Aspect, tense, modal force, and the effects of event variables in Romanian "a accepta + că / să"

Csongor HEGEDŰS[1]

In this paper, I analyse the predicate a accepta "to accept" followed and sometimes preceded (in previous events) by either the realis type conjunction că "that" or by the irrealis să "SJV marker". I try to answer questions like: (1) what are the boundaries between the two main modal forces, thus what happens when they appear simultaneously (or individually), (2) how these conjunctions might change the aspectual verification, donating, sharing or keeping (in terms of Roberts 2019), in CCs (Complex Clauses) with event variables (Davidson 1967), (3) how the Vendlerian (1967) classification might affect the general perception of the mentioned predicate when it is combined with other dependent / non-dependent events. The aim of the paper is to check the temporal, aspectual, and modal boundaries in the mentioned construction, so it is based on syntactical and cognitive notions. The analysis includes the relative compatibility of că "that" with [I' and w'] – which is usually associated with non-finite forms, and the accomplishment compatibility of să "SJV marker" – which is more prominent with CCs involving că "that" (with perfective events). The polarity-based negation is also part of the paper (in the examined structure), leading to negation as operator vs. stancetaking. The temporal and aspectual gaps are also key-points of the paper.

Keywords: *realis / irrealis, conjunction, event variable, aspect, negation*

1. Introduction

Usually, moods like subjunctive and conditional are associated with the irrealis modality, but we might ask if there are any boundaries between realis vs. irrealis, how the Modal Force (mF) is represented in a CC, what happens when multiple mFs are present? Further questions include the analysis of T0 (Tense) and A0 (Aspect), thus what causes the ungrammaticality in clauses like (1e) *[…] iar utilizatorul are dreptul *în viitor de a se adresa instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României*, and why sometimes the presupposed irrealis value cannot be true. The paper is also based on Dowty's (1979) and Reichenbach's (1947) theory; thus, syntax is combined

---

[1] University of Bucharest, csongor.hegedus@gmail.com

with cognitive linguistics. In the analytical part, (a)-type examples are from Sketch Engine, (b-to-n)[2]' are usually the modified versions of the (a)-type.

2. Literature review

In my paper, I use the Davidsonian (1967) event variable, which is not fully equivalent with the classical predicate. Davidson (1967) proposed a logical form representation of sentences, involving a variable. His motivation is illustrated in (1).

> (1a) Landon stabbed Ana.
> (1b) Landon stabbed Ana in the back with a knife.
> (1c) Landon stabbed Ana in the back.

The general predicate system of (1) is Stab (l, a) where *stab* being the predicate, (l, a) are its arguments, the first one is the subject, the second one the object. According to Davidson, this representation fails to capture main aspects of a sentence with modifiers. With the basic predicate system, there are two problems: the fact that adverbials modify the predicate cannot be illustrated, the same holds for entailment relations. (1b) entails (1c) but not invers, these aspects are not accounted in the basic viewpoint. Davidson solves this issue by an event variable[3], nowadays standardly assumed as e, associated with the whole clause.

> (2a) ∃(e) [Stab (l, a, e) & in the back (e)]

In the analysis part, I also mention the Vendlerian (1967) classification, according to him predicates subcategorize for different categories, as follows: (a) activity: to walk, (b) accomplishment: build a house, (c) achievement: to rich the top of the summit, (d) semelfactive: to knock etc. I also mention theories from Roberts (2019), he introduces notions like: tense sharing, donating etc. in his parametric analysis, thus a Romanian clause like: *am citit o carte* "I read a book", has a strong Determiner, more precisely the Determiner is goal defective with N, leading to N-to-D movement = strong Person, while, in some Romance languages the V-to-T leads to strong Tense. He combines the illustrated movements, with the *Paradigmatic Instantiation*, in order to illustrate the differences, mainly between the Romance languages.

In the analysis below, I use notions like grammatical vs. implied agent. The grammatical agent usually occupies the subject position and is labelled as <u>initiator</u> of

---

[2] Here I refer to "n" in order to mark the infiniteness.
[3] I illustrate only the main part of his theory.

an event; in exceptional cases, it can be the <u>undergoer</u>: *the flower blossomed*.[4] The implied agent is the argument who does not narrate the CC, but it rather performs the action narrated by grammatical agent. A good example is the relation between heterodiegetic narrator vs. his/her relation with the characters. I use primarily this differentiation in order to illustrate the relative perfectivity in a CC involving multiple clausal arguments, for example (2l). By this, one might believe that the implied agent can be exclusively characterized by being the experiencer of the event, however in a CC like *John was sick 1/, so he could not visit his friend* 2/ we can identify the relativity by means of semantic labelling: the heterodiegetic narrator is not the experiencer, but DP-John (the subject of E1) is, and the DP argument in E2 (his friend) is the implied agent of E2.

In what follows, I discuss issues related to tense, aspect, and modal force, involving the mentioned construction and these grammatical notions are accompanied by means of relativity. This relativity is also linked to the theory of Dowty (1979). He introduces [I(nterval) and W(orld)] to define non-perfective viewpoint (from cognitive approach) – which is represented as bar equivalent [I' and w'] of the initial [I and w].

I will mention different types of negations, for example: polarity vs. non-polarity-based negation. These notions are introduced by Holmberg (2016), the essence is on the fact that how a possible answer to a negative question can be interpreted. Thus, an interrogative clause like "John did not drink his coffee?" with a truth-based answer (yes), can be interpreted in two ways: (1) "it is true that John did not drink it" (non-polarity), (2) "it is true that he drank it" (polarity-based answer).

3. Analysis

I am going to analyse CCs in which we can find the mentioned predicate in (a) type examples and I completed them with other dependent / non-dependent events usually in my (b)…(n) types of examples. Note that I refer to the classical predicate in terms of Davidsonian event variable.[5]

3.1. The two opposite modal forces vs. temporal simultaneity

In this section, I analyse the effects of conjunctional selection, what happens when the two opposite modal forces co-occur, and the analysis is also concerned with

---

[4] The enumeration is not complete, so you might check notions like causative / inchoative alternation (for example, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1994), however the current paper does not rely on them.

[5] In the "Leipzig Glossing Rules", the notions PRS and PST are mainly used as tense markers; however, I use them as operators.

temporal and aspectual gaps, involving dependent and non-dependent events. The section also analyses how the accomplishment vs. activity type reading can be introduced by means of altered conjunctional selection. This is also underlined by the relative possibility of *că* to have the bar type reading (I' and w'), which it is claimed to be the neutral value of the present subjunctive.

(1a)   Prin accesarea acestui site, Utilizatorul acceptă 1/ că acest contract și orice dispută legată de el este guvernată și interpretată în concordanță cu legile României, 2/ iar Utilizatorul admite 3/ să se supună jurisdicției exclusive a instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României. /4
"By accessing this website, the user accepts that this contract and any possible issue related to it is governed in accordance with Romanian laws, and the user also admits to submit to exclusive jurisdiction of courts on the territory of Romania."

(1b)   Prin accesarea acestui site, Utilizatorul acceptă 1/ [că acest] [să *acest] fie de acord cu acest contract /2 și orice dispută legată de el este guvernată și interpretată în concordanță cu legile României, 3/ iar Utilizatorul admite 4/ [să se supună] [că se supune] jurisdicției exclusive a instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României. /5
"By accessing this website, the user accepts that [that this] [to *this] to agree with this contract and the possible issue related to it is governed in accordance with Romanian laws, and the user admits that [to submit himself] [that submits] to exclusive jurisdiction of courts on the territory of Romania."

(1c)   [...] iar utilizatorul [are] [avea] dreptul 1/ [*că (ca să) se adreseze] [să se adreseze] instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României. /2
[...] "and the user [has] [had] the right [*that he addresses] [to address] to courts on the territory of Romania."

