of ne-

The problem we address at this point is whether ne- directly merges on the verb, as a head adjunct, or whether it merges under the negative head, spelling out an interpretable negative feature, just as nu does. Using Zeijlstra’s (2004) test for determining the initial position of the negative marker, it may be shown that the negation ne- merges under the negative head and is attached to the verbal head during the derivation. Thus, for the negation ne- just as for the negation nu, quantifiers preceding ne- outscope it:

(71) a. Multe cărți nu au fost expediate la timp.

\[ \text{many books not have.3PL been sent.F.PL at time} \]

\'Many books have not been sent in time.'

\[ \text{multe > nu} \]

b. multe cărți nefiind expediate la timp

\[ \text{many books not-be.GER sent.F.PL at time} \]

\'many books not being sent in time’

\[ \text{multe > ne-} \]
We tentatively conclude that *ne*- has the same merge position as *nu* (‘not’); both merge under the Neg head and realize an interpretable negative feature. As shown in the Accusative assignment section, the key to the proper understanding of the syntax of the *ne*-moods (past participle, *gerunziu* and supine clauses) is the fact that they entail *verb phrase movement* rather than verb movement, this being a manifestation of the Pied Piping Parameter discussed a.o. in Roberts/Bieberauer (2005).

Assuming that *ne*- is a spell-out of the Neg head and assuming that adjunction is always to the left (see Kayne 1994), it follows that the negative supine does not represent an instance of head-movement of the verb to negation (since the verb raises as a VP, not as a head), but a movement of the affixal negation *ne*- to the verb, at the point when the VP has reached a suitable higher position. If it is correct that the supine verb moves as a VP, or rather as a SupP, and that there is a NegP headed by *ne*-, at some point the following configuration is reached:

(72) a. *(E important) de ne(mai)spus nimic (nimănui despre asta)*
   it is important not to tell anyone anything (anymore) about it

   b.                     NegP
        SupP               Neg'
        Sup              VP     Neg     TP……...
        V         Sup    V         DP
    spun-              -S  *spun*  nimic

(73)

   NegP
        SupP               Neg'
        Sup              VP     Neg     TP
        V         Sup    V         -S
    ne-              spun-  nimic  ne

    Neg    V
    ne-    spun-
A natural hypothesis is to assume that the negative prefix must satisfy its subcategorization properties as early as possible and will thus left-adjoin to the V, as shown in (72).

**On the attachment of mai.** One final empirical problem is the “prefixation” of the aspectual adverb *mai* (‘more, anymore’) between the negation and the verb, as in the examples below illustrating all of the *ne*-moods:

(74)  

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>nemaivenind</td>
<td>nimeni</td>
<td>not-anymore-come.GER</td>
<td>noone</td>
<td>‘noone else having come’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>un spectacol de nemaivăzut</td>
<td>a doua oară</td>
<td>a show DE not-more-see.SUP ART second time</td>
<td>‘a show which shouldn’t be seen a second time’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>o primadonă nemaiauzită</td>
<td>vreo dată în România</td>
<td>a primadonna not-more-heard.F.SG ever in Romania</td>
<td>‘a primadonna who was not ever heard in Romania before.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In supine clauses, *mai* (‘more, anymore’) is the only clitic adverb that has this property, *tot* (‘still, again, repeatedly’), *şi* (‘also, already’) etc. being excluded:

(75)  

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>A tot venit.</td>
<td>have.3SG repeatedly come</td>
<td>‘He/she repeatedly came.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a’.</td>
<td>*netotvenind</td>
<td>not-repeatedly-come.GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>a mai venit</td>
<td>have.3SG more come</td>
<td>‘he/she has come again’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b’.</td>
<td>nemaivenind</td>
<td>not-more-come.GER</td>
<td>‘not coming anymore’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the more puzzling fact is that while *mai* may cliticize on a negated supine or past participle, it may not cliticize on their non-negated counterparts:

(76)  

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>*un spectacol de maivăzut a doua oară</td>
<td>a show DE more-see.SUP ART second time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*o primadonă maiauzită</td>
<td>a primadonna more-heard.F.SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the null hypothesis that the syntax of *mai* is the same in finite and non-finite clauses, the attachment of *mai* should be similar to the attachment of *ne*-.. It should be possible to cliticize *mai* on the verb in the following configuration, assuming again that the VP/SupP moves to Spec T from Spec Asp as below:

(77)  

Yet, the cliticization of *mai* ("more, anymore") is illicit if not followed by the attachment of the negative head, and there is no non-adhoc way of guaranteeing that negation will merge on top of TP.

