

Complementizer Phrases (CP) in Romanian

Virginia Hill

This paper applies the split CP analysis in Rizzi (1997) to sentential complements in Romanian. Empirical data indicate that declarative sentences exhibit a reduced CP complement that qualifies as FinP. The head Fin displays lexical checkers at all times (i.e., either lexical complementizers or mood markers moved to Fin). Left dislocation to Topic and Focus is clause internal, following but not preceding the lexical material in Fin. On the other hand, indirect interrogatives and *wh*-interrogatives project to ForceP and display a complex CP field. The proposal based on these observations is that cross-linguistic variation may arise w.r.t. the complexity of the CP field because in some languages the presence versus the absence of a Force head is sufficient to mark a distinctive opposition between marked (e.g., interrogative, exclamative, conditional, etc.) and non-marked (e.g., declarative) sentential complements.*

0. Introduction

The split CP hypothesis proposed in Rizzi (1997) organizes the highest sentential field around two functional heads: Force and Finiteness (Fin), the latter selecting a clausal domain (labelled as Inflectional Phrase-IP in the pre-minimalist framework, and as Tense Phrase-TP since Chomsky 1995). In this system, parametric variation applies only at the level of Fin. Adopting the derivational approach of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995, 2001), this paper tests the split CP hypothesis on Romanian data and proposes a parameterization pattern that includes the Force head as well. It will be shown that a negative value for the features associated with Force (e.g., [+/-qu] features) entails absence of this projection from the derivation. Hence, a typological contrast arises between ForceP and FinP languages, which tallies with a wider cross-linguistic variation in the organization of the left periphery.

After reviewing the split CP hypothesis in section 1, the paper introduces empirical data in section 2 showing that the Romanian complementizers *cî/ca/de* occupy the head Fin and that the derivation of these sentential complements stops at FinP. In section 3 it is argued that sentential complements introduced by mood markers (i.e., subjunctive *sî* and infinitive *a*) follow the same syntactic pattern as *cî/ca/de* clauses, having the mood marker and the verbal string

(e.g., [*sî*-clitics-V]) in Fin. Section 4 presents data that confirm the relation between the presence/absence of Force and the presence/absence of Topic/Focus at the CP level. These data consist of indirect interrogatives in Romanian, which project to ForceP. In these constructions, Topic and Focus may appear above FinP, although such placement is denied in declarative CP complements. The ForceP versus FinP variation between Italian and Romanian declarative clauses is part of a wider typological contrast between Romance and Balkan languages, whose clause left peripheries pattern differently in their fronting strategies to Topic and Focus and in the application of verb movement to C.

1. *Theoretical and empirical data*

1.1. *Theoretical data*

In the pre-minimalist theory of grammar, the balance between empirical diversity and explanatory adequacy with respect to the clause structure has been attained by postulating a complex functional domain. Cross-linguistic variation followed, along these lines, from the composition of the functional domains. More precisely, the inflectional domain of the verb received a treatment along the split IP hypothesis (Kayne 1989, Pollock 1989), whereas the argumental domain of the verb was approached in terms of a VP-shell (Larson 1988). In the same spirit, Rizzi (1997) argues that CP must also be split over several functional heads, since it brings complex information regarding both the relation between the clause and the discourse (i.e., between the selecting verb and C), and the relation between the complementizer and the inflectional domain of the verb (i.e., the C - T system).

Fundamentally, CP ranges over two functional heads: (i) Force, which gives information on the clausal type (e.g., declarative, question, relative, etc.); and (ii) Fin, which gives information on the type of the embedded IP (mood features, conditions on subject agreement, tense distinctions). Between Force and Fin, functional heads encoding stylistic information may occur, namely, Topic and Focus, yielding the string in (1)¹.

- (1) ForceP.....(TopicP).....(FocusP).....(TopicP).....FinP

Italian illustrations of the CP system show the complementizers distributed between Force and Fin. Their location is established in relation to the sites for Topic and Focus phrases. Thus, Topic can follow but not precede the C – *che*, while it can precede but not follow the C – *di*. Accordingly, *che* occupies Force, whereas *di* occupies Fin. By the same test, relative pronouns are shown to occupy Spec,ForceP, whereas interrogative pronouns occupy Spec,FocusP. The positional distinction of complementizers interacts with syntactic checking rules, the result being translated in adjacency requirements between C and certain elements of IP (adjacency examples: *di* and infinitive verbs in Italian; *for* and the lexical subject of infinitive clauses in English; Aux in C and lexical subjects).

The corpus explored in Rizzi (1997) supports the idea that any CP carries the split structure in (1). Cross-linguistic variation concerns only the features of Fin, according to the extent to which additional IP information is replicated in CP (e.g., mood or subject agreement in C). In this paper we adopt a derivational approach, such as proposed in the Minimalist Program, since Chomsky (1995). When recast in this framework, the split CP hypothesis leaves room for variation at the level of Force as well, granting that a language may use the projection or the non-projection of Force as a distinctive opposition. From this point of view, the CP field may vary in complexity in the same way the IP does (e.g., clause structures that project only to VoiceP or AgrOP versus TP, according to the selecting properties of the higher head). The Romanian data presented in this paper serve as a study case of such variation.

1.2. Empirical data

The complementizer system of Romanian has a relatively high number of lexical items, which alternate in certain contexts. Table (1) presents the list of complementizers that may appear in the C-head of sentential complements (including indirect interrogatives and relatives). Complementizers select a specific mood inflection, which is also presented for each case. Illustration of each occurrence follows in the paradigms (2) to (6).²

Table 1. *Lexical C in sentential complements*

| C | Clause Type | | Compatible verbal mood | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|------------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| | declarative | other | indic. | cond. | subj. | infinitive | supine |
| cî | + | – | + | + | + ³ | – | – |
| ca | + | – | – | – | + | – | – |
| dacî | – | + | + | + | + | – | – |
| de | + | + | + | – | – | + ⁴ | + |
| oare ⁵ | – | + | + | + | + | – | – |

The occurrence of *cî*:

- (2) a. Spunea cî Ion a luat/ar lua o carte.
 said that Ion has-IND taken/would-COND take a book
 ‘She said that Ion has taken/would take a book.’
 b. Zice cî sî te duci Ți tu la bal.
 says that SA-SUBJ you-REFL go-2SG and you-NOM to party
 ‘She says that you should also go to the party.’

The occurrence of *ca*:

- (3) Voia ca Ion sî ia o carte.
 wanted that Ion SA-SUBJ take a book
 ‘She wanted Ion to take a book.’

The occurrence of *dacî*:

- (4) a. Mî întreb dacî Ion va/ar veni la petrecere.
 REFL ask whether Ion will-IND/would-COND come to party
 ‘I ask myself whether Ion will/would come to the party.’
 b. Mî întreb dacî sî plec mai repede.
 REFL ask whether SA-SUBJ leave-1SG more soon
 ‘I ask myself whether I should leave sooner.’