(1d)   [...] iar utilizatorul [are] dreptul 1/ [că în viitor] [să se adreseze] [se va putea adresa] instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României. /2
[...] "and the user [has] the right [that in future] [to address] [he will have the right to address] to courts on the territory of Romania."

(1e)[6]   [...] iar utilizatorul [are] dreptul 1/ [*în viitor] 1/ [de a se adresa] instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României. /2
[...] "and the user [has] the right *[in future] [to address] courts on the territory of Romania."

---

[6] In order to achieve the complex clause value of (1ef), we have to read them with the added E1 and E2 from (1a).

 (1f) [...] iar utilizatorul [are] dreptul 1/ [de a se adresa (în viitor)] instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României. /2
[...] "and the user [has] the right [to address (in the future)] courts on the territory of Romania."

Let us start with (1a), where E1 is in present simple, it is followed by the indicative type realis conjunction, thus E2 appears to be in the same label, while E3 is in the same realis indicative, followed by E4 which is introduced by the irrealis conjunction. What I observe at the 1st place is that in E1 the agent has authority, thus the E1 to E3 are dominated by this external force. The external force seems to have a final state at E4's Aktionsart, where the subjunctive marker suggests an internal acceptation of the previously mentioned conditions. Let us try to change the realis type conjunction to the irrealis one (1b). As we can observe, the subjunctive type irrealis conjunction cannot be directly followed by the AdjP, nor a DP, thus its dependent subjunctive predicate must be properly introduced. It appears that this is only a pure semantical restriction, although syntactical reasons also might be present. A final state of an event implies a different label, as compared with an event without a proper final state. The predicate **a accepta** "to accept" implies a final state; thus, when it is followed by the subjunctive type conjunction, this final state either may be weakened or suspended. In the one hand, in (1a), the realis type E1, implies the aspectual sharing with its dependent E2, both semantically and syntactically. The semantical value implies the truth-value of E1's predicate at E2's time. On the other hand, the version with the subjunctive (1b) – with the added explicit event (E2), confers a weakened label for E1. With the subjunctive, the sharing or donating are still possible, at the 1st glance, but the subjunctive's irrealis nature should be resolved, as in this particularly case the subjunctive does not refer to the near future, thus its T0 is simultaneous with E1's T0 – at least from the current CC's agent's point. From the reader's point, E1 can be prior to E2, as he first will know that he must accept what it is written at the bottom. In terms of semantic labelling, we might recall a term from Eleanor Rosch's (1976), Prototype theory, thus the main question is if we should treat (1b's) E1-with the realis conjunction + E2 with the irrealis conjunction as having the same membership status, or they are members in different "groups". From the CC's agent viewpoint, the essence would be that (1b) in the mentioned realis + irrealis construction to be avoided, because he wants to cover the meaning that all events in (1b) are governed by this external force, while the mentioned construction suggests the fact that his external force is present in E1 and E2, and E3's irrealis nature wants to cover the meaning that E4 is governed by the theme argument's volitional decision. This might be correct in a clause like (1c), where the subjunctive covers this possibility. As you can see, the realis type conjunction is not compatible with the rest of the clause (1c). Here one might suggest that we should opt for some

kind of aspectual donating or sharing, but it is not the case, since we have a strong incompatibility. The CC cannot be accepted neither with E1 in the imperfect, thus the ungrammaticality might not be caused by the wrong sequential tense usage, but if we slightly change E2's tense by a prepositional construction (1d), the CC is not near future oriented. This is the result of scope overtaking by the added PP. As the bracketed sequences illustrate, multiple versions are possible, and the present subjunctive is replaceable by future simple.

According to the realis vs. irrealis differentiation, when E1 in (1c) is followed by the realis conjunction, then technically it should mean the presence of an external force, and inverse in the case of the irrealis conjunction. When (1c)'s E1 is followed by *că*, the CC is ungrammatical because the conjunction triggers a PST operator, which cannot be valued by E1's tense. However, the past imperfect tensed E1 does not resolve the issue, because E2 creates a separate [I and w] label with PST dependency. The Force and Finite based *ca…să* (Stan 2007) is compatible with E1, but still the separate [I and w] is created, thus the required [I″ and w″] can be achieved if E2 is introduced by *să.* The Force + Force labels are excluded in (1c) because they provide the same syntactic label, the Finiteness is required to grant a different label. Here we also should observe the restrictive nature of a DP, the DP-dreptul "right" foreshadows an internal force for the implied theme argument. We should understand how this dual force does not exclude each-other, as (1d)'s correctness illustrates. We can hypothesise two possible options: (1) the force label on the right side takes a general scope overtaking, thus it will be the dominant one, (2) some kind of polarity is or must be present, just like in the case of TAM markers. The 1st possibility suggests that in (1d) the realis conjunction not only extends the temporality, but it also encodes a pragmatical value: *the expectation* – from the CC's agent to the implied agent, the 2nd possibility implies the external + the internal force. For the last one, we might separate the argument's positioning, to avoid a logical conflict: the force part of E1 must have been followed by a dependent event, thus combining different types of forces between dependent events might cause interpretative issues, as we can see in (1c). This would be correct, if the CC would have the same person as subjects, but (1d)'s E1 refers to a granted event – which correctly can be followed by the realis conjunction with variables, while E2's irrealis conjunction correctly provides the internal force. So, combining the external force, with the internal one is possible, and the following reading is not the preferred one, from labelling viewpoint: […] *iar utilizatorul are dreptul 1/ că în viitor se va putea adresa instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României. /2* As you can see, the future simple in E2 implies a proper [I and w], while the subjunctive type E2 (1d) has the [I′ and w′] label, thus if one would admit the pure irrealis value of E2 in subjunctive, it automatically would lead to E1's false condition.

Note that the preferred order in (1d) is realis + irrealis conjunction, because when the realis conjunction is followed by the same realis event type, with the doubled [I and w], a contradiction might appear (*iar utilizatorul are dreptul că în viitor se va putea adresa instanțelor judecătorești de pe teritoriul României*) – E1's present simple suggests a granted event, which turns out that it is not fully valid at the utterance time. Although, there are situations where a contradiction does not appear, when a law was promulgated, but it will be valid from a certain date. It is also worth to check how temporality is affected with the added variables.

On the one hand, (1e)'s ungrammaticality is caused by apparently a malfunctional T0 domain in E1, however I assume that not the T0 is malfunctional, since the present simple can be combined with future adverbials – which usually do not imply the distant future, but E1's local aspect[7] is falsified by the event variable, thus E1 does not have a verified truth conditional event, and its event variable (PP) wants to produce a meaningful event, without a verified truth conditional predicate – and this cannot be done. On the other hand, (1f) is correct, because the event variable (PP) modifies E2, thus E1 has a verified local truth conditional aspect. This also foreshadows that in (1e) aspectual donating is not possible, while in (1f) both sharing and donating are possible, the preferred might be the sharing, but donating is also able to produce a truth conditional sentence, if the donated distant aspect is no later than the PP's time – which will be a present utterance.

(2a) Parcă mi-era mai ușor 1/ să accept 2/ că Igor se pricepe la computere. 3/
"It was easier for me to accept that Igor is good at computers."

(2b) Parcă mi-era mai ușor 1/ să accept 2/ *să Igor se pricepe la computere. 3/
"It was easier for me to accept. SBJ maker + Igor that Igor is good at computers."

(2c) Parcă mi-era mai ușor 1/ *[că accept] [că am acceptat] 2/ să Igor se pricepe la computere. 3/
"It was easier for me *[that accept] [that I accepted] to Igor is good at computers."