The solution that we propose capitalizes on the strict ordering of the functional projection specified in (53) and on the intuition that non-finite clauses are or may be "smaller" than finite ones, since some of the projections are fused (syncretic) or missing. Consider the sequence of functional projections of the Romanian clause once again, trying to determine which heads are projected in the supine clause, since there is lexical material to fill them:

(78)  

While the supine morpheme has an aspectual interpretation and the supine VP must be assumed to raise at least as far as the AspP, and while evidence has been presented for the existence of a NegP, headed by *ne*-, there is no verbal morphology that specifically identifies a TenseP or PersonP. Since pronominal clitics are absent from the supine clause, it is natural to assume that there is no PersonP in this type of construction. The absence of a PersonP is also compatible with the impossibility of an overt Nominative subject, as shown above. However, the supine clause has Tense features, derivable from the semantics of the matrix verb in conjunction with the aspectual properties of the
We propose, that while conceptually required, in the supine clauses the TenseP is fused with the AspP. Such a proposal is backed up by the fact that Romanian, like other Romance languages (cf. de Swart 1998 for French), disposes of syncretic Tense/Aspect morphemes. For instance, the Romanian Imperfect morpheme -au in ei cântau (‘they were singing’) is [-perfective, +past, +3Pl]. The supine clause is thus a small(er) clause:

(79)  C > MP > Neg P > T/AspP > vP > SupP > VP
   de  ?  ne-  -(v)T...  -(v)T...

If the functional structure of the supine is as in (79) above, then it is immediately apparent why mai occurs only in negative clauses. Recall that in finite clauses mai moves up and adjoints to the V-head in the projection above Aspect. But clearly if there is no NegP, the supine verb does not raise further than the T/AspP and there is “no room” for mai-cliticization.

Before illustrating the attachment of mai to the verb in the supine clause, one should also understand why the other clitic adverbs do not attach to non-finite forms. Notice that in finite sentences adverbial clitics form clusters and that their order is semantically conditioned; in particular, some of the clitic (clusters) are infelicitous with negation. Given this, it is likely that the other clitic adverbs are simply filtered away from the (negative) supine clause for semantic reasons. From a syntactic perspective, adverbial clitics are reliable identifiers of an independent Tense projection; in the absence of a Tense projection the distribution of adverbial clitics is restricted.

(80)  a. Au mai tot venit.
      have.3pl. more still come
      ‘More people have still been coming.’
   b. Au mai și plecat târziu.
      have.3pl. more also left late
      ‘Moreover, some also left later.’
   c. Tot mai ploua.
      still more rain.IMPF.3SG
      ‘It was still raining.’

The insertion of mai between ne- and the supine verb suggests that ne- is itself a negative adverbial clitic rather than a prefix, so that ne- and mai form a clitic cluster successively adjoining to the verb. The rigid order in which they occur reflects locality

---

8 For the view that non-finite clauses may be interpreted as having Tense, see for instance Stowell (1993, 2004), Landau (2000), Comulescu (2004) etc..
constraints. Mai (‘more’), which is the head of a lower adjunct, attaches first, followed by ne-.

(81)  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>e imposibil de nemaIspus nimic nimănui despre asta de modificat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NegP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SupP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>ne-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>mai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectedly, the gerund clause is different, allowing clitic adverbs to cliticize in the affirmative, as well.

(82)  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Tot venind pe la ei, a aflat adevarul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>still come.GER at they.ACC have.3SG learned truth.DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Still visiting them frequently, he/she found out the truth.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Mai mergând pe la opera, ai invăţat muzică.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more go.GER to opera AUX.COND.2SG learn music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘If you went more often to the opera, you would learn music.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is in line with the fact that the gerund disposes of at least one more projection (say a TP or/and a PersonP), as clearly shown by the fact that pronominal clitics and Nominative subjects are both available in the gerund clause, but not in the supine clause.

In conclusion, the discussion of clitic adverbs led to the result that the supine has a reduced functional structure, in as much as it lacks a Person Phrase, as well as an independent Tense Phrase. Tense and Aspect form a syncretic head. The only projections below the CP are the optional negation phrase, a possible Mood Phrase (MP, but see below) and the obligatory Tense/Aspect-projection.
6. Tense in the supine clause

It has been shown above that the supine clause has a reduced functional structure, including only a fused Tense/Aspect-projection between the complementizer de and the vP. Since there is no independent Tense morpheme and the only overt supine morpheme is aspectual, with respect to the temporal interpretation, the supine clause follows the pattern of tenseless clauses (Ritter/Wiltschko 2011). This means that the temporal interpretation of the supine clause is derived from its aspectual potential, and a Tense-feature, when present, is valued by the matrix predicate. Since the supine is *aspectually imperfective*, when the supine clause is valued for tense, it denotes a *time different from that of the main clause*, moreover a future (or present) time sphere, *since past interpretations are conveyed by perfect aspect*.

The futurity of the supine has long been noticed and we claim that it is inferred from the imperfectivity of the supine. Futurity characterizes both prepositional supine constructions and de-complementizer ones.