The occurrence of *de*:

- (5) a. Aceastî perspectivî ne permite (de) a contempla infinitul.
 this perspective us permits of to-INF contemplate infinite-the
 ‘This perspective allows us to contemplate the infinite.’
 b. Am terminat de vopsit casa.
 have finished of painted-SUP house-the
 ‘I have finished painting the house.’
 c. M-a lîsat de m-am uitat la film.
 me has let of have-IND watched movie-the
 ‘She let me watch the movie.’

- d. Mergea la izvorul cela de te vindecî la rîni.
 went to source-the that which you heals at wounds
 'She was going to the source that heals your wounds.'

The occurrence of *oare*:

- (6) a. Oare Ion va/ar primi o carte?
 Q Ion will-IND/would-COND receive a book
 'Will/would Ion receive a book?'
 b. Mî întreb oare Ion va/ar primi o carte?
 REFL ask Q Ion will-IND/would-COND receive a book
 'I ask myself whether Ion will/would receive a book.'
 c. Oare sî plec mai devreme?// Mî întreb oare sî plec mai
 devreme?
 Q SA-SUBJ leave more soon// REFL ask Q SA-SUBJ leave more soon
 'Should I leave sooner?// 'I ask myself whether I should leave sooner.'

Oare is completely optional, but its presence heightens the stylistic effect. In embedded contexts, *dacî* is the default choice, the switch to *oare* being stylistically motivated. Also, the placement of *oare* in the linear order vary, according to a pattern discussed in section 4 and in the Appendix.

1.3. Diagnostic criteria

The tests to determine the position of complementizers and of the lexical material surrounding them rely on positional indicators, as follows:

(a) The extension of the hierarchy in (1) to Romanian. Thus, relatives occupy Spec,ForceP, phrases undergoing contrastive Focus movement and wh-elements occupy Spec,FocusP, whereas Topics may occur in between the functional CP-heads. There is no sign (to date and for Romanian) of cross-linguistic variation in this respect.

(b) The hierarchy of higher and lower adverbs proposed in Cinque (1999) extends to Romanian, with a few exceptions⁶. Therefore, adverb movement to the left periphery (i.e., higher than auxiliaries) means either adverb preposing or movement to a (contrastive) Focus position.

(c) The hierarchy of functional heads in Romanian IP is MP-TP-VP, where M stands for Mood and has a lexical manifestation through mood markers (e.g. subjunctive *sî*, infinitive *a*, conditional *a*] etc.)⁷. These mood markers behave as morphological affixes and join the clitic cluster preceding inflected verbs. For example, the sequence

[sÎ-clitic pronouns-short adverb-V] behaves as a complex head whose components cannot be separated by other constituents (e.g. *[sÎ-SUBJECT/ADVP-clitics-V]). Since M hosts the entire sequence, it follows that M checks the Phi-features, EPP and Case in Spec,MP, and head movement from M applies to the entire sequence, not only to the mood marker⁸.

(d) Subject positions also offer a hierarchical indication⁹. Romanian is a null subject language with free SVO-VSO word order, in which lexical subjects may surface in situ. Subject movement to a preverbal position is generally considered a Topic movement, although the argumental Spec,TP/Spec,MP may also be targeted. This latter possibility is a positional indicator for the border between IP and CP fields. In this paper we consider that indicative clauses project a Spec,TP, while other clauses project a Spec,MP for subject checking. The tests will use bare quantifiers (BQ) as subjects, as these nominals may not undergo movement to Topic (Cinque 1990). The contrast between (7a) and (7b) shows that BQ is excluded from a Topic position, while the grammaticality of (7c) shows that BQ may, however, occupy a preverbal position. We consider the latter one to be an argumental Spec,MP.

- (7) a. Ion cum sÎ-l anun e?
 John how SA him inform
 'How can John inform you?'
 b. *Cineva cum sÎ-l anun e?
 somebody how SA him inform
 c. Cineva sÎ-l anun e!
 somebody SA him inform
 'Somebody inform him!'

This test relies on the assumption that an equivalent argumental position is not available within the CP field, and every preverbal BQ subject is incompatible with Spec,Top or Spec,Focus within CP (if it does not carry intonational stress for contrastive focus)¹⁰.

- (7) d. Cineva i-o va recomanda evident chiar pe aceastÎ studentÎ lui Ion.
 Somebody him her will recommend evidently even pe-this student to Ion
 'Somebody will evidently recommend this very student to Ion.'
 e. [_{HT}Studenta aceasta], [_Tlui Ion] [_pevident] [_{SUBJ}cineva] [_{FOC}chiar pe ea] [i-o va recomanda.]
 Student this to Ion evidently somebody even pe-her him her will recommend
 'As for this student, evidently somebody will recommend exactly her to Ion.'

The pair of sentences in (7d, e) illustrate possible word orders in the left periphery of a root clauses. In (7d) the word order follows the normal ‘unmarked’ intonation pattern, whereas (7e) involves specific intonation relying on breaks. The latter has the sequence: Hanging Topic, Left Dislocation to Topic, Adverb Preposing, BQ in argumental subject position, Preverbal (contrastive) Focus, clitic cluster+Aux+V. Note that only contrastive Focus will be considered for the tests proposed in this paper.

The following chapters investigate the behavior of the constructions presented in (2) to (6) when they undergo positional tests based on the criteria listed in this section.

2. Locations in CP: C [-qu]

In this section, complementizers compatible with declarative C-heads (i.e., *cî*, *ca*, *de*) undergo distributional tests in relation to Topic and Focus phrases, as well as tests of alternation and/or complementary distribution. Section 2.1. demonstrates that the three morphemes occur in complementary distribution, and compete for the same functional head within the CP field. Section 2.2. identifies this head as Fin, and defines the respective sentential complements as FinPs. The mood markers *sî* and *a* are shown to undergo V/M-to-Fin in the absence of the lexical complementizer.

2.1. Distribution

As shown in the examples (2) and (3), non-interrogative clauses use *cî* and *ca* in finite complements, the latter being compatible only with subjunctives¹¹. In the equivalent context of a subjunctive complement, *cî* and *ca* exhibit a complementary distribution, as shown in (8).

- (8) a. Zicea *cî* (**ca*) Ion *sî* nu mai plece la câmp.
 said that Ion SA-SUBJ not more go to field
 ‘She said that Ion should not go in the field.’
 b. Zicea *ca* (**cî*) Ion *sî* nu mai plece la câmp.
 said that Ion SA-SUBJ not go to field
 ‘She said that Ion should not go in the field.’

The distribution in (8) indicates that *cî* and *ca* compete for the same position.

Topic and contrastive Focus in constructions such as (8) may follow but not precede *cî/ca*, as in (9).

- (9) a. Zicea (*pe Maria) *cî/ca* (pe Maria) *sî* n-o mai invite (pe Maria).
 said pe-Maria-TOP that pe-Maria-TOP SA-SUBJ not more invite pe-Maria
 ‘She/he said that he/she should not invite Maria any more.’
 b. Zicea (*pe MARIA) *cî/ca* (pe MARIA) *sî* n-o mai invite (pe MARIA).
 said pe-Maria-FOC that pe-Maria-FOC SA-SUBJ not her more invite pe-Maria-FOC
 ‘She/he said it’s Maria she/he should not invite any more.’