(2d) Parcă mi-era mai ușor 1/ să accept 2/ că Igor se pricepe la computere 3 [și știe 4/ să recite poezia /5] [și stie 4/ că recită poezia /5].
"It was easier for me to accept that Igor is good at computers [and he can recite the poem] [and he knows that he recites the poem]."

---

[7] My own classification (from a yet unpublished paper), local = "what it is"; distant = "what could be"

(2e) [şi stie 4/ că acum, în clădirea alăturată, Ana recită poezia /5].
      "[and he knows] that now, in the building behind, Ana recites the poem."

(2f) Parcă mi-era mai uşor 1/ să accept 2/ că Igor se pricepe la computere 3 [şi A
      stie 4/ că Igor recită poezia /5].
      "It was easier for me to accept that Igor is good at computers [and A knows
      that Igor recites the poem]."

(2g) Parcă mi-era mai uşor 1/ să accept 2/ [că stie 3/ să recite poezia /4] [şi că se
      pricepe la computere. /5
      "It was easier for me to accept that [he can recite the poem] [and he is good
      at computers]."

(2h) E mai uşor 1/ să accept 2/ [că stie 3/ să recite poezia /4] [şi că îşi face tema]. /5
      "It is easier for me to accept that [he knows that he recites the poem] [and he
      also does his homework]."

(2i) Accept 1/ că Igor îşi face tema 2 [şi stie 3/ să recite poezia /4] [şi stie că recită
      poezia /].
      "I accept that Igor is doing his homework and [he can recite the poem] [and he
      knows that he recites the poem]."

(2j) Ştiu 1/ că Igor îşi face tema 2 [şi stie 3/ să recite poezia /4] [şi stie că recită
      poezia /].
      "I know that Igor is doing his homework [and he can recite the poem] [and he
      knows that he recites the poem]."

(2k) Ştie 1/ să îşi facă tema 2/ şi să meargă la magazin. 3/
      "I know that he can do his homework and he is able to go to the store."

(2l) [...] [Şi stie 4/ să recite poezia /5] [şi stie 4/ că recită poezia /5].
      [...] "[And he can recite the poem] [and he knows that he is reciting the poem]."

(2m) Mă bucur 1/ că am acceptat 2/ să vină cu ideile sale 3/.
      "I am glad that I accepted to come up with his ideas."

(2n) Mă bucur 1/ că am acceptat 2/ (să mi-l repare 3/) că se pricepe la computere. 4/
      "I am glad that I agreed to repair it because he is good at computers."

Now let us continue with (2a), composed from three events. Our interesting point is still related to the two types of conjunctional combination. In E2, we have the irrealis one, while in E3 the realis one. The inverse order would be ungrammatical, in the same word order. E1 is based on the agent's subjectivity, while in E3 the agent narrates someone else's ability. In relation with my labelling analysis, (2a) proves that aspectual sharing or donating might appear more frequently. The irrealis label of the subjunctive must have a linguistic precedence, which is the E1, and by E3 we have 2 opposite labels. These labels can be considered not only pragmatical ones, but also syntactical, since neither the irrealis nor the realis conjunction cannot be doubled in the current word order (2b). The external force cannot be present in CC where other event variables implicitly refer to the internal one (2c), and even if we change the tense of the CC, the ungrammaticality still holds. Here am I referring to the internal force as internal volition which can be explained by terms of Dowty (1979) [I and w].

   Let us check (2d), with the added E4 and E5. Firstly, I added E5 with the subjunctive conjunction – here I intentionally avoid referring to it as an irrealis one, since E4 falsifies the irrealis value. E3's predicate refers to an ability; this meaning is still present in E4 and E5. However, the meaning is different between the bracketed parts. If the 1st bracketed part refers to Igor's ability to recite that poem, it means that E3's temporal and aspectual values are donated or shared with E4 and E5. If E3 is followed by the 2nd bracketed part, this sharing or donating cannot be extended to E4 and E5, since we do not have any linguistic tool which would link Igor's ability to X's ability. Thus, the implied meaning with the 2nd bracketed part (*și stie că recită poezia*) is: Igor has the ability to use or to repair computers and he knows that X can recite the poem. Thus, marginally we can say that Igor's ability can be extended to some relative point until E4 – but in the sense that Igor has the ability to understand that X can recite the poem. The essence is that where the cut line of E3 is. It is also interesting how our mind processes the verbal inflection of E3 in (2d). For us, Igor, (just like the narrator) is a 3rd person argument, we have to read the event which follows E4 in order to make a proper argument decode. By the subjunctive argument, we know that E5's subject is equal with the one present in E3 and E4, while the subject can be different with the realis type conjunction, our mind can decode the proper agent of E5. For the native speakers, a CC like (2d) would be out of the blue with the added subject argument, but this oddity disappears if we add variables like (2e) – where I nuanced the temporality, giving a simultaneous value.

   On the one hand, (2d) might not be odd for the native speakers, if the context was properly introduced: a journalist asks A, B, C, Igor and X are friends and the journalist asks them to characterize each other. Person A would not utter (2d) with the 2nd bracketed part, thus the subjunctive connector will be used in his E5 if and only if Igor is not in the process of reciting the poem, thus A and Igor are in the same place, without E5's Aktionsart. On the other hand, A could also utter E5 with the 1st

bracketed part, meaning that Igor's E5 has already an Aktionsart, thus the local aspect is verified. The local aspect, in the previous case, may or may not be verified: if A only believes that Igor knows the poem, E5's local aspect is not verified, if he heard Igor reciting the poem, the local aspect was also verified. The relativity may also be present: even if A heard Igor about reciting the poem, Igor may forget parts of the poem in the front of the audience. The readers cannot access the narrator's [I and w], thus we have to read the CC, to understand if E4 is based on Igor or on X.

Let us also comment the temporal axe of (2d). If I exclude some special situations – where the poem is read and not recited, then both conjunctions imply the presence of the (near) past. The conjunction *că* implies simultaneity, and if A and Igor would be in the same place, it would mean that they are interrupting each-other, by this, the final state of E5 must be close to A's ST, E5 with the subjunctive translates in an implicit ET<ST of A, or ET=ST, the preferred interpretation is the 1st value. So, the simultaneity vs. non-simultaneity seems to be a decisive factor, when we construct a sentence in our mind. (2d) may be uttered not only by a character, but also by a narrator. If he tells, its E2 by the subjunctive, E3 is introduced by the realis conjunction, E5 by the subjunctive, thus the CC refers to ET<ST of the narrator. This ET<ST is not explicitly told, but we interpret the clause based on some extralinguistic knowledge: the narrator heard Igor reciting the poem, or he knows for sure that Igor can recite the poem. If E5, from the same narratorial perspective, is introduced by the realis conjunction, then we can mention the multiple narratorial perspective, where the 2nd narrator – let us call B, mentions to the primarily narrator A the events covered by E4, E5, so we can have a clause like (2f). Here the character's and the primary narrator's (A) time appears to be equal with the time of the characters. By this, (2f)'s E1 covers B's narratorial time and E3-E5 may or may not have a temporal gap, depending on the communicative purpose: if the author wants to create suspense, it is a good idea to differentiate the temporality of the two narrators. This temporal gap may also give the possibility that B will make some correction in A's narrative. However, this possible correction may occur later in the hypothetical text, since the immediate correction is more possible with the interpretation where the two narrator's time is identical.