(83) a. A plecat la cumpărăt cărămizi.
    have.3SG gone to buy.SUP bricks
   „He/she went to buy bricks.”

b. S-a pus pe învăță tineaza.
   SE-have.3SG set on learn.SUP Chinese.DEF
   „He/she set about to learn Chinese.”

c. Curăță cea ce e imposibil de curățat.
   clean.3SG what be.3SG impossible DE clean.SUP
   „It cleans what seems impossible to clean.”

On the other hand, not all verbs select tensed complements, as recently shown in Cotfas’s (2012) analysis. There are also main verbs, which select tenseless supine complements, i.e. complements that merely copy the Tense feature of the main clause. A case in point is that of aspectual verbs:

(84) Am terminat de citit cartea.
    have.1SG finished DE read.SUP book.DEF
   „I have finished reading the book.”
   (= I have read the book.)

(85) Voi termina de citit cartea până mâine seară.
    AUX finish DE read.SUP book.DEF until tomorrow evening
   „I will finish reading the book by tomorrow evening.”
   (= I will have read the book by tomorrow evening.)

---

9 For the similarity between perfect aspect and past and imperfect aspect and present or future, see Demirdache/Uribe-Etxebarria (2000), Ritter & Wiltschko 2012 a.o.

10 Cl–closser slogan
We have thus distinguished two situations regarding the temporal interpretation of the supine. The by far most frequent situation in terms of its distribution is for the supine tense feature to be distinct from the main clause tense feature and to be valued as future, in line with the imperfectivity of the supine.

(86) I-a fost imposibil de spus adevărul
CL.3SG.DAT-have.3SG be.IMPF.3SG impossible DE tell.SUP truth.DEF
,It was impossible to him/her to tell the truth’

At a closer inspection, the interpretation of the supine should be characterized as irrealis future, an interpretation equivalent with that of the infinitive and the subjunctive. One question that may arise is whether the specific temporal interpretation of the supine clause is induced by the main verb which values the tense feature, or whether it derives from the aspectual meaning of the supine. A tentative answer to this question comes from relative clauses, whose nominal head does not contain a Tense phrase. The interpretation of supine relative clauses is homogenously future or generic, both readings naturally deriving from the (modal) aspectual properties of the supine.

(87) a. Aceasta este / va fi / a fost o mașină de scris. (generic)
this be.3SG / AUX.3SG be / have.3SG been a machine DE write.SUP
,This is/will be/has been a type-writer.’

b. texte de tradus acum/mâine/*ieri de către toți elevii (future)
texts DE translate.SUP now/tomorrow/yesterday by all students.DEF
,texts to be translated tomorrow by all the students’

In supine relatives, the head noun cannot transmit any particular Tense feature to the complementizer of the relative clause, so futurity is inferred clause internally. When the embedding predicate is verbal, it syntactically c-selects a supine, without imposing any further temporal requirements. On the contrary, it is the supine which limits the supine-expressible complements of a predicate to those that are future-oriented. Compare again the subjunctive and the supine from this point of view. As (88b) shows, the supine may not be used to express anteriority to the main clause, unlike the subjunctive:

(88) a. Este imposibil de spus asta mâine să spunem asta mâine.
be.3SG impossible DE say.SUP this tomorrow / SĂ say.IPL this tomorrow
,It is impossible to say this tomorrow.’

b. Este imposibil să fi spus asta ieri / *de spus asta ieri.
be.3SG impossible SĂ be said this yesterday / DE say.SUP this yesterday
,It is impossible to have said this yesterday.’
Tensed supines are independent, showing no restrictions imposed by the main verb, appearing, however, only if future or simultaneous readings are called for. The configuration of tensed subjunctives is as follows:

(89)

\[ \text{V'} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{T/AspP} \]
\[ [\+\text{Tense}] \quad \text{(Future)} \]
\[ [-\text{Agr}] \]
\[ [-\text{Perf}] \]

The second, less frequent situation, is that, due to the nature of the main verb, the supine clause is tenseless. The Tense-feature of the main clause is simply copied onto the Tense/Aspect-head of the embedded clause.

(90) a. Ion termină de citit. ⇒ Ion citește.
Ion finish.3SG DE read.SUP 'Ion finishes reading.'
Ion read.3SG 'Ion is reading.'

b. Ion va termina de citit ⇒ Ion va citi.
Ion AUX.3SG finish DE read.SUP 'Ion will finish reading.'
Ion AUX.3SG read 'Ion will read.'

c. Ion a terminat de citit ⇒ Ion a citit.
Ion have.3SG finished DE read.SUP 'Ion finished reading.'
Ion have.3SG read 'Ion read.'