At first sight, *cî* and *ca* seem to occupy the Force head, for which they compete. This would be in line with the behavior of the equivalent *que/che* in Romance. However, the behavior of *de* in relation to *cî* and *ca* shows a more complex situation.

The non-finite complementizer in Romance is *de/di*; that covers Romanian as well, although Romanian *de* has important peculiarities. Romanian makes use of *de* as the all-purpose complementizer; it appears in sentential complements (5a, b, c), relatives (5d), and adjunct clauses, and it combines with indicative, conditional, infinitive and supine verbs. From all these possibilities, only *de*-infinitive complements as in (5a) find equivalents in other Romance languages. Complements with *de* and indicative, as shown in (5c), occur in causative constructions. Note that the causative creates a configuration in which the indicative behaves as a non-finite verb, insofar as it exhibits anaphoric tense and obligatory coreference of matrix object and embedded subject. So (5c), repeated for convenience, cannot have a lexical subject, as in (10a) or independent tense specifications, as in (10b).

- (5) c. M-a lîsat de m-am uitat la film.
 me has let of me-REFL have-IND watched movie-the
 ‘She let me watch the movie.’
- (10) a. *M-a lîsat de (eu) m-am uitat (eu) la film.
 me has let of I me-REFL have-IND.PR.PAST watched I movie-the
 b. *M-a lîsat de mî voi uita la film.
 me has let of me-REFL will-IND.FUT watched movie-the

The complementation context in (5c) situates *de* on a par with *cî*, which also selects the indicative. This functional equivalence is trans-

parent in (11), where *cî* and *de* must occur in complementary distribution.

- (11) a. M-a fîcut (*aproape) *cî*(*de)-aproape-am plîns.
 me has made almost that of almost have-IND cried
 ‘She almost made me cry.’
 b. M-a fîcut (*aproape) de (**cî*)-aproape-am plîns.
 me has made almost of that almost have-IND cried
 ‘She almost made me cry.’

In (11) *cî* and *de* appear as competitors for the same position. The word order shows that the left dislocated adverb *aproape* ‘almost’ must follow *de* as well as *cî*, therefore the two complementizers must occupy the same position.

To sum it up, Romanian C [-qu] *cî*, *ca*, *de* compete for the same position within CP, which precedes Topic and Focus constituents. It remains to be determined whether this position is Force (as for Romance *que/che*) or Fin (as for Romance *de/di*).

2.2. *FinP* in declarative sentences

Data from different historical stages of Romanian show co-occurrence of *wh*-phrases and *cî*, as in (12).¹²

- (12) a. A visat cum *cî* fî-ar fi cumpîrat o vilî la munte.
 has dreamt how that REFL would be bought a villa at mountains
 ‘She dreamt that she has bought a villa in the mountains.’
 b. Pentru *Èe* *cî* au rîdicat Bafta Giurgiu oaste în hotarul
 Ardealului... (Rosetti 1966:302)
 for which that has risen B.G. army in border-the Ardeal-the-GEN
 ‘For which Bastea Giurgiu has risen his army at the border
 with Ardeal.’
 c. Am miluit boiarimul domniei mele... cu satul Borîfti
 have blessed domain-the kingdom-GEN my with village-the Borasti
cîce *cî*-au fost lui moje...
 which has been to him property...
 ‘I have blessed my kingdom with the village of Borasti, which
 had been his property.’

Assuming that the relative phrases *pentru Èe* ‘for which’ in (12b) and *cîce* ‘which’ in (12c) target SpecForceP, as in Italian, and assuming that some filter on doubly filled ForceP applies, then the lower *cî* must be in Fin. The example in (12a), from Modern colloquial

Romanian, is decisive through its word order: the *wh*-element *cum* ‘how’ co-occurs with *cî* ‘that’. This word order conforms to the predictions in (1): if the *wh*-element is in Spec,Focus, then the Topic must be higher, whereas *cî* must be lower, in Fin.

Modern Romanian also replaces *cî* with *de* in colloquial language, as in (13), with the restrictions on word order specific to *de*-complements (i.e., constituents may but rarely occur between *de* and the verb).

- (13) a. Mî-ntrebam cum de se poate afa ceva în lumea asta.
 REFL asked how of SE can this something in world-the this
 ‘I was asking myself how something like this is possible in this world.’
 b. Mî-ntrebam cum, Doamne, de se poate afa ceva.
 REFL asked how God-VOC of SE can this something
 ‘I was asking myself how, for God’s sake, something like this is possible in this world.’

As in (12a), *cum* in (13a) must be in Spec,FocusP, whereas *de* is in Fin. Some invocations (in Vocative Case) may intervene between *cum* and *de*, as in (13b), showing that they do not fill the Spec and the head of the same phrase.

To sum up the results so far, *cî* and *de* follow *wh*-elements located in Spec,ForceP or in Spec,FocusP, and thus qualify as Fin elements. Since section 2.1. shows that *cî*, *ca* and *de* occur in the same position, that position must be identified uniformly as the head Fin. Therefore, sentential complements in declaratives qualify as FinP, with the hierarchy in (14).

- (14) [_{FinP} *cî/ca/de* [_{IP} I+V [_{VP} *t_V*]]]

According to (14), Topic and Focus constituents following *cî/ca/de* target IP internal positions. The example in (15) refers to the diagnostic criterion illustrated in (7) in section 1.3 and shows that, in a configuration like (14), a preverbal BQ subject appears between Topic and Focus in an embedded clause.

- (15) Spunea *cî* pe fete cineva ATUNCI le-ar fi chemat (nu acum).
 said that pe-girls-TOP somebody then-FOC them would be called not now
 ‘She said that it was then that someone has called the girls, not now.’

If BQ is in an argumental position (i.e. Spec,TP in indicatives), then the Focus position is clause internal. The Topic position may

theoretically be anywhere, from clause internal position above TP to different hierarchical levels in CP. However, in the light of the tests on complementizers it is reasonable to assume that this particular Topic position is also clause internal.

To conclude, section 2 argues that the following variation arises between Italian and Romanian sentential complements: *che* and *di* sentences project to ForceP (with *che* in Force and *di* in Fin), whereas *cî* and *de* sentences project to FinP (with *cî* and *de* in Fin).

3. Mood markers and CP

In this section we confront the analysis in (14) with sentential complements that exhibit lexical mood markers, that is, the subjunctive *sî* and the infinitive *a*. Subjunctive paradigms consist of indicative or subjunctive verb forms preceded by the invariable morpheme *sî*, that serves as a lexical mark for the subjunctive mood. The restrictions on word order in the presence of *sî* are presented in section 1.3 and resumed in (16).

- (16) (XP).. *sî/a* ...(*XP)...(clitic pronouns), (neg), (clitic adverb),
(aux)...(*XP)...V...(XP)...