Now let us return to (2d), without the narratorial presence. I did not mention the possibility that E5 with the realis conjunction may also refer to the act of being consciousness, thus Igor knows that he is reciting the poem, thus he does not refer to X argument in E5. We have good reason to assume that the accomplishment type reading is possible only with the subjunctive, due to the mentioned PST dependency. The accomplishment value is still possible in (2d), but if and only if we treat as a narratorial sequence, which is followed by another CC where the narrator comments about (2d's) E5, in this case the PST dependency is granted by the narrator's presence. However, are they true accomplishments, or just our mind tries to process

them as result based events? Let us check briefly (2d)'s temporal relations, focusing on E2-E5, with the assumed self-conscious meaning in E5. E3 and E5 can be simultaneous events, even if Igor is the subject for both ones, but E3 is introduced by *că* while E5 by *să*. In one hand, I assume that there are 2 PST operators, in each event, the 1st PST refers to the general meaning of being able to use / repair computers vs. being able to recite a poem, the 2nd PST refers to the CC's agent's previous knowledge. On the other hand, if E3's conjunction is followed by the same realis conjunction in E5, then we have the 2 PST operators only in E3, while in E5 there is only 1 PST operator, which is based on the CC's agent's current assumption. On the other version, where E5 refers to X, not to Igor, we have 2 PST, but the 2nd one is not a proper PST operator, it covers only the agent's and Igor's decoding time. We might claim that the PST's influence is due to the subjunctive's position in E2, thus E3 is perceived as having more PST, due to the subjunctive. For this, I added (2g), with the modified event order. At first, the result is not conclusive, as E5 appears to be earlier than E3, but this is caused by the general value of E5, and also by the plural DP. If the semantic of (2g)'s E5 is eliminated, and if we trigger a CC with similar activity type events (2h), the subjunctive seems to happen earlier (E4) than the one introduced by *că* (E5). The result does not appear to be 100% conclusive, since we are still influenced by the semantics of *to know* (E2), but the same predicate in a very similar context (2d) and in the 2nd position after *că* in E3, *ştie că vs. ştie să*, gives a present axed event. Therefore, when *ştiu că* (2d) E4 is preceded by *că* in E3, the former refers to the present and when *ştie să* is used in the same context, the later can be equal temporally with E3, or E5 may even precede it.

(2i) illustrates the subjunctive's possible temporal precedence. I included the same predicate in (2j), in order to avoid the possible influence of the linear order, and again, our mind processes the same as in (2i). This can be proven by the impossible simultaneity between E2 and E4 with *că*: *Accept 1/ că Igor îşi face tema 2 [şi stie 3/ că recită poezia 4/]* – E2 and E4 cannot be simultaneous, but if E4 is in subjunctive, the precedence is marked by PST operator.

We are influenced by how many operators have an event, in (2j) the 2nd PST operator is still missing from E1 (from the agent's point), due to the missing correferentiality.

Let us discuss one more thing, before moving to another example. In (2l), the two types of conjunctions affect the aspectual checking. If E1 is followed by the subjunctive conjunction, E1's local aspect may be checked earlier than E2's, but it must be shared with E2. If it is not shared with E2, the CC suggests a proper final state for E1, but we want to assure that E1 has a truth condition at E2's Aktionsart. If person B knows that the implied agent can recite the poem, as he heard him being in the denoted process, then E2's distant aspect is also verified, thus the subjunctive may have a present perfect value. The aspectual sharing must also be present in the case of the 2nd bracketed part, when the realis conjunction is used, because we want

to assure that the act of consciousness has a truth value at E2's Aktionsart. With the realis conjunction, the distant aspect cannot be verified properly, only the local one is verifiable, and the other major difference relies in the iterability of events. With the subjunctive, we have the clear impression that it may refer to the same multiplied event: thus, the act of reciting the poem occurred in the past and it can happen any time in the near future. It also influences the successful rate of the denoted event. Due to the subjunctive's PST operator, it has a higher chance to be seen as a successful reciting, the agent is able to recite it without issues, and the missing PST operator in the *că* version changes the polarity: the focus is rather on the psychological pressure of reciting the poem – especially if it happens in a front of an auditorium thus if person B tells to C this version. It also refers to hidden psychological pressure: "how important it is to recite this poem", while the subjunctive E2 hiddenly included PST implies agent's believed self-confidence: "for him it is not a problem reciting the poem, and he did it at several times". The subjunctive version may also include the grammatical agent's irony or its self-confidence related to the implied agent's act of performing. If the grammatical agent uses the subjunctive with this self-saturated meaning, he actually erases the PST operator, as he is basing on failure, induced by the PRS operator. Here, one might claim that this is a very solid proof that tense and temporality are more important than aspect, but it is not the case, since a past tensed E1 (2l) weakens E2's truth value (with the subjunctive), at our ST. Based on this, we may also claim that E2's (with subjunctive) truth value, with its hidden PST operator, is present if and only if E1 is in present tense. Actually, this hidden PST operator is transferred to E1's meaning. (2l)'s E1 in the past cannot have a general reading with universal value, because the universal value also implies the ground value, thus a clause like "the water boils at 100 degrees Celsius at 1 bar atmosphere" implies a figure value (validated result) + a ground value (as marking its universal true).

Now we should also decide what is the best solution for (2l) with subjunctive: aspectual sharing, donating or individual checking, and we should put in contrast the data with the same (2l) with *că*. As we discussed, sharing is a good option, but an aspectual breakpoint must be inserted after E1 because the temporal axe between the already „performed" E2 and its possible repetition may not happen, or it may imply a too large temporal axe. The individual checking of E1, is possible if it is in a past tense, the ironical use of (2l) with subjunctive also triggers the individual checking of E1. In the case of *că* (2l), also the shared bridge checking is the most suitable, the main difference between them is the breakpoint's insertion period: with the subjunctive, the breakpoint is inserted closer to the left side – as being the PST marker, in the case of *că*, the insertion implies the centre of the axe, as the PRS marker, if we check the CC from the grammatical agent's point. I will call this as the "left" and the "centre" focused aspectual sharing.

We should pay attention that in (2c) the relative ungrammaticality has no syntactical reasons – at least not in combinatory terms, because E2's *că* can be followed by *să* in a CC like (2m). If we contrast (2m)'s grammaticality with the ungrammaticality of (2c), we can identify that in (2c) the [I and w] is different: E1 and E2's mF is realis, but E3 also tries to create a realis one, thus the events cannot be related. The aspectual and implicitly the temporal axe cannot be clearly differentiated.

In (2m), E1 and E2 are still realis based, but we cannot verify the distant aspect of E3, so E3 provides the [I' and w']. One might be tempted to claim that only a accepta + să "accept +to" provides a pure irreal mF. Let us check (2n), where I added a nuanced event (E3). As one can see, in (2n) am acceptat + că "accepted + that" is able to mark the same [I' and w'], of course, minor differences are present, for example, the presence of breakpoint in (2n) which saves the CC from crash. The general focus between (2m vs. 2n) is also different: in (2m) the left periphery is focused, thus agent oriented, while in (2n) the focus is both on the agent and on the theme argument, but of course, with the respected linear order. One might claim that here we are influenced by the semantics of E4's predicate *a se pricepe* "one is good at...", but the same dual focus can be maintained even if the variable is changed to […] *că pleacă luni* "he is going to leave on Monday". The focus is not introduced by *a accepta* "to accept", but rather by E1's predicate which eliminates a negative means of describing of the theme argument in (2n). In (2m), E3's irrealis value is also excluded by DP-the existence of the ideas, which must exist before its acceptance, else if E3's predicate refers to a pure activity. In (2n), the subjunctive may suggest that E3 has already happened, especially if the CC is told by a narrator, thus E4<E3, and E4 also > E3.

(3a) Trebuie 1/ să accepți că, 2/ dacă nicăieri în arhive nu este vreo evidență 3/ că au avut loc gazări, 4/ dacă nu există nici un singur document german 5/ ce se referă la gazare de ființe umane 6/ și dacă nu există nici o referință nicăieri în arhivele germane la vreun ordin dat de cineva pentru gazare de oameni 7/ și, dacă pe de altă parte, testele FORENSIC (la scop) de laborator al crematoriului și al camerelor de gazare de la Auschwitz nu arată niciun reziduu semnificativ de component cyanidic, 8/ atunci toate acestea nu pot 9/ decât să însemne un singur lucru: /10 că nu au existat camere de gazare. /11
"You must accept that, if there is no evidence in the archives that gassings took place, if there is not a single German document that refers to human gassing and if there is no any reference for gassing people and if FORSENIC laboratory tests show no significant cyanic component, then this can mean only one thing: that were no gas chambers."