In such cases, the supine clause lacks a Tense feature, and, in the interpretation of Landau (2004), Spyropoulos (2007), Cotfas (2012), the supine Tense feature is anaphoric and specified as such through the complementizer head, in the following configuration:

(91)

\[ \text{V'} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{T/AspP} \]
\[ [-\text{T}] \]
\[ \text{T/Asp} \quad \text{vP} \]
\[ \text{de} \]
\[ [-\text{T}] \]
\[ [-\text{Agr}] \]
\[ [-\text{Perf}] \]
In other words, aspectual verbs like *a continua*, *a termina* (‘continue’, ‘finish’) *select complements with anaphoric tense*, therefore *untensed complements*. The selected head C of the complement clause is marked as [-T] and this feature is copied on the Tense/Aspect-head. On the main clause cycle, the event is simply simultaneous with the main clause one, and the latter can be present, past, future, as shown in the examples in (90).

7. Modality
Examined as a non-finite mood of Romanian, the supine shows considerable semantic versatility. Its interpretation varies from contexts where it is simply paraphrasable by the subjunctive or the infinitive (with no other lexical modal operator required), and situations where it clearly expresses circumstantial and deontic modality, so that in paraphrasing the supine, some lexical modal verb is also required. Compare:

(92) a. Suntem dornici de pleca / (de) a pleca / să plecăm.
   are eager.PL DE leave.SUP /DE A leave / SĂ leave.1PL
   ‘We are eager to leave.’
   b. carte de citit până mâine
   book DE read.SUP until tomorrow
   ‘a book which *must* be read by tomorrow’

One context that is always modal in the „strong sense” is that of relative clauses. Thus Giurgea/Soare (2010: 68) show that generally modal non-finite relatives in Romance (= Romanian supine relatives) express *deontic necessity* and are possibly combined with adverbs like *neapărat* (‘no matter what, at all costs’):

(93) cărţi de citit neapărat
   books DE read.SUP no matter what
   ‘books to definitely read’

The feeling that the supine expresses deontic necessity is reinforced by the fact that this is the interpretation that obtains with the most frequent supine selecting verbs *a avea* (‘have’), *a fi* (‘be’). This is also the case for German, employing the verbs *haben* (‘have’) and *sein* (‘be’) with the infinitive (94b, 95b), which render the same interpretation:

(94) a. Ce e de făcut?
   what be.3SG DE do.SUP
   ‘What’s to be done?’
   b. Was ist zu tun?
   what be.3SG to do
What’s to be done?’

(95) a. Am de scris o lucrare.
   have.1SG DE write.SUP a paper
   ‘I have to write a paper.’

b. Ich habe ein Papier zu schreiben.
   I have.1SG a paper to write
   ‘I have to write a paper.’

Another frequent circumstantial modal interpretation compatible with the future orientation of the supine is that of teleological potentiality (= something you can/should do to achieve a certain goal), as in the example below (see also Giurgea/Soare 2010: 68):

(96) Ai adus ceva de citit pe drum?
   have.2SG brought something DE read.SUP on way
   ‘Did you bring something to read on the way?’

In this discussion, we focus only on the contrast between contexts where the supine is not the equivalent of the subjunctive or the infinitive, because it expresses a more specific form of circumstantial, deontic modality, and contexts where it is the equivalent of the subjunctive and of the infinitive. The equivalence of the three forms is also insisted upon in Joseph (1983), who describes the supine as one of the non-finite forms with infinitival function (Joseph 1983: 161, 170-173). 11

We will assume that the supine like the infinitive and the subjunctive realizes a more abstract propositional modality, which, following descriptions current in the literature, may provisionally be described as irrealis (future) (Quer 1998), or as unrealized (Hoekstra/Hyams 1998), or as non-assertive (Quirk et al. 1972).

Deriving the modal interpretation
While the modal meanings expressed by the subjunctive, the infinitive and the supine are often equivalent, these meanings are compositionally derived from different syntactic structures. The hypothesis that we entertain is that the regular modal interpretation of the supine is also always derived from its imperfective aspectual meaning.

Imperfective forms have long been shown to be modal, necessarily making reference to possible worlds for evaluation (Dowty 1979; Cipria/Roberts 2000; Villalta 2008 etc.).

11 „The supine is infinitive-like in some ways - it is nonfinite and has “infinitival” functions, […] it seems best to regard the supine not as a new infinitive in the language, but as a parallel member of the nonfinite category which includes the infinitive.” (Joseph 1983: 170)
The earliest statement to this effect is Dowty’s imperfective paradox (1979: 148), discussed with respect to the English progressive and made visible in the following type of examples involving accomplishments:

(97) a. Jack London was building a house at the time of his death.
    b. Jack London construa o casă când a murit.

According to Dowty, the event of building the house, which is incomplete in the real world, comes to fulfilment in all of the „inertia worlds” determined by the context world. Inertia worlds are to be thought of as worlds which are exactly like the context world up to the time of the event, and in which the future course of events after this time develops in ways most compatible with the past course of events. Informally, inertia worlds are minimally different from the real one, varying only with respect to the fact that in the inertia worlds the event comes to completion and the house being built actually comes into being.