As seen in the examples (2) and (3), *ca* and sometimes *cî*, followed by phrasal constituents may precede the *sî*-V string, while *de* may precede the *a*-V string, as in (5a). Since infinitive clauses (with or without *de*) are scarce in Modern Romanian as complements to verbs, the following discussion will focus on subjunctives and any conclusions drawn for the subjunctive *sî* will be generalized to the infinitive *a*.

Subjunctive complements with *ca* display the same word order and restrictions as the sentential complements with *cî* and indicative, that is: Topic and Focus follows but cannot precede *ca*, as in (17a); when they follow *ca*, as in (17b), they surround a preverbal BQ subject, that indicates the clause internal field.

- (17) a. *Ar fi preferat pe fete ATUNCI ca cineva sî le fi chemat (nu acum).
would be preferred pe-girls-TOP then-FOC that somebody SA them be called not now
b. Ar fi preferat ca pe fete cineva ATUNCI sî le fi chemat (nu acum).

would be preferred that pe-girls-TOP somebody then-FOC SA them be called not now
'She would have preferred that somebody had called the girls THEN (not now).'

The word order in (17) is representative for the equivalent status of *cî* and *ca* as complementizers, as well as for the location of *sî* in M, in the clausal domain, lower than the preverbal BQ subject. These conclusions find extensive support in current studies on Romanian syntax (see end note 7). To them, the present analysis adds the definition of *ca* as a Fin element. Then, it is important to determine what happens when *ca* is absent from the construction, which is possible while maintaining the same interpretation, as shown by the examples in (18) which replicate the examples in (17).

- (18) a. Ar fi preferat *sî* le fi chemat cineva pe fete ATUNCII (nu acum).
would be preferred SA them be called somebody then-FOC not now
'She would have preferred that somebody had called the girls THEN (not now).'
- b. #Ar fi preferat pe fete cineva ATUNCII *sî* le fi chemat (nu acum).
would be preferred pe-girls-TOP somebody then-FOC SA them be called not now
'She would have preferred that somebody had called the girls THEN (not now).'

The structures in (17) and (18) differ through the deletion of *ca*. In that situation, Standard Romanian allows only the word order in (18a), where no constituent may precede *sî*. Topic, Focus, lexical subjects may appear only in post-verbal positions. This restriction of word order justified the overall analysis of constructions such as (18a) as showing *sî* movement to C (i.e., Fin in this framework), to substitute for the functional role of *ca* (Farkas 1985, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 a.o.). Since *sî*, as an affix, moves to Fin together with the entire inflectional V-string shown in (16), then constituents generally found in the left periphery (e.g., Topic, preverbal subject, Focus) will always appear lower than the inflected verb, without necessarily being located in the right periphery. So, in the minimalist terminology, (18a) shows movement of V/M-to-Fin, so that the *sî*-V string may check the features of Fin in the absence of *ca*.

Colloquial Romanian, as in (18b), contrasts with the Standard variety insofar as it allows both pre- and post-verbal placement of

Topic and/or BQ preverbal subject and/or Focus¹³. If the preverbal BQ subject is an indicator for clause internal fields, then (18b) shows that either V/M does not move to Fin, or that if such movement takes place, the lower copy is chosen for pronunciation. The latter analysis is possible in the MP framework which allows for copy and deletion of lexical items (Chomsky 2001) and seems more reasonable, since it ensures a uniform account for *sî*-subjunctive complements. That is, *sî*-subjunctives always project to FinP so that the *sî*-V string checks the features of Fin; Standard Romanian pronounces the higher copy of the *sî*-V string in Fin, whereas Colloquial Romanian may pronounce the lower copy, in M¹⁴.

To sum up the results so far, sentential complements in declarative clauses project to FinP, where Fin contains either lexical complementizers (i.e., *cî/ca/de*) or V-strings with mood markers (i.e., subj. *sî* or infin. *a*). FinP complements allow for movement to Topic and Focus in the left periphery of their inflectional phrase (which is a TP in indicatives and an MP in subjunctives).

4. Word order in CP: C [+qu]

This section confirms that the placement of Topic and Focus within IP does not follow from independent properties of Romanian grammar but from the unavailability of a full-fledged CP. Argument: when a complement clause projects to ForceP, Topic and Focus may occur in the CP field in Romanian as well.

Complement clauses which project to ForceP have [+qu] features associated with the head Force. The relevant complementizers for our tests are *dacî* ‘if, whether’ and *oare*, which is a question morpheme. *Dacî* has a recognized subordinator status in traditional grammar, whereas *oare* is classified as an adverb. Section 4.1. will redefine *oare* as a complementizer. Section 4.2. will determine the location of *dacî* in Force, in relation to *oare*, in Fin. Topic and Focus constituents may appear between *dacî* and *oare*, as well as lower than *oare*.

4.1. Oare

4.1.1. Distribution

The element *oare* appears only in questions, in root and embedded clauses, where it is considered optional, as shown in (6), repeated for convenience. “Optionality” means that the sentences are grammatical with or without *oare*. However, inserting *oare* is the choice if

stylistic features are selected for an intended reading. That is, *oare* adds a stylistic dimension to the question (e.g., doubt, wonder, irony, etc.) which is not transparent in its absence.

- (6) a. (Oare) Ion va/ar primi o carte?
Q Ion will-IND/would-COND receive a book
'Will/would Ion receive a book?'
- b. Mî întreb (oare) Ion va/ar primi o carte?
REFL ask Q Ion will-IND/would-COND receive a book
'I ask myself whether Ion will/would receive a book.'

Yes-no questions, as in (6), may have the SV order, and the presence of *oare* does not affect it. *Wh*-questions have obligatory VS word order, which is, again, unaffected by *oare*:

- (19) a. (Oare) unde (*Ion) va primi Ion cartea?
Q where Ion will receive Ion book-the
'Where will Ion receive the book?'
- b. Mî întreb (oare) unde (*Ion) va primi Ion cartea?
REFL ask where Q Ion will-IND receive Ion book-the
'I ask myself where Ion will receive the book.'

In structures such as (19a, b) *oare* may appear at almost any point in the structure, as further shown in (20).

- (20) a. (Oare) unde (oare) va primi (oare) Ion cartea (oare)?
Q where Q will receive Q Ion book-the Q
'Where will Ion receive the book?'
- b. Mî întreb (oare) unde (oare) va primi (oare) Ion cartea (oare)?
REFL ask Q where Q will receive Q Ion book-the Q
'I ask myself where Ion will receive the book.'

The distributional flexibility of *oare* is considered as an adverbial property in traditional grammar, although the semantics and usage would rather assign it to a special category of question markers, such as *li* and *dali* in Bulgarian and Slavic¹⁵. A closer look at the syntax of *oare* will show that it meets the criteria for a lexical complementizer.

4.1.2. The status of *oare*

First, let us consider the possibility that *oare* may be a clitic, such as suggested in some morphological approaches (e.g., Joseph

2001). If this were the case, *oare* should not be able to appear by itself and should exhibit the same distributional pattern as other clitic adverbs in the language (e.g., *mai* ‘more’). The data show that none of these conditions are met.