(3b) [...] [să nu existe] [să nu fi existat] camere de gazare.
      [...] "[not to exist] [not to have existed] gas chambers."

(3c) [...] atunci toate acestea nu pot 9/ decât să însemne un singur lucru: /10 [*să
      nu existe] [să nu fi existat] camere de gazare. /11
      [...] "then this can only mean that [*not to exist] [not to have existed] gas
      chambers."

(3d) Să fii de acord 1/ și să nu pleci. 2/
      "To agree with it and do not leave."

(3e) Să nu existe alte căi de atac 1/ [că] [*să] plec de aici. 2/
      "There should be no other appeals [because] [*to] I am going to leave from
      here."

(3f) Să plec de aici [că] [?să] nu există(e) alte căi de atac.
      "I should leave from here [because] [?to] there do not exist further appeals."

(3g) Accept că trebuie să plec de aici.
      "I accept that I have to leave this place."

(3h) Accept să plec de aici.
      "I accept to leave from here."

Let us comment the current CC, composed from 11 events, we have subjunctive in E2 and in E10, we have *că* in E3, E4, E5 and in E11. As I mentioned in the above examples, the subjunctive may also refer to an internal obligation. E2 follows this pattern, while in E10 the combination with *decât* "just" produces a restrictive subordinate, via the convergent structure. What is the scope of a restrictive construction? It focuses on a single based event, excluding others. Can we say that in the agent's mind the subjunctive E10 has an irrealis value? No! A positive answer would lead to the false condition of the restrictive subordinate, and it is banned intrinsically by the restrictive denomination. The restrictive nature of E10 is also foreshadowed by E9's NegP, and by the concessively used AdvP *atunci* "in that case". An irrealis type presupposition would be possible with the present subjunctive among the negation (3b). When the negation is followed by the past subjunctive, the irrealis value is no more present, the distant aspect of the subjunctive predicate has been already verified. This may also trigger that the PST operator mentioned in (2), is possible because the stancetaking type negation is not present (*for further details, see example 5 below*).

Let us check (3c). Here, I modified the realis type conjunction with the presupposed irrealis one. The present subjunctive is ungrammatical with the preceding events, although it has the same grammatical role as *că* in (3a). Thus, we should be able to identify a cognitive answer. (3a) from E9 is based on the mentioned restrictive value, and when we built a restrictive type subordinate, we have 2 major possibilities: (1) constructing it in a similar way, just like in (3a) combining să with că + other linguistic expressions, all of these unified in a convergent structure, (2) using să [...] să in both events (3d-f), but with differences in meaning. In (3d), both subjunctives are possible, they are referring to the same 2nd person, singular. If we hypothesise the above-mentioned internal obligation, then the CC wants to cover an emphasised meaning, thus without an external force. (3d) may also have an exclamation, instead of a full stop, even in that case it has still this internal force: the grammatical agent wants to convince the implied agent to perform E1 and to not perform E2. This also may be verified by the possibility of adding an emphasised event *te rog* "please", which obviously also lacks an external force.

Now let us change the context, to check if we are able to produce CCs in which the mentioned conjunctions can appear in different positions, with differences in meaning. For (3e), let us imagine a situation where a worker utters (3e), with the following background information: he previously had a conflict with a co-worker that ended in a courtroom. The agent won the trial, the co-worker made an appeal, which was also won by the agent, and at that point he uttered (3e). As you can see, there is a subjunctive in E1 with the marked ungrammatical structure in E2, if the subjunctive is present, instead of *că*. We know that both types of conjunctions can introduce different types of subordinate clauses, and it seems that in (3e) the realis vs. the irrealis differentiation is possible. In E1 we have a coindexed event with the grammatical agent, the PST operator is missing, there is also a negation which is actually weakened by the subjunctive, thus E1 is based on hope. It is also at least near future oriented, E1 does not refer to the agent's ST. E2 can only be introduced by *că* – and the main question is why? E2's Aktionsart depends on the verified local/distant aspect of E1, with a truth polarity-based negation (happened E1). If this happens, E1 has no more that internal force, based on a personal desire, but it has proper final state, a fact. This fact forces the agent to externalise the previous internal desire, thus in his mind the act of leaving (E2) is seen as an obligation. One might ask why it still cannot be seen as internal? An internal force functions like a coin: it has at least two equal solutions, which at that particularly utterance time may appear too similar, the agent may not see the unforeseen consequences by selecting one of the possible solutions. The internal force may give the false impression that there will not be unforeseen consequences, giving a sense of freedom. Now returning to (3e), with the verified truth conditional E1, the agent does not see any other internal forced based solution, because he recognizes the consequences (the atmosphere

after returning to the workplace, his future interaction with his co-worker etc.). The agent uttered (3e) when E1 does not have a verified truth condition, he stated E2 as a certain event. We are not able to enter his [I and w], but we can explain the CC with the help of labels. If both events are introduced by the same conjunction, the force would be the same, however E1 represents the reason and E2 the effect -- the ground vs. the figure labelling. We should also discuss the linear order. In (3e), it is obvious that it cannot be changed, we can change the word order (with minor modifications), but the cause-effect relationship triggers the linear order. Does the linear order apply mandatorily for (3d)? I assume that no, because due to the missing external force, we can easily inverse the events (with minor modifications: eliminating the coordinative conjunction in front of E2 and placing it accordingly), thus the CC may have the following meanings: (1) the actual word order: person B should agree with it and should not leave, (2) the inverted order: person B should not leave and should agree with it, thus the internal coin gives him this possibility without unforeseen consequences. It is important to mention that the unforeseen consequences are not present here because someone else granted to person B this choice, and most probably, the grammatical agent did not consider it as relevant.

Based on these explanations, we have to consider (3f). Here the event order is inverted as compared with (3e), which also affects the CC's temporal axe. In (3e), E1 refers to a possible near future; the cognitive perception is that E2 follows immediately after E1's verified truth condition – the agent's warning, which is instantaneous, is transferred to E2. In (3f), we cannot identify the agent's assumed warning because E2 has already a true value. In (3e), the unverified distant aspect maintains what is called the Cliffhanger technique[8]. So, (3e)'s equivalent is (3g), where the dominant modal force is both external and internal: external because it is already out from the agent's control, and internal because the agent's previous warning must be fulfilled, otherwise its dignity is affected, and from the agent's point there is no regret. In (3f), the modal force is discussable, but I assume that the external force is no more present due to E2's verified distant aspect, so it has the following interpretation: the agent most probably was conscious of the past nature of E2, thus he could not utter a warning, he accepted that unmentioned conditions, it suggests that he was conscious about E2's result. Of course, there is some kind of relativity here because one might claim that the agent was forced by some external conditions to accept the verified state of E2, or E2's state does not have a truth value when he started to work at that place.