Unlike the Romanian imperfect or the progressive, which may appear in root sentences, the supine clause is always dependent, and which worlds count as „inertia worlds” or worlds of evaluation for the supine is the semantic contribution of the embedding predicate, as has been known ever since Hintikka (1974) and especially Kratzer (1991). It is Kratzer (1991) who first insists on the idea that there are several parameters of modality interpretation, the modal base being only one of them. The meaning of a propositional modality is determined by at least the following parameters: i. the modal base, ii. the ordering source, iii. the strength of the modal quantifiers (i.e. whether the modal quantifier is existential or universal).

The hypothesis we adopt is that the apparently very different interpretations of the supine modality may be understood as variations in the parameters of modality, strictly determined by the semantics of the embedding predicate. The most relevant divide is between „subjunctive interpretations” (the supine is interpreted using the same verb in the subjunctive) and „non-subjunctive interpretations”, where a lexical modal operator

---

12 Dowty (1979: 148):
Inr (I, w) = set of inertia worlds for w and interval I
[Prog φ] is true at <I, w> iff for some interval I' s.t. I ⊆ I' and I is not a final subinterval for I', and for all w' such that w' ∈ Inr (I,w), φ is true at <I', w'>
Let us examine the subjunctive interpretation of the supine first. From a distributional point of view (as will also appear below), the supine occurs with a subset of the predicates that allow the subjunctive, whether they are verbs, adjectives or nouns:

\[(\text{99})\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Merită } \text{de spus } \text{adevărul.} \\
& \text{to be worth.3SG DE tell.SUP truth.DEF} \\
& \text{‘It is worth telling the truth.’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Merită } & \text{să se spună } \text{adevărul.} \\
& \text{to be worth.3SG SĂ SE tell.SUBJ.3SG truth.DEF} \\
& \text{‘It is worth telling the truth.’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. E important } & \text{de spus } \text{adevărul.} \\
& \text{be.3SG important DE tell.SUP truth.DEF} \\
& \text{‘It is important for the truth to be known.’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. E important } & \text{să se spună } \text{adevărul.} \\
& \text{be.3SG important SĂ SE tell.SUBJ.3SG truth.DEF} \\
& \text{‘It is important that the truth should be known.’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{e. dorinţa } & \text{de plecat } \text{de aici} \\
& \text{desire.DEF of go.DEF from.DEF}
\end{align*}
\]
Given this distribution, one can extend, at least partly, to the supine embedding verbs
the semantic characterization of the subjunctive embedding verbs. The most salient
attribute of subjunctive embedding predicates is that in their case, the evaluation of the
complement clause requires not only a modal base, but also an ordering source. As
shown by Farkas (1992), subjunctive embedding predicates are strong intensional
predicates, making implicit reference to ideals. As known, the modal base is the set of
evaluation worlds for the complement clause, determined by the main verb. Thus, a
doxastic modal operator like believe or consider introduces into the discourse a set of
possible worlds compatible with what the speaker believes. In those worlds, all of the
speaker’s beliefs are true, i.e. in an example like Tom believes that Bill is guilty, the
proposition Bill is guilty is true in all of the doxastic alternatives introduced by the main
verb believe. Modal bases are not sufficient to account for the difference between
indicative selectors and subjunctive/infinitive/supine selectors. A particularly salient
ingredient of modality is that it may have a strong normative component. People reason
function of ideals which represent perfect behaviour, the realization of all one’s wishes
etc. This is typically the case of lexical modal operators like desire, good, bad etc. Such
modal operators not only introduce a set of alternatives, but also order them function of
how close they come to the envisaged ideals. Modal judgements of this type imply not
only a modal base (a set of alternative worlds), but also an ordering source, i.e. a set of
principles/propositions imposing an ordering among the considered alternatives. Worlds
in the modal base are ordered according to how many propositions in the ordering
source (in the ideal) they realise, i.e. how close they get to the ideal. Complement
propositions count as true in all those worlds which best fulfil the ideals.

An interesting proposal regarding the semantics of the subjunctive is due to Villalta
(2008), based on a semantics of comparison. The main generalization proposed is that a
predicate selects the subjunctive mood in its embedded proposition, if the proposition is
compared to its contextual alternatives on a scale introduced by the predicate. Villalta
(2008: 481) argues that a complement proposition $p$ appears in the subjunctive mood
“iff the matrix predicate introduces an ordering relation between propositions and
compares $p$ to its contextually available alternatives”. As to the contribution of the
subjunctive mood itself, Villalta (2008: 502) claims that it is an operator that has IP
scope, whose role is “to evaluate the alternatives for the matrix predicate”. Thus, certain
predicates require the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause, just because “they
require the presence of a set of contextual alternatives to the embedded proposition”
(Villalta 2008: 504), ordered along a gradable scale introduced by the main verb. Depending on the ordering source, the alternatives are part of doxastic sets, of desire-sets etc.