- (21) a. - Ion s- a hotîrât sî se apuce de lucru.
 Ion REFL-has decided SA REFL start-SUBJ.3SG of work
 ‘Ion has decided to start working.’
 - *Oare?/Oare!*
 ‘Is that right?/No kidding!/I wonder.’
- b. (*mai) Maria (*mai) a (mai) pus (*mai) scrisorile (*mai) la poştă (*mai)?
 more Maria more has more put more letters-the more at mail more
 ‘Did Maria mail the letters at all?’
- c. (oare) Maria (oare) a (*oare) pus (oare) scrisorile (oare) la poştă (oare)?
 Q Maria Q has Q put Q letters-the Q at mail Q
 ‘Did Maria mail the letters?’

In (21a), *oare* stands by itself, as answer to a question, unlike short clitic adverbs like *mai*, which would be ungrammatical in this position. In (21b), *mai* has a complementary distribution when compared with *oare* in (21c): *mai* appears only as attached to the past participle (*pus* ‘put’), a position which rules out *oare*. So the positional contrast between *oare* and *mai* in (21) eliminates the possibility of defining *oare* as a clitic.

Second, we will explore the adverbial status of *oare* by comparing it with full-fledged adverbs. It is expected that *oare* share in both the phrasal properties and the distributional pattern of these adverbs. Again, these expectations are not borne out by the data.

Adverbial phrasal properties cannot be obtained with *oare*. That is, adverbs may take modifiers, whereas *oare* cannot, as shown in (22).

- (22) a. *mai/*prea/*cam/*abia oare
 more/ too/ quite/ hardly Q
- b. mai/ cam mereu; mai/ prea mult;
 more/quite frequently; more/quite much;
 mai/ abia acum; mai/abia ieri
 more/hardly now; more/hardly yesterday

However, a comparison between (21c) and (23) may still suggest

that *oare* has some adverbial properties since it seems to occur in the same locations as adverbs such as *ieri* ‘yesterday’.

- (23) (ieri) Maria (ieri) a (*ieri) pus (ieri)
 yesterday Maria yesterday has yesterday put yesterday
 scrisorile (ieri) la poștă (ieri)?
 letters-the yesterday at mail yesterday
 ‘Has Maria mailed the letters yesterday?’

Further tests will show that the distributional similarity in (21c) and (23) must be coincidental, since *oare* and full-fledged adverbs do not target the same position in other contexts. The first example of different distribution comes in *sî*-subjunctives, as in (24).

- (24) a. Mî gândeam oare sî plec mai devreme?
 REFL thought Q SA go more early
 ‘I was thinking whether I should leave earlier.’
 b. *Mî gândeam mâine sî plec mai devreme?
 REFL thought tomorrow SA go more early
 c. Mî gândeam, oare, mâine, sî plec mai devreme?
 REFL thought Q tomorrow SA go more early
 ‘I was thinking whether I should leave earlier tomorrow.’

As mentioned for (18), *sî*-initial complements ban lexical material in front of *sî* in Standard Romanian, although colloquial language allows it. Interestingly, speakers are sensitive to this ban in interrogative sentences as in (24b), irrespective of the language register¹⁶. In this particular case, the adverb ‘tomorrow’ is presumably preposed from a post-verbal position¹⁷. Whatever the reason is for this restriction, it does not concern *oare*, in (24a). Moreover, the insertion of *oare* in (24c) is shown to rescue (24b). The behavior and distribution of *oare* in (24) matches the behavior and distribution of *ca* in (17) insofar as it precedes *sî* and allows constituents to intervene between the two elements.

A second example of contrastive distribution between *oare* and adverbs appears in the word order of wh-interrogatives, as in (25).

- (25) a. Pe cine oare invitase Maria ieri?
pe whom Q invited Maria yesterday
 ‘Whom had Maria invited yesterday?’
 b. Pe cine (*ieri/ *Maria) invitase (Maria)?
pe whom yesterday/Maria invited Maria

- c. Pe cine mai/ abia invitase Maria?
pe-whom more/hardly invited Maria
 ‘Whom else did Maria invite?//Whom has Maria just invited?’

Romanian *wh*-phrases require strict adjacency between the *wh*-phrase and the verb¹⁸. In particular, constituents that merge in a Spec position in the left periphery rule out the sentence, as is the case with the adverb or the preverbal subject in (25b). Only short clitic adverbs may appear in this context, as in (25c), where the clitic is included in the verbal head. It is already established that *oare* does not have clitic properties. Then, the location of *oare* in (25a) may be accounted for only if it does not occupy a Specifier position, as the adverb does. Therefore, (25) shows a distributional contrast between adverbs and *oare* that corresponds to a contrast between placement in a Spec position and placement in a head position. Only the latter would not interfere with the *wh*-chain, and it must contain *oare*.

A third distributional contrast between *oare* and adverbs appears in non-finite complements. Romanian non-finite clauses do not serve as interrogative complements except in one configuration, known as the “bare infinitive” and illustrated in (26).

- (26) Nuftiu (*oare) unde (*oare) pleca (*oare) (chiar acum) (*oare).
 not know Q where Q go-INF Q right now Q
 ‘I don’t know where to go right now.’

Oare is excluded from any position in (26), although this is not expected in light of grammatical examples as in (20). On the other hand, adverbs such as ‘now’ are compatible with (26). Again, *oare* and adverbs do not share distributional properties. If we follow current analyses of the constructions in (26) (e.g., Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 a.o.), the bare infinitive moves to C. Then the configuration in (26) suggests that *oare* competes with the bare infinitive rather than with adverbs. Again, *oare* appears as a candidate for the C position.

Summing up the observations so far, *oare* behaves on a par with *ca* in subjunctive complements, it may intervene between a *wh*-phrase and the finite verb, and it competes with the infinitive verb in V-to-C configurations. This behavior, in addition to the contrastive distribution in relation to adverbs, indicates that *oare* is a complementizer, not an adverb¹⁹. Along these lines, we conclude that *oare* occupies a head in the CP field at all times. Variation of placement as seen in (21c) follows from constituent movement to the left of *oare*, as opposed to the Merge of *oare* at different levels in the derivation. The

Appendix to this paper offers samples of leftward movement in *oare* sentences. The immediate task is to determine the C-head hosting *oare*, as well as the conditions which allow constituents to move to the left of *oare* but not to the left of *cî/ca/de*.

4.2. Interrogative complements

As already mentioned, the morpheme *oare* is compatible with both *yes-no* questions and *wh*-interrogatives in root and embedded clauses. In all these contexts *oare* is optional, and when present, it co-occurs with interrogative elements. If *oare* is a complementizer, its position in relation to other interrogative complementizers or *wh*-elements will help to determine the extent of CP in these structures, as well as the location of each element in this field. The data show that interrogative complements project to ForceP, they exhibit the interrogative complementizer in Force, the *wh*-elements in FocusP, and *oare* in Fin. Relevant to our analysis is the location of Topic and Focus constituents between Force and Fin in these structures.