---

[8] A literary device whose role is to create suspense, usually at the final part of chapters or instalments. Charles Dickens was among the first writers, who used it. For details, you might check the following website: https://literaryterms.net/cliffhanger/

One thing is sure: (3f) cannot be perceived as (3e)'s continuation, because it would lead to a pragmatical and also a cognitive contradiction: (3e) is based on the agent's dignity, while (3f) is based on regret. These two concepts cannot be valid for the same event, without causing a contradiction. What is the cognitive explanation for this? In order to understand it, let us mention their temporal axes. (3e)'s basic axe is: FUT+PRS = truth value for both events, if E1 gets true, (3f)'s basic axe is: PRS or near FUT+PRS which is actually a PRS with PST operator. On the one hand, in (3f), the agent's dignity cannot be identified because E2 has the mentioned PST operator, and which is more important is that not the past value is the most relevant, but its truth conditional verified aspect, and the time applies and indirect pressure: the more time passed between E2's verified aspect and the E1's Aktionsart, the less self-respect has the agent, if we exclude other possibilities like being forced to work still there. On the other, (3e) is based on the immediate consequence if E1 gets true – and actually it is not an immediate consequence, since the agent foreshadowed its action, and this why (3f) is not a suitable time-lapse based answer for (3e). We can represent the act of leaving also by using circles. According to this, (3e) should contain two circles, one for E1, one for E2, connected with the cause-effect sign or a larger circle, representing E2, contains a smaller one, representing E1. I assume that a 2nd circle should not be present in (3f)'s representation, and I also think this is the way how our brain differentiates these two examples. If we hypothesise that (3f) has two circles, it would lead to a situation where an [I" and w"] labelled system wants to dominate the basic [I and w] or Kayne's (1994) Antisymmetry where the only reasonable order is Spec-Head-Complement, the Spec-Complement-Head would result a situation where an IP could dominate a CP, but as I mentioned in (3f), the issue is not a syntactical one. (3e) is based on the cause-effect relation, thus our mind correctly wants to keep this order, and the question is why the same cannot be transposed to (3f).

The syntactical explanation can be based on the verified aspect of E2, and I hypothesise that our mind may also process correctly that from cognitive point E2 is empty at ST, thus cause is no longer present, or it cannot be processed properly. This leads me to put another question: is there any temporal or aspectual distance / result that cannot by bypassed by the cause-effect arguments? – a possible bypassing may lead to a different interpretation, like in (3ef)? It appears to be logical that the cause cannot have a different value as it is stated in the effect event, by this I am referring to the cause event's ST and ET. If the cause argument's ET<ST, the mentioned "dignity factor" may not be as recoverable as the agent assumes it, this is also verifiable by the fact that in (3f) E2 cannot be copied in E1's circle.

3.2. The effects of added events upon the modal force and cognitive vs. syntactical final state

In this subsection, I mainly analyse the circumstances that might affect the initial modal force, thus how a single-labelled modal force can become a binary one. The subsection also contains interpretative differences between cognitive vs. syntactical final states. It is also based on the relative interpretability of polarity-based negation, thus under what circumstances a negation (in the analysed structure) can have an operator value and when it can be the marker of stancetaking.

(4a) Omul trebuie 1/ să accepte 2/ că nimic nu e sigur și cert, 3/ că totul e într-o continuă transformare 4/ și că perfecțiunea nu există. 5/
      "The people should accept that nothing is certain, that everything is in continuous transformation and that perfection does not exist."

(4b) Trebuie să învăț.
      "I must learn."

(4c) Trebuie să participi la ședința de mâine.
      "You have to participate on tomorrow's meeting."

(4d) Este posibil 1/ [*să] [că] nimic nu e sigur și cert, 2/ că totul e într-o continuă transformare 3/ și că perfecțiunea nu există. 4/
      "It is possible [*to] [that] nothing is certain and everything is in continuous transformation and that perfection does not exist."

(4e) Omul trebuie 1/ să accepte 2/ că nimic nu e sigur și cert, 3/ totul e într-o continuă transformare 4/ și perfecțiunea nu există. 5/
      "The people should accept that nothing is certain, that everything is in continuous transformation and the perfection does not exist."

(4f) Omul trebuie 1/ să accepte 2/ că nimic nu e sigur și cert, 3/ că totul e într-o continuă transformare 4/ și că perfecțiunea nu există, 5/ altfel nu va înțelege esența vieții. 6/
      "The people should accept that nothing is certain, that everything is in continuous transformation and that perfection does not exist, otherwise they will not understand the essence of life."

(4g) Trebuie 1/ să învăț 2/ ca să primesc o notă bună. /3
      "I have to learn in order to get a good grade."

Let us continue with (4a), which has five predicates, the subjunctive is present in E2, the *că* type conjunction is present in E3, E4 and E5. In E1, we have an impersonal verb, but more importantly, its modal value refers to an obligation. In the above examples, I mentioned that *să* may also refer to an internal obligation, especially when the grammatical agent is also the theme argument, when there is a coreferentiality. Here the agent is not coreferential with the implied theme argument, and the CC does not refer to a proper individual, but to a general argument. Moreover, E1's predicate is usually be followed by *să*. In this term, Romanian is different from English where we have multiple lexical entries, based on external vs. internal force. Thus, the verb *have (to)* implies an external modal force, while the proper modal verbs *must* or *should* may have both of the values. As my examples illustrate, *să* can be used in both internal obligation (4b) and in external (4c). We have to check the possible boundaries of the modal force in (4a). When the verb "a accepta" is followed by *că*, as in (3g), the force is external; when it is followed by *să*, it is internal (3h). If we read (4a) from E2 without *că* conjunctions, the general modal force is still external, although not as powerful as is with the presence of E1-E2. If we hypothesise that *accept să* "accept + să" implies a possibility and not a fact, we should explain how our brain processes the modal value of the CC, because it seems to be a cognitive conflict between E2's *să* vs. *că*, in the following events. With a minor reorganization, *că* is also compatible with the idea of being possible. In one hand, we have the following scenarios: (4a)'s modal force is only external, is only internal, or there is external to some point, then internal. Starting out from the semantical properties of *a accepta* "to accept", the fully external approach does not seem possible, as it implies the internal force, but the agent wants to emphasise the external force, due to the generic value, but on the other hand, he is not able to perform it. In his mind, the external force cannot be present for infinite period. There is a good reason to claim that the agent wants to influence indirectly the theme arguments: conjunction *că* is repeated in all events from E3-E5, and although syntactically these conjunctions introduce the transitive subordinates, the same CC can be uttered with minor modifications: E4's conjunction may be omitted, and using a comma, and E5's *că* clearly repeats E2's predicate (4e). Of course, by (4e) the subordinate types are apparently the same, if we read the CC as being dependent by E2's predicate, but this means that we must keep all the conjunctions. There is also another possibility. E1, E2 and E3 are the CC1 and E4, E5 are CC2. By this, E5 is not linked to E2, and E4 is apparently free from E2. Does this syntactical difference change the cognitive reception? I assume that most humans would perceive these two possibilities as having the same or almost the same meaning: the agent wants to convince them about E3-E5. This might foreshadow that in a CC where multiple *că* conjunctions are present, might not multiple the modal force, or that modal force is

dependent from the predicate's semantical properties combined with extralinguistic factors – the agent's authority. For this, let us verify the aspectual checking of (4ae).

In (4a), it is clear that E1 and E2 must have an extended aspectual point, otherwise the modal force is dropped. Based on Roberts' (2019) tense valuing, there are 3 possibilities: individual checking, sharing and donating. Due to the fact that nor events are past oriented, the individual checking seems to be the less acceptable, but from the modal force's point, we can mention at least one mechanism: the external modal force of E1 and E2, let us call mF, is copied into the following events, but the aspect itself is individually verified. If this copying is realised, then E2's subjunctive force is copied into the following *că*'s modal section / phrase. At first, this may sound odd, but in (4a) it functions because there is no consequence illustrated, the missing cause-effect relationship affects the modal force. In E3, we have *că*, but its external force cannot be verified due to the missing labels and because E2's mF situates above E3-E5, it imposes a single type modal force.