Let us consider a few semantic subtypes of predicates that select the subjunctive, as well as the supine, to illustrate Villalta’s proposal. The first group is that of evaluative predicates, primarily adjectives like bun (‘good’), rău (‘bad’), important (‘important’), esențial (‘essential’), vital (‘important’) etc., for which it is very intuitive to consider that they introduce contextual alternatives (i.e. possible worlds), ordered according to how well they satisfy particular contextual goals (viewed as „ideals“):

(100) a. 3SG good / difficult / easy / important to tell the truth.
   ‘It is good/difficult/easy/important to tell the truth.’

b. 3SG good / possible to tell the truth.
   ‘It is good for the truth to be told.’

A second important group is that of modal predicates expressing likelihood (necesar „necessary”, posibil „possible”, probabil „probable”)

(101) a. Este necesar / possible to say that.
   ‘It is necessary / possible to say that.’

b. Este necesar / possible to say that.
   ‘It is necessary / possible to say that.’

Such predicates are associated with likelihood scales of comparative possibility. The likelihood scale in such cases is based on closeness to the actual world. There may be variation regarding the ranking of the propositions among the contextual alternatives. For example in the case of possible, the requirement would be that p is not the best alternative.

Directive (exercitive) predicates (a da „give”, a ordona „order”, a comanda „order”, a cere „ask”, a impune „impose” etc.) are associated with a specific ordering source, which Villalta (2008: 483) labels the addressee’s To-do list. A To-do list is a set of propositions that the participants intend to make true. Imperative sentences are used to make requirements, i.e. to add a proposition to someone’s To-do list. Directive predicates make reference to this To-do list:

(102) a. I-a dat / cerut / ordonat de scris scrisoarea.
He/she has given/asked/ordered (him/her) to write the letter.

He/she has given/asked/ordered SĂ write.3SG letter.DEF

In conclusion, whenever the embedding predicate is one which introduces an ordering source and thus an evaluation of the contextual alternatives along some scale, the supine has a subjunctive interpretation, i.e. it can be paraphrased by a subjunctive.

Let us turn to the non-subjunctive interpretations now, illustrated in examples of type (103) below.

(103) a. Consider problema de rezolvat până mâine neapărat.
    consider.1SG problem.DEF DE solve.SUP until tomorrow necessarily
    ‘I consider that the problem should be necessarily solved before tomorrow.’

b. carte de citit neapărat până mâine
    book DE read.SUP necessarily until tomorrow
    ‘book to necessarily read by tomorrow’

Sentences (103a, b) differ with respect of their temporal interpretation, since complements of raising verbs like consider are [-Tense] (see Pesetsky complementation), while relative clauses have the usual future interpretation. Beyond this difference, examples in (102) are similar in their modal meaning, since no ordering source is required, as will be seen.

Recall that the supine, through its imperfectivity, introduces a set of alternatives, Dowty’s inertia worlds (1979), where the event comes to fulfilment. While subjunctive embedding predicates impose ordering relations on the contextual alternatives introduced by the supine, epistemic verbs (like consider), as well as non-modal heads (like book), do not impose any ordering relation, with the result that the complement clause is supposed to be true, in all of the evaluation worlds in the modal base. The result is that the supine modality is interpreted as a universal quantifier, equivalent with verbs like must, be obliged etc. Notice that adverbs like neapărat, obligatoriu (both: ‘necessarily’) etc., which are universal quantifiers themselves, are often called for in the supine clause. Thus, sentence (103a) is true, only if the problem is solved by tomorrow in all of the worlds introduced by consider. This explains the similarity between (103a) and (104a), as well as between (103b) and (104b), where the examples under (104) include an overt universal deontic modal.

(104) a. Consider că problema trebuie rezolvată până mâine.
consider.1SG that problem.DEF must solved.F until tomorrow
'I consider that the problem should be solved before tomorrow.'

b. carte, care trebuie citită neapărat până mâine
book that must read.F necessarily until tomorrow
'a book, that must be necessarily read by tomorrow'

Strong evidence that the supine modality is a universal quantifier comes from negation, in examples like:

(105) a. Consider problema de nerezolvat până mâine.
    consider.1SG problem.DEF DE not-solve.Sup until tomorrow
    'I consider that the problem cannot be solved by tomorrow.'
    reading: In all possible worlds the problem is not solved by tomorrow, i.e. there is no possible world in which the problem is solved. ('It is impossible to solve it by tomorrow.')

b. carte de necitit până mâine
    book DE not-read.Sup until tomorrow
    'a book which cannot be read by tomorrow'
    reading: In all relevant possible worlds the book is not read by tomorrow, i.e. there is no world in which it is read, therefore it is impossible for the book to be read by tomorrow.