Indirect interrogatives exhibit an obligatory lexical complementizer, that is *dacî* ‘whether’, etymologically based on Latin *quod* (i.e., *de ad quod*), on a par with *cî*. In these structures, Topic and Focus may follow but not precede the complementizer, as in (27).

- (27) a. Mî întreb dacî nu cumva SPRE VEST ar trebui sî
mî orientez.
REFL ask whether not somehow toward west-FOC would-1sg should
SA REFL look
‘I wonder whether I should not look towards the West.’
- b. *Mî întreb nu cumva SPRE VEST dacî ar trebui sî
mî orientez.
REFL ask not somehow toward west-FOC whether would-1sg should
SA REFL look

The ungrammaticality of (27b) may have two sources: *dacî* is in Force, so Topic and Focus may not target higher positions, or *dacî* is in Fin, on a par with *cî*, and there is no more structure above FinP to accommodate those constituents. Clarifications come after the insertion of *oare* in the structure, as in (28).

- (28) a. Mî întreb [(**oare*) dacî (*oare*) n- ar fi mai bine sî plec.]
REFL ask Q whether Q not would be more well SA go-SUBJ.1sg.
‘I wonder if it wouldn’t be better for me to go.’

- b. Mî întreb [dacî (oare) pînî la urmî (oare) CAS√ (oare) o sî-Ńi
 cumpere Ion?]
 REFL ask whether Q up to end Q house Q will SA REFL
 buy Ion
 ‘I wonder if, in the end, it will be a house Ion is going to buy.’

Although *oare* may co-occur with *dacî*, the hierarchical order is strictly *dacî* - *oare*, as in (28a)²⁰. In (28b), the two elements may be adjacent or separated by Topic, or Topic and Focus. Taking into consideration the head status of *oare* and the hierarchy of the split CP in (1), it follows that *dacî* must occupy Force, *oare* is in Fin, and optional Topic and Focus constituents may occur between Force and Fin²¹. Since Romanian IP left periphery also has the capacity to accommodate Topic and Focus, as seen in FinP complements, these constituents may also remain lower than *oare*, as seen in (28b). Therefore, the examples in (27) and (28) support an analysis of indirect interrogatives as ForceP, and show the possibility for fronting to Topic and Focus in the CP field.

Relatives and *wh*-interrogatives observe the hierarchy in (1) as well, as shown in (29).

- (29) a. Nu Ńtiu pe care cum (oare) sî- l mai potolesc (oare).
 not kow pe-which how Q SA him more calm Q
 ‘I don’t know which one to calm down in which way.’
 b. Nu Ńtiu care (oare) pînî la urmî (oare) o sî dea (oare) rezul-
 tate (oare).
 not kow which Q up to end Q will SA give Q results Q
 ‘I don’t know which one will finally give la urmî (oare) o
 sî reuŃim (oare).
 c. Nu Ńtiu pînî urmî cum (oare) (*pînî la urmî) (oare) o sî
 reuŃim (oare)
 not know up to end how Q up to end Q will-1pl SA succeed Q
 ‘I don’t know how we will succeed in the end.’

In (29a), relatives in ForceP precede interrogatives phrases in FocusP, which precede *oare* in Fin. The embedded IP may also move to Spec,Fin, resulting in the “post-position” of *oare*. Topic constituents follow the relative, as in (29b), and either precede *oare*, in which case they are in the CP field, or follow *oare*, in which case they are in the IP field. Other phrasal constituents from the embedded clause may move to Spec,Fin, leaving *oare* stranded at various levels. In a *wh*-interrogative, such as (29c), the Topic constituent may precede the *wh*-element, being higher than FocusP in the CP field. However, the

same constituent may not intervene between *cum* and *oare*, or between *oare* and the inflected verb, since it would disrupt the obligatory adjacency between the *wh*-phrase and the inflected verb. Therefore, the examples in (29) show that relatives and *wh*-interrogative complements project to ForceP and allow for Topic and Focus movement to the CP field.

An interesting difference between indirect interrogatives as in (28) and *wh*-interrogatives as in (29) is the variable hierarchy in relation to *oare*. Although *oare* may not precede *dacî*, it may precede relatives and *wh*-elements, as in (30).

- (30) a. Nu ştiu (oare) care - o sî dea rezultate?
 not know Q which will SA give results
 'I don't know which one will finally give results.'
 c. Nu ştiu (oare) cum o sî reuşim?
 not know Q how will-1pl SA succeed
 'I don't know how we will succeed in the end.'

The word order in (30) is not surprising if we assume that *wh* and Focus constituents occupy the same position and that Topic and Focus may target IP internal positions in Romanian. Thus, the relative and *wh*-element in (30) must be in the left periphery of IP, lower than Fin²². Data from colloquial Romanian indicate this possibility in (31).

- (31) a. Mî întreba cî unde sî se duce (?*oare).
 me asked that where SA REFL go Q
 'He asked me where he should go.'
 b. Mî întreba cî cu care sî voteze (?*oare).
 me asked that with which SA vote
 'He asked me for which one he should vote.'

Since *cî* 'that' is in Fin, the *wh*-phrase in (31a) and the relative in (31b) must be in the left periphery of the embedded IP/MP. As expected, *oare* is not welcome in these constructions, since it would clash with *cî* in features and location²³.

To sum up this section, tests with *oare* show that embedded interrogatives in Romanian project to ForceP and allow for Topic and Focus placement in the CP field. Concurrently, placement of Topic and Focus is available in the left periphery of the embedded IP, and the choice between the CP and the IP field depends on the intended interpretive effects. Looking back at Section 3, the lack of Topic and Focus in the field of the complementizers *cî*, *ca*, *de* indicates the

unavailability of a suitable domain, rather than a general interdiction in the language to move constituents above the clausal border.

5. Conclusions

This paper adopted the split CP hypothesis proposed in Rizzi (1997) and applied it to Romanian. The hierarchy of the CP field is represented in (1). Tests on Romanian sentential complements show that all the [-qu] complementizers (i.e., *cî*, *ca*, *de*) occupy the Fin head, because they are hierarchically lower than relatives and wh-elements. Topic and Focus may follow but not precede these complementizers, which indicates that: (i) there is no CP field above FinP; and (ii) a head in the IP left periphery is able to accommodate the [topic] and [focus] features which ensure checking for the corresponding constituents.

Data on interrogative clauses bring two clarifications in regard to the organization of the left periphery in Romanian: ForceP (versus FinP) is the CP structure in indirect interrogatives, relatives and wh-interrogatives; and in the presence of ForceP, Topic and Focus can move to the CP field. Diagnostic tests with *oare* help to determine the location of interrogative elements as well as the extent of Topic and Focus movement.

Thus, a contrast emerges between the FinP structure of declarative sentential complements and the ForceP structure of any other type of complement clauses. This contrast springs from the way in which the selectional information is resolved: a 'declarative' is the default option, and no syntactic marking occurs, so the CP is single headed; conversely, interrogatives or any clausal type that involves operator features in CP appears as the marked option, it needs a syntactic validation, so CP is double headed, with Force carrying the operator-like feature. Along this line of inquiry, the projection to FinP versus ForceP depends on the selection properties from the matrix, and not on the intrinsic features of lexical complementizers. The latter have the main function of checking the finiteness feature of Fin, irrespective of the complexity of CP. Therefore, it is not surprising that the same lexical complementizers seen in declarative sentential complements (e.g., *de*) may also occur in the more complex CP of relative or adjunct clauses.