Let us read (4f), where I added E6, an event whose label differs from E1-E5. (4f)'s E6 is introduced by an adverb, this illustrates that multiple word categories can affect the modal force. E6 has also another tense, as compared with the preceding events, thus the temporal / aspectual verification also differs. The added event changes the single type labelled force, to a binary, essentially to a ground and figure one. E6 corresponds to a verbalized unforeseen consequence. Its presence might influence the general modal force. As I stated above, an internal modal force may lack the presence of an unforeseen factor. If we would hypothesise that the major modal force in a CC is imposed by the 1st subordinate event – from linear order's point, then in (4f) this force should be internal one and this essentially would exclude the cause-effect labelling, or an event equalizer, like the syntactical one should be present, but this event equalizer may not be representable. What seems to be more plausible in (4f) is the following: the agent wants to convince his theme arguments about the mentioned events by firstly constructing in his mind the CC with external modal force, which he hopes to be transformed into an internal force (by the arguments). The internal force is represented by E6, he includes that unforeseen event, which at first might not be present in the internal modal force. However, the fact that an internal modal force might not include an unforeseen consequence is not a universal true as (4g) illustrates.

In (4g), the act of being consciousness about the "unforeseen" event in represented by E3, so, if (4g) would contain only E1 and E2, the inability to foreshadow an unforeseen consequence can be identifiable. In (3), I mentioned the aspectual / temporal influence that cannot be bypassed, without affecting the content, now we should also discuss if mF has to be on the same axe as tense and aspect? I hypothesise that mF does not have to be on the same axe. When the theme argument receives (4f) he also processes the mF. If he accepts the true condition of

E1-E5, then from cognitive point he rejects E6's truth condition – thus the polarity-based negation is valued, but from syntactical point, he must be able to see at least the local aspect of E1-E6 – where E6's aspect is essential. He might opt in a later point for the stancetaking, but the syntactical aspect must have an infinite validity. We should also understand that an event internal final state could have dual values: cognitive and syntactical – more precisely which has a greater influence, or do they have the same importance? Look for example at (4f)'s E5. Its grammatical tense is the present simple, but E6's future simple with the assumed false condition translates in the local / distant aspectual final state for E5.

I believe that we cannot define the clear boundaries between these two categories since they are interdependent. The syntactical final state cannot exist independently from the cognitive one – at least for humans, the cognitive final state also depends from syntactical mechanisms like what is the correct word order and the fact that we use past tense for a happened event, and usually a future or a future valued tense to express an unhappened one. At this moment, it seems to be plausible that the cognitive final state confers also the syntactical one, thus in case of (4f) E6 does not have to be verified if the previous events have a truth-value. We are not forced to await that undetermined time expressed by E6 in order to make a personal stancetaking and the cognitive final state has the ability to change the CC's generic value, to a possible individual one. I also assume this individual cognitive stancetaking is not a pure possibility, it is mandatory because when the theme arguments receive (4f) they either admit or reject it, or maybe they suspend for a short period the admitting or the rejecting, but too many imperfective events would affect the flow of the mind.

(5a) Acum lucrurile se complică, pentru că anul este greu. Deși situația este dificilă, 1/ cei din administrația publică nu acceptă 2/ că li s-au blocat majorările de salarii 3/ – salarii care au însemnat în 2020 110 miliarde de lei, 4/ adică (au însemnat) 26% din toate veniturile statului 5/ – (este) un salt de 7,6% față de 2019. 6/
"Now things get complicated because this is a challenging year. Even though the situation is difficult, those from the public administration do not accept that their salary increases have been blocked – salaries that amount were 110 billion lei in 2010, this means 26% income of the country, it means a 7,6% increasement as compared with 2019."

(5b) […] nu acceptă 2/ să aibă salarii blocate. 3/
[…] "do not accept to have blocked salaries."

(5c) (nu) […] acceptă 1/ să aibă salarii blocate. 2/
      (not) […] "they accept to have blocked salaries."

(5d) (nu) […] acceptă 1/ că au salarii blocate. 2/
      (not) […] "they accept that they have blocked salaries."

Let us continue with the current CC, in which I indicated the larger context that is the 1st CC without event numbering. In the proper CC, I also indicated in brackets the hidden predicates. In (5a), there is no subjunctive conjunction, the 1st impression is that the CC is dominated by an external mF. E1 is the concessive subordinate; it is linked to E3, by E1 the grammatical agent's position is related to the external mF. We should pay attention to temporal and the aspectual facts: E1, E2, E6 are in present simple, E3, E4 and E5 are in past compound. Without a proper aspectual bridge, the CC's truth condition would fail, due to the concessive subordinate. If we would treat E1 as a true present simple, whose Aktionsart is equal with the ST, then E3's past dependency should not cause uninterpretability, because at E3's time the situation was not worse – this is not the assumed meaning by the agent, E1 has at least a PC2 (present perfect) value. Returning to the modal perception, E2 cannot be followed by the subjunctive conjunction, without modifying the following predicate – by event adding. A possible solution by using the subjunctive can be seen in (5b). We should understand what is the role of the apparent external force and if we can identify a clear boundary between (5a vs 5b). I tend to disagree with the external mF in (5a). By the external force, the agent either has an authority over the goal arguments, or he uses the external force, which later may be transferred to internal one, by the theme arguments – as it was in (4f). In my viewpoint, the external mF would require something similar to Dowty's (1979) theory, the inability of access someone's [I and w] in a real time. If we hypothesise that (5a)'s agent ST = ST of the implied goal arguments, then according to external mF we should obtain a similar [I and w] accessing. Referring to (5a), there is a situation in which this [I and w] accessing is possible, in order to do it we have to erase E4 to E6. Why these events? Because these represent the subjective stancetaking, thus conjunction *că* can represent the external mF if the mentioned events are omitted. E4 is mild evidence for the subjective mF, while E5 – introduced by a conclusive adverbial reiterates the agent's stancetaking. By this, we can see that the mF of a conjunction either is very weak, or it can be affected by the preceding / following events. We know that conjunctions are usually inert semantically, and even though I illustrated a situation where (3) there was a difference between *să* and *că*, (5a)'s unrequired events may prove that the possible mF of some conjunctions can been easily overtaken by subordinate clauses. Now we should read (5a) with its counterpart in (5b), thus E1-E2 from (5a) + E3 from (5b). Without any other additional information, are we able to define what

is the mF of the mentioned CC? Most probably we cannot define clearly whether it is external or internal mF, but we can hypothesise two possible answers: (1) the subjunctive conjunction marks the agent's personal implication; thus, he truly feels sorry for the goal arguments situation, (2) he does not have any personal implication, but he introduces E3 with the subjunctive because E2's predicate is based on the internal mF, a force which is also doubled by the clausal negation.

Let us continue with (5cd). From temporality (5c) is at least near future oriented, while (5d) is near past oriented. Both events are in the same present simple, but E1 cannot have the same simultaneous value at the agent's ST, at least not from aspectual point. (5d)'s E1 may be a true present simple – with its aspectual value verified at the agent's ST, but the same cannot be true for E2. If E2 would have the same aspectual value at the agent's ST, it would mean that he accepts something which he is not conscious about, or he is thinking what should he accept – of course, this is not the logical order of the assumed events. When the agent utters E1, he must know what he accepts. From the verified aspectual viewpoint, these two CCs do not provide the same axe. (5c) means that E2's distant aspect is not verified at E1's time, especially if we analyse from the implied agent's point. The verified local aspect is a mandatory condition, so E2 may have a different value, at its distant aspect point, although this is not the expected condition. In one hand, we have a good reason to extend E1's distant aspect to E2's point -- we want to ensure about E1's truth condition. By this, it seems that E1's aspectual sharing with the inserted breakpoint is the best solution; we can deduce that inserting the breakpoint also can include the individual checking. If this is mandatory or not, we will see later. On the other hand, (5d)'s aspectual state in past oriented. One might ask why they are not simultaneous events, as both events are in present simple. From the implied agent's point, E2's condition must be verified, with the realis conjunction, the expected condition is not based on a possible change, this should mean that E2's distant aspect is already verified, although this is not the general expectation of the present simple. Here, the verification is induced by E1, (5d) also proves that our perception is rather aspectual than temporal, since these two events are in the same tense.