A variant of the universal interpretation is offered by the generic operator, a frequent realization of imperfective modality, as in the following example:

(106) carte de citit
    book DE read.Sup
    'book to read'

This very sketchy and incomplete presentation of the modal interpretation of the supine, throws light on the two factors which determine the modality of complementizer de-supine clauses: In the first place, what is essential is the imperfective aspect of the supine which determines its modal, intensional reading. Secondly, the semantics of the main verb also contributes a lot towards specifying the modal interpretation of the supine clause. At least one relevant difference we have established is that between predicates which require the interpretation of the complement clause with respect to both a modal base and an ordering source (e.g., evaluative predicates, directive predicates) and predicates which do not imply ordering sources (e.g., epistemic predicates). Supine complements of verbs that require ordering sources have subjunctive interpretations; the supine clause is equivalent with a subjunctive clause and has an irrealis future interpretation. Supine complements subordinate to epistemic verbs
or to nouns have more specific circumstantial modal readings (deontic necessity, teleological modality). No special Mood projection seems to be required. Concluding, the functional structure of supine de-clauses is minimal, including the following projections:

(107) C > Neg > Tense/Aspect > vP > SupP > VP

8. Conclusions

(i) This paper has focused on supine clauses introduced by the complementizer de. The complementizer de has been characterized as a functional preposition (similar to the English for in the infinitive for-to construction). The preposition de is instrumental in valuing the case feature of nominal arguments. Given that the complementizer de is a preposition, the internal structure of the complementizer de-supine is similar to that of prepositional supines: prepositional supines are headed by lexical prepositions and are likely to have a null complementizer. The analysis above, and therefore, its conclusions, characterize both the prepositional supines and the complementizer de-supine, even if reference is made mostly to the complementizer de-supine.

A detailed analysis of the supines introduced by the complementizer de has shown that they have a reduced functional structure, consisting of the following ordered projections:

(108) CP > (NegP) > T/AspP > (PassP) > vP > SupP > VP

In our analysis, all the properties of the supine clause have been derived from the properties of the supine morpheme. The homonymy of the supine and the participle is not accidental, since they are both aspectual morphemes. As aspectual morphemes, the past participle and the supine contrast with respect to perfectivity, as shown by minimal pairs of the following type:

(109) carte citită : carte de citit  
book read,PART.F book DE read,SUP  
’a read book’ ‘a book to read’

The past participle is [+perfective], the supine is [-perfective]. The participle is bounded, possibly resultative, the supine is unbounded (undetermined and unrealized). The supine’s grammatical aspect feature is checked in the Aspect Phrase right above the lexical vP. All supine constructions (nominal or verbal) include a grammatical aspect phrase.

(ii). In the history of Romanian, the supine started out as a nominal construction licensing a Genitive IA, as in (110a). The supine subsequently developed (more) verbal
abilities, namely, the ability to license an IA in the Accusative case, *provided that the supine verb is immediately preceded by a preposition.*

(110) a. Aflarea adevărului îl preocupă de mult.

find out.INF.DEF truth.GEN.DEF CL.3SG.M.ACC preoccupy.3SG for long

'The finding out of the truth has preoccupied him for a long time.'

b. Uneori e greu de aflat adevărul.

sometimes be.3SG hard DE find out.SUP truth.GEN.DEF

'Sometimes it is difficult to find out the truth.'

Our problem was to account for the *alternating* nominal versus verbal behavior of the supine, as well as for the obligatory presence of the preposition when the supine is verbal and takes an Accusative IA. In our interpretation the supine never becomes fully verbal, in that it is not endowed with [uφ]-features. Technically, we have proposed that the supine’s “mixed” verbal-nominal nature simply lies in the fact that its φ-features are “unspecified”, being neither verbal, that is, uninterpretable [uφ], nor nominal, that is interpretable [iφ], but simply being [αφ-features]. It is the next functional category above the supine, with which the supine agrees, that determines the (un)interpretable nature of the supine’s φ-features. When the supine is nominalized, it is the nominalizing suffix, light n, which provides interpretable φ-features. The supine turns into a noun and licenses a determiner and a Genitive IA as in (110a). The supine may act as a verb in the context of a lexical preposition, or the prepositional complementizer *de.* Since the preposition or the prepositional complementizer is by definition [uφ, αV], the supine verb, specified as [+V, αφ] agrees with the prepositional complementizer, getting from the latter the [uφ] specification it needs in order to license its internal argument. The supine verb assigns structural Accusative to its IA and it is compatible with any type of IA, except for personal pronouns and proper names. This restriction follows from the absence of clitics in the supine clause.

(iii). Agreement between the prepositional complementizer and the supine verb takes place in a strictly local context, as proved by the impossibility of inserting any constituent between the prepositional complementizer and the supine. The V(P) should be in the projection immediately below the preposition. We have proposed that the supine verb *moves as a VP,* pied piping the Direct Object (The Pied Piping Parameter). As a consequence, the closest DP to the prepositions (and the verb) is the IA, which has raised with the VP; this explains why it is the IA, rather than the EA, which (indirectly) takes advantage of the uninterpretable φ-features of the preposition(al complementizer).
Non-finite clauses can thus be divided into those which rely on V-Movement (e.g., infinitive complements), which follow the model of finite clauses, and those which rely on VP-Movement, such as the supine, and, presumably, the gerund.