Appendix: Movement to the oare field

This section dissects an interrogative sentence with *oare* to list the possible movements to the CP field. The assumptions are that *oare* occupies Fin and phrasal movement through adjunction, as in Kayne (1994, 1998), is available in the language.

An interrogative sentence such as (1) allows for *oare* insertion at the border of any constituent:

- (1) (oare) Crezi (oare) cî o sî calce (oare) cineva (oare) în groapa asta (oare)?
 Q think-2sg Q that will SA step-3sg Q someone Q in hole this Q
 ‘Do you think that someone will be stepping right in this hole?’

Readings differ in (1) according to the constituent questioned. Thus, in order from left to right: the first *oare* carries over the whole sentence, the second *oare* concerns only the matrix verb (i.e., do you think so or not), the third and fourth *oare* question the embedded verb (i.e., will there be a stepping action or not, done or not done by a person). The idea is that the reading is obtained in a configuration of structural agreement between *oare* and the questioned constituent, and this agreement may be obtained under the checking process, either by feature matching or by movement (Spec-head agreement).

Many variations of word order are possible in the presence of *oare*, in addition to the illustrations in (1). In (2) for example, the sentence may begin with a fronted constituent or may change the word order in the embedded clause.

- (2) a. Chiar în groapa asta (oare) crezi (oare) cî o sî calce (oare) cineva?
 right in hole this Q think Q that will SA step Q someone
 b. O sî calce (oare) cineva (oare) chiar în groapa asta crezi?
 will SA step Q someone Q right in hole this think

The following is a list of movements that may take place in the sentence in (1).

1. *Oare* is in Fin and selects IP-FinP
oare [_{IP} Crezi [_{FinP} cî o sî calce cineva în groapa asta?]]
2. The embedded FinP moves to adjoin to matrix IP; matrix IP moves to Spec,Fin-*oare*:
 [_{IP} Crezi t_{FinP}] *oare* [_{FinP} cî o sî calce cineva în groapa asta] [_{IP} t]
3. The embedded FinP has the inflected verb in IP and the rest of constituents in VP, in situ:
 [_{FinP} cî [_{IP} o sî calce [_{VP} cineva în groapa asta]]]
 VP moves cyclically to adjoin to matrix IP; matrix IP moves to Spec,Fin-*oare*:

4. $[_{IP} \text{ Crezi } \hat{c} \text{ } \text{o } \text{s} \hat{i} \text{ } \text{calce } t_{VP}] \text{ } oare [_{VP} \text{ } \text{cineva } \text{în } \text{groapa } \text{asta}] [_{IP} \text{ } t]?$
 The PP *în groapa asta* moves cyclically to adjoin to Topic position to matrix IP:
 $oare, [_{PP} \text{ } \text{în } \text{groapa } \text{asta}] [_{IP} \text{ } \text{crezi } [_{FinP} \text{ } \hat{c} \text{ } [_{IP} \text{ } \text{o } \text{s} \hat{i} \text{ } \text{calce } [_{VP} \text{ } \text{cineva } t_{PP}]]]]?$
 Then matrix IP may move to Spec,Fin-*oare*:
 $[_{IP} \text{ } \text{Crezi } [_{FinP} \text{ } \hat{c} \text{ } [_{IP} \text{ } \text{o } \text{s} \hat{i} \text{ } \text{calce } [_{VP} \text{ } \text{cineva } t_{PP}]]]]] \text{ } oare [_{PP} \text{ } \text{în } \text{groapa } \text{asta}] [_{IP} \text{ } t]?$
5. The entire IP-CP moves to Spec,Fin- *oare*:
 $[_{IP} \text{ } \text{Crezi } [_{FinP} \text{ } \hat{c} \text{ } \text{o } \text{s} \hat{i} \text{ } \text{calce } \text{ } \text{cineva } \text{în } \text{groapa } \text{asta}]] \text{ } oare [_{IP} \text{ } t]$

Basically, matrix IP is attracted to Spec,*oare*. The lexical content of this IP depends on operations that have previously applied in the sentence. Individual constituents may also target Spec,*oare*, for example the initial PP in (2a). Any other variation of word order, as seen in (2), may be analysed along this pattern.

Address of the Author

Humanities and Languages, University of New Brunswick, P.O.Box 5050,
 Saint John, NB, Canada E2L 4L5 <mota@unbisj.ca>.

Notes

* I am grateful to Dana Isac and two anonymous reviewers for useful comments and suggestions. Research for this paper was partly supported by grant UNB 37-8.

¹ Rizzi (2002) refines the composition of the CP field as follows:

ForceP....TopP....IntP....TopP.....FocusP.....ModP.....TopP.....FinP.....IP

For the purpose of this paper the first, more reduced, hierarchy is sufficient.

² Some of these complementizers occur in adjunct clauses. For example, *dac* and *de* appear in conditionals, *de* and *c* in consecutives, *ca* in purpose adjuncts. This paper does not discuss adjunct clauses. The assumption is that they must all project to ForceP, since they occur in non-selected context, and the features containing instructions for their interpretation (e.g., condition, consequence, purpose, etc.) are contained under Force.

³ Rare and colloquial.

⁴ *De* is rare in V- selected infinitivals, but obligatory in N- selected infinitivals.

⁵ *Oare* occurs in matrix and embedded interrogatives.

⁶ Some Rom. adverbs have a clitic status and appear in the clitic cluster preceding simple tenses or the auxiliary in complex tenses (e.g. *mai* 'more', *prea* 'too', *cam* 'approximately', *abia* 'hardly'). So the Rom. hierarchy for "lower" adverbs is:

(i) nu mai normal deja mereu complet tot bine
 not more usually already always completely all well

⁷ An MP analysis of clauses with non-indicative verbs is adopted in most current studies on Romanian syntax (Alboiu 2000, Avram 1999, Cornilescu 2000, Isac 2001, Motapanyane 1995, Pîrvulescu 2002). Some proposals extend the MP

analysis to indicative clauses (Cornilescu 2000), where M is non-lexical. Others exclude TP from subjunctives and infinitives, considering that MP recovers all the feature cluster generally associated with T, except for [+tense] (Pîrvulescu and Roberge 2000, Pîrvulescu 2002).

⁸ Mood markers have been shown (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Motapanyane 1995, a.o.) to behave differently from the complementizers listed in Table 1 (e.g. constituents may be fronted between a lexical complementizer and the verb, but not between a mood marker and the verb; also, the verb may carry different modal inflections under the same complementizer but not under the same mood marker). So it is clear that the elements in Table 1 cannot be ‘particles’ activating functional heads in the modal field of IP (as an anonymous reviewer was wondering).