Let us check what happens if we insert a clausal negation in front of E1 in (5cd). If we insert it in (5c), the aspectual verification may remain unchanged: E2 still started either in the near past or in the near future, it is true at ST and it may also be true after ST. If we verify E1's aspect without sharing, it triggers an issue if the subjunctive is near future or near past oriented because it excludes the truth condition of E1 at ET of E2, if E2's ET equals with E1's, then even donating is a suitable option for E1. The near past reference for the subjunctive is valid only when the CC is narrated by another person (told by another grammatical agent), in this case even E2's local aspect can be donated to E1. If the CC is not narrated in a multiple narrative context, the donated local aspect of (5c)'s E2 to E1 is not possible, because it causes the initial

truth condition of E2. In case of (5d), the sharing or the donating of E2 is not the most suitable because it leads to wrong labelling: the figure argument E2 tries to succeed the ground one. E1's aspectual sharing is correct, as it is a true conditional requirement. From the implied agent's point, E1's aspectual donating is not possible because E2 has a past reference, thus either the shared aspect or the individually checked is the most suitable. If we opt for the shared one in E1 (5d), we have to include a breakpoint in E2's aspectual axe, otherwise E1's aspect is shared with an empty, unmentioned event. I can think of at least one situation, when the clausal, or in this case the event negation can affect the aspectual verification. If (5c)'s E2 refers to the near future, then E1's neither local nor its distant aspect cannot be donated to E2, because it would cause interpretation issues: E2 will / might have a truth condition. In case of (5d), this would not cause ungrammaticality because its E2 is already true, so the negation acts like an operator in (5c), while in (5d) it rather expresses a stancetaking. To summarise, if (5c)'s negation does not refer to the same temporality (present) as E2, then E1 must have a shared checking. In (5c), the aspectual donating has most probably only a theoretical chance – a situation where the implied agent utters at the moment of blocking his salary its E1+E2 (with the proper 1st person inflection), at that situation E1's local aspect is equal with E2's distant aspect (or the distant aspect is suspended).

Let us discuss the mF of (5cd), from the grammatical agent's point. Both CCs are affirmative ones and without a proper context, we cannot state for sure their internal or external mF. Both CCs are suitable for narratorial use. If we add the clausal negation, (5c)'s external mF may include the agent's subjective stancetaking, related to a possible unhappened event, but due to the semantical nature of E1, the external mF is not the preferred one, because if the agent would had authority, he most probably would have used another predicate in E1. The same is valid for (5d), but here E2's distant aspect indicates an anteriority as compared with E2 of (5c).

4. Conclusions

In (1b), I examine how the internal vs. the external modal force is applied, with the realis vs. the irrealis conjunction, how the external modal force can be affected when the realis is combined with irrealis, thus how *a accepta* can refer to obligation vs. volition. In (1c), I examine the possible scope overtaking of the external force, yielding a realis + irrealis label, and the realis + realis conjunctions can lead to an initial false condition, in the mentioned CC. Here I also claim that the issue between realis + irrealis cannot be solved by aspectual donating or sharing. I also claim that a Force + Force label is not possible, and the ungrammaticality is eliminated if Finiteness is added. In (1e), I illustrate why the aspectual head (A0) is falsified rather

than the tense head (T0), in (1f), I check the powerful effect of a prepositional event variable: it modifies E2, thus its dependent E1 has a verified truth condition, (1ef) indirectly gives us an answer why in (1e) aspectual donating is not possible, while in (1f) it is. In (2a), I illustrate the presence of opposite labels, (2b) illustrates that both types of conjunctions imply different verified aspectual labels with the analysed predicate, (2c) illustrates that a dependent event cannot provide a different label, in terms of Dowty (1979), thus the internal volition cannot be recovered, if the previous dependent event provides an external force label. (2d) illustrates both the interpretative and the syntactical differences, in the realis + irrealis vs. in the realis + realis subevents, the 1st bracketed sequence is compatible with temporal / aspectual sharing, while the 2nd one is not. (2d) focuses on interpretative differences, thus how the presence of multiple arguments and narrators can change the polarity of the base clause and why the subjunctive can have an accomplishment value. In (2g), I examine the possible influence of a plural DP with a generic value, which might affect the linear perception; (2h) is a counterpart of (2g). In (2ij), I illustrate the temporal and aspectual gap, claiming that the apparently realis *că* – cannot provide a simultaneous reading (if i=i), with a non-dependent event. In (2l), I illustrate why the distant aspectual checking is not possible with realis conjunction, and in what circumstances the iterative meaning can be identified. It also illustrates what happens when the grammatical agent erases the PST operator of the subjunctive. By (2m), I motivate that (2c)'s ungrammaticality is not based on a pure syntactical reason, but on the simultaneously co-occurred and unrelated realis + realis values, (2n) illustrates that even *accepta + că* "accept + that" can imply the [I' and w'] – which is usually "reserved" for the present subjunctive. In (3a), I claim that that E10's subjunctive cannot be considered as irrealis, due to its restrictive nature. In (3e), I analyse the cause-effect relationship in CCs linked with *să* [E1] + [E2 … E(n)] *că* construction, examining the modal force and unforeseen consequences. (3e) also illustrates the role of the Cliffhanger technique, thus unifying both external and internal modal force, (3g) is the counterpart of (3e). (3ef) illustrate what is the linguistic connection between dignity-based and a regret-based CC. In (4a), I discuss the extended modal force of two dependent events, arguing that a single-valued modal force is present. (4f) illustrates that an added event can change the single type label force to a binary one, and the fact that the 1st subordinate clause does not have to mandatorily define the general modal force of the CC. Here, I also illustrate the mandatory interdependency between cognitive vs. syntactical final state. The modal force must be processed, but it does not have to be on the same axe with aspect or tense. (4f)'s E1-E5 can have a true condition, from cognitive point, which implies the falseness of E6. However, the syntax must consider E1-E6. Based on this, I suggest that cognitive final state does not have to be as stable, as the syntactical one. In (5a), I illustrate the

mandatory aspectual bridge. (5cd) illustrate the mandatory different verification of the distant aspect (with and without negation as operator / as stancetaking) and the effect that our perception is rather aspectual than temporal.

Glossary

CC – complex clause
E followed by a number – event / predicate, in terms of Davidson (1967)
ET – event time
mF – modal force
PRS – present (tense) as operator
PST – past as operator
ST – speech time

References

Davidson, Donald. 1967. "The Logical Form of Action Sentences." In *The Logic of Decision and Action*, ed. by Nicholas Rescher, 81-95. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.

Dowty, David. R. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar. The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht/ Boston / London: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Holmberg, Anders. 2016. *The Syntax of Yes and No: Studies in Rethinking Comparative Syntax*, vol 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1994. "A preliminary analysis of causative verbs in English." *Lingua* 92: 35–77.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1966 [1947]. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. New York: The Free Press.

Roberts, Ian. 2019. *Parameter Hierarchies and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.

Rosch, Eleanor, Carolyn B. Mervis, Wayne D. Gray, David M. Johnson, and Penny Boyes-Braem. 1976. "Basic objects in natural categories." *Cognitive Psychology* 8(3): 382-439.

Stan, Camelia. 2007. "Notă gramaticală: conjuncția *ca* (...) *să*." *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* LVIII(2): 451-458.

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. "Verbs and Times." *Linguistics in Philosophy*, 97-121. Cornell University Press.