(iv). The subject is left behind, in Spec, vP. Since the supine Tense feature is devoid of agreement features, i.e. it is \( [\pm T, -Agr] \), the supine (active) subject is always PRO and cannot be lexicalized. There are two strategies of licensing the subject in the supine clause. If the clause is active, the subject is not lexicalized, it is PRO, interpreted by means of Control, as in (111a). If the clause is passive, the active subject may be lexicalized as a by-phrase, as in (111b).

(111) a. Pentru Ion este ușor de tradus textul for Ion be.3SG easy DE translate.SUP text.DEF
   ‘For Ion it is easy to translate the text.’ (*by Ion)

   b. Textul este ușor de tradus de către Ion.
      text.DEF be.3SG easy DE write.SUP by Ion
   ‘The text is easy to translate by Ion.’

(v). The clitic negation \( ne- \) has the properties of clausal negation, with respect to Klima’s tests, ability to license N-words and polarity items. These empirical facts indicate the presence of a NegP in the supine clause. The negation \( ne- \) is a spell-out of the Neg; when the VP is in the specifier of the NegP, the clitic \( ne- \) left-joins to the verb, satisfying its c-selection feature: \([__V] \).

(vi). By means of a close study of the distribution of the adverbial clitic \( mai \) (‘more, again’) in negative, as well as in affirmative supine and gerund clauses, it has been shown that the supine clause does not contain an independent Tense Projection. In the supine clause, the Tense feature is fused with the Aspect one. The absence of an independent Tense Projection is compatible with the absence of the clitics, the absence of auxiliary verbs, as well as with the severely restricted distribution of clitic adverbs in the supine clause.

(vii). The temporal interpretation of the supine clause is derived from its aspectual properties. The Tense feature, when present, is valued by the matrix predicate. Since the supine is aspectually imperfective, when the supine clause is valued for tense, it denotes a time different from that of the main clause, namely it denotes a future time sphere (the event is unrealized). The futurity of the supine is inferred from its imperfectivity of the supine. There are also main verbs (e.g., aspectual verbs) which select untensed complements, complements which have an anaphoric tense feature copying the tense of the main clause.

(112) a. E imposibil de corectat toate lucrările până mâine.
be.3SG impossible DE grade.SUP all papers.DEF until tomorrow
'It is impossible to grade all the papers by tomorrow.'

b. Am terminat de corectat lucrările.
have.1SG finished DE grade.SUP papers.DEF
'I have just finished grading the papers.'

(viii). The modal interpretation of the supine is also derived from its aspectual properties, possibly in conjunction with the semantics of the main verb. The hypothesis we have tried to verify for complementizer de-supines is that the apparently very different interpretations of the supine modality may be understood as variations in the parameters of modality, strictly determined by the semantics of the embedding context. The most relevant divide is between „subjunctive interpretations” (the supine may be understood using the same verb in the subjunctive) and „non-subjunctive interpretations”, where a lexical modal operator (e.g., a modal adjective, a modal verb) in the indicative is required to correctly render the meaning of the supine.

(113) Suntem dornici de plecat / să plecăm.
be.1PL eager.PL DE leave.SUP / SĂ leave.1PL
'We are eager to leave.'

(114) Consider aceste cărţi de citit obligatoriu pentru examen.
consider.1SG these books.DE read.SUP obligatorily for exam
'I consider that these books must be read for the exam.'

The tentative results obtained so far bring to light two factors which determine the modality of complementizer de-supine clauses: In the first place, what is essential is the imperfective aspect of the supine which determines its modal, intensional reading. Secondly, the semantics of the main verb also contributes a lot towards specifying the modal interpretation of the supine clause. At least one relevant difference is that between predicates which require the interpretation of the complement clause with respect to both a modal base and an ordering source (e.g., evaluative predicates, directive predicates) and predicates which do not imply ordering sources (e.g., epistemic predicates).

Supine complements of verbs that require modal bases and ordering sources have subjunctive interpretations, i.e. the supine clause is equivalent with a subjunctive clause and has an irrealis future interpretation. Supine complements subordinate to epistemic verbs or to nouns have more specific circumstantial modal readings (deontic necessity, teleological modality).
Remaining problems: One problem that we have not addressed in this paper is that complementizer de-supine clauses are not homogeneous. In Cornilescu/Cosma (2013) we have shown that supine clauses may differ with respect to the manner in which the IA is case-licensed. In non-restructuring clauses, the IA is case-licensed inside the supine clause, as described above. In restructuring supine clauses, the IA remains in the supine clauses, but it is case-licensed by a functional (V-v, or T) of the main clause; finally, in raising supine clauses, the IA overtly moves inside the main clause, where it is case-licensed.
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