⁹ Subject clitic doubling is the usual diagnostic test to identify the argumental subject position. Since this operation is not available in Romanian, we substitute the BQ preverbal subject test. Constraints on wellformedness of A'-quantificational chains ensures that such subjects must occupy an A-position, especially in the presence of concurrent constituents in contrastive Focus.

¹⁰ Hill (2002) shows that preverbal BQ subjects may cooccur with preverbal (contrastive) Focus constituents in TP with multiple Spec and that focus features parasite on tense features in these configurations.

¹¹ The etymology may shed light on the inherent properties of the complementizers, especially on the restricted occurrence of *ca*. Rosetti (1966) has *cî* < quod (frequent C in Latin); *ca* qua/quam (mixed status of preposition/complementizer in Latin). As a preposition, *ca* selects constituents with D features, including non-finite clauses with nominal properties (e.g., gerunds). Compare: *vorbește ca* [_{NP} *tine*] ‘she/he talks like you’ and *o consider ca* [_{IP} *având mult talent*] ‘I consider her having a lot of talent’.

¹² The data from Old Romanian in (12) are instrumental to show the low location of *cî*. Beyond that, the word order is not relevant to the forgoing discussion because of significant differences between Old and Modern Romanian w.r.t. constituent fronting and verb movement.

¹³ I am grateful to Dana Isac and an anonymous reviewer for bringing this type of examples to my attention.

¹⁴ There is a further argument for *sî*-V movement to Fin: a verb is consistent in its selectional properties. For example, the causative *las* ‘let’ is consistent in the selection of a FinP complement, although Fin may contain different lexical items (i.e., *de* or *sî*-V), as in (i).

(i) a. M-a l|sat [_{FinP} *de* m-am uitat la film.] ‘She let me see the movie.’

b. M-a lîsat [_{FinP} *sî* mî uit la film.] ‘She let me see the movie.’

So *sî*-V movement to Fin is also supported by its free alternation with *de* in this context

¹⁵ A comparison of *oare* with Bulg. *li* is proposed in Hill (2003).

¹⁶ For example, an anonymous reviewer who made a case for the colloquial constructions in (18) did not argue with the star in (24b), as it would be expected.

¹⁷ The in situ position of the adverb *mîne* ‘tomorrow’ is post-verbal, with the preposing possibilities shown in brackets:

(i) Speram ca (mîne) Ion (mîne) sî plece mîne mai devreme.

hoped-1sg that Ion SA go tomorrow more early

‘I was hoping that Ion would leave earlier tomorrow’

¹⁸ Adjacency between wh-phrases and verbs follows from properties that are independent of V-to-C, as argued in Alboiu 2000, Cornilescu 2000 (for Romanian) and Lambova 2001 (for Bulgarian).

¹⁹ The etymology of *oare* may also be taken as support to its definition as a head. According to Rosetti (1966), *oare*, with the variant *vare*, is the output of *volet*

'wants'. The verbal origin itself indicates a head-element, that changed the category. Interestingly, the same study shows that *volet* gave rise to elements he classifies as "conjunctions" (e.g., *si + volet ^seva^sau 'or'*). So his definition of *oare* as an adverb is inconsistent with the classification of the other derivatives from *volet* as connective (head) elements.

²⁰ Judgments are divided between speakers who accept the sequence *oare-dac̃i* and those who use *oare* only in complementary distribution with *dac̃i*. The author and an anonymous reviewer belong to the latter group, which would simplify the analysis. However, other (linguists) native speakers accept these elements co-occurring in the above sequence, as part of the colloquial language.

²¹ We presume that stylistic features may free-ride on the [+fin] feature and become visible for computation under the head Fin. *Oare*, specified for [+qu, +styl/fin], checks the [+fin] feature of Fin and the [styl] feature against a constituent (either by feature matching or by attracting it to Spec,Fin). The [+qu] feature must be checked through feature matching from Force.

²² See Alboiu (2000) for an exclusive IP treatment of relatives and wh-phrases in Romanian.

²³ Grammaticality with *oare* in (31) may be obtained if the embedded clause becomes direct speech (i.e., 'He asked: which one to vote for?'). Intonation is different for the two readings and *c̃i* must be deleted.

Bibliographical References

- ALBOIU, Gabriela (2000), *The Features of Movement in Romanian*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Manitoba.
- ALBOIU, Gabriela & Virginia MOTAPANYANE (2000), "The generative approach to Romanian grammar: an overview", in MOTAPANYANE (2000:1-48).
- AVRAM, Larisa (1999), *Auxiliaries and the structure of language*, Bucharest, EUB.
- CHOMSKY, Noam (1995), *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, Noam (2001), "Derivation by Phase", in KENSTOWICZ (2001: 1-52).
- CINQUE, Guglielmo (1990), *Types of A'-Dependencies*, Cambridge, MIT Press.
- CINQUE, Guglielmo (1999), *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. New York, OUP.
- CORNILESCU, Alexandra (2000), "The double subject construction in Romanian", in MOTAPANYANE (2000:83-134).
- DOBROVIE-SORIN, Carmen (1994), *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- FARKAS, Donka (1985), *Intensional descriptions and the Romance subjunctive Mood*, New York, Garland Publishing Inc.
- HAEGEMAN, Liliane, ed. (1997), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- HILL, Virginia (2002), "Adherent Focus", *Linguistic Inquiry* 33.1:164-172.
- HILL, Virginia (2003), "Discourse markers in interrogative clauses". *Balkanistica* 16: 71-96.
- ISAC, Dana (2001), "Mood and Force features in the languages of the Balkan", Paper presented at the Conference on Balkan Sprachbund Properties, University of Leiden, June 7-9, 2001.

- JOSEPH, Brian (2001), "On defining 'word' in Greek and other Balkan languages", Paper presented at Acme Balkanica Conference, Concordia University, Montréal, April 27-29, 2001.
- KAYNE, Richard (1989), "Facets of Romance Past Participle Agreement", in BENINCA (1989:85-103).
- KAYNE, Richard (1994), *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge, MIT Press.
- KAYNE, Richard (1998), "Overt vs. Covert Movement", *Syntax* 1.2:128-191.
- KENSTOWICZ, M, ed. (2001), *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- LAMBOVA, Mariana (2001), "On A-Bar Movements in Bulgarian and their Interaction", General Examination Paper, University of Connecticut.
- LARSON, R. (1988), "On the double object construction", *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:335-391.
- MOTAPANYANE, Virginia, ed. (2000), *Comparative studies in Romanian syntax*, Oxford, Elsevier.
- PIRVULESCU, Mihaela (2002), *Le concept de paradigme et la morphologie verbale*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto.
- PIRVULESCU, Mihaela and Yves ROBERGE (2000), "The syntax and morphology of Romanian imperatives", in MOTAPANYANE (2000:295-314).
- POLLOCK, Jean-Yves (1989), "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:365-424.
- RIZZI, Luigi (1997), "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in HAEGEMAN (1997:281-339).
- ROSETTI, Alexandru (1966), *Istoria limbii române*, vol. 4-5-6, București: Editura TM tiin ificî.